

**VALUE CO-CREATION IN THE PROJECT MANAGEMENT INDUSTRY IN SOUTH
AFRICA: IMPLEMENTATION EXAMINED**

Department of Construction Economics and Management



Mpelegeng Mologadi Promise Moshidi

The copyright of this thesis vests in the author. No quotation from it or information derived from it is to be published without full acknowledgement of the source. The thesis is to be used for private study or non-commercial research purposes only.

Published by the University of Cape Town (UCT) in terms of the non-exclusive license granted to UCT by the author.



Acknowledgements:

I thank the Lord for His grace, mercy and guidance that carried me through this MSc in Project Management journey. I thank my supervisor Professor Keith Cattell for the long hours spent coaching me, helping me and being patient throughout the journey. You are a legend.

I thank my mother Makubu Sylvia Moshidi and sister Onkarabile Valentia Moshidi for the unwavering support. I thank my brother Tumisho Mahlase for the constant support. I thank my fiancé Thabiso Samuel Moloto for the love and support he gave me throughout the journey. This thesis is dedicated to my late dad Simon Kgoroshi Moshidi. I know you are proud that I am following your footsteps. I dedicate this thesis to my son Lehumo Monaheng Oaratwa Moshidi. Thank you for allowing me to fulfil my dreams and being my motivation.

UNIVERSITY OF CAPE TOWN



Construction Economics and Management

PLAGIARISM DECLARATION

Declaration

1. I know that plagiarism is wrong. Plagiarism is to use another's work and pretend that it is one's own.
2. I have used the Harvard convention for citation and referencing. Each contribution to, and quotation in, this assignment from the work(s) of other people has been attributed and has been cited and referenced.
3. This assignment is my own work.
4. I have not allowed, and will not allow, anyone to copy my work with the intention of passing it off as his or her own work.

Promise Moshidi

Signature:

Date: 07 March 2021

Signed by candidate

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT	i
LIST OF TABLES	ii
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
1.1. Introduction	1
1.2. Background	2
1.3. Problem Statement	4
1.4. Research Questions	4
1.5. Research Aim	4
1.6. Research Proposition	4
1.7. Research Objectives	5
1.8. Research Method	5
1.9. Scope and Limitation	6
1.10. Chapter outline	6
Chapter 2: Literature review	7
2.1. Introduction	7
2.2. Theoretical Framework	7
2.2.1. Service-dominant logic theory	7
2.3. Define value co-creation	8
2.4. Value co-creation in South Africa	9
2.5 Project Management	10
2.6. Integrating value co-creation in Project Management	11
2.6.1. Customer value co-creation	12
2.6.2. Firm value co-creation	15
2.6.3. Value Co-creation interaction	16
2.7. Managerial outcomes of Value co-creation	17
2.8. Consumer motives for value co-creation	19
2.8.2. Curiosity motives	20
2.8.3. Self-efficacy motives	21
2.8.4. Individual motives	21
2.9. Impediments to the implementation of value co-creation	22
2.9.1. Change in attitude	22
2.9.2. Secrecy and ownership of intellectual property	22
2.9.3. Information overload	23
2.9.4. Word of mouth	23

2.9.5. Poor communication.....	24
2.10. Overcoming barriers to the implementation of value co-creation.....	24
2.11. Summary	25
Chapter 3: Research Methodology.....	26
3.1. Introduction	26
3.2. Research approach.....	26
3.3. Research paradigm.....	26
3.4. Case study	27
3.5. Data Analysis and Interpretation.....	28
3.6. Reliability and validity.....	29
3.6.1. Credibility.....	29
3.6.2. Dependability	29
3.6.3. Transferability.....	29
3.6.4. Confirmability.....	30
3.7. Pilot study	30
3.8. Ethical considerations	30
3.8.1. Permission.....	30
3.8.2. Informed consent.....	30
3.8.3. The right to withdraw	31
3.8.4. Confidentiality.....	31
3.8.5. Protection of participants	31
Chapter 4: Presentation, interpretation and discussions of findings.....	32
4.1. Introduction	32
4.2. Demographic details	32
4.3. Impediments hindering value co-creation in project management	33
4.3.1. Project scope changes	34
4.3.2. Poor communication.....	35
4.3.3. Lack of performance standards.....	35
4.3.4. Lack of knowledge.....	36
4.3.5. Unrealistic expectations.....	37
4.3.6. Stakeholder involvement	37
4.4. Impact of ineffective management of value outcomes	38
4.4.1. Bad company reputation.....	39
4.4.2. Financial implications.....	39
4.4.3. Conflict of interests	40
4.4.4. Poor quality of work	41

4.5. Managing impediments that hinder value co-creation in project management ..	41
4.5.1. Risk assessment	42
4.5.2. Setting realistic goals	43
4.5.3. Value interaction	43
4.5.4. Stakeholder accountability.....	44
4.5.5. Project management training	44
4.6 Discussions	45
4.7 Conclusion	48
Chapter 5: Conclusions and recommendations	48
5.1. Introduction	48
5.2. Conclusions.....	48
5.3. Recommendations	52
5.4 Suggestions for Future Research	53
REFERENCES	54
ANNEXURE	60
ANNEXTURE A: ETHICAL CLEARANCE	60
ANNEXTURE B: ORGANISATION APPROVAL LETTER	61
ANNEXTURE C: INTERVIEW GUIDE	62

ABSTRACT

Value creation has emerged as an integral part of project management to necessitate customer satisfaction, profitability, and long-lasting value. Value creation in the context of construction is related to the benefits that can be realised after the project is completed. There is little information in the literature which articulates the impediments that hinder the adoption of value co-creation for the benefit of all stakeholders. The study is concerned about why value co-creation is not a common practice in the South African project management industry. The study adopted an explanatory research design based on qualitative approach to gather data using semi-structured interview from ten (10) participants selected using purposive sampling. The study was based on a single case study and interviews were audio recorded. Data was analysed using thematic analysis using manual method on Microsoft Word document. Findings identified that impediments that hinder value co-creation in project management include project scope changes, lack of performance standards and poor communication, stakeholder involvement, lack of knowledge and unrealistic expectations. The impact of ineffective management of value outcomes include bad company reputation and financial implications. Ways to manage impediments that hinder value co-creation in project management include risk assessment, setting realistic goals, value interaction, and accountability. Recommendations are made to the project managers, project clients, project stakeholders and future researchers in the field of Project Management.

LIST OF TABLES

Table 4.1. Demographic details.....	38
Table 4.2. Impediments hindering value co-creation in project management.....	40
Table: 4.3: Impact of ineffective management of value outcomes.....	44
Table 4.4. Managing impediments that hinder value co-creation in project management.....	47

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1. Introduction

Value creation has emerged as an integral part of project management to necessitate customer satisfaction, profitability, and long-lasting value. Value creation in the context of construction is related to the benefits that can be realised after the project is completed (Haddadi, Johansen and Andersen 2016). Customer needs and strategic goals are elements in value creation for the effective implementation of project management (Cohen, Rozenes and Horowitz 2017).

Globalisation has increased the competition and demand for high quality products and services, and companies are cautious to engage in creative ways of conducting their business (Liu, Fellows and Chan 2014). Innovation and creativity have become bearers of companies' competitive advantage and essential drivers for value co-creation. Innovation may be fundamental to project management companies that need to implement effective value co-creation to be more competitive in the market (Zhang 2017). Companies that invest in information acquisition for value co-creation gain vital knowledge about the customer and market needs (Claudy, Garcia and O'Driscoll 2015). External sources of information have potential to increase knowledge flow in project management companies to elevate their levels of innovation and performance. The challenge that can be faced by project management company in acquiring innovative information is the customers' lack of willingness to participate in the value co-creation process, and lack of internal ability to acquire information from external sources (Chen, Tsou and Ching 2011). Zwikael and Smyrk (2011) suggested that value co-creation relies on consultation with relevant stakeholders to achieve project management outcomes as: relevant project management team; supplier satisfaction; performance management; common purpose; customer satisfaction; open communication; business-oriented relationship with clients; and the satisfaction of stakeholders.

Value co-creation incorporates the mutual beneficial relationship existing between the customers and suppliers to achieve desirable outcomes of the project (Acar 2018). Effective value co-creation requires the integration of appropriate and relevant value required for a positive outcome of the project management process (Cossío-Silva *et al.* 2016). This clearly shows that value co-creation is an important process whereby

the value co-created must be clearly appropriate and relevant. Communication channels and platforms need to be effective among the stakeholders to embrace and implement the proposed value (Chen, Tsou and Ching 2011). The communication process should ensure mutual understanding and clarity on proposed value between the stakeholders. According to Salomonson *et al.* (2013), the effective communication lies in the key activities which include customer focus, discernment and receptivity which brings the customer and supplier together based on understanding of common valued co-created.

1.2. Background

Increasing numbers of companies implement a creative business by looking at new perspectives and practices by developing a new creative culture. Those companies that cultivate creativity are more likely to gain advantages compared to the less creative companies. A company has potential to improve its revenue and competitive advantage through creativity that incorporates the participation of customers (Forrester Consulting 2014). A study in 2016 highlights that 90% of CEOs perceive their customers and clients as the top priorities while implementing a strategy and 27% of these CEOs believe that their customers are looking for a relationship with organizations that address wider stakeholders needs (Pricewaterhousecoopers 2016).

The role of customers within the value creation has tremendously increased becoming fundamental for the company (Krishna, Lazarus and Dhaka 2013). Nowadays, customers are more informed and educated. Due to the large capacity of choices, customers are also volatile when it comes to loyalty (Vega-Vazquez, Revilla-Camacho and Cossío-Silva 2013). When it comes to the process of innovation, customers can have different types of role. Some can provide information, such as need information or solution information, other customers are more willing to evaluate innovative concepts (O'Cass and Wetzels 2018). Companies may change their perception toward the customers role, the evolution of their needs and their loyalty, leading to reconsider their innovation process. Thus, it becomes important for the company to acquire relevant knowledge from external sources, especially customers to create products that meet their needs.

The co-creation process has affected the marketing field in highlighting the shift from good dominant logic to the service dominant logic (Leclercq, Hammedi and Poncin

2016). Indeed, in the service dominant logic, consumers and customers are perceived as operant resources with knowledge and skills. Therefore, the relationship between the company and the customers is perceived as an exchange in terms of knowledge and skills and services in which a value is co-created.

Achievement of value creation is difficult in megaprojects due to its complexity and associated challenges (Cohen, Rozenes and Horowitz 2017). The assessment of value is measured in relation to the project inputs which suggests the essence of value co-creation during the project execution (Claudy, Garcia and O'Driscoll 2015). Organisations are facing challenges in creating and delivering long lasting value and outcomes to the project stakeholders. Smyth, Lecoeuvre and Vaesken (2018) suggested that value is theorised as a co-created value proposal at the front end with implications for comprehending post completion. Value co-creation decision making extends beyond the project management triangle of time, cost, and quality.

European literature uses Service Dominant Logic (SDL) to assess value co-creation on megaprojects. This tool uses inputs which are mentioned prior to the inception of the project, value is realised based on inputs and a value proposition is created. The effectiveness and efficiency of the value proposition configuration plays a significant role in the realisation of value (Smyth, Lecoeuvre and Vaesken 2018). It suggested provision as a service rendered to others who invest their resources to realise value. This tool is highly based on co-creation which involves a lot of interaction (Agrawal and Rahman 2015). Project management value creation is currently centred around meeting the traditional practices that are focusing on risk management and threats to the project implementation (Allen, Dholakia and Basuroy 2016). This is encompassed in the value proposition of time, quality, and cost. There is minimal emphasis on benefits impacts and delivery (Cohen, Rozenes and Horowitz 2017).

Value co-creation implies that the supplier and customer are vigorously involved throughout the value creation process (Mani and Chouk 2018). Value co-creation has various activities which include adaptation, bridging and advising of stakeholder. Stakeholders including the supplier need to be involved in the activities. There are various actions associated with the value co-creation activities (Payne and Frow 2014). Adapting activities include actions such as training activities which assist in increasing flexibility to different situations, work consistently in technological activities

and sufficient resource support (Du Toit 2016). Bridging involves the evaluation of possibilities to co-create value with all stakeholders, awareness creation on value co-creation, plan meetings with both suppliers and customers to identify opportunities and share knowledge with all stakeholders (Cohen, Rozenes and Horowitz 2017).

Clearly, there is limited research on value co-creation in project management. Value creation in South Africa is mostly based on meeting the time, cost and quality objectives of the project. What remains a question is the extent of value co-creation adoption in the South African Project Management context.

1.3. Problem Statement

The problem statement to be examined in this research is stated as follows: There is little information which articulates the impediments that hinder the adoption of value co-creation in the project management industry. A study in 2016 highlights that 90% of CEOs perceive the customers and clients as the top priorities while implementing a strategy and 27% of these CEOs believe that their customers are looking for a relationship with organizations that address wider stakeholders needs (Pricewaterhousecoopers 2016). The statistics shows the potential of value co-creation in the organisation; however, it does not mean its wide adoption. There is a need to investigate the impediments that hinder the implementation of value co-creation in the South African project management industry.

