

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/24077420>

# Partnering in Construction: a Critical Review of Issues, Problems and Dilemmas

Article in *Construction Management and Economics* · February 2000

DOI: 10.1080/014461900370852 · Source: RePEc

CITATIONS

622

READS

8,257

2 authors:



[Mike Bresnen](#)

Manchester Metropolitan University

110 PUBLICATIONS 5,264 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



[Nick Marshall](#)

University of Brighton

34 PUBLICATIONS 2,092 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



Management Knowledge in Health Care [View project](#)

**PARTNERING IN CONSTRUCTION:  
A CRITICAL REVIEW OF ISSUES, PROBLEMS  
AND DILEMMAS**

**by**

**Mike Bresnen & Nick Marshall**

**Final accepted pre-publication version published as:**

Bresnen, M. and Marshall, N. (2000) Partnering in Construction:  
A Critical Review of Issues, Problems and Dilemmas. *Construction  
Management and Economics*, 18(2), 229-37

**To link to this article:** <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/014461900370852>

# **Partnering in Construction: A Critical Review of Issues, Problems and Dilemmas**

## **Abstract**

Partnering in construction has been presented as a potentially important way of improving construction project performance through the direct benefits it can bring to both clients and contractors. However, there is still considerable debate about the nature and merits of a partnering approach. This paper attempts to contribute towards this debate by exploring the presumed link between partnering and cultural change within the industry, at both organisational and inter-organisational levels of analysis. To do so, it draws upon theory and research from the social sciences (especially organisational theory) to explore some of the issues, problems and dilemmas which emerge when full and proper account is taken of the complexities of organisations, as well as some of the subtleties and intricacies of the concept of organisational culture. The paper concludes that it is only by fully appreciating the effects of such complexity that a more realistic and practical approach to the development and implementation of partnering will emerge.

Keywords: partnering, alliancing, culture

## **Introduction**

In recent years there has been a growing interest in the use of *partnering* in construction (ACTIVE, 1996; Construction Industry Institute (CII), 1989, 1991; CRINE, 1994; Latham, 1994; NEDO, 1991). During the 1990s, partnering and related forms of collaboration have been seen as a way of dealing with the fragmentation and lack of integration that have bedevilled attempts to improve project performance over the years (e.g. Banwell, 1964; Higgin and Jessop, 1965; NEDO, 1988).<sup>1</sup> Research has suggested that performance, in terms of cost, time, quality, buildability, fitness-for-purpose and a whole range of other criteria, can be dramatically improved if participants adopt more collaborative ways of working (e.g. Bennett and Jayes, 1995, 1998; Bennett *et al.*, 1996). Consequently, a good deal of attention has been directed towards examining the conditions which encourage or inhibit collaboration between clients and their contractors (e.g. Barlow and Cohen, 1996; Barlow *et al.*, 1997; Bennett and Jayes, 1995, 1998; Bennett *et al.*, 1996; Green and McDermott, 1996; Holti and Standing, 1996). At the same time, there is still considerable disagreement about precisely what form partnering can or should take, under what conditions it is likely to develop and how such ways of working can be fostered and developed (Barlow *et al.*, 1997; Thompson and Sanders, 1998).

---

<sup>1</sup> As will be seen, not only do definitions of partnering vary widely, but also forms such as 'alliancing' are referred to. For ease of presentation, 'partnering' is used in this paper to refer generically to all such collaborative approaches.

The aim of this paper is to explore some of the key issues and debates surrounding the concept of partnering.<sup>2</sup> The flavour of the paper is a critical one and its central theme is that there is still a need for more systematic and in-depth research which examines the nature, efficacy and feasibility of a partnering approach. One reason for this is that the debate has remained at a largely prescriptive level and empirical evidence concerning partnering in practice has largely been piecemeal and anecdotal. Where evidence does exist, it is difficult to say just how much any observed improvements in performance are directly attributable to 'partnering' (Barlow *et al.*, 1997). Another reason, however, concerns the way in which partnering has been conceptualised and investigated. In particular, very little of the research to date has explored the social and psychological aspects of partnering as a mode of organising. This is despite the fact that commentators place considerable emphasis upon the importance of changing attitudes, improving interpersonal relationships and transforming organisational cultures.

This paper therefore seeks to reassess partnering in a way that differs from the prevailing discourse within the industry. To do so, it draws much more directly upon social science concepts and theories used in organisational theory and research.<sup>3</sup> In doing so, it seeks critically to examine some of the tensions and contradictions that only really emerge when the meanings and assumptions underlying the approach are held up to closer scrutiny. In particular, the paper concentrates upon the presumed role that cultural change plays in supporting partnering within the industry (cf. Morgan, 1986, chs 5). It also traces through some of the effects of variation in organisational and environmental context, in an attempt to identify organisational attributes and management practices which appear to support or inhibit collaborative approaches. The intention in doing so is to move towards a more practically grounded and realistic interpretation of the nature of organisational change than is commonly encountered in much of the literature.

