Management Strategies and Engineering Sciences

Vol. 5. No. 1. Pages 1-11

Engineering Project Governance: A Review of Policies, Structures, and Performance Outcomes

Najmeh Jafari[1]
Mehran Moradi[2*]

1. Department of Economics, Suleiman Mosque Branch, Islamic Azad University, Suleiman Mosque, Iran
2. Department of Educational Sciences, Bandar Abbas Branch, Islamic Azad University, Bandar Abbas, Iran

Abstract

Engineering project governance is crucial in determining the success of projects by influencing decision-making processes, resource allocation, and stakeholder engagement. This narrative review provides a comprehensive examination of the governance structures and policies applied in engineering projects, focusing on their impact on performance outcomes. The review synthesizes findings from a wide array of studies, identifying key governance structures such as hierarchical, matrix, and network-based models, and analyzing how these structures distribute roles and responsibilities within projects. It also explores the direct and indirect effects of governance on performance outcomes, distinguishing between quantitative measures such as cost, time, and quality, and qualitative factors such as stakeholder satisfaction and team morale. The review highlights the critical importance of aligning governance frameworks with project goals, as well as the need for flexible and adaptive governance structures in dynamic project environments. The findings underscore the necessity for further research on the long-term impacts of governance choices and the integration of emerging trends in governance practices. This review contributes to both academic and practical understanding of engineering project governance, offering insights that can guide the design and implementation of effective governance frameworks in future projects.

Keywords: engineering project governance, governance structures, project performance outcomes, hierarchical structures, matrix structures, network-based governance, stakeholder engagement, project management.

Introduction

Effective governance in engineering projects is a critical determinant of project success, influencing outcomes such as cost efficiency, timely delivery, and quality assurance. In the complex and dynamic environment of engineering endeavors, governance structures and policies provide the necessary framework for decision-making, risk management, and stakeholder engagement (Müller, 2017). The increasing scale and complexity of engineering projects in recent decades have underscored the importance of robust governance mechanisms to navigate challenges and ensure alignment with organizational objectives and societal expectations (Ahola et al., 2014).

The primary purpose of this review is to systematically examine the existing literature on engineering project governance, with a particular focus on the interplay between governance policies, structures, and performance outcomes. By synthesizing findings from diverse studies, this review aims to identify prevailing trends, theoretical underpinnings, and practical implications that can inform both academic inquiry and industry practice. The central research question guiding this review is: "How do various governance policies and structures influence performance outcomes in engineering projects?"

The scope of this review encompasses a comprehensive analysis of governance frameworks applied within engineering projects across different sectors and geographical contexts. It delves into specific aspects such as regulatory, contractual, and organizational policies, as well as hierarchical and network-based governance structures. Furthermore, the review explores performance outcomes including project efficiency, quality standards, stakeholder satisfaction, and sustainability considerations. The temporal boundary of the literature examined spans studies published up to 2021, ensuring the inclusion of contemporary insights while acknowledging foundational research in the field.

This review holds significant relevance for both academic and practical domains. Academically, it contributes to a deeper understanding of the conceptual and theoretical dimensions of project governance, identifying gaps in current knowledge and suggesting directions for future research. Practically, the insights derived can aid project managers, policymakers, and stakeholders in designing and implementing effective governance frameworks that enhance project performance and mitigate risks (Too & Weaver, 2014). By bridging theory and practice, this review seeks to facilitate the development of governance models that are adaptable, resilient, and conducive to successful engineering project outcomes.

Methodology

The first step in the methodology involved an extensive literature search across multiple academic databases, including but not limited to, Scopus, Web of Science, IEEE Xplore, and Google Scholar. The search was conducted using a combination of keywords such as "engineering project governance," "governance policies," "governance structures," and "project performance outcomes." To ensure comprehensiveness, the search was not limited to a specific time frame, allowing the inclusion of both foundational and contemporary studies. The selection criteria for articles included relevance to the topic, contribution to the understanding of governance in engineering projects, and the presence of empirical or theoretical insights.