1.4. Research Questions

Why is value co-creation not a common practice in the South African project management industry?

1.5. Research Aim

The aim of this research is to:

Investigate the impediments that hinder the implementation of value co-creation in the South African project management industry.

1.6. Research Proposition

Proposition 1: Lack of awareness about the importance of value co-creation in the project management industry impedes its wide adoption in South Africa.

Proposition 2: Secrecy and ownership of intellectual property impede the wide adoption of value co-creation in project management industry.

Proposition 3: Information overload impede the implementation of value co-creation in project management industry.

Proposition 4: Poor communication in project management industry impede the implementation of value co-creation.

Proposition 5: Changing of attitude impedes the wide adoption of value co-creation in project management industry.

1.7. Research Objectives

The research objectives to be achieved are to:

Objective 1: To assess the awareness, knowledge, and the practise of value co-creation in projects through interviews.

Objective 2: Identify barriers and concerns regarding value co-creation implementation through interviews with managers.

Objective 3: Assess the implementation of value-co creation in projects by reviewing past projects company documents.

1.8. Research Method

The above objectives will be achieved by adopting the following research method:

- a) A critical review of the literature related to this study to identify the gaps which need to be addressed by the current study.
- b) A single case study of a project management organisation will be conducted.
- c) Analysis and interpretation of collected data will be based on thematic analysis to identify, name and interpret the themes that emerged from the data. Thematic analysis involves the synthesis, re-arranging, and re-organising of data to formulate themes, sub-themes and categories.
- d) Conclusion and Recommendations were drawn from the findings of the study. The conclusions addressed the research questions and objectives by comparing the correlation between the researcher's analysis and discussions. Conclusions indicated the gaps that existing in the literature review which were addressed by the current study. Recommendations were directed to the relevant stakeholders and future researchers based on the findings obtained from the study.

1.9. Scope and Limitation

The limitations to this study include.

The research findings were derived from a single case study of a South African firm. Consequently, there is a geographical limitation to the applicability of the results. Further, the results cannot be generalised to the population of all project management organisations.

1.10. Chapter outline

The research is organised as five chapters.

In Chapter 1, an outline of the research topic is specified, followed by the research problem statement, the research questions, and the research propositions. This section will also include the research objectives and research methodology and limitations.

Chapter 2, a critical literature review on value co-creation to understand how this concept is currently applied globally. Question to be addressed: What impediments are hindering the implementation of value co-creation in South Africa?

Chapter 3 discusses the research approach, methods, sampling, and data analysis method used for the study.

Chapter 4 consists of the qualitative analysis of the data and identification of themes followed by discussion.

Chapter 5 comprises the conclusion and recommendations for this study.

Chapter 2: Literature review

2.1. Introduction

This chapter highlights the existing literature on the implementation of value co-creation in project management and other business environments. The review focused on exploring the state of value co-creation in South Africa, the implications of integrating value co-creation project management, managerial outcomes of value co-creation, customer motives for participating in value co-creation, impediments that hinder implementation of value co-creation and ways of overcoming barriers to the implementation of value co-creation. The Service-Dominant logic model is discussed as the theoretical framework, which is closely linked to the implementation of value co-creation.

2.2. Theoretical Framework

2.2.1. Service-dominant logic theory

The S-D logic focuses on the prominent relationship between the firms and customers in terms of value co-creation through the application of distinctive competences for mutual benefit between the involved stakeholders. The theory is a direct critique to the traditional theory based on goods-dominant (G-D) logic theory. The G-D logic implicitly suggests a critical assumption that firms can act autonomously in the whole value creation process from designing products to managing sales channels with little or no interaction with or intervention from customers (Grönroos and Ravald 2011). This view is in accordance with the traditional, manufacturing based perspective that the firm and customer are ideally separated with the purpose to enable maximum efficiency and profit, and customers only get involved at the point of exchange (Vargo and Lusch 2015). S-D logic theory considers the customer experience in the context of value co-creation and conceptualises the economic activities as components of service (Grönroos and Ravald 2011). The relationship between the firms and customers is of paramount significance in the concept of value co-creation and innovation as tools of competitive advantage. In the S-D logic model, the organisation relies on the information that is being shared by the external stakeholders which include suppliers and customers (Payne and Frow 2014). An exchange of skills, expertise and general information is valuable for the value co-creation implementation.

The S-D logic emerged as critique to the G-D logic model. S-D logic perceives firms and customers as separate and the need to bring the two parties together for effective value co-creation to take place (Zhang 2017). G-D logic model emphasises the efficiency of the manufacturing process, while the S-D logic focuses on the responsiveness to the customers' needs (Leclercq, Hammedi and Poncin 2016). S-D logic approach prioritises the relationship between the value co-creation participants or actors (Roggeveen, Tsiros and Grewal 2012).

S-D logic model operates under the principles of value co-creation as market driven and customer centric business (Vargo and Lusch 2015). Participation of customers in the value creation is essential in the current business environment, and many business entities appeal to implement the value co-creation based on the S-D logic model. The customers and suppliers are active creators of value through their participation in value co-creation and acceptance of the products or service (Neghina *et al.* 2015). The traditional project practices were focusing on the risk management as an integral aspect of PMBOK (Cohen, Rozenes and Horowitz 2017). Value co-creation approach adds more opportunities to project management through promoting strategic scope and planning processes.

2.3. Define value co-creation.

Cohen, Rozenes and Horowitz (2017) conceptualised value co-creation as the outstanding strategy for managing the complex relationships that exist between the project stakeholders; that is, the project team and the project customers. Formation of partnerships and strong relationships during the execution of the project facilitates a high quality of project performance and improved project outcomes.

Value co-creation is a newly emerged concept in the field of construction which paves the way for the innovative ways of engaging the service providers and customers through direct interactions to offer high quality services (Liu, Fellows and Chan 2014). Grönroos (2011) defined value co-creation as an interactive and functional process that aims at enhancing and sustaining the value to the customers through creating the conducive business environment between the firm and clients.

Value co-creation is defined in the context that the project is not accomplished by an individual as isolated, rather many factors play significant roles in determining the

value outcomes of the project including teamwork, project environment, and external actors (Mani and Chouk 2018). Value co-creation shifted from the traditional belief that value is solely created by the organisations to the new belief that value is created through productive interaction between the company and its customers in the execution of the project.

The concept of value co-creation gives companies the opportunity to adopt innovative ways of developing new products and services, which are appealing to the customers, through engaging customers in the process of creating value (O'Cass and Wetzels 2018).

Collaborative interaction between the company and customers in value creation is an advanced means of inviting customers to express their knowledge, perceptions, expectations, behaviour and needs (Claudy, Garcia and O'Driscoll 2015). Suppliers and companies benefit from the participation of customers in value co-creation through gathering of new insights and ideas that can help in improving the products and services.

2.4. Value co-creation in South Africa

The current market and business environment in the Project Management industry are characterised by stiff competition. Consequently, technology and customer data have become tools for achieving competitive advantage. Zwikael and Smyrk (2011) argued that the concept of value co-creation remains an option for the firms to remain profitable in the highly competitive environment. Adopting value co-creation in the company maximises its competitive advantage and operates within the range of customer needs. Thus, it becomes more interesting to understand the factors that hinder its adoption in South Africa since it enhances company efficiency and effectiveness.

Organisations realise the relevance of value co-creation, change and innovation as key components that can be implemented to achieve their business goals and realise their projects benefits (Pinto 2016). Modern business environment is compromised by the wide-range of technologies, dynamic customers' need, complex market demands (Frito Lay 2014).

The implementation of value co-creation in the retail sector in South Africa resulted in an increase of purchases by 17%, and profitability also increased by 36% (Allen,

Dholakia and Basuroy 2016). Value co-creation interactions are relevant across all stages of project cycle (Artto, Ahola and Vartiainen 2016). The evidence of positive outcomes of value co-creation in the retailer sector leads one to infer that the same outcome would be achieved if value co-creation were to be effectively implemented in project management companies (Allen, Dholakia and Basuroy 2016).

Value co-creation becomes appealing in modern business endeavours as the vehicle for accomplishing ultimate business objectives through active participation of customers in productive and innovative efforts in the business (Acar 2018). Digital era is dominated by the value co-creation of firms and customers driven by the concept of big data and ever-changing customers' needs (Xie *et al.* 2016). Value co-creation has transformed the interaction between businesses, customers and markets to discover new opportunities. Customer's participation in value co-creation has the potential to sustain the competition edge and track the performance of the business.

Firms generated large amount of customer up to 90% in 2011 worldwide with the use of big data and advance analytic techniques (Science Daily 2013). Gathering customer data is used by firms as a tool to understand customer behaviour, changing of customer needs and their biographical patterns. However, firms may face change in effectively generating and analysing big data to offer practical solutions to the problems faced in the business.

2.5 Project Management

The traditional approach to Project management has focused on delivering the outcomes on time, within budget and to specification without significant emphasis on the creation of long-lasting relationships with customers (Keren and Cohen 2012). In traditional project management the emphasis is on systematic project planning and execution to ensure effective risk management and minimise threats to the project performance. Weaknesses of the traditional approach led to project failures in the last decade, due to its failure to cope with dynamic and emerging trends, such as new technology and new customer needs.

Project management based on the traditional approach faces operational challenges, while value co-creation provides strategic insights and understanding to project managers (Cohen, Rozenes and Horowitz 2017). Value co-creation in project management encourages creativity and initiatives informed by customer participation.

Value co-creation focuses on long-term relationships in project management, as compared to the traditional approach that is limited to the scope, time and budget concept to achieve project performance (Cohen, Rozenes and Horowitz 2017). Value co-creation practices in project management incorporate the project team, customers and project contactors to contribute towards achieving the strategic objectives of the project and effectiveness of the project organisation (Keren and Cohen 2012).

Project management organisations that invest in innovation and change realised the benefits of value co-creation to achieve business objectives and success in their project (Keeyes and Huemann 2017). Value co-creation in Project Management serves an essential role in organisations to ensure successful project strategies, realise business objectives, and deliver benefits through their projects (Laursen and Svejvig 2016). The traditional project management approach and methodologies such as the PMBOK focus on value creation during the project implementation phase to closure phase, whereas value co-creation considers the long-term relationship beyond the closure phase of the project (Edkins *et al.* 2013).

Traditional project management focuses on the short-term perspective within the context of valuing inputs, meeting project requirements, documenting the project, balancing project trade-offs and execution of the project (Smyth, Lecoivre and Vaesken 2018). In contrast, value co-creation establishes long-term standards that connect project management and strategic project outcomes (Zwikael and Smyrk 2011). Value co-creation has increasingly gained attention in project management to improve project performance throughout the project lifecycle, and to establish long-term relationship with customers (Artto, Ahola and Vartiainen 2016).

2.6. Integrating value co-creation in Project Management

Value co-creation comes as a new approach of managing the project relationship between the project clients and project team and engaging all stakeholders in determining the end product of the project.

Integrating value co-creation in project management creates a platform for the project client and project contractor to collaborate in maximising project performance and raising the quality of the project outcomes (Pinto 2016).

The core aspect of value co-creation is the creation of a mutual partnership between the contractor and customer, bringing managers from both sides together in decision

making, budgeting and performance management (Cohen, Rozenes and Horowitz 2017). This contractor-customer relationship may be strengthened through frequent engagements and meetings to give updates concerning budgets, time schedule, opportunities and risk management strategies. Value co-creation requires consultation to strengthen the relationship between the contractor and clients (Zwikael and Smyrk 2011). Consultations in the monitoring of projects form the cornerstone of value co-creation in project management.

Strategic perspective in the management of the project becomes clear in terms of the project scope, timetable and budget when the contractor and customer maintain the partnership under the umbrella of value co-creation (Pinto 2016). The integration of both team members from the contractor and customer merges the understanding of the project technical needs and requirements that lead to value co-creation (Chen, Tsou and Ching 2011).

2.6.1. Customer value co-creation

Customers are competent and skilful in a wide range of areas that can add value to the production process, therefore, companies are curious to involve customers in value cocreation to maximise their competitive advantage (Rubio, Villaseñor and Yagüe 2020).

Companies perceive customers as valuable assets to inform the decision making about the product features based on their knowledge and skills. Companies are now benefiting from the participation of customers in value co-creation which allows them to provide information resources to improve the product output and ensure users' satisfaction (Roggeveen, Tsiros and Grewal 2012). The information provided by customers to the company is valuable in determining the preferences of customers in product design. Customers are regarded as valuable assets of the companies with the knowledge and ideas they contribute to the production process, and value co-creation. The core priority of companies is to impress customers and address their needs. Therefore, their information contributes significantly to the decision-making process of the company.

