



Cairo University

Investigating the Performance of Relational Contracts Using Social Network Analysis

By

Mahmoud Mohamed Abd El-Moneim El-Sayed

A Thesis Submitted to the
Faculty of Engineering at Cairo University
In Partial Fulfilment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
In
STRUCTURAL ENGINEERING

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, CAIRO UNIVERSITY
GIZA, EGYPT
2017

Investigating the Performance of Relational Contracts Using Social Network Analysis

By

Mahmoud Mohamed Abd El-Moneim El-Sayed

A Thesis Submitted to the
Faculty of Engineering at Cairo University
In Partial Fulfilment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
In
STRUCTURAL ENGINEERING

Under the supervision of

Dr. Omar H. Al-Anwar

Associate Professor of Construction
Engineering and Management

Structural Engineering Department
Faculty of Engineering, Cairo University

Dr. Islam H. El-Adaway

Associate Professor of Construction
Engineering and Management

Structural Engineering Department
Faculty of Engineering, Tennessee University

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, CAIRO UNIVERSITY
GIZA, EGYPT
2017

Investigating the Performance of Relational Contracts Using Social Network Analysis

By

Mahmoud Mohamed Abd El-Moneim El-Sayed

A Thesis Submitted to the
Faculty of Engineering at Cairo University
In Partial Fulfilment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
In
STRUCTURAL ENGINEERING

Approved by the Examining Committee

Ass. Prof. Omar H. Al-Anwar

Associate Professor of Construction Engineering and Management – Structural Engineering Department - Cairo University - Thesis Main Advisor

Ass. Prof. Islam H. Al-Adaway

Associate Professor of Construction Engineering and Management – Structural Engineering Department - Tennessee University - Thesis Co-Advisor

Prof. Mohamed Mahdy Marzouk

Professor of Construction Engineering and Management – Structural Engineering Department - Cairo University - Internal Examiner

Dr. Mohamed Abd El-Lateef Bakry

Former Strategic Manager of the Social Development Fund - External Examiner

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, CAIRO UNIVERSITY
GIZA, EGYPT
2017

E n g i n e e r ' s Mahmoud Mohamed Abd El-Moneim El-Sayed
Name:

Date of Birth: 28/03/1991

Nationality: Egyptian

E-mail: Mahmoud.m.elsayed@ess.aucegypt.edu

Phone: 01019841044

Address: Fifth Settlement, Cairo

Registration
Date: 01/10/2014

Awarding Date:/....../2017

Degree: Master of Science

Department: Structural Engineering

Supervisors:

Dr. Omar H. Al-Anwar

Dr. Islam H. El-Adaway

Examiners:

Dr. Omar H. Al-Anwar - Cairo University (Thesis Main Advisor)

Dr. Islam H. El-Adaway – Cairo University (Thesis Co-Advisor)

Prof. Mohamed Mahdy Marzouk – Cairo University (Internal Examiner)

Dr .Mohamed Abd El-Lateef Bakry – (External Examiner)

Title of Thesis:

**Investigating the Performance of Relational Contracts Using Social
Network Analysis**

Key Words:

Relational Contracts, Social Network Analysis, Integrated Project Delivery, Partnering.



Summary:

Construction projects are generally characterized by their evolving complexity where any given project would include - among other reasons - multiparty relationships and numerous transactions. Managing these relationships is often complicated further by the traditional contractual approaches, which diverge the focus of involved parties away from the project main goals and promote individualism among the associated parties. Hence, relational contracts were introduced in an attempt to align the goal of the different parties to enhance the multi-party interactions, communication, and collaboration. This study presents a simulated model-based comparative analysis between two of the main relational contracts standard forms in the US and the UK; namely, (1) the Association of Consultant Architects (ACA) Project Partnering Contract PPC2000, and (2) the American Institute of Architects (AIA) Document C191™ – 2009, Standard Form Multi-Party Agreement for Integrated Project Delivery. The performance of the selected processes defined in these two forms was graphically and computationally analyzed using Social Network Analysis (SNA). Employing SNA is an innovative approach to model and analyze the expected interactions among the involved parties under each contractual setting. In this study, UCINET 6 for Windows was used to analyze the networks data for the change orders, disputes resolution, Estimating the contract's price, and design processes according to the provisions of each contract form. Metrics such as Adjacency, Degree Centrality, and Closeness Centrality were insightful in providing a deeper understanding of the expected level of collaboration and involvement among the involved parties at each step of the four processes. Meanwhile the processes in both forms promote direct communication among most of the key parties, the results of graphical and computational analysis favored PPC2000 form over C191 form in terms of the clarity of procedures and in terms of the general results of connectivity.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my extreme gratitude to my supervisors **Dr. Omar H. Al-Anwar & Dr. Islam H. El-Adaway** for their continuous support of my M.Sc. study and research, their patience, motivation, immense knowledge and valuable ideas. I am also very grateful to **Dr Mohamed Bakry**, and **Prof. Mohamed Mahdy Marzouk** for their time and help.