After gathering the relevant literature, the articles were carefully reviewed and categorized based on their focus on governance policies, structures, or performance outcomes. This categorization facilitated

a structured analysis, enabling the identification of key themes and trends within each category. The analysis was descriptive in nature, aiming to provide a nuanced understanding of how governance is conceptualized and implemented in engineering projects, as well as how it impacts project performance.

In addition to categorizing the literature, the review process also involved a critical evaluation of the methodologies employed in the selected studies. This allowed for an assessment of the rigor and validity of the findings reported in the literature, ensuring that the conclusions drawn in this review are based on robust evidence. The evaluation also helped in identifying any methodological gaps or inconsistencies in the existing research, which are discussed in the context of future research directions.

The synthesis of the reviewed literature was conducted with the goal of identifying the relationships between governance policies, structures, and performance outcomes. This involved comparing and contrasting findings from different studies, as well as integrating insights from various theoretical frameworks. Where possible, the review also sought to draw on case studies and empirical examples to illustrate how governance practices are applied in real-world engineering projects and the resultant impact on performance outcomes.

The narrative approach taken in this review allowed for a detailed exploration of the complexities and nuances of engineering project governance. Rather than focusing solely on quantitative metrics, this methodology emphasized the qualitative aspects of governance, such as the roles of stakeholders, decision-making processes, and the organizational context in which governance practices are embedded. This approach was deemed appropriate given the multifaceted nature of governance and the need to consider both formal structures and informal practices in understanding its impact on project success.

Theoretical Framework and Conceptual Background

Governance, in the context of projects, refers to the frameworks and processes that guide decision-making, accountability, and control to achieve desired objectives (Turner, 2018). Specifically, project governance encompasses the mechanisms through which project activities are directed and regulated to ensure alignment with organizational strategy and stakeholder interests (Müller & Lecoeuvre, 2014). Policies within this framework constitute the formalized rules and guidelines that dictate acceptable practices and procedures, serving as essential tools for standardization and compliance (Bekker, 2015). Structures pertain to the organizational configurations and hierarchies that facilitate coordination, communication, and oversight within the project environment (Ahola et al., 2014). Performance outcomes are the measurable results of project activities, including dimensions such as efficiency, effectiveness, quality, and stakeholder satisfaction (Too & Weaver, 2014).

Several theoretical perspectives underpin the study of project governance, providing diverse lenses through which governance dynamics can be understood and analyzed. Agency theory is a prominent framework that examines the relationships and contractual arrangements between principals (owners) and agents (managers), highlighting issues of information asymmetry and the need for monitoring and incentives to align interests (Eisenhardt, 1989). In the context of engineering projects, agency theory underscores the importance of governance mechanisms that mitigate risks associated with delegating authority and ensure accountability (Winch, 2017).

Stewardship theory offers an alternative perspective by positing that agents are inherently motivated to act in the best interests of principals, emphasizing trust, empowerment, and shared goals

(Davis et al., 1997). This theory suggests that governance structures fostering collaboration and intrinsic motivation can enhance project performance by leveraging the commitment and expertise of project participants (Hernandez, 2012). Stakeholder theory further expands the governance discourse by recognizing the diverse interests and influences of all parties involved in or affected by the project, advocating for inclusive and responsive governance practices that balance competing demands and foster sustainable outcomes (Freeman, 1984; Aaltonen & Kujala, 2016).