Partnerships and collaboration between firms and customers have become dominant in the modern business community to improve customer satisfaction by involve them in the value co-creation process (Salomonson *et al.* 2013). Companies do not work in

isolation or exist in the vacuum, rather they seek to engage customers as much as possible to understand their preferences and demographic features. In a multicultural community like South Africa, it is profitable for companies to tap into detail about a variety of needs of customers from different cultural groups. Value co-creation remains a necessary component of the company which strives to achieve high productivity and profitability through customer satisfaction.

Effective collaboration between the company and customers should be based on mutual understanding and clear objectives of participating in value co-creation. Customer dialogues are essential to ensure that the customers are provided with all the necessary information about the products or services. Companies strive to ensure transparency during the value co-creation process to ensure that the customers make relevant contribution to the modification of the products or services to suit their unique needs (Samarov 2015). Transparency and accountability about the products and the process of manufacturing it provides the room for customers to suggest possible best ways of delivering the best quality of products which directly meet their desires. Value co-creation forms an important pillar in the company by incorporating customers in the production process, giving them an opportunity to decide the outcome of the product. Therefore, the companies which do not adopt value co-creation might not be aware of the benefits of this practice in business in moving towards its ultimate goals. Technological advancement empowers the participation of customers in value co-creation due to internet connectivity which allows them to access tools that enable them to communicate with the firms more efficiently and share their knowledge and experiences (Galvagno and Dali 2014). The use of technological devices in implementing value co-creation accommodates customers who participate anonymously, as well as those who wish to contribute from across the world. Customers can participate in value co-creation through technological platforms that allow them to share their views and experiences with the firm or company, and the information shared is then used by the company to solve the problems associated with the current products and to co-create new value (Keeys and Huemann 2017). Technological advancement has brought significant transformation from manual processes to digital processes which enhances the participation of customers in value co-creation, regardless of their geographic location. The most important aspect of

value co-creation is reinforcing the relationship between the company and its customers for mutual benefit.

Value co-creation empowers customers from being passive to become active participants in the production process and make decisions about the products that are being produced for them. The review of literature points to the customers perspective, strategies used by companies to convince customers to participate in value co-creation, customers' motivation to participate and ways of participation (Rubio, Villaseñor and Yagüe 2020). Customers play a key role in the adoption of value co-creation, and they feel empowered when they purchase products, the production outcome of which they influenced. Companies benefit from the participation of customers in the production activities and win their commitment to purchase the products. Nature of business venture and product characteristics determine the nature of customer participation in value co-creation. Value co-creation incorporate all the behaviours, interaction, interpretations, experiences and evaluations of the actors based on their social construction (Agrawal and Rahman 2015). A gap has been identified in the literature regarding why value co-creation is not widely adopted, considering its positive outcomes for both companies and customers.

The success of the value co-creation may vary based on the nature of tasks involved and customers' skills and knowledge. Customers motivation for participating in value co-creation may be determined by the agreement made between the participant and company, and the outcome of value co-creation can establish long-lasting relation between customer and firms. A close relationship established between consumers and service providers during the service favours the collaboration between actors (Cossío-Silva *et al.* 2016). Co-production and customisation require the participation of customers and evaluation of customer participation to make decisions about production (Bhattacharjee 2012). Raising awareness in companies and among customers about the importance of value co-creation helps in building long-lasting relationships, which ultimately benefit both companies and customers.

Customers are convinced to participate in value co-creation based on the reputation of the company, self-efficacy, personal values and attitudes, technical skills of customers and their level of knowledge (Agrawal and Rahman 2015). The ability of the company to capture the customer's attitude, self-efficacy and behaviour through

incorporating them in value co-creation leads to highly customer-oriented practices and maximises its capabilities of meet customers' needs. Companies that need to facilitate value co-creation should consider the customers' perspectives and their personal attributes.

Customers' knowledge of technology is essential when innovation decisions are part of value co-creation (Pongsakornrungrasit and Schroeder 2011). Decisions to improve the innovation of the company may need the input of customers to ensure the sustainability of the new innovation or technology (Romero and Molina 2011).

Outputs of value co-creation rely on task complexity, customers' commitment, knowledge and skills and benefits associated with participation in value co-creation process (Smyth, Lecoivre and Vaesken 2018). It is, therefore, essential for companies to invest in raising awareness of their customers and employees about the benefits of value co-creation to their operations. The under-adoption of value co-creation by many project management companies in South Africa might reflect a lack of awareness by the companies and customers about the essential role of value co-creation in the production process and project management.

2.6.2. Firm value co-creation

Firms consider the valuable collaboration between its stakeholders and customers to participate in value co-creation. Firms adopted the concept of value co-creation to maximise its profitability through interacting with customers and engage them in making decisions regarding the products. Value co-creation in firms rely on the structure and functions of the business to achieve its core objectives (Cossío-Silva *et al.* 2016). Customer participation in value co-creation is beneficial to the firm considering that the products are designed to match the unique needs of customers (O'Cass and Wetzels 2018). The effectiveness of the business relies on its ability to meet the ultimate needs of customers; therefore, value co-creation helps firms to achieve this objective.

Existing employees play an integral role in facilitating the effectiveness of value co-creation in the firm, and ensure effective participation of customers to create their own unique experiences (Zhang 2017). Employees have the responsibility to create a value co-creation environment gather relevant information from customers. Training, resource procurement and information infrastructure are the building blocks for the

success of value co-creation in a firm (Artto, Ahola and Vartiainen 2016). Capabilities and skills for employees are necessary to be able to acquire information from customers, and use the same information in the designing of products or services (Cohen, Rozenes and Horowitz 2017). Employees need to be flexible and adaptive considering that they interact with customers with different attributes and come from different backgrounds (Agrawal and Rahman 2015). Value co-creation actors influence management decisions in the product designing, marketing and personnel management (Neghina *et al.* 2017). Interpersonal interaction between the firm and customers has potential to establish strong and long-term relationship (Rubio, Villaseñor and Yagüe 2020). The value co-creation informs the firms' decisions based on the operand of the customers and available resources to support the ideas raised by the customers (Cohen, Rozenes and Horowitz 2017). Firms have the responsibility to design platforms that facilitate customer data management during value co-creation (Neghina *et al.* 2017).

2.6.3. Value Co-creation interaction

Value co-creation is implemented within the confines of interaction between the company and customers, and both parties are important to each other (Grönroos 2011). The interaction between the company and customers for the purpose of value co-creation should be based on transparency, dialogue and risk benefit to ensure positive outcomes (Sahi, Sehgal and Sharma 2017). The management of value co-creation interaction can be understood in terms of the customer value-creating process, the firm value-creating process and the challenges that are faced in implementing these processes (Zhang 2017). The nature of interaction between customers and companies is a dynamic and everchanging process, depending on the stakeholders involved in the given value co-creation relationship and changing market demands (Smyth, Lecoivre and Vaesken 2018). The customer and the firm engage in dialogue because of mutual trust and can co-create through integrity and shared risk. Customers' involvement in the creation of the product should satisfy their needs better. Companies gather information resources and knowledge concerning customer needs as they interact with them, and use this information to create value which matches the customer needs (Randall, Gravier and Prybutok 2011). Customers' active role in the creation of the product and services increases value to the company

because it operates with the specifications decided by the customers, and this can be applicable in project management companies in South Africa.

Customer value co-creation is multidimensional consisting of two primary dimensions namely customer participation and citizenship behaviour (Oldemaat 2013). Customer participation behaviour entails expected behaviours of customers required for the successful completion of value co-creation while citizenship behaviour involves voluntary and discretionary behaviours that are not required for the successful value co-creation (Yi and Gong 2012). Both dimensions of value co-creation provide a valid and reliable scale for the measurement of co-creation. Customer participation in value co-creation takes place in two forms which include the provision of information that can improve the quality of the product, or the customers can involve themselves in developing the product which suits their needs (Zhang 2017).

The communication environment created for customers during the value co-creation determine the outputs of the whole co-creation process. Open communication, sociable, creative and playful environment encourage customers to feel comfortable in displaying their knowledge and skills for the benefit of the company (Grissmann and Stokburger-Sauer 2012). Companies may invest on the immaterial resources that would facilitate the effective value co-creation environment to embrace diverse customers perceptions and personalities during co-creation process. Value co-creation has become an information sharing platform that allow customers from different backgrounds to participate in the designing of the products (Dvorak 2013). Value co-creation promote an exchange of cultures and interaction between companies and customers for the improvement of the products or services.

The literature on value co-creation put more emphasis on open communication as a catalyst for the successful adoption of value co-creation, and this brings light to the fact that project management companies in South Africa also capable of achieving value co-creation if they embrace the concept of open communication in their business.

2.7. Managerial outcomes of Value co-creation

Value co-creation activities provide a wide range of benefits to the company through improved product quality, reduced business risk, reduced cost of production, opening of new markets, improved acceptance of the products in the market and growth of

revenue (Zhang 2017). The concept of value co-creation is not limited to internal benefits of the company such as sustaining its reputation, brand image and company image, rather it goes beyond the external context of the company and improves the power of the consumer over the company's products. Information communicated by consumers is valuable to the company to modify its brands and products to suit the needs of customers. The literature shows the opportunities behind adopting value co-creation, despite the less adoption of value co-creation by project management companies in South Africa. Therefore, it is worthy to unpack the barriers and obstacles which restrict the wide adoption of value co-creation by project management companies in South Africa.

Companies should be aware of the positive role value co-creation plays in building long-term customer trust, satisfaction, loyalty and relationships (Vega-Vazquez, Revilla-Camacho and Cossío-Silva 2013). The more the company engages with customers to hear their views regarding the product, the more it succeeds in adopting value co-creation. It is possible that project management companies in South Africa do not yet fully grasp the concept of value co-creation increase their competitive advantage. In the business environment, innovation and competitive advantage are outcomes of value co-creation because the interaction that takes place between the firm and customers influences the outcomes of the quality of products (Agrawal and Rahman 2015). Customer ideas and feedback are essential to the development of better value products and services in firms.

Companies create personalised services from the feedback they receive from the customers. Customers participate in the production process and present their views regarding the designing of products. Value co-creation allows customers to make their contributions about a product with the intentions to improve the quality of products or services (Sahi, Sehgal and Sharma 2017). Value co-creation plays a critical role during the development of a new product or service.

Company's performance and sustainability are directly influenced by the ability to customise its products and services. Customisation of products requires the customers to participate in the production and communicate their preferences about the products being designed (Zhang 2017). Mass customisation abilities are enhanced by understanding customer demography and preferences at the particular time, and

the company should operate in response to the given preferences. The growing competitive business atmosphere suggests that even project management companies are not spared if they do not adopt value co-creation in their business models. The growing competitive business atmosphere suggests that even project management companies are not spared if they do not adopt value co-creation in their business models (Leavy 2012).

Value co-creation helps to improve the innovation of the company depending on its business orientation and response to new technologies. The company's value co-creation on the aspect of innovation maybe affected by availability of the company expertise, business compatibility with technology and business relations (Chen, Tsou and Ching 2011). Companies which need to benefit from value co-creation must design their business models, structures and strategies to accommodate the innovative ideas contributed by customers, and mobilise adequate resources to implement the proposed innovations (Leavy 2012). Companies which are flexible and responsive to the input of customers can benefit from value co-creation. Value co-creation may not automatically yield positive results to the company, rather, there are challenges and barriers that can hinder the implementation of value co-creation.

Value co-creation based on customer participation minimises the solitary decisions made by firms regarding the outcome of products (Zhang 2017). Input of customers in value co-creation benefits by improving product quality, however, it is associated with high risks and uncertainties because new ideas are generated. Customers make decisions by themselves on which information to disclose or withhold, therefore, there are no parameters to measure on whether customers have shared relevant and adequate information during value co-creation. Value co-creation put pressure and increase stress on existing employee regardless of contribution to customer satisfaction (Essen, Winterstorm and Liljedal 2016). Existing employees are required to adapt to new strategies more often as decided by the customers.

2.8. Consumer motives for value co-creation

Previous research emphasised on the motivation for customers to participate in value co-creation in different business environments (Fernandes and Remelhe 2016). Customers' motivation for value co-creation varies based on the significance of the activity and perceptions of the customers (Neghina *et al.* 2017). Literature on value

co-creation identified various motives for customers' participation including reward, curiosity, self-efficacy and individual motives. Factors that motivate customer participation in value co-creation can be general or professional reasons (Neghina *et al.* 2017).

2.8.1. Reward motives

A wide range of motives describing the reasons for consumers to participate in value co-creation activities are covered in the literature. Understanding the models and reasons for attracting consumers to participate in value co-creation may benefit the project management industry to deal with the impediments that hinder the adoption of value co-creation. Generic and professional motives drive the consumers to participate in value co-creation (Neghina *et al.* 2017).

Consumer perception of reward given after participation in the product or services related activities motivate their willingness to be committed or disregarding the activity (Schüler, Maier and Liljedal 2020). Monetary rewards for participation in value co-creation attract many consumers to share their creative and innovative ideas with the firms with fewer obstacles or hinderance (Mack and Landau 2015).