The discussion in this paper revolves around three main sets of issues, problems and dilemmas that remain unresolved or under-explored in the literature. These are: the lack of an adequate and precise definition of partnering; the potential conflict between commercial pressures and forms of collaboration in practice; and the inherent difficulties in attempting to change organisational cultures to support collaborative approaches. Before addressing these three main concerns, however, the discussion begins with a short review of the case put forward for partnering.

### **The case for partnering**

Although partnering as a specific concept is relatively new, the difficulties which it attempts to address have been identified for some considerable time. According to Luck (1996, p. 1), 'partnering and integration strategies attempt to address a fundamental characteristic of the industry ... that it is fragmented, as individuals from different organisations which are geographically and temporally dispersed are involved in the construction process'. Since the 1960s, a long series of government

---

<sup>2</sup> Work on which this paper is based was supported by EPSRC grant reference GR/L01206. The authors would like to thank Professor Geoffrey Trimble for his important contribution to this work.

<sup>3</sup> Organisational theory is, of course, a wide-ranging discipline. For an overview of major perspectives in organisational theory, the reader is referred to Burrell and Morgan (1979) or Morgan (1986).

and industry reports has sought solutions to the problems associated with this fragmentation caused by the peculiar characteristics of the construction process (see Harvey and Ashworth, 1993). Particular attention has focused upon improving the quality of relations between project participants and encouraging feedback and mutual adjustment between design and construction processes (e.g. Banwell, 1964; Higgin and Jessop, 1965; NEDO, 1988).

Partnering represents the latest in this series of initiatives (CII, 1989, 1991; Latham, 1994; NEDO, 1991). According to ACTIVE (1996, p. 7), 'the confrontational culture which is endemic in the sector has resulted in the development of inefficient business processes, which feed through, as overheads, to total project costs'. Partnering is thus intended to reduce the adversarialism which is said to be typical in the industry and which has confounded previous attempts to encourage better integration and cooperation between contractual partners. Central to partnering therefore is a determination to move away from adversarialism and litigation and to resolve problems jointly and informally through more effective forms of inter-firm collaboration.

According to the CII (1991, p. iv), 'Partnering refers to long-term agreements between companies to co-operate to an unusually high degree to achieve separate yet complementary objectives'. Similarly, partnering has been defined as 'a long-term commitment between two or more organisations for the purpose of achieving specific business objectives by maximising the effectiveness of each participant's resources' (NEDO, 1991, p. 5). Most of the attention in the literature has so far been directed at studying partnering between clients and (main) contractors - although there is an increasing recognition that the principles of collaboration may apply at other points in the supply chain (notably, in relationships between contractors and subcontractors).<sup>4</sup> There is therefore a fairly wide consensus over the basic philosophy underpinning partnering: namely, that it should involve a commitment between firms to co-operate. This is based on the premise that this will allow each organisation to meet its own business objectives more effectively, at the same time as achieving the objectives of the project as a whole (Bennett and Jayes, 1995, p. 2).

The incentives for engaging in partnering, as well as its supposed advantages, are also fairly well established in the literature. Bennett and Jayes (1995, p. 25), for example, emphasise the potential net benefits that stem from increased productivity and reduced costs. An emphasis on cost reduction is also clearly evident in a number of construction sector reports and initiatives which all call for a reduction in costs by 30% (ACTIVE, 1996; CRINE, 1994; Latham, 1994).<sup>5</sup> However, as well as significant cost reductions, partnering has also been attributed with a number of other virtues that stem from shared understandings and the pursuit of common interests. First, it is claimed that project times can be reduced. In particular, the early involvement of contractors in the design stage can 'assist in constructability input and maximizing

---

<sup>4</sup> See, for instance, Construction Productivity Network (1997). The same principles also apply to joint ventures (cf. Miles and Snow, 1978), which represent a more formal, investment-based type of collaborative relationship (cf. Thompson and Sanders, 1998).

<sup>5</sup> CRINE (Cost Reduction Initiative for the New Era) was set up to improve performance in the offshore oil and gas sector. ACTIVE (Achieving Competitiveness Through Innovation and Value Engineering) is a similar initiative established for the process plant sector.

value engineering, thus improving both cost and schedule' (CII, 1991, p. 9). Consistent reference is also made to the advantages of greater project team integration (through teambuilding) and, where long-term relationships occur, of the elimination of learning curves. Second, that a focus on learning and continuous improvement can result in improved quality (both of products and processes), as well as improvements to safety (CII, 1991; Loraine, 1996; NEDO, 1991). Third, it is claimed that partnering results in improved customer focus and client satisfaction, as well as better responsiveness to changing market conditions (Bennett and Jayes, 1995, p. 17; Bennett *et al.*, 1996). Finally, the greater stability in workload associated with long-term partnering helps companies deploy their resources more effectively and makes them more likely to invest in training and research.