The interplay between governance policies, structures, and performance outcomes in engineering projects is complex and multifaceted. Effective governance policies provide clear guidelines and standards that inform decision-making processes and operational procedures, thereby enhancing consistency and reducing uncertainty (Bekker, 2015). These policies are operationalized through governance structures that delineate roles, responsibilities, and lines of authority, facilitating efficient coordination and control mechanisms (Ahola et al., 2014). When well-designed and appropriately implemented, the synergy between policies and structures contributes to improved performance outcomes by ensuring that project activities are conducted efficiently, risks are managed effectively, and stakeholder expectations are met or exceeded (Too & Weaver, 2014). Conversely, deficiencies or misalignments in governance frameworks can lead to project delays, cost overruns, quality issues, and stakeholder dissatisfaction, underscoring the critical importance of robust governance in engineering project success (Müller, 2017).

Review of Governance Policies in Engineering Projects

Governance policies in engineering projects serve as foundational instruments that establish the parameters within which projects are planned, executed, and controlled. These policies can be broadly categorized into regulatory, contractual, and organizational dimensions, each playing a distinct role in shaping project governance frameworks.

Regulatory policies encompass the laws, standards, and compliance requirements imposed by governmental and industry bodies that govern engineering practices. These policies ensure that projects adhere to safety standards, environmental regulations, and ethical norms, thereby protecting public interests and maintaining industry integrity (Loosemore & Lim, 2015). For instance, construction projects must comply with building codes and environmental impact assessments, which dictate specific procedures and performance criteria that must be met (Zeng et al., 2013). Regulatory policies provide a compulsory baseline that all engineering projects must follow, influencing project planning and execution through mandatory compliance.

Contractual policies refer to the agreements and contractual arrangements between project stakeholders, including clients, contractors, suppliers, and consultants. These policies define the scope of work, responsibilities, deliverables, timelines, and financial terms, thereby establishing the operational and legal framework for project execution (Turner & Simister, 2014). Different contractual models, such as fixed-price, cost-plus, and design-build contracts, present varied governance implications by distributing risks and responsibilities differently among parties involved (Chen et al., 2012). Effective contractual policies are essential for clarifying expectations, facilitating coordination, and providing mechanisms for dispute resolution, all of which are critical for project success.

Organizational policies involve the internal rules and procedures established by the organizations undertaking engineering projects. These policies govern aspects such as project management

methodologies, quality assurance processes, risk management strategies, and stakeholder engagement practices (Too & Weaver, 2014). Organizational policies are tailored to the specific context and strategic objectives of the organization, providing a customized governance framework that aligns project activities with broader organizational goals (Müller & Lecoeuvre, 2014). For example, adopting agile project management policies can enhance flexibility and responsiveness in dynamic project environments, thereby improving performance outcomes (Conforto et al., 2016).

The development and implementation of governance policies in engineering projects involve systematic processes that require careful planning, stakeholder involvement, and continuous monitoring. Policy development typically starts with identifying the needs and objectives of the project, followed by drafting policy documents that articulate the necessary guidelines and procedures (Bekker, 2015). Stakeholder consultation is a critical component of this process, ensuring that the policies consider diverse perspectives and gain broad support (Aaltonen & Kujala, 2016). Once developed, implementation involves disseminating the policies, training relevant personnel, and integrating the policies into project management systems and practices (Too & Weaver, 2014). Effective implementation also necessitates establishing monitoring and enforcement mechanisms to ensure compliance and facilitate ongoing improvement through feedback and learning (Ahola et al., 2014).

The impact of governance policies on project performance outcomes is substantial and multifaceted. Well-designed and effectively implemented policies contribute to improved efficiency by providing clear guidelines and reducing ambiguities in project execution (Turner, 2018). For instance, comprehensive risk management policies enable proactive identification and mitigation of potential issues, thereby preventing delays and cost overruns (Ward & Chapman, 2013). Quality assurance policies ensure that project outputs meet specified standards, enhancing reliability and stakeholder satisfaction (Zeng et al., 2013). Additionally, robust stakeholder engagement policies foster transparent and inclusive communication, which can lead to increased trust and support from stakeholders, further contributing to project success (Aaltonen & Kujala, 2016).

