



Prioritising project management competences across the software project life cycle

DOI:

[10.1108/IJMPB-11-2017-0145](https://doi.org/10.1108/IJMPB-11-2017-0145)

Document Version

Accepted author manuscript

[Link to publication record in Manchester Research Explorer](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Cha, J., & Maytorena-Sanchez, E. (2019). Prioritising project management competences across the software project life cycle. *International Journal of Managing Projects in Business*, 12(4), 961-978. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJMPB-11-2017-0145>

Published in:

International Journal of Managing Projects in Business

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on Manchester Research Explorer is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Proof version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Explorer are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Takedown policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please refer to the University of Manchester's Takedown Procedures [<http://man.ac.uk/04Y6Bo>] or contact uml.scholarlycommunications@manchester.ac.uk providing relevant details, so we can investigate your claim.





Prioritising project management competences across the software project life cycle

Journal:	<i>International Journal of Managing Projects in Business</i>
Manuscript ID	IJMPB-11-2017-0145.R1
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	Project management competence, Competence prioritisation, Software project, Project management life cycle



Prioritising Project Management Competences across the Software Project Life Cycle

Article classification: Research paper

Structured Abstract

Purpose: This paper investigates the relative importance of project management competences across the different stages of a software project life cycle to identify competence development gaps and opportunities.

Design/method/approach: A deductive and quantitative approach was adopted to address our research questions with a web-based survey for data collection.

Findings: After reviewing the context of competences and project management competences, the importance of the project management competences overall and for specific stages in the project life cycle was analysed. The result highlights that functional and meta-competences are perceived to be the most important competence dimensions for software project practitioners.

Originality/value: This study makes three contributions. First, it consolidates PM competences into a set of 20 within four competence dimensions. Second, it prioritises these competences across the software project life cycle. Third, it identifies the significance of the inter-relationship between project management competences and project life cycle to reveal project management competence development gaps and opportunities.

Keywords

Project management competence; competence prioritisation; software project; project management life cycle

Introduction

This paper investigates the relative importance of project management (PM) competences across the different stages of a software project life cycle to identify competence development gaps and opportunities.

This is of particular relevance: despite the steady development of research since the 1990s into the importance of PM competences for the successful delivery of projects (Morris and Hough, 1987; Heywood *et al.*, 1992; Crawford, 2003; Cheng *et al.*, 2005; Crawford, 2005; Morris, 2013). There has been limited research on PM competence prioritisation across the project life cycle (Buchanan, 1991; Stevenson and Starkweather, 2010).

More specifically, research has identified PM competences (Crawford, 2000, 2002); proposed competence development frameworks (Suikki *et al.*, 2006; Takey and Monteiro, 2015); prioritised competences for specific types of projects (Edum-Fotwe and McCaffer, 2000; Seppänen, 2002; Crawford and Nahmias, 2010; Skulmoski and Hartman, 2010; Li *et al.*, 2011; Palacios-Marques *et al.*, 2013), and for specific project stages (Havila *et al.*, 2013; Gomes *et al.*, 2012; Ahadzie *et al.*, 2014).

However, studies on PM competences tend to focus on the early stages of a project with limited consideration of competences needed at different stages (Havila *et al.*, 2013). In addition, Stevenson and Starkweather (2010) identify the need to determine the link between specific competences and project stages.

This paper therefore focuses on two different but connected aspects of PM competences. First, we identify the main PM competences from existing literature and establish their perceived level

of importance in managing software projects. Second, we explore PM competence prioritisation across the software project life cycle.

This research therefore contributes to developing the body of knowledge in software PM competences by recognising and linking relevant competences to specific project life cycle stages.

Following this introduction, the paper defines terms and identifies the PM competences from existing literature. We describe the methodological approach employed. We then present and discuss the findings. Finally, we conclude with some implications for PM development and practice.

Managerial Competence and Projects

Managerial competences are an important part of any organisation. The identification and development of these can contribute to the achievement of an organisation's strategic goals.

The concept of competence is well discussed in two complementary bodies of literature. First, in the human resource management and development literature discussing managerial capability (Stamp, 1981; Cave and Wilkinson, 1992); and second, in the literature discussing individual managerial competence (Boyatzis, 1982, 2008; Cave and Mckeown, 1993; Woodruffe, 1993; Mirabile, 1997; Sandberg, 2001; Le Deist and Winterton, 2005; Königová *et al.*, 2012).

While there remains an ongoing debate about definitions of competence (Le Deist and Winterton 2005; Königová *et al.*, 2012), overall, this body of work focuses on the individual manager and the knowledge, skills, attributes, traits, behaviours and abilities required to perform a certain role, job or function effectively and is concerned with how to develop these.