The large number of customers are attracted by rewards to participate in value co-creation, and the high rewards for participation the high customer engagement in presenting their information required for the product design (Schüler, Maier and Liljedal 2020). Besides monetary rewards that can be granted for participating in value co-creation, some customers may participate to earn recognition for their input on the product design.

2.8.2. Curiosity motives

Consumers are driven to participate in value co-creation out of curiosity or intentions to relieve themselves from boredom. Companies which seek to invite the consumers to participate in value co-creation present themselves as needing a favour from consumers or creating entertainment to raise the curiosity of the consumers to participate.

Businesses use entertainment to relieve the boredom of the consumers, yet raising their curiosity to participate or visit the physical location of the business with the intention to break away from boredom (Schüler, Maier and Liljedal 2020). Companies

may encourage value co-creation through the curiosity of consumers. Customers may be curious to participate in a specific task or general task based on their curiosity. Customers connect their curiosity motives and playfulness motives to participate in value co-creation activities especially when the activities are playful, fun, rewarding or associated with multimedia-rich content (Otchere *et al.* 2019).

2.8.3. Self-efficacy motives

Little empirical evidence supports the notion that consumers often perceive value co-creation activities as complex and difficult to master (Neghina *et al.* 2017). In the context of consumers perceiving themselves as possessing the power to make positive contributions to the output products or services, they become proud about their contributions and continue to participate (Schüler, Maier and Liljedal 2020). Customers perceive value co-creation as an opportunity to improve their own self-efficacy (Fernandes and Remelhe 2016). Perceptions of customers shape their self-efficacy to enjoy participating in value co-creation (Mani and Chouk 2018). High level of customer self-efficacy leads to high commitment and willingness to share ideas during value co-creation.

Customers related various social and emotional benefits for participating in value co-creation, and high connection with social and emotional aspects lead to high self-efficacy (Fernandes and Remelhe 2016). Customers evaluate the characteristics of the company and imagine the nature of interaction that will be engaged and decide whether to participate in value co-creation or not (Neghina *et al.* 2017). Some aspects of value co-creation take place in physical stores where service personnel interact with customers and inquire about their perceptions regarding the products, and areas that need improvement (Schüler, Maier and Liljedal 2020).

2.8.4. Individual motives

Consumers may participate in value co-creation to fulfil the individual motives to express the ideas, preferences and present their skills in the production process to ensure that their needs are satisfied (Fernandes and Remelhe 2016). Individualism motives have been mentioned in the literature that consumers become willing to participate in value co-creation and mass customisation ensure that their views and preferences are considered during the manufacturing of the products (Von Hippel, Ogawa and De Jong 2011). Mass customisation improve the customers' preferences

for the products considering that they participate in the production process (Claudy, Garcia and O'Driscoll 2015).

Personal motivation to participate in value co-creation is regarded as being individualism motive considering that the reward for customer participation is individual experience. Customers are motivated to participate in value co-creation to be considered as part of the team and being appreciated for their input on the product (Neghina *et al.* 2017). Ethical issues should be strictly considered when individualism motives are motivating customers to participate in value co-creation because they should be treated with fairness and honest to facilitate transparency (Neghina *et al.* 2017). Individualism motives account for the daily operations of the company and its communication practices and policies to protect personal data.

2.9. Impediments to the implementation of value co-creation

2.9.1. Change in attitude

The paradigm shift in marketing moved the focus from customer-centric to co-creation through the interrelatedness of stakeholders (Gyrd-Jones and Kornum 2013). When respect ceases to exist between the stakeholders, conflict prevails, that eventually has negative implications for the implementation of value co-creation in the organisation (Agrawal and Rahman 2015).

Pera, Occhiocupo and Clarke (2016) postulated that organisations are prone to the challenges of changing management's attitude to the implementation of value co-creation. A common challenge faced by management is discovering appropriate ways to achieve value exchange between the involved stakeholders (Hillebrand, Driessen and Koll 2015). The priority for the effective implementation of value co-creation in an organisation must focus on creating a conducive environment for the smooth value exchange relationship.

2.9.2. Secrecy and ownership of intellectual property

The implementation of value co-creation requires the open communication and collaboration between stakeholders. Secrecy hinders and destroys the relationship between stakeholders. According to Ind and Coates (2013), the partners or stakeholders who seek to secure their intellectual property or interests are most likely to distance themselves from participating in the implementation of the value co-creation process. Du Toit (2016) suggested that stakeholders or organisations are

motivated to disclose their knowledge and skills if they believe that they are going to be rewarded or acknowledged.

Secrecy and ownership for intellectual property standards creates a barrier to the implementation of value co-creation. Customers may consider the value of their ideas are more than the conditions agreed for their participation, therefore, they choose to sell them for a better price (Du Toit 2016). Du Toit (2016) argued that companies may not other information to the customers to protect their secrecy, therefore, the contribution of customers in value co-creation may be limited by the information presented to them.

2.9.3. Information overload

It is difficult to analyse a large volume of information gathered from various sources and develop a valid conclusion to inform the effective implementation of a value co-creation program in the organisation (Du Toit 2016). The value co-creation process involves the collaboration and participation of stakeholders to compile all relevant information. If there is too much information, this can lead to confusion and make it difficult to implement.

Information overload can be experienced by the company that seeks to implement value co-creation considering that customers may share large amount of information or ideas some of which are contradictory. Selecting the correct idea from large amount of information becomes a challenge because unexpected and diverse ideas are generated during the value co-creation process. Firms that are experiencing information overload may consult customers to assess the ideas and select the most appropriate ideas especially at the final stage of value co-creation (Du Toit 2016).

2.9.4. Word of mouth

The use of word of mouth in communicating the objectives of value co-creation to stakeholders can yield both positive or negative outcomes. Romero and Molina (2011) argued that the word-of-mouth approach is an effective instrument for marketing to achieve high positive response or perception, but it can also play a destructive role in the implementation of value co-creation. Du Toit (2016) emphasised that the word-of-mouth approach can facilitate customer loyalty and the co-operation of stakeholders towards achieving the goals of value co-creation.

Effective customer service led to positive word of mouth spread to the friends, relatives and colleagues about the products or services (Gebauer, Füller and Pezzei 2013). argued that bad communication and interaction with customers paint a bad picture of the company and promote spreading of negative word of mouth about the products and services.

Romero and Molina (2011) suggested that negative information about the products and services can be shared online and damage the reputation of the company. Therefore, word of mouth may not be spread directly through interaction, but social media platforms can be used to communicate with other potential customers.

2.9.5. Poor communication

The literature focused more on the positive impact of value co-creation motivated by consumer participation, but negative outcomes can be obtained when poor communication exists between the company and consumers. Engaging consumers to participate in the business's programmes without clarification and effective communication can result in negative outcomes that include anger, frustration and the perception of being exploited (Gebauer, Füller and Pezzei 2013). Poor communication and lack of clear explanation discourage customers from participating in value co-creation (Essen, Winterstorm and Liljedal 2016). Consumers may engage negative feelings towards a company, it becomes a barrier to engage consumer participation in value co-creation.

Companies which seek to implement value co-creation should communicate with consumers before engaging them to participate, so that they can receive clarification and justification for their participation (Mani and Chouk 2018). Failure of the company to communicate with the consumers concerning the intended value co-creation may engender feelings of anger and frustration, which can make consumers unwilling to participate in value co-creation activities (Gebauer, Füller and Pezzei 2013).

2.10. Overcoming barriers to the implementation of value co-creation

The holistic and integrative approach in the concept of value co-creation needs to be understood in term of its multiple dimensions (Agrawal and Rahman 2015). Value co-creation requires theoretical and practical dimensions to be explored analytically, focussing on the points of divergence between different perspectives and approaches.

The essential role of communication and social interaction in the value co-creation process forms the foundation for the success of the organisation in achieving its business and projects objectives (Smyth, Lecoeuvre and Vaesken 2018). Effective sharing of information, expertise, skills and experiences leads to the creation of a better service experience for the clients, employees and all involved stakeholders in the interaction process.

Integrating the managerial knowledge within the organisation concerning value co-creation is essential to embrace the differences in opinions that can hinder the implantation of the strategy (O'Cass and Wetzels 2018).

Advanced technological applications and platforms are used as mechanisms for the implementation of value co-creation. The process of value co-creation involves the gathering of diverse forms of data that cannot be easily analysed through manual processes (Smyth, Lecoeuvre and Vaesken 2018).

2.11. Summary

The reviewed literature indicated the empirical and scholarly evidence on the application of value co-creation in the project management setting and other business environments. Despite the existing literature discussed, the gaps are still noticed in the body of knowledge that the content in the literature does not describe the execution of value co-creation in the South African project management industry, specifically, which is the goal of the current study to fulfil. This chapter prepares for the next chapter which will focus on methods and design used to gather data to achieve the objectives of the study.

Chapter 3: Research Methodology

3.1. Introduction

This chapter presents the research methodology adopted for the study. The research approach, research paradigm, research design, data collection, data analysis and trustworthiness of the findings.

3.2. Research approach

Qualitative approach was adopted for this study. Babbie (2016) emphasised the contextual relevance of the qualitative approach in understanding social phenomena in the real world. Creswell and Miller (2000) ascertained that the qualitative approach provides insight into the experience of the subjects which cannot be reached through numerical and statistical measurements of quantitative research approaches. Denscombe (2010) suggested that qualitative research approach is concerned about the subjects' perception and interpretation of the social realities in their social context. Qualitative research perceives social reality as socially constructed and interpreted in the context of the individuals involved (Denzin and Lincoln 2011). Practices and beliefs of participants can be subjectively understood in their social context; therefore, qualitative approach was adopted for this study to unpack the in-depth information on impediments that hinder value co-creation the project management.

3.3. Research paradigm

A research paradigm is the philosophy that provide the lens for understanding reality (Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill 2018). There are many paradigms in research including positivism, pragmatism, critical realism, postmodernism and interpretivism. Positivism regards reality from an observable and measurable perspective and suggests that the relationship between the dependent and independent variables should be established to accept or reject the hypothesis (Cuervo-Cazurra *et al.* 2017). Postmodernism emphasises the aspect of ethics and morals as valuable in understanding social reality (Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill 2018). Pragmatism suggests that there are multiple realities that may not be universally understood by each philosophy, therefore, the research should adopt the philosophy that offers practical solution for a particular context (Kelemen and Rumens 2008). Critical realism

emphasises on the relevance of past experiences and sensations as the basis for understanding the social reality and events (Reed 2005).

The interpretivist paradigm provides the basis of the study in which the multiple realities are analysed from the subjects' interpretation of their experiences (Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill 2018). Reality and truths are constructed in the social context hence the interpretivist approach seeks to understand the underlying meanings attached to the phenomena within the social context (Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill 2018). The interpretivist paradigm understands the concept of multiple realities as being subjectively perceived, experienced, formed, expressed and modified (Hennink, Hutter and Bailey 2011). The interpretivist paradigm was adopted for this study considering its assumption of human capabilities to create their own realities and experiences. Qualitative approach described in the previous section falls within this interpretivist paradigm.

3.4. Case study

Qualitative research can either adopt an exploratory, explanatory, case study or descriptive research design to achieve its intended goals. The study adopted a qualitative research approach using a single case study of a company. The case study research design adopted for this study is revelatory in nature. A case study was adopted as the research design of the study. Yin (2009) suggested that case study research design aims at answering the 'why' and 'how' questions related to the phenomena in which the researcher does not influence or manipulate the situations or events. The philosophy behind using a case study research design in this study is vested in its ability to offer explanation of events in real life situations which cannot be obtainable by experimental or survey methods.

Case study was used as the data collection method. Case study involves the investigation of the events, groups or individuals in their context or real-world settings to achieve in-depth or detailed description of the phenomena. A case study is an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon in depth and within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clear. It is a holistic approach to the understanding of complex and specific processes as they occur in the confined natural environment, situations, or settings.

This study is a revelatory single case study because it focused on one company that implements value co-creation. The company is a leading brewer, established in more than 50 countries in the world, with over 600 years of heritage and more than 500 brands. It was chosen as a case of the study considering its implementation of value co-creation on a regular basis.

A revelatory case study provides the opportunity to investigate into a previously inaccessible inquiry. Managers were selected based on their previous experience of value co-creation and were interviewed to get a deep understanding of the implementation of value co-creation and the barriers thereof.

Unit of analysis included the opinions and reported experiences of selected participants regarding impediments to value co-creation and the management of value. Project managers of a company presented their views and experiences.

3.5. Data Analysis and Interpretation

Analysis of data from case studies involves thorough examination, categorisation, tabulation and integration of acquired information to make conclusion about the phenomenon investigated. This source of information provided first-hand information on value co-creation in the company. De Vos (2005) suggested that data analysis involves the close examination and analysis of a large volume of data to formulate codes and themes which can be qualitatively interpreted.