Conversely, inadequate or poorly implemented governance policies can negatively affect project outcomes. Ambiguous or overly rigid policies may lead to confusion, inefficiencies, and resistance among project teams, hindering effective execution (Loosemore & Lim, 2015). Failure to comply with regulatory policies can result in legal penalties, reputational damage, and project delays (Chen et al., 2012). Moreover, insufficient stakeholder engagement policies can lead to misunderstandings, conflicts, and a lack of support, jeopardizing project objectives (Müller, 2017).

Several challenges are commonly encountered in the development and implementation of governance policies in engineering projects. One significant challenge is ensuring the adaptability of policies in the face of changing project environments and requirements. Rigid policies may not accommodate unforeseen circumstances, leading to inefficiencies and project disruptions (Conforto et al., 2016). Another challenge involves aligning diverse stakeholder interests and expectations, which can be complex given the varying priorities and perspectives involved (Aaltonen & Kujala, 2016). Ensuring compliance and effective enforcement of policies also poses difficulties, particularly in large and complex projects with multiple actors and layers of subcontracting (Loosemore & Lim, 2015).

To address these challenges, several best practices have been identified in the literature. Incorporating flexibility into policy design allows for adjustments and responsiveness to changing project conditions, enhancing resilience and effectiveness (Conforto et al., 2016). Engaging stakeholders early and throughout the policy development process fosters collaboration and buy-in, facilitating smoother implementation and adherence (Müller & Lecoeuvre, 2014). Establishing clear and transparent monitoring and evaluation mechanisms ensures accountability and enables continuous improvement through feedback and learning (Too & Weaver, 2014). Additionally, fostering a culture of ethical conduct and compliance within organizations supports the successful adoption and enforcement of governance policies, contributing to overall project success (Zeng et al., 2013).

Review of Governance Structures in Engineering Projects

Governance structures in engineering projects are critical frameworks that organize, manage, and oversee project activities, ensuring alignment with broader organizational goals and stakeholder expectations. These structures can vary widely, with some of the most common being hierarchical, matrix, and network-based governance structures.

Hierarchical governance structures are characterized by a clear chain of command where decision-making authority is concentrated at the top levels of the organization. This structure provides a well-defined framework for roles and responsibilities, with decisions flowing from senior management down to project teams. While hierarchical structures offer clear lines of authority and accountability, they can also be rigid, leading to slower decision-making processes and reduced flexibility (Winch, 2017). This type of structure is particularly effective in projects that require strict compliance with regulations and where tasks are well-defined and predictable.

Matrix governance structures, on the other hand, blend aspects of both hierarchical and functional structures, allowing for greater flexibility and resource sharing across projects. In a matrix structure, project managers share authority with functional managers, leading to dual lines of accountability. This can enhance communication and collaboration across different departments, but it also introduces complexity in managing conflicts of interest and prioritizing tasks (Kerzner, 2013). Matrix structures are commonly used in large engineering projects where cross-functional expertise is essential, such as in construction or aerospace projects.

Network-based governance structures represent a more decentralized approach, characterized by a web of interconnected teams and stakeholders who collaborate to achieve project objectives. In such structures, decision-making is often distributed among various nodes, allowing for rapid adaptation to changing project needs and greater innovation (Grabher & Powell, 2004). However, the lack of centralized control can pose challenges in maintaining coherence and alignment with overall project goals. This structure is particularly useful in projects involving multiple organizations or those that require extensive collaboration across geographical boundaries, such as international infrastructure projects.

The distribution of roles and responsibilities within these governance structures significantly impacts project outcomes. In hierarchical structures, roles are typically well-defined, with each team member understanding their specific duties and the authority they report to (Müller, 2017). This clarity can enhance accountability and efficiency, especially in projects with stringent regulatory requirements. In contrast, matrix structures require individuals to navigate dual reporting lines, which can lead to

conflicts but also foster a more collaborative environment where functional expertise is leveraged across projects (Kerzner, 2013). Network-based structures, by their nature, distribute roles more broadly, often leading to shared responsibilities and collaborative decision-making processes. While this can enhance creativity and responsiveness, it can also lead to challenges in maintaining consistency and control over project direction (Winch, 2017).