Last but not least, I am eternally grateful to **my parents** and **my friends** for their support and encouragement every step of the way.

Mahmoud Mohamed Abd El-Moneim El-Sayed

April 27th , 2017

Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	ii
List of Figures.....	v
Abstract.....	viii
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
1.1. Research Topic.....	1
1.2. Problem Statement.....	3
1.3. Goals and Objectives.....	3
1.4. Research Methodology.....	4
1.6. Organization.....	4
Chapter 2: Literature Review.....	5
2.1. Introduction.....	5
2.2. Relational Contracts.....	5
2.3. Integrated Project Delivery.....	7
2.4. Partnering.....	10
2.5. Available Standard Relational IPD Contracts.....	11
2.6. Available Standard Relational Partnering Contracts.....	12
2.7. The Association of Consultant Architects (ACA) Project Partnering Contract PPC2000.....	15

2.8. The American Institute of Architects (AIA) Document C191™ – 2009, Standard form Multi-Party Agreement for Integrated Project Delivery.....	15
2.9. Social Network Analysis.....	16
2.10. Network’s Density.....	19
2.11. Centrality.....	19
2.12. Research Gap.....	20
Chapter3: Change Order Process.....	21
3.1. Introduction.....	21
3.2. Change Order Process in ACA’s Project Partnering Contract PPC2000.....	21
3.3. Change Order Process in AIA Document C191™ – 2009, Standard Form Multi-Party Agreement for IPD...	24
3.4. Graphical and Computational Analysis.....	25
Chapter 4: Disputes Resolution Process.....	28
4.1. Introduction.....	28
4.2. Disputes Resolution Process in ACA’s Project Partnering Contract PPC2000.....	28

4.3. Disputes Resolution Process in AIA Document C191™ – 2009, Standard Form Multi-Party Agreement for IPD.....	40
4.4. Graphical and Computational Analysis.....	45
Chapter 5: Design Process.....	51
5.1. Introduction.....	51
5.2. Design Process in ACA’s Project Partnering Contract PPC2000.....	51
5.3. Design Process in AIA Document C191™ – 2009, Standard Form Multi-Party Agreement for IPD.....	58
5.4. Graphical and Computational Analysis.....	63
Chapter 6: Cost Estimation Process.....	67
6.1. Introduction.....	67
6.2. Cost Estimation Process in ACA’s Project Partnering Contract PPC2000.....	67
6.3. Cost Estimation Process in AIA Document C191™ 2009, Standard Form Multi-Party Agreement for IPD....	71
6.4. Graphical and Computational Analysis.....	74
Chapter 7: Conclusion and Future Works.....	77
References.....	82

List of Figures

Figure 2.1: Differences between DB, DBB, and IPD.....	9
Figure 2.2 Nodes or Actors and relationships among them.....	18
Figure 2.3. Density, Centrality, Isolates, and Subgroups.....	20
Figure 3.1. Modeling Sub-Clause 17.1: Initiating a Change Order.....	22
Figure 3.2. Modeling Sub-Clause 17.2: Considering the Change Order..	22
Figure 3.3. Modeling Sub-Clause 17.3: Evaluating and Deciding on the Change Order.....	23
Figure 3.4. The Change Orders Process According to PPC2000 Contract Form.....	24
Figure 3.5. The Change Orders Process According to AIA C191 Contract Form.....	24
Figure 3.6. The Computational Analysis of ACA PPC2000 Using UCINET 6.....	26
Figure 3.7. The Computational Analysis of AIA C191 Using UCINET 6.....	26
Figure 4.1. Modeling sub-clause 27.1 according to ACA PPC2000.....	29
Figure 4.2. Modeling sub-clause 27.2 according to ACA PPC2000.....	30
Figure 4.3. Modeling sub-clause 27.3 according to ACA PPC2000.....	31
Figure 4.4. Modeling sub-clause 27.4 according to ACA PPC2000.....	32
Figure 4.5. Modeling sub-clause 27.5 according to ACA PPC2000.....	37
Figure 4.6. Modeling sub-clause 27.6 according to ACA PPC 2000.....	39
Figure 4.7. Disputes Resolution process according to ACA PPC 2000...	39
Figure 4.8. modeling sub-clause 2.2.3 according to AIA C191.....	41
Figure 4.9. modeling sub-clause 2.1.2 according to AIA C191.....	42
Figure 4.10. modeling sub-clauses 9.3 and 9.4 according to AIA C191..	43
Figure 4.11. modeling sub-clause 9.5.1 according to AIA C191.....	45
Figure 4.12. The Computational Analysis of disputes resolution process in ACA PPC2000	47