Evidence in favour of partnering is, however, not always convincing. There is a tendency within the partnering literature to concentrate on success stories. These often have an anecdotal flavour to them and concentrate on the experiences of 'exemplar' organisations such as DuPont (Cowan *et al.*, 1992), the US Army Corps of Engineers (Weston and Gibson, 1993), Marks and Spencer (Tse, 1985) and BP (Knott, 1996). In an attempt to overcome the dearth of systematic empirical evidence for the performance effects of partnering, Larson (1997) conducted a survey of 291 construction projects and discovered a positive relationship between partnering activities and measures of project success. However, although there have been fewer indications of the failure of partnering to meet performance expectations, these are by no means absent (e.g. Angelo, 1998; CII, 1994; Rackham *et al.*, 1996). It should also be noted that most of the literature promoting partnering has focused entirely on experiences in the UK (e.g. Latham, 1994; NEDO, 1991), the US (e.g. CII, 1989; 1991) and Australia (e.g. Quick, 1994; Thompson, 1994) - suggesting perhaps the need to be cautious when attempting to extrapolate to other national contexts.

### **In search of a definition of partnering**

Despite the case put forward in favour of partnering, there are also several other questions which remain unanswered. The most obvious of these is what precisely does partnering entail in practice? While there is broad agreement about the overall 'philosophy' of partnering, there are nevertheless varying views on a number of its features, including the precise role of contracts and charters, the duration of partnering arrangements, the role of incentives systems, and the need for formal team-building and facilitation (see Barlow *et al.* (1997) for a review). Partnering is thus an imprecise and inclusive concept capturing within it a wide range of attitudes, behaviours, values, practices, tools and techniques. As Holti and Standing (1996, p. 5) have suggested, '[r]ather than being a separate or definable initiative in its own right, partnering or increasing collaboration is best understood as the result of making progress with one or more of a number of inter-related technical and organisational change initiatives' (see also Loraine, 1993, p. 2; NEDO, 1991, p. 10). Indeed, more recent accounts of partnering have attempted to inject a greater degree of sophistication by viewing the diversity of partnering practices as being ranged along a continuum from competition to co-operation, collaboration and coalescence (Thompson and Sanders, 1998).

However, the term ‘partnering’ is also often used to capture a ‘spirit of cooperation’ that may occur on any type of project - collaborative or otherwise (Barlow and Cohen, 1996). One consequence of this semantic ambiguity (where partnering can also signify an *outcome*) is that it makes it difficult to distinguish between partnering as a distinctive practice and partnering as managerial rhetoric (Hinks *et al.*, 1996). Another is that it is important to bear in mind that the use of partnering methods *per se* does not necessarily lead to effective outcomes (or even collaboration) - in the same way that using traditional forms of contract does not necessarily result in poor performance, or even conflict (Green and McDermott, 1996).

Notwithstanding these difficulties in definition, there are some commentators who insist on a more pragmatic, instrumentalist view of partnering. With a strong emphasis on tools and techniques, this approach has led to the generation of lists of systems and procedures that organisations should follow in order to establish a partnering arrangement. These include: charters and dispute resolution mechanisms; teambuilding exercises and facilitation workshops; continuous improvement processes; total quality management; business process mapping; and benchmarking (e.g. Bennett and Jayes, 1995; Evans and Bailey, 1996; Loraine, 1993; NEDO, 1991). In addition, information technology, such as 3-D CAD and shared databases, is often seen as crucial in supporting open communications and information sharing.

There is insufficient space here to discuss these systems and practices, each of which is important in its own right. However, as a whole they do raise two important general questions. First, is it possible to define partnering as a coherent strategy, that involves the deployment of a more or less universal set of systems, practices and procedures? Or is the term partnering so diffuse and malleable that it can be ascribed to any form of non-adversarial relationship? These questions are important if the intention is to develop standardised tools and techniques that can be universally applied across projects, clients and sectors<sup>6</sup>. The problem here is that all the evidence points to partnering being *contingent* upon a number of commercial and other conditions (cf. Bresnen, 1996, pp. 127-31). In the offshore oil and gas sector, for instance, it was the need to develop economically marginal fields at lower cost which led to the search for more cost-effective contractual solutions (Green, 1995). By way of contrast, partnering in the public sector has been much more constrained by competitive tendering requirements (Loraine and Williams, 1997). In other words, partnering is by no means universally applicable, let alone a panacea (Barlow *et al.*, 1997).

Moreover, companies interested in partnering will naturally seek to develop applications that reflect their own circumstances and requirements. However, evidence from other industrial sectors on the diffusion of ‘best practice’ shows how this can lead to companies adopting new practices in an *ad hoc* or piecemeal fashion, bowdlerising complete ‘packages’ by selecting only preferred elements, adjusted to suit their existing systems of operation (Bresnen, 1996, p. 126). One implication of this is that real experiences of ‘partnering’ may vary so much from one project to the

---

<sup>6</sup> An intention made explicit in many recent policy and research initiatives, including CRINE, ACTIVE and the EPSRC’s Innovative Manufacturing Initiative.

next that it militates against any attempts to develop standard and transferable applications.