Pattern matching, content analysis and thematic analysis are all potentially appropriate techniques for analysing case study data. Thematic analysis, the method used in this research, is a qualitative research method that can be used for a wide range of paradigms and designs. It is a method for identifying, analysing, organizing, describing, and reporting themes found within a data set (Braun and Clark 2006).

Thematic analysis is more flexible to analyse qualitative data from different sources, and can be adopted for complex nature of data (Braun and Clark 2006). King (2004) suggested that using thematic analysis helps to identify the similarities and differences existing in the qualitative data generated from the participants. Thematic analysis summarises the common features within the large amount of qualitative data to generate well-structured final report of the findings (Braun and Clark 2006). The strengths of thematic analysis as a method lies in its richness and flexibility in

analysing complex forms of and large amounts of data gathered from participants. The accounts and narratives of the participants will be transcribed from audio to text document for easy coding and formulation of themes.

3.6. Reliability and validity

The relevance of the study in terms of reliability and validity for qualitative research will be checked using the criteria of credibility, confirmability, transferability and dependability to ensure that the findings are trustworthy (Bhattacharjee 2012). According to Yin (2015), trustworthiness of qualitative research is built on the basis of transparency and credibility.

3.6.1. Credibility

Credibility involves ensuring that the data is free from bias or distortion. The essence of credibility checking lies in the internal validity of the findings ensured by member checking which involves confirming the meaning of the text from participants. According to Creswell and Miller (2000), the researcher is required to check with the participants to confirm if there is consistency in terms of their interpretation and meaning of the narratives. A high level of consistency between the interpretation of findings by the researcher and participants indicates a high level of credibility. The researcher referred to the participants to confirm whether the findings were accurately representing their narrations and responses to the interviews. The member checking concluded that the findings were credible.

3.6.2. Dependability

Dependability involves ensuring that the finding can be trusted or believed. The dependability of findings in qualitative studies can be confirmed by presenting the actual words of the participants (Dye *et al.* 2000). The researcher presented the actual words of the participants and separated the researcher's interpretation and participants' responses to ensure that findings were free from bias.

3.6.3. Transferability

Transferability involves evaluating the extent to which the findings can be applied to the same situations in a different setting or environment (Rolfe 2006). Findings with high transferability can be appropriately applied to other settings beside the context in which the environment in which the study was carried out. The researcher compared

the previous literature and findings to check the transferability of the findings. The checking of transferability confirmed that the findings are transferable to other contexts.

3.6.4. Confirmability

Confirmability involves checking with the participants that they interpret the narratives in the same way (Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill 2018). The extent to which the interpretation of the narratives is consistent indicates the confirmability of the findings. The researcher conducted member checking by referring to the participants to confirm the meanings of their narrations. The outcomes of member checking indicated the findings were confirmable.

3.7. Pilot study

A pilot study was conducted to test the effectiveness of the questionnaire. A pilot study was completed by 2 participants selected from the same company that forms the case of the study. Participants who participated in the pilot study were excluded from the actual study. The pilot was conducted with the managers that have value co-creation experience. No changes were made to the interview questions because they all seemed to be relevant and appropriate for the study.

3.8. Ethical considerations

3.8.1. Permission

The University of Cape Town ethics clearance procedure was followed to obtain the ethics clearance. The interview consent letter, the research proposal and ethics application were submitted to the ethics department via submittable. A questionnaire was completed on submit table regarding the research ethics. An approval was obtained.

3.8.2. Informed consent

Participants granted their informed consent after they read and understood the information provide on the informed consent form regarding the topic, purpose of the study, duration and nature of interview. The researcher explained to the participants about the scope of the study and ethical considerations to observed. The researcher informed the participants about their rights to withdraw from the study, voluntary

participation, privacy and anonymity. Participants who granted their permission signed the informed consent form prior to their participation in the study.

3.8.3. The right to withdraw

The researcher informed the participants about their right to withdraw from the study whenever they wish or feel uncomfortable. The researcher explained to the participants they will not be punished or receive any negative consequences for their decision to withdraw from the study. No effort may be made by the researcher to convince or coerce the participants to proceed with the study if they wish to withdraw.

3.8.4. Confidentiality

The researcher assured the participants that their personalities, responses and any information that may lead to their identification will be treated with confidentiality. The researcher used pseudonyms for the identification of the participants during the data collection and presentation of findings to ensure the privacy and anonymity of participants. The data and study materials were kept safely in a drawer secured with a lock, and soft copies were kept in a computer folder secured with a password. All the study materials will be destroyed after the completion of the study.

3.8.5. Protection of participants

The researcher ensured that the participants are protected from emotional, physical and social harm during the study. Protection of emotional harm was ensured using professional and formal language that ensures the respect and integrity of the participants. The researcher ensured protection of participants from physical harm by encouraging the participants to choose the places that they felt comfortable and safe from any physical harm. The research used neutral words during the interviews to protect participants from social harm and any possible stereotype.

Chapter 4: Presentation, interpretation and discussions of findings

4.1. Introduction

This chapter presents that findings of the study. Some of the interview questions asked: What challenges do you face in generating and delivering value outcomes for a wide range of stakeholders in project management? Please explain., what do you think are the sources of impediments hindering the implementation of value co-creation in project management in your company? Demographic details of participants are presented in this chapter. The data was analysed using thematic analysis. The researcher manually analysed the participants' responses to identify similar ideas and group them into themes. Themes were formulated under each research objective. Direct words of the participants are presented to ensure credibility of the findings. Discussions of findings are provided to link the findings from the interviews and existing literature.

4.2. Demographic details

The demographic details of the participants were gathered in relation to their level of education, working experience and occupational position.

Table 4.1. Demographic details

Participant	Level of education	Working experience	Occupational position
1	Honours	5 years	Brewing Area Manager
2	Bachelors	10 years	Technical Project Manager
3	Honours	5 years	Brewing Project Engineer
4	Honours	7 years	Control Manager
5	Bachelors	3 years	Project operation Manager
6	Honours	8 years	Raw Material and process development specialist
7	Bachelors	3 years	Brewing Project Engineer
8	Bachelors	5 years	Control Manager

9	Honours	7 years	Control Manager
10	Honours	3 years	Control Manager

Six (6) participants were holders of Honours degrees and four (4) had Bachelor's degrees. Differences in the level of education determined the depth of participants' response to the interview questions where participants with Honours provided more detailed information as compared to participants with Bachelor's degrees.

Working experience of participants ranged from three (3) to ten (10) years. Three participants had three years of experience, and other three participants had five years of experience, two had seven years of experience, one had eight years of experience and another one had ten years of experience.

Occupational positions of the participants included Brewing Area Managers, Technical Project Managers, Brewing Project Engineers, Control Managers, Project Operation Manager, and Raw Material and process development specialist. The diversity of occupational positions is essential for the study to gather information from different perspectives and experiences. The responses of the participants were unique based on their occupational positions and their daily roles in the company.

4.3. Impediments hindering value co-creation in project management

The generated themes in relation to impediments that hinder value co-creation in project management include project scope changes, lack of performance standards and poor communication, stakeholder involvement, lack of knowledge and unrealistic expectations.

Table 4.2. Impediments hindering value co-creation in project management

Themes	Interpretation
1. Project scope changes	Participants indicated that project scope changes impede value co-creation in project management.
2. Lack of performance standards	Participants indicated that there are no specific performance standards in the project management.

3. Poor communication	Participants pointed to the poor communication as impeding value co-creation in project management.
4. Stakeholder involvement	Participants indicated that stakeholder involvement is problematic in value co-creation in project management
5. Lack of knowledge	Participants indicated that lack of knowledge in project implementation impede value co-creation in project management.
6. Unrealistic expectations	Participants mentioned that unrealistic expectations cause unnecessary pressure on team members that lead to post-project issues.

4.3.1. Project scope changes

Participants indicate that project scope irregularities affect the value co-creation in the project management. The scope regularities incorporate changes in the scope of the work and project requirements. The following participant reported that:

Participant 1:

When the stakeholder constantly changes the scope of the work.... stakeholder does not appropriately define the key outcomes required from the project.

Participant 5:

Managing the demand from different stakeholders is very difficult...lack of clarity in the requirements of a project impedes the effective implementation of value co-creation in the project.

The project scope irregularities present a barrier to the implementation of value co-creation since the project scope and requirements is not clearly defined. The participants suggested that changes in the project scope result in the changes of the required project outcomes, and difficult to manage.

4.3.2. Poor communication

Participants expressed that poor communication impedes the implementation of value co-creation in the project management. When the stakeholders have different perspective of the value about the project, it affects the project quality and results in cost implications. Participants suggested that they face challenges when they are not given relevant information upfront.

Participant 1:

Having different perspectives of value between the two parties involved, for example, the value for the supplier is generally the engineering outcomes, whereas for the company, it is beyond that. We also look at the quality output, the cost implications and whether the changes will improve efficiencies and delivery.

Participant 2:

I would say one of the challenges we face is not being told relevant information upfront which results to lack of communication and people taking up actions of their roles.

Participant 4:

At different stages in the goal creation we do have problems that include what I refer to as the inability of the end user (customer) to clearly define the way certain issues and projects be implemented which forces us sometimes to do things in a certain way and only after that do we now get criticism, this is but one challenge amongst many others.

4.3.3. Lack of performance standards

Participants reported that there are no specific standards for measuring performance, and it becomes difficult to trace the performance and achievements in the project management. Participants suggest that there are many measures used randomly to measure project performance hence it becomes difficult to determine the final success of the project. The participants said the following:

Participant 2:

There isn't a standard or a specific measure that we would use, but when you go back to analyse your achievements of your performance criteria you would generally trace where you sort of went wrong. Which will then come down to the design phase in maintenance. So, once you've identified the phase which the deviation of your goal took place you can then identify the activities which you didn't have sufficient support on.

Participant 4:

The main thing is on defining what the purpose of the project is and the measures that will be used to show project success, often there are too many measures thrown around which then skews the final measure of project success.

4.3.4. Lack of knowledge

Participants reported that lack of practical knowledge about project implementation is a barrier to value co-creation in project management. Participants reported that sometimes the client might not have knowledge, skills or experience with the project at hand, and result in continual change to the project scope.

Participant 4:

Continual change in the scope of the project is a challenge we face in most of our projects...this coupled by lack of knowledge of what is practical and what is not this is sometimes because of lack of skills, experience and sometimes it is just lack of commitment and self-management.

Participant 7:

Lack of knowledge and skills about project on the part of the client is very difficult because the client end up continuously change the project scope and make additional designs that will cost us in future.

4.3.5. Unrealistic expectations

Participants mentioned that customers promise unrealistic deadlines to the top management and that result in unnecessary pressure on the project teams. When customers lack project experience it results in some of them being unrealistic in their demands. Participants mentioned that some of the customers' budget may not match with the project demands. The following participants said:

Participant 4:

This in our case results in our customers promising unrealistic deadlines to top management resulting in unnecessary pressure on the project teams which may sometimes lead to work accidents and shortcuts being taken.

Participant 8:

Sometimes lack of project experience among members results in some being unrealistic in their demands and on the flip side the more experienced do not readily change and adapt to the new ways of doing things

Participant 10:

The problem usually starts with I have such and such amount and I need this done however in most cases the funds available do not match the amount of work being proposed, so when trying to align the expectations with the available funds there is usually a disconnect and unhappiness.

4.3.6. Stakeholder involvement

Participants indicate that lack of stakeholder involvement in the project from the onset create problems to the value co-creation in the project management. The lack of stakeholders in the project result in the mismatch between the work demands and cost implications. Participants also indicate that too much involvement of the stakeholders is problematic, and it leads to unnecessary changes to the project scope and shortcuts to reduce costs. The following participants said:

Participant 3:

Lack of involvement of the end user from the beginning of the project is a huge concern. You find that the end user has a long list of abnormalities due to short cuts taken during the project implementation in order to cut costs.

Participant 9:

It is both side that when the stakeholders are not involved in the project from start, by the time you try to involve them, they come with many changes and suggestions to the project scope...however, too much involvement of the stakeholders create more problems because begin to make unnecessary changes to the project scope and short-cuts to reduce costs.

The findings on the impediments that hinder the implementation of value co-creation were consistent with the study propositions and explained why value co-creation is not a common practice in Project Management in South Africa. The study propositions highlighted the lack of awareness about the importance of value co-creation, secrecy and ownership of intellectual property, information overload, poor communication, and changing attitudes as the impediments that hinder the implementation of value co-creation in project management in South Africa. Similar factors were found by the study including project scope changes, lack of performance standards, poor communication, stakeholder involvement, lack of knowledge and unrealistic expectations.

4.4. Impact of ineffective management of value outcomes

Ineffective management of the project leads to bad company reputation, financial implications, conflict of interests and poor quality of work.