The influence of governance structures on project management is profound. Hierarchical structures tend to centralize decision-making, which can streamline processes but may also slow down responses to emergent issues (Turner, 2018). Conversely, matrix structures distribute decision-making power, which can enhance flexibility and allow for more nuanced decision-making processes that consider various functional perspectives. However, the complexity of managing such structures can lead to inefficiencies if not properly coordinated (Kerzner, 2013). Network-based structures, with their decentralized approach, enable rapid decision-making and adaptation, which is critical in dynamic project environments. However, they also require robust communication channels and a strong culture of collaboration to avoid fragmentation and misalignment (Grabher & Powell, 2004).

Case studies from the literature provide concrete examples of how governance structures impact project outcomes. For instance, a study on the governance of large-scale construction projects in the UK found that hierarchical structures were effective in ensuring compliance with safety and regulatory standards but were less effective in managing stakeholder engagement and innovation (Winch, 2017). In contrast, a case study on aerospace projects highlighted the benefits of matrix structures in fostering cross-functional collaboration and innovation, though it also pointed to challenges in managing conflicts between project and functional priorities (Kerzner, 2013). Another study on international infrastructure projects demonstrated the effectiveness of network-based structures in managing complex, multi-organizational projects, though it also noted the difficulties in maintaining coordination and control across diverse stakeholder groups (Grabher & Powell, 2004).

Analysis of Performance Outcomes

Performance outcomes in engineering projects are multifaceted, encompassing a range of quantitative and qualitative measures that reflect the success or failure of project objectives. These outcomes can include traditional metrics such as cost, time, and quality, as well as broader considerations like stakeholder satisfaction, environmental impact, and long-term sustainability.

Quantitative performance outcomes are often the primary focus in engineering projects, with cost, time, and quality being the most commonly measured parameters. Cost performance involves assessing whether the project was completed within the allocated budget, while time performance evaluates whether the project met its deadlines. Quality performance, on the other hand, examines whether the project outputs meet the predefined standards and specifications (Atkinson, 1999). These metrics are crucial in evaluating the efficiency and effectiveness of project execution, and they provide a clear basis for comparing the success of different projects or approaches.

Qualitative performance outcomes, while sometimes less emphasized, are equally important in providing a holistic view of project success. These outcomes include stakeholder satisfaction, which reflects the degree to which the needs and expectations of all project stakeholders are met (Davis, 2014). Team morale and organizational learning are also significant qualitative outcomes, as they influence the

long-term capabilities of the organization to manage future projects. Furthermore, the environmental and social impacts of engineering projects are increasingly recognized as critical performance indicators, particularly in the context of sustainable development goals (Shen et al., 2010).

The link between governance and performance outcomes is well-established in the literature. Governance policies and structures directly influence how project resources are allocated, risks are managed, and decisions are made, all of which impact performance outcomes (Müller & Lecoeuvre, 2014). For example, stringent governance policies on risk management can lead to better cost and time performance by preventing or mitigating unforeseen issues that could derail the project (Ward & Chapman, 2013). Similarly, a well-defined governance structure that facilitates clear communication and efficient decision-making can enhance project quality and stakeholder satisfaction by ensuring that project activities are aligned with objectives and expectations (Kerzner, 2013).

Quantitative outcomes such as cost savings and project duration are often directly affected by the efficiency of governance structures. A hierarchical structure, with its clear lines of authority, can be effective in controlling costs and adhering to timelines, especially in projects with well-defined tasks and processes (Turner, 2018). However, in projects requiring high levels of innovation or stakeholder involvement, such a structure might hinder performance by limiting flexibility and slowing down decision-making. On the other hand, matrix and network-based structures, which promote collaboration and flexibility, can lead to better qualitative outcomes such as stakeholder trust and team morale, though they may face challenges in maintaining cost and time efficiency due to the complexity of managing multiple lines of communication and authority (Kerzner, 2013; Grabher & Powell, 2004).