A second important question is to what extent, if at all, is it possible to create or 'engineer' collaboration in the short term? It appears to be almost universally accepted that partnering requires: 'changing traditional relationships to a shared culture ... based upon trust, dedication to common goals, and an understanding of each other's individual expectations and values' (CII, 1991, p. 2). Indeed, in their review of approaches to partnering, Barlow and Cohen (1996) note that mutual objectives, trust, and an understanding of each other's commitments appear in most formulations. However, while these essentially attitudinal and behavioural characteristics are typically considered to be central to any successful partnering arrangement, the manner in which they are to be encouraged is less than clear.

On the one hand, there are those who believe that attitudes and behaviours evident in the construction industry are deeply ingrained and that it is difficult to engineer any rapid movement away from such an embedded culture. Green and McDermott (1996, p. 2), for example, argue that partnering: 'should be the result of natural evolution of long term relationships between two parties who have realised the financial benefits of combining production processes and by-passing the traditional tender procedures, and have through this working relationship begun to trust one another'. In effect, the development of trust between organisations is seen as a function of the length of the relationship between them, and the mechanisms that lead to this alignment (repetition, routine, understanding) are largely viewed as informal.

On the other hand, there are those who regard the engineering of trust, mutuality, openness and alignment as wholly feasible over much shorter time periods, and who thus propose using formal tools and techniques to develop project-specific partnering (e.g. Bennett *et al.*, 1996; Loraine, 1993). While the advantages of project-specific partnering are perhaps not regarded as equal to those of longer term arrangements (what Bennett and Jayes (1995) call 'strategic partnering'), the fact that it is considered possible to bring about change over the timescale of a single project is indicative of the view that partnering can be engineered and does not have to evolve 'naturally'.

There is therefore a division between those who see partnering as an informal and organic development and those who regard it as something more formal that can be actively engineered. This separation between formal *instrumental* and informal *developmental* views on partnering is also reflected in attitudes towards the role of contracts in such arrangements, as well as towards the use of incentive systems based upon risk/reward (or 'gainshare/painshare') formulae. For some, the level of understanding forged in less formal terms with a partnering arrangement effectively supersedes the role of the contract (e.g. ACTIVE, 1996, p. 13; Green and McDermott, 1996; Quick, 1994). Others view the formal contract as a crucial safeguard against any breakdown of the partnering arrangement (e.g. Loraine, 1996; Roe, 1996). Whatever the difference of view concerning the role of the contract, it is quite clear therefore that relying on formal contracts alone is not seen as sufficient to promote deeper desired changes in attitude. More generally, it alerts one to the fact that behaviour is not simply determined by formal structures and systems, but is instead



the result of conscious choices and actions and a complex interplay between structural imperatives and their subjective interpretation and enactment (cf. Bresnen, 1991; Seymour and Rooke, 1995; Silverman, 1974).

### **Partnering, contracting and cultural transformation**

Underpinning the case for partnering is the presumption that the key to effective change within the industry lies in developing an appropriate culture of relations to support the contracting mechanisms needed for a partnering approach to work. Partnering is therefore seen as essentially about changing behaviour and/or attitudes - encouraging clients and contractors to transgress the conflicting interests that lie at the heart of their exchange relationship, by appealing to common interests centred around specific project goals (e.g. Loraine, 1993) and/or more strategic long term relationships (CII, 1991, p. iv; NEDO, 1991, p. 5).

The problem, however, with this conceptualisation of the relationship between partnering and culture is that it can easily be forgotten that there is a real tension between, on the one hand, the need for the development of trust between clients and contractors and, on the other hand, surrounding economic conditions that can predispose contractual partners to act (for very rational economic reasons) in more 'traditional', adversarial and even exploitative ways (cf. Bresnen, 1996, p. 123-7). This is not meant to suggest that this makes collaboration impossible or unlikely. Rather, that it is collaboration (rather than conflict) which is the aberration to the norm: as over 30 years of government and industry reports have shown, lack of cooperation based upon fundamental differences in interests between clients, contractors and others is endemic and almost a defining characteristics of the industry (cf. Higgin and Jessop, 1965; Latham, 1994).

Put another way, economic conditions which encourage clients and contractors to work together towards a common purpose may be essential and much will thus depend upon prevailing market conditions. For example, a 'buyer's market' may enable powerful clients to shift risks onto contractors and press more effectively for changes to their methods of operation. There is some evidence from the oil and gas sector, for instance, that economic conditions have made contractors accede more readily to client pressure to develop alliances (Green, 1994, 1995, p. 202). The downside to this, of course, is that economic conditions may also encourage a more negative orientation towards partnering.