Figure 4.13. The Computational Analysis of disputes resolution process in ACA PPC2000	47
Figure 4.14. The Computational Analysis of disputes resolution process in AIA C191.....	48
Figure 4.15. The Computational Analysis of disputes resolution process in AIA C191.....	49
Figure 5.1. Modeling sub-clause 8.4 according to ACA PPC2000.....	52
Figure 5.2. Modeling sub-clause 8.3 (i) according to ACA PPC2000.....	53
Figure 5.3. Modeling sub-clause 8.3 (ii) according to ACA PPC2000....	54
Figure 5.4. Modeling sub-clause 8.3 (iii) according to ACA PPC2000 ..	55
Figure 5.5. Modeling sub-clause 8.3 (V) according to ACA PPC2000...	56
Figure 5.6. modeling sub-clause 8.5 according to ACA PPC2000.....	56
Figure 5.7 modeling sub-clause A.4.a according to AIA C191.....	59
Figure 5.8. The Computational Analysis of Design Process in the ACA PPC2000.....	64
Figure 5.9. The Computational Analysis of Design Process in the ACA PPC2000.....	65
Figure 5.10. The Computational Analysis of Design Process in the AIA C191.....	66
Figure 5.11. modeling sub-clause 10.3 according to ACA PPC2000.....	66
Figure 6.1. modeling sub-clause 10.3 according to ACA PPC2000.....	68
Figure 6.2. modeling sub-clause 10.4 according to ACA PPC2000.....	69
Figure 6.3. Modeling sub-clause 12.6 according to ACA PPC2000.....	69
Figure 6.4. modeling sub-clause 12.9 & 18.1 according to ACA PPC2000.....	70
Figure 6.5. modeling sub-clause 12.9 (AH) according to ACA PPC2000.	71
Figure 6.6. modeling sub-clause 5.1 according to ACA PPC2000.....	72
Figure 6.7. modeling sub-clause 5.1 according to ACA PPC2000.....	72
Figure 6.8. modeling sub-clause 5.1 according to ACA PPC2000.....	73
Figure 6.9. The computational Analysis of Cost Estimation process in ACA PPC2000.....	74

Figure 6.10. The computational Analysis of Cost Estimation process in ACA PPC2000.....	75
Figure 6.11. The computational Analysis of Cost Estimation process in AIA C191.....	75
Figure 6.12. The computational Analysis of Cost Estimation process in AIA C191.....	76

Abstract

Construction projects are generally characterized by their evolving complexity where any given project would include - among other reasons - multiparty relationships and numerous transactions. Managing these relationships is often complicated further by the traditional contractual approaches, which diverge the focus of involved parties away from the project main goals and promote individualism among the associated parties. Hence, relational contracts were introduced in an attempt to align the goals of the different parties to enhance the multi-party interactions, communication, and collaboration. This study presents a simulated model-based comparative analysis between two of the main relational contracts standard forms in the US and the UK; namely, (1) the Association of Consultant Architects (ACA) Project Partnering Contract PPC2000, and (2) the American Institute of Architects (AIA) Document C191™ – 2009, Standard Form Multi-Party Agreement for Integrated Project Delivery. The performance of the selected processes defined in these two forms was graphically and computationally analyzed using Social Network Analysis (SNA). Employing SNA is an innovative approach to model and analyze the expected interactions among the involved parties under each contractual setting. In this study, UCINET 6 for Windows was used to analyze the networks data for the change orders, disputes resolution, estimating the contract price, and design processes according to the provisions of each contract form. Metrics such as Adjacency, Degree Centrality, and Closeness Centrality were insightful in providing a deeper understanding of the expected level of collaboration and involvement among the involved parties at each step of the four processes. While the processes in both forms promote direct communication among most of the key parties, the results of graphical and computational analysis favored PPC2000 form over C191 form in terms of the clarity of procedures and in terms of the general results of connectivity and centrality. The analysis and SNA results emphasized that ACA's PPC2000 provides the users with a clear roles of actors in each process and show obvious and clear communication channels among involved parties. On the other hand, AIA C191 in all processes lacks this clarity.