The synthesis of findings from the literature highlights several key relationships between governance and performance outcomes. First, the alignment of governance policies with project goals is critical for achieving desired outcomes. Projects with governance frameworks that are closely aligned with their strategic objectives tend to perform better across both quantitative and qualitative dimensions (Müller & Lecoeuvre, 2014). Second, the adaptability of governance structures is a significant factor in project success, particularly in dynamic environments where project requirements may change rapidly. Structures that allow for flexibility and responsiveness, such as matrix and network-based governance, are more likely to achieve positive outcomes in such contexts (Kerzner, 2013). Finally, the importance of stakeholder engagement in governance cannot be overstated; projects that effectively involve stakeholders in governance processes tend to have higher levels of satisfaction and support, leading to better overall performance (Davis, 2014).

Discussion

The findings of this review underscore the critical role of governance in determining the success of engineering projects. The analysis reveals that the choice of governance structure—whether hierarchical, matrix, or network-based—has significant implications for both project management and performance outcomes. Hierarchical structures, while offering clear lines of authority and control, may hinder flexibility and innovation, which are often necessary for complex or rapidly changing projects. In contrast, matrix and network-based structures promote collaboration and adaptability, though they also introduce challenges in coordination and conflict management.

Comparing these findings with existing literature, it is evident that there is no one-size-fits-all approach to governance in engineering projects. The effectiveness of a governance structure depends largely on the specific context of the project, including its size, complexity, and stakeholder environment. For instance, Müller and Lecoeuvre (2014) emphasize the importance of aligning governance structures with project goals, a theme that is consistently echoed across studies. Similarly, the work of Kerzner (2013) highlights the benefits and challenges of matrix structures, particularly in projects requiring extensive cross-functional collaboration.

Despite the rich insights provided by existing research, there are notable gaps in the literature that warrant further exploration. One such gap is the need for more empirical studies examining the long-term impact of different governance structures on project performance. While many studies focus on immediate project outcomes, there is limited understanding of how governance choices affect organizational learning and future project capabilities. Additionally, there is a need for research that explores governance in the context of emerging trends, such as digital transformation and sustainability, which are increasingly relevant in today's engineering projects.

From a practical perspective, the findings of this review offer valuable implications for policymakers and project managers. For policymakers, the review highlights the importance of developing governance frameworks that are flexible and adaptable, capable of responding to the unique challenges of each project. For project managers, the review suggests that careful consideration of governance structures can enhance project outcomes by aligning resources and decision-making processes with project goals. Moreover, the review emphasizes the importance of stakeholder engagement in governance, which can lead to higher levels of satisfaction and support, ultimately contributing to project success.

Conclusion

This review has provided a comprehensive analysis of governance in engineering projects, focusing on the roles of governance policies and structures in shaping project outcomes. The findings highlight the critical importance of selecting governance structures that align with the specific needs and goals of the project, as well as the broader organizational context. Hierarchical, matrix, and network-based structures each offer distinct advantages and challenges, and their effectiveness depends on how well they are suited to the project's requirements.

The contribution of this review lies in its synthesis of existing research, offering a nuanced understanding of how governance influences project performance. By bridging the gap between theory and practice, the review provides insights that can inform the design and implementation of governance frameworks in engineering projects. This work also identifies key areas for future research, particularly in the exploration of long-term impacts and the integration of emerging trends into governance practices.

In conclusion, effective governance is essential for the success of engineering projects. The ability to navigate complex stakeholder environments, manage risks, and adapt to changing conditions is contingent on the robustness of governance structures and policies. As engineering projects continue to evolve in scale and complexity, the need for innovative and responsive governance frameworks will only grow, making this an increasingly important area of study and practice.