Evidence from other sectors, for example, shows how collaborative forms of contracting can depart from the ideal, through being driven by the narrower concern simply to reduce costs or to pass costs and risks on to those further down the supply chain (Bresnen, 1996; Imrie and Morris, 1992). In the short term, of course, suppliers or contractors may be willing to absorb any extra costs in order to develop or maintain a relationship. However, such an approach may be unsustainable if compensating gains are not forthcoming. Indeed, where clients use collaboration as a means of 'ratcheting up' performance targets (e.g. via continuous improvement programmes), margins may only be achievable by contractors reverting to adversarialism. In these circumstances, there is the paradoxical danger that partnering could become a victim of its own success.

Another way in which one sees a departure from the collaborative ideal in other industrial sectors is through an unwillingness to commit fully to close, long-term relationships, because they stop companies from taking advantage of price competition and more favourable deals from alternative suppliers (Bresnen, 1996; Imrie and Morris, 1992). In a similar way, there is certainly plenty of anecdotal evidence of scepticism on the part of clients and contractors unwilling to be 'locked into' long-term dependence upon particular firms. Other longer-term commercial considerations may also come into play: for example, while some companies may be willing to share their technical know-how with contractual partners, others may jealously guard such proprietary knowledge.

All in all, to proceed on the assumption that such conditions can readily be transgressed by an appeal to common interests is to underplay the constraining influences of economic forces and institutional barriers. As Rasmussen and Shove (1996) have argued, recent partnering discourse tends to over-emphasise the power of agency to overcome structural barriers and constraints. In other words, while there is no simple 'structural fix' to the problem of fragmentation and conflict (e.g. through new forms of contract), there is also no simple solution based upon exhortations to act in ways that fly in the face of powerful economic imperatives and well-established traditions.

Moreover, whatever the precise conditions, perceptions of the pros and cons of partnering are inevitably also going to be *relative*, since partnering may serve quite different interests for different parties. Even if these interests do coincide, this does not mean the absence of distributional conflicts - as evidenced by disagreements over gainshare/painshare arrangements (centring around the 'correct' assignment of risks and rewards and agreement on target performance levels). Consequently, examining partnering from different viewpoints may also help encourage a proper appreciation of the range and diversity of stakeholder interests in any partnering arrangement (cf. Bresnen, 1991; Seymour and Rooke, 1995).

### **Partnering and organisational culture**

Even if one can presume some basic unity of interest, this does not necessarily mean that aligning attitudes is straightforward. Much of the literature tends to presume that cultural alignment (where organisations share some basic values, attitudes and beliefs) is a prerequisite for partnering. Consequently, unless there is some compatibility between organisations to begin with, organisations need to change their ways of working. The problem here is that it is well established that it is difficult enough effecting cultural transformation *within* organisations, let alone between them (e.g. Beer *et al.*, 1990). The reason for this is that organisational culture is by no means a unitary and consensual phenomenon whose management involves a simple, 'top down' process of senior figures manipulating key variables (structures, reward systems) in order to effect change. Instead, culture is a complex and multi-faceted phenomenon that arises and develops through on-going social interaction amongst members of a community (Hofstede, 1980; Meek, 1988; Schein, 1985). It is not simply something that can be imposed from on high and attempts to do so often

simply provoke resistance or produce unintended and undesired consequences (Kotter and Schlesinger, 1979).

Indeed, organisational culture is so ubiquitous but, at the same time, intangible that it even defies easy definition, identification and analysis. Precise definitions of organisational culture vary, although there is considerable agreement that culture consists of a system of shared meanings, based around common values and beliefs held by members of an organisation.<sup>7</sup> Moreover, one important complicating factor in the study of culture is that it operates at many different levels - from outward behavioural manifestations to much more deep-seated attitudes, values and beliefs (Schein, 1985). What is clear, however, is that changing *behaviour* does not necessarily depend upon changing such deeper underlying attitudes, beliefs and values (compliance is a possibility). Therefore, not only may economic incentives be sufficient to produce any desired behavioural change, but also claims that such changes have been any more profound rest upon the presumption that new attitudes, beliefs and values have been *internalised* by members of the project team. In other words, a commitment to partnering might be a truly felt experience or it might simply be skin deep - either way, it is extremely difficult to tell, since behaviour can easily be misrepresented or rationalised (e.g. Hodgetts, 1991).

Another complicating factor is the existence of 'subcultures' within organisations that are associated with horizontal and vertical differentiation (departmental specialisation and hierarchical stratification, respectively). It has long been acknowledged, for example, that clients can themselves be complex organisations (e.g. Cherns and Bryant, 1984) and that this internal complexity can have implications for the management of external relations (Bresnen, 1990). The effects of *horizontal* differentiation are likely to make themselves felt when attempts are made to collaborate across the organisation with other groups who are driven by their own departmental or divisional interests. So, for example, although project teams might themselves be well aligned, relations with other internal groups (e.g. users of the facility) might be poor. In some cases, this might even lead to a marginalisation of the project team within the organisation.