Table: 4.3: Impact of ineffective management of value outcomes

Themes	Interpretation
Bad company reputation	Findings indicated that ineffective management of value outcomes lead to bad company reputation.
Financial implications	Participants indicated that changes in the project scope result in financial implications.

Conflict of interests	Participants expressed that lack of specific parameters to measure project performance led to conflict of interests between the contractor and client.
Poor quality of work	Participants indicated that poor quality of work can be experienced when the client lacks knowledge and experience with project.

4.4.1. Bad company reputation

Participants indicate that ineffective management of value outcome led to bad company reputation as being unreliable. Participants mentioned that people begin to lose trust in the company's capabilities and abilities to deliver on the expectations.

Participant 1

Makes the company unreliable.... people loose trust in its capabilities and abilities to deliver on the expectations.

Participant 3:

It becomes difficult to satisfy the supplier and end user at the same time. Some suppliers bid at a low price and leave the end user with post project issues...It can ruin the reputation of the business as some projects can result in a food safety risk for consumers if not done properly

Participant 10:

Customers can put a lot of pressure for their work to be done within a short time frame, and when they begin to not post project issues, the perceive the company as bad.

4.4.2. Financial implications

Participants reported that the allocation of insufficient time for the project lead to the project running out of budget due to new issues coming up and not able to complete the scope required. Participants also indicated that changes that are made to the project scope have serious financial implications since new changes come with additional costs. The participants said the following:

Participant 5:

Insufficient time spent on the front-end engineering/design, which leads to the project running out of budget due to new issues coming up and not able to complete the scope required.

Participant 9:

'...those impediments that require structural changes to the project take priority as they have serious financial implications because those changes introduced come with additional costs.

4.4.3. Conflict of interests

Participants expressed that lack of specific parameters to measure project performance lead to conflict of interests between the contractor and client.

Participant 3:

'Project management need to be directed by specific standards and rules that makes the client and contractors to be at the same level otherwise without those parameters conflict of interests may exists between the client and contractor.'

Participant 7:

'Lack of consensus between the contractor and client is common in project management if there is poor communication among the project stakeholders.... if differences are not communicated and addressed, the conflict of interests may arise.'

Participant 9:

'Project stakeholders need to be updated on all the information about the project to avoid conflict of interest and sabotage, especially when project specifications are not clear to all stakeholders.'

4.4.4. Poor quality of work

Participants indicated that poor quality of work can be experienced when the client lacks knowledge and experience with project.

Participant 1

The interpersonal communication in project management affects the outcomes of the project, so when the project is poor managed the quality is also negatively affected.

Participant 7

'Poor management of the project manifests itself through the quality of work produced, and if immediate interventions are not made, the project may fail to achieve its objectives.'

Participant 10

Many projects suffer from ineffective management and lack of experiences of both client and contractor that lead to poor quality or failure to reach the optimum standards.

The findings indicated the impact of ineffective management of value outcomes in project management including bad company reputation, financial implications, conflict of interests and poor quality of work. The findings intended to meet objective 2 of the study which sought to identify the barriers and concerns regarding value co-creation implementation through interviews with managers. The findings fully addressed the concerns regarding value co-creation implementation. This section partially addressed the requirements of objective 2.

4.5. Managing impediments that hinder value co-creation in project management

The themes generated regarding ways to manage impediments that hinder value co-creation in project management include risk assessment, setting realistic goals, value interaction, and stakeholder accountability.

Table 4.4. Managing impediments that hinder value co-creation in project management

Themes	Interpretation
--------	----------------

Risk assessment	Participants recommended for the pre-project and post-project assessment to manage the impediments that hinder value co-creation in project management.
Setting realistic goals	Participants suggested that setting of realistic goals assists in managing impediments that hinder value co-creation in project management
Value interaction	Participants recommended for the value interaction to address the impediments that impede value co-creation
Stakeholder accountability	Participants recommended that stakeholders should be accountable for their contribution throughout the project life cycle.

4.5.1. Risk assessment

Participants indicated that risk assessment should be conducted to ensure that the project objectives align with the projected outcomes. Participants suggest that risk assessment should be carried out by multiple stakeholders to reach a holistic conclusion. The risks assessment should be done before the project start to make projections about the success of the current project, and post-project risk assessment should be conducted to identify areas of mistakes to be corrected in the future projects. The following participants said:

Participant 1:

Managing the impediments that hinder value co-creation requires risk assessment to be conducted before the project starts and at the end of the project...by performing risk assessments against the projective objectives and the expected outcomes

Participant 6:

Risk assessments not being done with a multidisciplinary team so that the view of risks is holistic to significantly reduce additional costs later... a post project review is one way of identifying the impediments as a learning for future and the criteria used to identify the impediments is in the form of a risk assessment. The risk assessment takes into account the severity, the frequency, likelihood, cost to company.

4.5.2. Setting realistic goals

Participants mentioned the importance of setting realistic goals in managing the impediments that hinder value co-creation in project management. The setting of realistic goals at the beginning of the project informs the decision making throughout the project life cycle, and achieving of short, medium and long-term benefits of the project. The following participants said:

Participant 1:

'... realistic goals are highly crucial to conceptualise at the onset as they get tied to every decision that will be made during the course of the project. Moreover, these are imperative in that the medium term and long-term benefits or lack thereof, will be taken by the company'

Participant 6:

The stakeholders should set realistic goals and key performance indicators for the project...It really depends on the relationship between the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) as you sometimes can achieve one KPI at the expense of the other. So, it is important to see the Total Cost of Ownership for the solution being implemented so that the long-term impact is taken into account.

4.5.3. Value interaction

Participants indicate that value interaction should be used to manage impediments of value co-creation in project management. Participants mentioned that value interactions ensure that all the stakeholders understand the requirements of project and ensure that the value outcomes are delivered effectively. Value interaction should be ensured at a moderate level because over interaction may cause more challenges related to project creeping and disagreements. The following participants said:

Participant 3:

Value interactions ensure that all stakeholders understand what is required of them and this ensures that value outcomes are delivered effectively.

Participant 4:

Over interaction sometimes creates project creeping and constant goal post changing I have been in situations at project implementation level where things were required to be changed and sometimes have had to refer customer to agree and sign off project plan. This does cause unhappiness and disagreements at project handover and may have financial implications.

4.5.4. Stakeholder accountability

Participants reported that stakeholder accountability is required to management impediments that hinder value co-creation. The participants mentioned that keeping the suppliers accountable at minimum cost ensure that the project value is delivered without compromising the reputation of the business.

Participant 3:

'... the project manager or production team need to keep suppliers accountable at minimal cost and ensures that the required value is delivered without compromising the reputation of the business.'

Participant 6:

'...lack of accountability and waste of resources lead to the company not being viewed as efficient and reliable.... managing value co-creation impediments requires stakeholder accountability in the project management.'

4.5.5. Project management training

Participants pointed to the need for project management training for stakeholders to curb the impediments that hinder the implementation of value-co-creation in project management. Training programmes assist stakeholders to participate fully in the project management and make contributions in the decision-making processes.

Participant 2:

'...lack of handing out the right project packages can ruin the reputation of the organisation and project package which can also lead to contamination of products. I could therefore conclude that the SOPs need more training.'

Participant 4:

The ways are geared to meet the goals of the client, however the clients in future they need project management training to understand all the processes and stages of projects so that they can be able to participate and give full attention and contributions and add value to the project rather than being given a project that they have had no input to.

The findings show the ways of managing the impediments that hinder the implementation of value co-creation including risk assessment, setting realistic goals, value interaction and stakeholder accountability. The findings intended to meet the requirements of objective 3 which sought to assess the implementation of value co-creation through reviewing of past projects company documents. The objective was partially addressed because the findings were based on interviews only, and not document review.

4.6 Discussions

The managers identified the impediments that hinder value co-creation in project management include project scope changes, poor performance standards and poor communication.

Project scope changes affect the value co-creation in the project management. The scope regularities incorporate changes in the scope of the work and project requirements. The project scope irregularities present a barrier to the implementation of value co-creation since the project scope and requirements is not clearly defined. This was not in the literature; hence it was an insight gained by this study. The participants provided detailed information about their experiences regarding the implementation of value co-creation, therefore, more insight was gained.

The managers emphasised that poor communication impedes the implementation of value co-creation in project management. When the stakeholders have different perspectives of the value about the project, it affects the project quality and result in cost implications. The project managers face challenges when they are not given relevant information upfront. Communication in value co-creation plays an integral role to convince customers to participate positively in the production process (Gebauer, Füller and Pezzeri 2013). Communication is essential in both value co-creation and implementation of the project to engage and update all project stakeholders on the aspects of the project (Mani and Chouk 2018). The managers suggested that there

are no specific standards for measuring performance, and it becomes difficult to trace the performance and achievements in the project management. There are many measures used randomly to measure project performance, it becomes difficult to determine the final success of the project.

Lack of practical knowledge about project implementation is a barrier to value co-creation in project management. The managers mentioned that sometimes the client might not have knowledge, skills or experience with the project at hand, and result in continual change to the project scope. This was not in the literature, it is an insight gained by this study.

Customers promise unrealistic deadlines to the top management and that results in unnecessary pressure on the project teams. When customers lack project experience it results in some of them being unrealistic in their demands. The managers mentioned that some of the customers' budgets may not match with the project demands. This was not in the literature, it is an insight gained by this study.

Lack of stakeholder involvement in the project from the onset creates problems for the value co-creation in project management. The lack of stakeholders in the project result in the mismatch between the work demands and cost implications. The managers allude that too much involvement of the stakeholders is problematic, and it leads to unnecessary changes to the project scope and short-cuts to reduce costs. This was not in the literature, it is an insight gained by this study.

The managers identified the impact of ineffective management of value outcomes including bad company reputation and financial implications.

Ineffective management of value outcome lead to bad company reputation as being unreliable. The managers made it clear that people begin to lose trust in the company's capabilities and abilities to deliver on the expectations. This was not in the literature, it is an insight gained by this study.

The allocation of insufficient time for the project lead to the project running out of budget due to new issues coming up and not able to complete the scope required. Changes that are made to the project scope have serious financial implications since new changes come with additional costs. This was not in the literature, it is an insight gained by this study.

The managers suggested ways to manage impediments that hinder value co-creation in project management include risk assessment, setting realistic goals, value interaction, and stakeholder accountability.

Risk assessment should be conducted to ensure that the project objectives are aligned with the projected outcomes. Risk assessment should be carried out by multiple stakeholders to reach a holistic conclusion. The risks assessment should be done before the project start to make projections about the success of the current project, and post-project risk assessment should be conducted to identify areas of mistakes to be corrected in the future projects. This was not in the literature, it is an insight gained by this study.

Setting realistic goals is crucial in managing the impediments that hinder value co-creation in project management. The setting of realistic goals at the beginning of the project informs the decision making throughout the project life cycle, and achieving of short, medium and long-term benefits of the project. This was not in the literature, it is an insight gained by this study.

Value interaction should be used to manage impediments of value co-creation in project management. Value interactions ensure that all the stakeholders understand the requirements of the project and ensure that the value outcomes are delivered effectively. Value interaction should be ensured at a moderate level because over interaction may cause more challenges related to project creeping and disagreements. Consistent engagements between the company and customers for value co-creation facilitate the quality of the products and services (Romero and Molina 2011). Value interaction assists in building relationships with customers and convince them to participate in value co-creation (Dvorak 2013). Value co-creation lays the foundation for the establishment of customer trust, loyal and relationships (Vega-Vazquez, Revilla-Camacho and Cossío-Silva 2013). In the business environment, innovation and competitive advantage are outcomes of value co-creation because the interaction that takes place between the firm and customers influences the outcomes of the quality of products (Prahalad and Ramaswamy 2004). Hence, the findings are supported by the existing literature on the importance of value interaction in managing the impediments that hinder value co-creation.

Stakeholder accountability is required to management impediments that hinder value co-creation. Keeping the suppliers accountable at minimum cost ensure that the project value is delivered without compromising the reputation of the business. Value co-creation is implemented within the confines of interaction between the company and customers, and both parties are important to each other (Grönroos 2011). The interaction between the company and customers for the purpose of value co-creation should be based on transparency, dialogue and risk benefit to ensure positive outcomes (Prahalad and Ramaswamy 2004). The findings are supported by the existing literature on the aspect of stakeholder accountability as a strategy to manage the impediments that hinder value co-creation.

Project management training for stakeholders to curb the impediments that hinder the implementation of value-co-creation in project management. Training programmes assist stakeholders to participate fully in the project management and make contributions in the decision-making processes. This aspect is not supported by the existing literature, it is insight gained by the study.

4.7 Conclusion

This chapter presents that findings of the study. Demographic details of participants are presented in this chapter. The findings are presented into themes supported by the direct words of the participants. The researcher's interpretation of findings is provided based on the quotation of participants.