References

Aaltonen, K., & Kujala, J. (2016). Towards an improved understanding of project stakeholder landscapes. *International Journal of Project Management*, 34(8), 1537-1552. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2016.08.009

Ahola, T., Ruuska, I., Artto, K., & Kujala, J. (2014). What is project governance and what are its origins? *International Journal of Project Management*, 32(8), 1321-1332. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2013.09.005

Atkinson, R. (1999). Project management: Cost, time and quality, two best guesses and a phenomenon, its time to accept other success criteria. *International Journal of Project Management*, 17(6), 337-342. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0263-7863(98)00069-6

Bekker, M. C. (2015). Project governance: "Schools of thought". *South African Journal of Economic and Management Sciences*, 18(4), 638-656. https://doi.org/10.4102/sajems.v18i4.1392

Chen, G., Zhang, G., Xie, Y., & Jin, X. (2012). Overview of alliancing research and practice in the construction industry. *Architectural Engineering and Design Management*, 8(2), 103-119. https://doi.org/10.1080/17452007.2012.659506

Conforto, E. C., Salum, F., Amaral, D. C., da Silva, S. L., & de Almeida, L. F. M. (2016). Can agile project management be adopted by industries other than software development? *Project Management Journal*, 45(3), 21-34. https://doi.org/10.1002/pmj.21448

Davis, J. H., Schoorman, F. D., & Donaldson, L. (1997). Toward a stewardship theory of management. *Academy of Management Review*, 22(1), 20-47. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1997.9707180258

Davis, K. (2014). Different stakeholder groups and their perceptions of project success. *International Journal of Project Management*, 32(2), 189-201. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2013.02.006

Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Agency theory: An assessment and review. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(1), 57-74. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1989.4279003

Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Cambridge University Press.

Grabher, G., & Powell, W. W. (Eds.). (2004). *Networks*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Hernandez, M. (2012). Toward an understanding of the psychology of stewardship. *Academy of Management Review*, 37(2), 172-193. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2010.0363

Kerzner, H. (2013). *Project management: A systems approach to planning, scheduling, and controlling* (11th ed.). Wiley.

Loosemore, M., & Lim, B. T. H. (2015). Inter-organizational unfairness in the construction industry. *Construction Management and Economics*, 33(4), 310-326. https://doi.org/10.1080/01446193.2015.1059955

Müller, R. (2017). Project governance. In R. Müller (Ed.), *Project governance* (pp. 1-14). Gower Publishing.

Müller, R., & Lecoeuvre, L. (2014). Operationalizing governance categories of projects. *International Journal of Project Management*, 32(8), 1346-1357. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2014.02.008

Shen, L. Y., Wu, Y. Z., & Zhang, X. (2010). Key assessment indicators for the sustainability of infrastructure projects. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 136(6), 703-710. https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)CO.1943-7862.0000162

Too, E. G., & Weaver, P. (2014). The management of project management: A conceptual framework for project governance. *International Journal of Project Management*, 32(8), 1382-1394. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2013.07.006

Turner, J. R. (2018). The governance of project management: A case study. *International Journal of Project Management*, 36(1), 95-110. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2017.07.018

Turner, J. R., & Simister, S. J. (2014). Project contract management and a theory of organization. *International Journal of Project Management*, 32(8), 1367-1381. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2013.07.006

Ward, S., & Chapman, C. (2013). Risk management perspective on the project life cycle. *International Journal of Project Management*, 31(8), 1149-1152. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2013.09.001

Winch, G. M. (2017). *Project management: Achieving competitive advantage* (4th ed.). Pearson Education.

Zeng, S. X., Tam, V. W. Y., Tam, C. M., & Deng, Z. M. (2013). Towards effective quality assurance in building construction. *Building and Environment*, 38(3), 645-656. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0360-1323(02)00240-6