The effects of *vertical* differentiation are likely to be encountered when attempts are made to 'cascade' new ways of working down the organisation. The literature on partnering is often insistent that top management support and enthusiasm is vital in generating and sustaining changes a collaborative approach (e.g. Barlow *et al.*, 1997). However, it is rather less clear on how to narrow any gap between expressed intentions at a corporate level and what actually happens 'on the ground' - where behaviour can be influenced by a wide range of factors (including experiences of actually working directly with contractual partners). It might thus be difficult to convert formal partnering arrangements into real differences in behaviour at operational levels, creating a difference between partnering as 'espoused theory' and partnering as 'theory-in-use' (Argyris and Schon, 1978). The obvious way to compensate is through more direct control of behaviour. However, this runs counter to many prescriptions for effective partnering which stress the importance of

---

<sup>7</sup> For a more thorough discussion of the meaning and attributes of organisational culture see, for instance, Brown (1995) or Pheysey (1993)

decentralised, flexible structures, where the team is expected to operate with considerable autonomy and discretion.

A further difficulty with culture concerns the complex dynamics associated with implementing change. The management of change literature is awash with examples of unsuccessful cultural change initiatives - largely caused by a failure to match the attention paid to the *content* of change, with that paid to the (internal) *context* and *process* of change (Pettigrew and Whipp, 1991). As regards context, there can often be a blindness to the inevitable 'political' ramifications of change, as new structures and processes affect the roles, motivations, status and influence of individuals and groups in various organisational locales (Kotter *et al.*, 1986). Indeed, cultural change programmes often fail since they presume that the need for change and the direction it should take, once articulated and specified, will simply be taken as given (e.g. Beer *et al.*, 1990). As regards processes of change, implementation strategies may need to vary quite considerably to reflect differences in the motivation and ability of individuals and groups to resist (actively or passively) attempts made to introduce new ways of working (Kotter and Schlesinger, 1979). Achieving cultural change can also be an extremely long, drawn-out process (Child, 1984), as it involves what Lewin (1951) describes as 'refreezing' (i.e. institutionalising) new behaviours, attitudes, beliefs and values.

Many researchers would go even further than this and question whether in fact it is possible to manipulate and change organisational culture in the ways commonly prescribed. It has long been recognised that organisational culture is not simply a variable that can be manipulated in the way that one might adjust structures or reward systems. Instead, 'culture' captures the very essence of what an organisation *is* and how it operates as a social collectivity (Martin, 1985; Meek, 1988; Morgan, 1986). The implications of this way of looking at organisational culture are that organisational cultural change, at best, crucially depends upon a number of situational factors (Martin, 1985). These include: whether there is shared perception of a need for change (perhaps due to crisis); whether the climate is 'supportive' or not (i.e. encouraging open debate and trust); whether the existing culture is powerful, well-established and mature (i.e. entrenched); and whether or not powerful and competing subcultures or counter-cultures exist. Obviously, whereas some of these conditions certainly do assist the drive for change in the construction industry, it is not too difficult to see that there are others which still represent major barriers to change.

## **Conclusion**

This paper has given a brief, and by no means exhaustive, overview of some of the main issues arising from current research on partnering. In developing the discussion, the paper has attempted to show how the analysis of partnering as a form of inter-organisational collaboration might benefit significantly from drawing more than it has done to date on frameworks and findings from mainstream organisational theory and research that are concerned precisely with the issues and problems that preoccupy construction management researchers interested in partnering. Although the discussion has seemingly introduced further complexity into the debate, this has been done with the intention of highlighting the very *practical* benefits ultimately to be

gained from taking a more realistic view, informed directly by organisational theory and research.

In the course of the paper, a number of general themes have been developed which critically confront some of the assumptions that underpin more prescriptive accounts of partnering. First is the emphasis placed upon contingency and context and the difficulty in presuming that partnering does, can or should cohere as a strategy. Not only is 'partnering' a rather loose term to describe what is in reality a multi-faceted practice, it is also clearly not always seen as necessary or desirable. One implication of this is that more attention needs to be paid to identifying the conditions (economic, institutional, technical and organisational) that encourage or inhibit partnering in practice. Another implication is that hopes of ultimately being able to standardise models of partnering 'best practice' may be somewhat misplaced and the real benefits may be achieved through *customising* partnering, based upon a sensitivity to salient local conditions.