1
2
3 In this paper, we draw on the work of Le Deist and Winterton (2005) who develop a holistic
4 typology of competence. This brings together the distinct approaches to competence definitions
5 and usages, such as: a behavioural approach in the USA; a functional approach in the UK; and a
6 multi-dimensional and holistic approach in France, Germany and Austria. Le Deist and
7 Winterton's (2005) competence typology consists of four dimensions:
8
9
10
11
12
13

- 14
15 1. Cognitive competence refers to knowledge and understanding, reinforced by theory and
16 tacit knowledge gained through experience. Le Deist and Winterton refer to this as
17 'know-what' and 'know-why'.
18
19
- 20
21 2. Functional competence refers to the skills and abilities an individual should possess when
22 working in a specific area. Le Deist and Winterton refer to this as 'know-how'.
23
24
- 25
26 3. Social competence refers to behaviours and attitudes which are characteristic of an
27 individual and are usually associated with exceptional performance. It considers the way
28 individuals create, build and maintain relationships, and interface with others. Le Deist
29 and Winterton refer to this as 'know-how to behave'.
30
31
32
33
34
35
- 36
37 4. Meta-competence refers to the ability to acquire and learn new competences, and
38 includes reflection and self-awareness. We can refer to this as 'know thyself'.
39
40

41 This multi-dimensional conceptualisation provides a holistic understanding of the term
42 competence and provides a foundation for thinking about training and development in different
43 professions. But perhaps because of the different international approaches mentioned above,
44 studies in managerial competence in project management have in fact been extraordinarily wide
45 ranging.
46
47
48
49
50
51

52
53 Broadly this research identifies competences (Crawford, 2000, 2002; Fong and Chan, 2004;
54 Cheng *et al.*, 2005; Gillard and Price, 2005; Partington *et al.*, 2005; Brill *et al.*, 2006; Ahsan *et*
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *al.*, 2013); develops competence frameworks (Suikki *et al.*, 2006; Takey and Monteiro, 2015);
4 identifies competences for a specific type of project (Edum-Fotwe and McCaffer, 2000;
5 Seppanen, 2002; Crawford and Nahmias, 2010; Skulmoski and Hartman, 2010; Li *et al.*, 2011;
6 Palacios-Marques *et al.*, 2013); and identifies competences for a specific project stage (Gomes *et*
7 *al.*, 2012; Havila *et al.*, 2013; Ahadzie *et al.*, 2014). These studies generally provide a list of
8 knowledge areas, skills, and/or abilities required to manage projects.
9

10
11 For instance, Crawford (2000) identifies 24 competences for project managers; Fong and Chang
12 (2004 cited in Suikki *et al.*, 2006) identify five key capabilities required for effective project
13 management work; Gillard and Price (2005) identify 10 competences; Partington *et al.* (2005)
14 identify 17 key attributes of programme management; and Stevenson and Starkweather (2010)
15 identify core and critical competences for IT project managers.
16

17
18 However, three limitations of this body of research can be identified. First, as Nijhuis *et al.* (2015)
19 state there does not seem to be a common agreement on a set of project management
20 competences; nor does there seem to be an agreement on which competences are most important;
21 Crawford (2005) and Cheng *et al.* (2005) are two exceptions to this. Second, the research has
22 tended to focus on the early and middle stages of managing projects or been generic; Skulmoski
23 and Hartman's (2010) project phase investigation is an exception. Third, there seems to be an
24 assumption in the literature that these competences are equally important throughout the project
25 life cycle.
26

27
28 This is important as the nature and dynamics of projects require a range of managerial
29 competences to be deployed to accomplish the required tasks as the project progresses.
30 Recognising the relationship between competences and life cycle stages could advance the
31 efficiency of PM resource allocation and managerial efficiency (Stevenson and Starkweather,
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

2010) as well as identify opportunities for PM development (Silvius, 2009; Ekrot *et al.*, 2016). Silvius and Batenburg's (2009) study begins to identify these opportunities by providing insights into the expected future development in PM competences in 2027. By developing four future scenarios of Europe (i.e. levels of international cooperation and public/private responsibilities), the importance of 46 PM competences were tested based on responses from project managers and practitioners (Silvius, 2009). The result contributes to our better understanding of PM competence variations in a macro perspective (in a different era), but it does not focus on micro variations in a project life cycle (in a different project stage). Thus, more understanding of PM competences across the software project life cycle is needed.

Therefore, this research will address the following research questions (RQ):

- RQ1. What is the perceived level of importance of existing project management competences for managing software projects?
- RQ2. What is the level of prioritisation of PM competences across the software project life cycle?

Project Management Competence Typology and Description

We follow the suggestions of Durach *et al.* (2017) to begin to address RQ1 and identify the PM competences. We determined to review existing literature that explicitly studied and identified individual PM competences aligned to Le Deist and Winterton's (2005) competency typology dimensions and across a range of projects such as IT/IS, engineering, R&D and manufacturing.