Chapter 5: Conclusions and recommendations

5.1. Introduction

This chapter presents the discussions, conclusions, and recommendations of the study. The discussions consider the consistency of findings and existing literature. Conclusion is the final statements that are made regarding the findings in relation to the research question and objectives. Recommendations are made to specific individuals, departments, organisations, and future researchers.

5.2. Conclusions

The study focused on investigating why is value co-creation not a common practice in the South African project management industry.

The research question was:

Why is value co-creation not a common practice in the South African project management industry?

The findings from the field and literature were as follows: there are impediments that hinder the adoption and effectiveness of value-co-creation in project management including poor communication, lack of specific standards for measuring performance, lack of practical knowledge, unrealistic deadlines, lack of stakeholder involvement and insufficient management of value outcome.

The research propositions were:

Proposition 1: Secrecy and ownership of intellectual property impede the wide adoption of value co-creation in project management industry. The proposition was rejected by the findings. The proposition was supported by the literature; however, the findings did not consider secrecy and ownership of intellectual property as an impediment of value co-creation in project management industry.

Proposition 2: Information overload impede the implementation of value co-creation in project management industry. The proposition was rejected by the study. The proposition was only supported by the literature; however, the finding did not identify information overload as an impediment that hinders value co-creation in project management.

Proposition 3: Word of mouth impede the wide spread of value co-creation in the project management industry. The proposition was accepted considering that it was supported by the literature and findings as an impediment that hinder value co-creation in project management industry. The findings suggested that negative word of mouth tannish image of the company and undermines its reputation.

Proposition 4: Poor communication in project management industry impede the implementation of value co-creation. The proposition was accepted because it was supported by literature and findings as an impediment that hinders value co-creation in project management industry. Poor communication was linked to

unrealistic expectations of the clients and continual changes of the project scope.

Proposition 5: Changing of attitude towards value co-creation impedes the wide adoption of value co-creation in project management industry. The proposition was rejected. The proposition was in the literature, but it was not supported by the findings.

The research objectives were to:

Objective 1: To assess the awareness, knowledge and the practise of value co-creation in projects through interviews.

The findings fully addressed the research objective through highlighting the previous implementation of value co-creation in project management industry, and shared experiences with value co-creation.

Objective 2: Identify barriers and concerns regarding value co-creation implementation through interviews with managers.

The objective was fully addressed considering that the findings identified the impediments that hinder the implementation of value co-creation in project management industry.

Objective 3: Assess the implementation of value-co creation in projects by reviewing past projects company documents.

The objective was partially addressed because the responses focused more on the previous encounters and experiences with implementing value co-creation, however, the aspect of company documents was not fully covered.

The objective of the study was achieved through identification of impediments that limit the adoption of value co-creation in project management in South Africa. A single case was used in the study because the company was geographically convenient and accessible for the researcher. The findings of this case study are limited to one organisation. The project scope changes present a barrier to the implementation of value co-creation since the project scope and requirements is not clearly defined. Poor communication impedes the implementation of value co-creation in the project management. When the stakeholders have different perspective of the value about

the project, it affects the project quality and result in cost implications. The project managers face challenges when they are not given relevant information upfront. There are no specific standards for measuring performance, and it becomes difficult to trace the performance and achievements in the project management. There are many measures used randomly to measure project performance hence it becomes difficult to determine the final success of the project. Lack of practical knowledge about project implementation is a barrier to value co-creation in project management. The study found that sometimes the client might not have knowledge, skills or experience with the project at hand, and result in continual change to the project scope. Customers promise unrealistic deadlines to the top management and that result in unnecessary pressure on the project teams. When customers lack project experience it results in some of them being unrealistic in their demands. The study found that some of the customers' budget may not match with the project demands.

Lack of stakeholder involvement in the project from the onset create problems to the value co-creation in the project management. The lack of stakeholders in the project result in the mismatch between the work demands and cost implications. Too much involvement of the stakeholders is also problematic, and it leads to unnecessary changes to the project scope and short-cuts to reduce costs. Ineffective management of value outcome lead to bad company reputation as being unreliable. The study found that people begin to lose trust in the company's capabilities and abilities to deliver on the expectations. The allocation of insufficient time for the project lead to the project running out of budget due to new issues coming up and not able to complete the scope required. Changes that are made to the project scope have serious financial implications since new changes come with additional costs.

Practical suggestions were made to minimise the impediments of value co-creation in the South African project management industry. Risk assessment should be conducted to ensure that the project objectives are align with the projected outcomes. Risk assessment should be carried out by multiple stakeholders to reach a holistic conclusion. The risks assessment should be done before the project start to make projections about the success of the current project, and post-project risk assessment should be conducted to identify areas of mistakes to be corrected in the future projects. Setting realistic goals is crucial in managing the impediments that hinder value co-creation in project management. The setting of realistic goals at the beginning of the

project informs the decision making throughout the project life cycle, and achieving of short, medium and long-term benefits of the project. Value interaction should be used to manage impediments of value co-creation in project management. Value interactions ensure that all the stakeholders understand the requirements of project and ensure that the value outcomes are delivered effectively. Value interaction should be ensured at a moderate level because over interaction may cause more challenges related to project creeping and disagreements. Stakeholder accountability is required to management impediments that hinder value co-creation. Keeping the suppliers accountable at minimum cost ensure that the project value is delivered without compromising the reputation of the business.

Project management training for stakeholders to curb the impediments that hinder the implementation of value-co-creation in project management. Training programmes assist stakeholders to participate fully in the project management and make contributions in the decision-making processes.

5.3. Recommendations

The recommendations are made to the organisation being studied, project managers, project clients and project stakeholders.

- **The case study organisation**

Recommendations are made to the organisation being studied to advance value co-creation. The organisation is recommended to involve all project stakeholders in value co-creation to ensure that they clearly understand the objectives of the projects. Effective change management is required in the organisation to ensure effectiveness of value co-creation in the organisation. The organisation should invest in new technology and innovation that support the implementation of value co-creation. The parameters and standards for measuring the effectiveness of value co-creation in project management should be set by the organisation to ensure accurate assessment and projections of project success.

- **Project managers**

The project managers are recommended to set performance standards and parameters that guide the implementation of the projects and measure its success.

The lack of performance standards may create problems related to project quality. The project manager should facilitate effective communication that eliminate potential communication challenges. Project managers accurate project the realistic timeframe required to complete the project so that workers may not receive unnecessary pressure.

- **Project clients**

Clients are recommended to provide specific and relevant information about their projects before the project has started. The provisions of relevant information prevent cases of changes to the project scope or additional costs. The Clients should research more or seek information about their projects before approach the project implementers.

- **Project stakeholders**

The project stakeholders include the project sponsors, employees, and end-users. The project stakeholders should not be too much involved in the project implementation and put unnecessary pressure. The involvement of stakeholders should be optimum to prevent the use of unnecessary short-cuts that can lead to additional costs.

5.4 Suggestions for Future Research

The future researcher should investigate value co-creation in other industries that are not covered by this study, for example, the retail industry in South Africa. Further, research should explore the company perspective and customer perspective towards value co-creation in the project management industry based on multiple cases and larger samples for comparison within the same industry. More research involving quantitative analysis should be conducted.

REFERENCES

- Acar, O A (2018) Harnessing the creative potential of potential consumers: Money, participation and creativity in idea crowdsourcing. *Marketing Letters*, **29**(4), 177-88.
- Agrawal, A K and Rahman, Z (2015) Roles and resource contributions of customers in value co-creation. *International Strategic Management Review*, **3**(6), 45-50.
- Allen, B J, Dholakia, U M and Basuroy, S (2016) The economics benefits to retailers from customer participation in proprietary web panels. *Journal of Retailing*, **92**(2), 147-61.
- Artto, K, Ahola, T and Vartiainen, V (2016) From the front end of projects to the back end of operations: Managing projects for value creation throughout the system lifecycle. *International Journal of Project Management*, **34**(2), 258-70.
- Babbie, E (2016) *The practice of social research*. 14th ed. Boston: Cengage Learning.
- Bhattacharjee, A (2012) *Social science research: Principles, methods, and practices*. Global Text Project. Available online from <https://bit.ly/34yiRtC>.
- Braun, V and Clark, V (2006) Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Quantitative Research in Psychology*, **3**(2), 77-101.
- Chen, J S, Tsou, H T and Ching, R K H (2011) Co-production and its effects on service innovation. *Industrial Marketing Management*, **40**(8), 1131-346.
- Claudy, M C R, Garcia, R and O'Driscoll, A (2015) Consumer resistance to innovation: A behavioral reasoning perspective. *Journal of Academy of Marketing Science*, **43**(4), 528-44.
- Cohen, Y, Rozenes, S and Horowitz, R (2017) Integrating strategic considerations and value co-creation in project management. *Universal Journal of Management*, **5**(2), 94-104.
- Cossío-Silva, F J, Revilla-Camacho, M Á, Vega-Vázquez, M and Palacios-Florencio, B (2016) Value co-creation and customer loyalty. *Journal of Business Research*, **69**(3), 1621-5.
- Creswell, J W and Miller, D L (2000) Determining validity in qualitative inquiry. *Theory into Practice*, **39**(3), 125-30.
- Cuervo-Cazurra, A, Mudambi, R, Pedersen, T and Piscitello, C (2017) Research methodology in global strategy research. *Global Strategy Journal*, **7**(3), 233-40.
- De Vos, A S (2005) *Combined qualitative and quantitative approach. Research at grassroots for the social science and human service professions*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

- Denscombe, M (2010) *The good research guide for small-scale social research projects*. 4th ed. New York: Open University Press, McGraw Hill.
- Denzin, N K and Lincoln, Y (2011) *Handbook of qualitative research*. 3rd ed. Sage: Thousand Oaks.
- Du Toit, N (2016) *Barriers to multiple stakeholders value co-creation in JSE-listed companies*, MBA, University of Pretoria.
- Dvorak, T (2013) Co-innovation: Customer motives for participation in co-creation processes via social media platforms. In: *2nd IBA Bachelor Thesis Conference*, Enschede, The Netherlands: University of Twente.
- Dye, J F, Schatz, I M, Rosenberg, B A and Coleman, S T (2000) Constant comparison method: A kaleidoscope of data. *The Qualitative Report*, **4**(1), 1-10.
- Edkins, A, Geraldi, J, Morris, P and Smith, A (2013) Exploring the front-end of project management. *Engineering Project Organization Journal*, **3**(2), 71–85.
- Essen, A, Winterstorm, V and Liljedal, K T (2016) Co-production in chronic care: Exploitation and empowerment. *European Journal of Marketing*, **50**(5), 724-51.
- Fernandes, T and Remelhe, P (2016) How to engage customers in co-creation: Customers' motivations for collaborative innovation. *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, **24**(4), 311-30.
- Forrester Consulting (2014) *The creative dividend: How creativity impacts business results*. Forrester Consulting. Available online from <https://adobe.ly/3uAgn8P>.
- Frito Lay (2014) *Lay's potato chips reveals the four finalists competing for a \$1 million grand prize in the Lay's "do us a flavor" contestor" contest*. Frito Lay. Available online from <https://bit.ly/3wGVOcc>.
- Galvangno, M and Dali, D (2014) Theory of value co-creation: A systematic literature review. *Managing Service Quality*, **24**(6), 643-83.
- Gebauer, J, Füller, J and Pezzeri, R (2013) The dark and the bright side of co-creation: Triggers of member behavior in online innovation communities. *Journal of Business Research*, **66**(9), 1516-27.
- Grisseemann, U S and Stokburger-Sauer, N E (2012) Customer co-creation of travel services: The role of company support and customer satisfaction with the co-creation performance. *Tourism Management*, **33**(6), 1483-92.
- Grönroos, C (2011) Value co-creation in service logic: A critical analysis. *Marketing Theory*, **11**(3), 279-301.
- Grönroos, C and Ravald, A (2011) Service as business logic: Implications for value creation and marketing. *Journal of Service Management*, **22**(1), 5-22.