Second, a lot of emphasis has been placed upon exploring inter-relationships between formal and informal aspects of partnering. This has involved questioning whether understanding the workings of the 'technical apparatus' of partnering (contracts, pricing formulae, charters, workshops, etc.) is sufficient to understand how partnering works and whether collaboration can be actively 'engineered' simply by applying these techniques. It has also involved questioning whether trust and cooperation can fully develop in the context of an exchange relationship, that may be affected by imbalances in economic power and widely varying economic conditions. Although the review by no means answers these questions, it does however suggest that it is much too simple to presume that the application of tools and techniques, backed up by an expressed commitment to partnering, is all that is needed. Rather, it needs to be established whether or not any changes induced are deep enough to be properly considered attitudinal change, or whether they simply reflect behavioural compliance based upon calculations of self-interest. Perhaps most importantly, the discussion emphasises the importance of taking a *pluralistic* approach to the study of partnering (cf. Burrell and Morgan, 1979, pp. 204-388), in which it is acknowledged that the parties to the relationship may have very different aims in mind and be approaching it from very different perspectives.

The importance of pluralism is also evident in the discussion concerning the relationship between partnering and organisational cultural change. Here, a number of points were raised about the nature of organisational culture and the ease or difficulty with which it can be changed (particularly due to complications caused by internal structural differentiation). The major implication of this discussion is that calls to adopt 'new ways of working' are somewhat naive and simplistic if they fail to recognise and allow for what is a highly complex construct that works in subtle and intricate ways (Martin, 1985). Implementing partnering effectively may require rather more than project team building, a set of appropriate tools and techniques and a strong commitment from top management. It may also require a sensitivity to factors that subtly reinforce particular ways of working, an understanding of the likely impact on individuals' and groups' motivations and interests, and a full appreciation of the complex (long-term) dynamics of implementation processes (Lewin, 1951; Kotter and

Schlesinger, 1979). To recommend that cultural change is needed serves merely to flag up what is in fact a wide range of very difficult issues, problems and dilemmas.

## References

- ACTIVE (1996) *ACTIVE Engineering Construction Initiative: the action plan*. ACTIVE, London.
- Angelo, W.J. (1998) Partnering goes awry on Connecticut bridge job. *ENR*, 240(18), 17.
- Argyris, C. and Schon, D. A. (1978) *Theory in practice*. Jossey Bass, San Francisco.
- Banwell (1964) *The placing and management of contracts for building and civil engineering work*. HMSO, London.
- Barlow, J. and Cohen, M. (1996) Implementing partnering: some common red herrings in the literature, in *Partnering in Construction*, ESRC/EPSRC Workshop, University of Salford, 13 May.
- Barlow, J., Cohen, M., Jashapara, A. and Simpson, Y. (1997) *Towards positive partnering*. The Policy Press, Bristol.
- Beer, M., Eisenstat, R. A. and Spector, B. (1990) Why change programs don't produce change. *Harvard Business Review*, Nov-Dec, 158-66.
- Bennett, J., Ingram, I. and Jayes, S. (1996) *Partnering for construction*. Centre for Strategic Studies in Construction, Reading University.
- Bennett, J. and Jayes, S. (1995) *Trusting the team: the best practice guide to partnering in construction*. Centre for Strategic Studies in Construction/Reading Construction Forum, Reading.
- Bennett, J. and Jayes, S. (1998) *The Seven Pillars of Partnering*. Reading Construction Forum, Reading.
- Bresnen, M. (1990) *Organising construction*. Routledge, London.
- Bresnen, M. (1991) Construction contracting in theory and practice: a case study. *Construction Management and Economics*, 9, 247-63.
- Bresnen, M. (1996) An organisational perspective on changing buyer-supplier relations: a critical review of the evidence. *Organization*, 3(1), 121-46.
- Brown, A. (1995) *Organisational culture*. Pitman, London.
- Burrell, G. and Morgan, G. (1979) *Sociological paradigms and organisational analysis*. Tavistock, London.
- Cherns, A. B. and Bryant, D. T. (1984) Studying the client's role in construction management. *Construction Management and Economics*, 2, 177-84.
- Child, J. (1984) *Organisation: a guide to problems and practice*, 2nd ed. Harper & Row, London.
- Construction Industry Institute (1989) *Partnering: meeting the challenges of the future*. CII Special Publication.
- Construction Industry Institute (1991) *In search of partnering excellence*. CII Special Publication.
- Construction Industry Institute (1994) *Benchmarking implementation results, teambuilding and project partnering*. CII, Austin, TX.
- Construction Productivity Network (1997) *What does supply chain management offer the construction industry?* Workshop Report of joint CPN/CIB/BRE conference held at Building Research Establishment, Garston, Herts., 5 November 1997.