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1. Research Topic

Construction projects are usually characterized by their complexity, which is attributed to the interdependency between their tasks and relationships [1]. Conventional contracts are criticized by their inability to account for such complexity because of their promotion of hierarchical contracting and fragmentation, which often leads to adversarial relationships among contractual parties [2]. Conflicts, claims, and disputes among the associated stakeholders are the expected outcome from such adversarial relationships [1].

Collaboration and cooperation among all contractual entities are essential but often challenging ingredients to the success of construction projects; thus motivating the development of relational contracts, such as Integrated Project Delivery in the United States of America and Partnering in the United Kingdom. A relational contract is an agreement whereby all contractual parties collaboratively and cooperatively work together under the same conditions. Relational contracts decentralize decisions, create a trust-based environment, promote open communications, enhance cooperation, and maximize the efficiency of the construction process by aligning interests and integrating the talent of all involved parties in a collaborative environment [3]. Relational contracts have gained popularity in the US construction industry [2]. However, there are serious challenges and obstacles with the up-take of, understanding of, approach to, and implementation of partnering within and across different national and institutional settings [4]. To this end, multiple entities are developing standard forms of relational contracts and agreements. Two of these forms were selected to be within the scope of this study; namely, (1) the Association of Consultant Architects (ACA) Project Partnering Contract PPC2000, and (2) the American Institute of Architects (AIA) Document C191™ – 2009, Standard Form Multi-Party Agreement for Integrated Project Delivery.

While guided by the same principles of relational contracts, the two selected standard forms propose different procedures and processes; and hence are expected to achieve the goals of relational contracts to various degrees. This study aims to investigate the Change Orders, Disputes Resolution, Design, and Estimating the Contract Price processes as proposed by each standard form and compare how the information flow and communication channels are shaped. To this end, this study presents an innovative methodology to model and analyze the contractual clauses using Social Network Analysis (SNA) in order to have an insight into the relationships among the contractual parties.

Social networks have increasingly and widely affected our lives, largely, because of the opportunities provided by the Internet [5]. SNA is a well-established methodology to investigate social networks through the usage of mathematical formulations abstracted from graph theory [4]. SNA has been successfully used in social sciences to evaluate how individuals and institutions, which constitute social networks, are influenced and

affected by the societal or professional networks [6]. The concept of networks and some basic SNA terminology have entered people's everyday lives and increasingly inform our understanding of the society in which we live [1]. However, our thinking and understanding are not familiar with modeling institutions and organization, specially, in the construction industry as social networks [5].

All organizations and institutions consisting of people are considered to be social networks, since social relationships exist among these people. The relationships among these people could be measured to investigate the quality of these relationships. If the relationships among any organization's employees are poor, this organization will not be able to achieve its goals or at least it will achieve its goals with great difficulty. Therefore, it was a must to find a method to measure and investigate the relationships among any group of people or entities. SNA allows us to model, measure, analyze, and investigate the relationships among a group of people. Further, SNA measures the position of each actor and evaluates the prominence of this actor in the network. SNA uses both graphical and mathematical approaches to investigate and analyze the quality of relationships, the strengths of relationships, and the flow of information among actors. Hereinafter, this study in the literature review chapter presents and demonstrates the theory of SNA and the approach it follows to achieve its aforementioned functions. The usage of SNA is growing rapidly in the engineering and construction industry, where concepts such as trust and communication among project participants are receiving significant attention [7]. A social network is a social structure that always consists of actors (nodes) that are connected by one or more specific type of relations which are usually represented as arrows among these nodes, such as friendship, firm alliance, or international trade [8]. As contracts organize and arrange the relationships among involved parties, therefore, it is expected that multiple communication channels emerge. Thus, SNA's degree and closeness centralities were best suited for the analysis associated with this study.

SNA has been applied to several civil and construction engineering applications where the networks' main actors were people or organizations controlled by people [9]. El-Adaway et al. (2016) presented an SNA model to analyze transportation networks, and consequently corroborate the effectiveness of SNA as a complementary tool for improved transportation planning [10]. Wambeke et al. (2012) presented an SNA model using centrality analysis to identify a social network of construction trades [11]. Wambeke's research was useful to project managers and is significant as it outlines and illustrates a method of identifying the underlying network and associated key trades of a construction project based on spatial proximity [11]. Priven et al. (2015) presented an SNA model to investigate and identify the effects of the last planner system on social networks among construction trade crews [12]. Chinowsky et al. (2008) studied the engineering-based approach to project success to reconfigure this approach and to reemphasize the need to develop high performing teams by recognizing the importance of the project network [13]. This recognition was formalized in the social network model of construction that integrated classic project management concepts with social science variables to enhance the focus on knowledge sharing as the foundation for achieving high performance teams and project results. Park et al. (2011) presented an SNA model