- Gyrd-Jones, R I and Kornum, N (2013) Managing the co-created brand: Value and cultural complementarity in online and offline multi-stakeholder ecosystems. *Journal of Business Research*, **66**(9), 1484-93.
- Haddadi, A, Johansen, A and Andersen, B (2016) A conceptual framework to enhance value creation in construction projects. *Procedia Computer Science*, **100**, 565-73.
- Hennink, M, Hutter, I and Bailey, A (2011) *Qualitative research methods*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Hillebrand, B, Driessen, P H and Koll, O (2015) Stakeholder marketing: Theoretical foundations and required capabilities. *Journal of Academy of Marketing Science*, **43**(4), 411-28.
- Ind, N and Coates, N (2013) The meaning of co-creation. *European Business Review*, **25**(1), 86-95.
- Keeys, L A and Huemann, M (2017) Project benefits co-creation: Shaping sustainable development benefits. *International Journal of Project Management*, **35**(6), 1196-212.
- Kelemen, M L and Rumens, N (2008) *An introduction to critical management research* London: Sage.
- Keren, B and Cohen, Y (2012) Optimising project performance: The triangular trade-off optimisation approach. *International Journal of Engineering Management and Economics*, **3**(1-2), 152-70.
- King, N (2004) Using templates in the thematic analysis of text. In: Cassell, C and Symon, G (Eds.), *Essential guide to qualitative methods in organizational research*, pp. 256–70. London: Sage.
- Krishna, A, Lazarus, D and Dhaka, S (2013) Co-creation channel: A concept for paradigm shift in value creation. *Journal of Management Science and Practice*, **1**(1), 14-21.
- Laursen, M and Svejvig, P (2016) Taking stock of project value creation: A structured literature review with future directions for research and practice. *International Journal of Project Management*, **34**(4), 736–47.
- Leavy, B (2012) Collaborative innovation as the new imperative – design thinking, value co-creation and the power of “pull”. *Strategy & Leadership*, **40**(2), 25-34.
- Leclercq, T, Hammedi, W and Poncin, I (2016) Ten years of value cocreation: An integrative review. *Recherche et Applications en Marketing*, **31**(3), 26-60.
- Liu, A, Fellows, R and Chan, I (2014) Fostering value co-creation in construction: A case study of an airport project in India. *International Journal of Architecture, Engineering and Construction*, **3**(2), 120-30.

- Mack, T and Landau, C (2015) Winners, losers, and deniers: Self-selection in crowd innovation contests and the roles of motivation, creativity, and skills. *Journal of Engineering and Technology Management*, **37**(7), 52-64.
- Mani, Z and Chouk, I (2018) Consumer resistance to innovation in services: Challenges and barriers in the Internet of Things era. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, **35**(5), 780-807.
- Neghina, C, Bloemer, J, Van Birgelen, M and Caniëls, M C J (2017) Consumer motives and willingness to co-create in professional and generic services. *Journal of Service Management*, **28**(1), 157-81.
- Neghina, C S, Caniels, M C J, Bloemer, J M and Van Birgelen, M J (2015) Value cocreation in service interactions: Dimensions and antecedents. *Marketing Theory*, **15**(2), 221-42.
- O'Cass, A and Wetzels, M (2018) Contemporary issues and critical challenges on innovation in services. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, **35**(5), 674-81.
- Oldemaat, L (2013) *Co-creation: The P of participation. How co-creation affects product and brand attitudes and behavioural intentions of non co-creative consumers*, MSc, University of Twente.
- Otchere, S K, Hong-Yun, T, Addy, W O and Kumaning, R G (2019) The effect of value co-creation on innovation performance: The mediating role of customer perceived value *European Journal of Business and Management*, **11**(27), 47-55.
- Payne, A and Frow, P (2014) A strategic framework for customer relationship management. *Journal of Marketing*, **69**(4), 167-76.
- Pera, R, Occhiocupo, N and Clarke, J (2016) Motives and resources for value co-creation in a multi-stakeholder ecosystem: A managerial perspective. *Journal of Business Research*, **69**(10), 4033-41.
- Pinto, J K (2016) *Project management: Achieving competitive advantage*. 4th ed. New York: Pearson.
- Pongsakornrunsilp, S and Schroeder, J (2011) *Understanding value co-creation in a co-consuming group*. The University of Exeter Business School Discussion Papers in Management Paper number 09/04. Available online from <https://bit.ly/2TvXhUv>.
- Prahalad, C K and Ramaswamy, V (2004) Co-creation experiences: The next practice in value creation. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, **18**(3), 5-14.
- PricewaterhouseCoopers (2016) *19th annual global CEO survey*. PricewaterhouseCoopers. Available online from <https://pwc.to/34vAmeb>.

- Randall, W S, Gravier, M J and Prybutok, V R (2011) Connection, trust, and commitment: Dimensions of co-creation? *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, **19**(1), 3-24.
- Reed, M (2005) Reflections on the 'realist turn' in organization and management studies. *Journal of Management Studies* **42**(8), 1621-44.
- Roggeveen, A L, Tsiros, M and Grewal, D (2012) Understanding the co-creation effect: When does collaborating with customers provide a lift to service recovery? *Journal of Academic and Marketing Science*, **40**(6), 771-90.
- Rolfe, G (2006) Validity, trustworthiness and rigour: Quality and the idea of qualitative research. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, **53**(3), 304-10.
- Romero, D and Molina, A (2011) Collaborative networked organisations and customer communities: Value co-creation and co-innovation in the networking era. *Production Planning & Control*, **22**(5-6), 447-72.
- Rubio, N, Villaseñor, N and Yagüe, M J (2020) Value co-creation in third-party managed virtual communities and brand equity. *Frontiers in Psychology*, **11**(927), 1-4.
- Sahi, G K, Sehgal, S and Sharma, P (2017) Predicting customers recommendation from co-creation of value, customization and relational value. *VIKALPA: The Journal for Decision Makers*, **42**(1), 19-35.
- Salomonson, N, Allwood, J, Lind, M and Alm, H (2013) Comparing Human-to-Human and Human-to-AEA communication in service encounters. *Journal of Business Communication*, **50**(1), 87-116.
- Samarov, E (2015) *Value creation and co-creation in a consumer sphere within online retail*, MBA, University of Pretoria.
- Saunders, M, Lewis, P and Thornhill, A (2018) *Research methods for business students*. 8th ed. London: Pearson.
- Schüler, M, Maier, M F and Liljedal, K T (2020) Motives and barriers affecting consumers' co-creation in the physical store. *The International Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer Research*, **30**(3), 289-310.
- Science Daily (2013) *Big data, for better or worse: 90% of world's data generated over last two years*. Science Daily. Available online from <https://bit.ly/3vAosf6>.
- Smyth, H, Lecoeuvre, L and Vaesken, P (2018) Co-creation of value and the project context: Towards application on the case of Hinkley Point C Nuclear Power Station. *International Journal of Project Management*, **36**(1), 170-83.
- Vargo, S L and Lusch, R F (2015) Service-dominant logic: What it is, what it is not, what it might be. In: Lusch, R F and Vargo, S L (Eds.), *The service-dominant logic of marketing: Dialog, debate, and directions*, pp. 43-56. Oxon: Routledge.

- Vega-Vazquez, M, Revilla-Camacho, M Á and Cossío-Silva, F J (2013) The value co-creation process as a determinant of customer satisfaction. *Management Decision*, **51**(10), 1945-53.
- von Hippel, E A, Ogawa, S and de Jong, J P J (2011) The age of the consumer-innovator. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, **53**(1), 27-35.
- Xie, K, Wu, Y, Xiao, J and Hu, Q (2016) Value co-creation between firms and customers: The role of big data-based cooperative assets. *Information & Management*, **53**(8), 1034-48.
- Yi, Y and Gong, T (2012) The development and validation of a customer value co-creation behavior scale. In: *Global Marketing Conference*, Tokyo, Japan.
- Yin, R K (2009) *Case study research: Design and methods*. 4th ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Yin, R K (2015) *Qualitative research from start to finish*. 2nd ed. New York: The Guildford Press.
- Zhang, P (2017) *Co-creation experience: Measurement development and influence on value in sharing economy*, PhD, College of Hospitality, Retail and Sport Management, University of South Carolina.
- Zwikael, O and Smyrk, J R (2011) *Project management for the creation of organisational value*. London: Springer.

ANNEXURE

ANNEXTURE A: ETHICAL CLEARANCE

Application for Approval of Ethics in Research (ER) Projects
Faculty of Engineering and the Built Environment, University of Cape Town

ETHICS APPLICATION FORM

Please Note:

Any person planning to undertake research in the Faculty of Engineering and the Built Environment (EBE) at the University of Cape Town is required to complete this form before collecting or analysing data. The objective of submitting this application prior to embarking on research is to ensure that the highest ethical standards in research, conducted under the auspices of the EBE Faculty, are met. Please ensure that you have read, and understood the EBE Ethics in Research Handbook (available from the UCT EBE Research Ethics website) prior to completing the application form: <http://www.ebe.uct.ac.za/eberesearch/ethics1>

APPLICANT'S DETAILS	
Name of principal researcher, student or external applicant	
Department	
Preferred email address of applicant:	
I Student	Your Degree e.g., MSc, PhD, etc.
	Credit Value of Research: e.g., 60/120/180/360 etc.
	Name of Supervisor (if supervised):
If this is a research contract, indicate the source of funding/sponsorship:	
Project Title	

Promise Mashidi
Construction, Economics & Management
promash123@gmail.com
MSc
60
Keith Cattell
NA
Value co-creation in the Project Management Industry in SA: implementation & examine

I hereby undertake to carry out my research in such a way that:

- there is no apparent legal objection to the nature or the method of research; and
- the research will not compromise staff or students or the other responsibilities of the University;
- the stated objective will be achieved, and the findings will have a high degree of validity;
- limitations and alternative interpretations will be considered;
- the findings could be subject to peer review and publicly available; and
- I will comply with the conventions of copyright and avoid any practice that would constitute plagiarism.

APPLICATION BY	Full name	Signature	Date
Principal Researcher/ Student/external applicant	Promise Mashidi	Signed by candidate	19/09/2020
SUPPORTED BY	Full name	Signature	Date
Supervisor (where applicable)	Prof. KS Cattell		30/4/2020
APPROVED BY	Full name	Signature	Date
HOD (or delegated nominee) Final authority for all applicants who have answered NO to all questions in Section 1; and for all Undergraduate research (including Honours).	Louise van Schalkwyk		16 June 2020
Chair: Faculty ER Committee For applicants other than undergraduate students who have answered YES to any of the questions in Section 1.	Louise van Schalkwyk		16 June 2020

ANNEXTURE B: ORGANISATION APPROVAL LETTER

ABInBev

This letter confirms that Mpelegeng Mologadi Promise Moshidi was granted permission to conduct research at ABInBev regarding Project Management. All information must be kept confidential|and information must be destroyed post the research.

Plant Manager

S.W Seabela



Researcher

MMP Moshidi



ANNEXTURE C: INTERVIEW GUIDE

Annexure: C. An interview guide for Project Managers at an FMCG company

My name is Promise Moshidi. I am a student at the University of Cape Town in the Department of Construction Economics and Management. I am carrying out a study entitled, 'Value co-creation in the Project Management Industry in South Africa: Implementation examined.'

This study is part of the researcher's requirements in the fulfilment of Masters' degree in Project Management at University of Cape Town.

I want to understand the extent of implementation of value co-creation in a specific company. I would like to interview people who have project management experience in the specific company which the single case study is based on.

Participation in this study is voluntary and the participants have the right to withdraw from participation anytime they feel inclined to discontinue with the study. Participants are encouraged to communicate to the researcher about their decision to withdraw from the study, and no consequences can be faced by the participants following such decision.

One hour zoom interview will be scheduled. It is expected that the interviewee checks their schedule and recommends a suitable time by the 30 October 2020. No costs will be incurred as digitalization will be used.

This project will not result in direct benefits to the interviewee.

The research discriminates as it only requires participants to have at least one-year project management experience.

The risk associated with participation in this project involve discomfort and intense reflective moments of past projects. The risk is that confidential data will be collected therefore company name and employees interviewed will not be mentioned by name. This will protect their reputation.

Values of confidentiality and privacy will be ensured throughout the study. No names of the participants will be identified with their responses, rather, codes will be used to identify the responses of the participants.

The interview documents will be kept safely in a locked device and will be destroyed immediately on completion of the study.

Permission and access to past projects will be required.

Project feedback will be emailed to participants. This will include the full research report.

I hereby giving my permission to participant in this study of the above-mentioned title. I am fully informed about the purpose of the study and the ethical considerations which guide the conduct of this research:

I agree	
I disagree	

Section. A. Demographic details

1. Level of education Metric Bachelors Honours Masters PhD
2. Work experience.....
3. Occupational Position.....

Section. B. Impediments hindering value co-creation in project management in South Africa

Screening question:

4. Have you ever participated or are you currently participating in Project Management in your career in this company? Yes/No. If No, the interview will be terminated.
5. What challenges do you face in generating and delivering value outcomes for a wide range of stakeholders in project management? Please explain.
6. What do you think are the sources of impediments hindering the implementation of value co-creation in project management in your company? Elaborate further.
7. How often do you face challenges in the implementation of value co-creation in project management? Please explain.
8. What criteria do you use to identify the impediments that are hindering the implementation of value co-creation in project management? Please go into detail.
9. What additional comment would you make on the current state of impediments hindering the implementation of value co-creation in project management in your company?
10. How does ineffective management of value outcomes affect the overall reputation of the company?
11. What do you think about the impact of the traditional supplier and production-oriented approach on the effectiveness of value management in projects?
12. To what extent do the value interactions contribute to achieving the client value outcomes in the medium- and long-term? Please clarify.

13. What challenges do you face in ensuring value interactions across the project lifecycle to improve functionality of the value outcomes? Please explain.

14. Do the current ways of managing value outcomes necessarily meet the mandatory goals of the clients? Please explain.