- Cowan, C., Gray, C. and Larson, E. (1992) Project partnering. *Project Management Journal*, 23, 5-11.
- CRINE (1994) *CRINE report*. Institute of Petroleum, London.
- Evans, G. N. and Bailey, A. (1996) Supply chain methodology for improving construction industry performance, in *Partnering in Construction*, ESRC/EPSRC Workshop, University of Salford, 13 May.
- Green, R. (1994) Collaborative relationships between producers and contractors in the UK oil and gas production industry, in *Proceedings, British Academy of Management Annual Conference*, Lancaster, 13 September.
- Green, R. (1995) *Partnering and alliances: theory and practice*. Society of Petroleum Engineers, Richardson TX.
- Green, C. and McDermott, P. (1996) An inside-out approach to partnering, in *Partnering in Construction*, ESRC/EPSRC Workshop, University of Salford, 13 May.
- Harvey, R. C. and Ashworth, A. (1993) *The construction industry of Great Britain*. Newnes, Oxford.
- Higgin, J. and Jessop, N. (1965) *Communications in the building industry*. Tavistock, London.
- Hinks, J., Cooper, R., Allen, S. and Carmichael, S. (1996) Is partnering a state of mind? A comparison of manufacturing and construction, in *Partnering in Construction*, ESRC/EPSRC Workshop, University of Salford, 13 May.
- Hodgetts, R. M. (1991) *Modern human relations at work*. 3rd ed. Dryden Press: Orlando FL.
- Hofstede, G. (1980) *Culture's consequence: international differences in work-related values*. Sage, Beverley Hills, CA.
- Holti, R. and Standing H. (1996) *Partnering as inter-related technical and organisational change*. Tavistock, London.
- Imrie, R. and Morris, J. (1992) A review of recent changes in buyer-supplier relations. *OMEGA International Journal of Management Science*, 20(5/6), 641-52.
- Knott, T. (1996) *No Business as Usual: An Extraordinary North Sea Result*. The British Petroleum Company plc, London.
- Kotter, J. P. and Schlesinger, L. A. (1979) Choosing strategies for change. *Harvard Business Review*, March-April, 106-114.
- Kotter, J. P., Schlesinger, L. A. and Sathe, V. (1986) *Organisation: text, cases and readings on the management of organisational design and change*. Irwin, Homewood, ILL.
- Larson, E. (1997) Partnering on construction projects: a study of the relationship between partnering activities and project success. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*, 44(2), 188-195.
- Latham, M. (1994) *Constructing the team*. HMSO, London.
- Lewin, K. (1951) *Field theory in social science*. Harper & Row, New York.
- Loraine, R. K. (1993) *Partnering in the public sector*. Business Round Table, London.
- Loraine, R. K. (1996) Guidelines for partnering in the public sector: a toolbox. Mimeo.
- Loraine, R. K. and Williams, I (1997) *Partnering in the public sector*. European Construction Institute, Loughborough.
- Luck, R. (1996) Construction project integration strategies. University of Reading, Department of Construction Management and Engineering.

- Martin, J. (1985) Can organisational culture be managed?, in *Organisational culture*, Frost, P. J., Moore, L. F., Louis, M. R., Lundberg, C. C. and Martin, J. (eds), Sage, California.
- Meek, V. L. (1988) Organisational culture: origins and weaknesses. *Organisation Studies*, 9(4), 453-73.
- Miles, R. E. and Snow, C. C. (1978) *Organisational strategy, structure and process*. McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Morgan, G. (1986) *Images of organisation*. Sage, London.
- NEDO (1988) *Faster building for commerce*. HMSO, London.
- NEDO (1991) *Partnering: contracting without conflict*. HMSO, London.
- Pettigrew, A. and Whipp, R. (1991) *Managing change for competitive success*. Blackwell, Oxford.
- Pheysey, D. C. (1993) *Organisational cultures*. Routledge, London.
- Quick, R. W. (1994) *Partnering: the Australian experience*. CIB Proceedings of Construction Conflict: management and resolution, Lexington KE.
- Rackham, N, Friedman, L. and Ruff, R. (1996) *Getting partnering right: how market leaders are creating long-term competitive advantage*. McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Roe, M. (1996) *Partnering: the legal aspects*. Masons Solicitors, London.
- Rasmussen, M. and Shove, E. (1996) Cultures of innovation. Discussion paper, Centre for the Study of Environmental Change, Lancaster University.
- Schein, E. H. (1985) *Organisational culture and leadership*. Jossey Bass, San Francisco.
- Seymour, D. and Rooke, J. (1995) The culture of the industry and the culture of research. *Construction Management and Economics*, 13(6), 511-23.
- Silverman, D. (1974) *The theory of organisations*, 2nd ed. Heinemann, London.
- Thompson, M.J. (1994) The Australian environment and the future for partnering. *Australian Construction Law Newsletter*, 38, 41-58.
- Thompson, P.J. and Sanders, S.R. (1998) Partnering continuum. *Journal of Management in Engineering*, 14(5), 73-78.
- Tse, K.K. (1985) *Marks and Spencer: anatomy of Britain's most efficiently managed company*. Pergamon, Oxford.
- Weston, D. and Gibson, G. (1993) Partnering project performance in US Army Corps of Engineers. *Journal of Management in Construction*, 9(4), 331-344.