To retrieve a sample of potentially relevant literature we conducted a key word search for managerial competence in projects (competen*+ project*+ manag*) on three search engines (Science Direct, Web of Science and ProQuest). We used a backward approach, limiting our

1
2
3 search to 12 years (2017-2005) in the first instance. This stage provided a baseline sample of 64
4
5 publications. We then consolidated the database and reviewed the abstracts for relevance of
6
7 content, in other words, did the studies identify PM competences along the competence typology
8
9 dimensions (Le Deist and Winterton, 2005).
10

11
12
13 This resulted in 19 publications identified as pertinent. Two independent searches were
14
15 undertaken and compared for consistency. Alongside this process, we also used cross-
16
17 referencing to identify relevant publications published before 2005. In addition, we included in
18
19 the review project management bodies of knowledge (APM, 2012; PMI, 2013) and competence
20
21 frameworks (IPMA, 2006; PMI, 2007; APM, 2008) which capture and represent the required
22
23 knowledge and understanding (cognitive dimension) in project management. In total, we
24
25 reviewed 31 sources of literature. It is to this literature that we turn next.
26
27
28

29
30 We used as a baseline Crawford's (2000, 2005) study as the majority of the post 2005
31
32 publications make reference to this work. Crawford (2000, 2002) identifies 24 PM competences
33
34 as a result of a systematic review. Crawford (2005) provides an integrated model of project
35
36 management competence which aligns with Le Deist and Winterton's (2005) competence
37
38 typology along three (cognitive, functional, social) of the four competence dimensions. We
39
40 therefore used the cognitive, functional, social and meta-competence dimensions and definitions
41
42 as high level coding dimensions and synthesised 20 PM competences (identified in **bold**, and
43
44 summarised in table 1).
45
46
47

48
49 [insert Table 1 about here]
50

51
52 Within a cognitive competence ('know-that' and 'know-why') dimension, studies (Andersen,
53
54 2008; Thomas and Mengel, 2008; Stevenson and Starkweather, 2010; Starkweather and
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Stevenson, 2011) have found several elements that are central to the development of PM
4 competence: knowledge acquired through **educational background** in project management
5 (Stevenson and Starkweather, 2010; Andoh-Baidoo *et al.*, 2011); relevant **training and**
6 **certification** programmes such as PMP or PRINCE2 (Thomas and Mengel, 2008; Stevenson and
7 Starkweather, 2010; Starkweather and Stevenson, 2011); and a working history in terms of **prior**
8 **project experience** in relevant projects (Anderson, 1992; Hölzle, 2010; Stevenson and
9 Starkweather, 2010; Taylor and Woelfer, 2010). Knowledge and understanding about major **PM**
10 **process knowledge**, as captured in the various project management bodies of knowledge (APM,
11 2012; IPMA, 2006; PMI, 2013) have been used in competence studies (Crawford, 2000; El-
12 Sabaa, 2001; Cicmil, 2006; Brière *et al.*, 2015) and therefore can be considered collectively as a
13 cognitive competence.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 For example, research has identified the importance of knowledge and understanding in resource
30 and **planning** management including time, cost and human resources for project productivity
31 (Anderson, 1992; Wateridge, 1997; Crawford, 2000; El-Sabaa, 2001; Muzio *et al.*, 2007; Müller
32 and Turner, 2010a, 2010b, 2010c; Brière *et al.*, 2015). In addition, various authors (Anderson,
33 1992; Wateridge, 1997; Jurison, 1999; Crawford, 2000; El-Sabba, 2001; Stevenson and
34 Starkweather, 2010; Starkweather and Stevenson, 2011) have highlighted **technical knowledge**;
35 that is, having technological knowledge and understanding relating to software and systems as a
36 key competence.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 Within a functional competence ('know-how') dimension we find a range of studies highlighting
49 the relevance of competence in **managing risk and uncertainty**: in other words, the knowledge
50 and ability to deal with ambiguity, uncertainty, threats and change; to solve problems; and to
51 control escalation (Wateridge, 1997; Crawford, 2000; El-Sabaa, 2001; Opfer *et al.*, 2002; Muzio
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *et al.*, 2007; Thomas and Mengel, 2008; Stevenson and Starkweather, 2010; Fisher, 2011;
4
5 Starkweather and Stevenson, 2011; Li *et al.*, 2011). Bander and Giber (1995) and Cheng *et al.*
6
7 (2005) have identified what we call **informative power**, the knowledge and ability to seek and
8
9 understand relevant information as a competence of superior PMs alongside **negotiation skills**
10
11 (Jurison, 1999; Crawford, 2000; Cheng *et al.*, 2005; Cicmil, 2006; Andersen, 2008; Skulmoski
12
13 and Hartman, 2010).

14
15
16
17 Competence in **decision making** has been conceptualised (Wateridge, 1997; Crawford, 2000;
18
19 Cheng *et al.*, 2005; Cicmil, 2006) as knowledge, skills and ability for critical judgment;
20
21 conceptual thinking; intuitive insight; and timely decision making.
22
23
24

25
26 **Assembling the project team** is concerned with the ability to understand the organisational
27
28 context (strategy, structure) and how this affects the project for staffing, team building and
29
30 support (Anderson, 1992; Bander and Gilber, 1995; Wateridge, 1997; Crawford, 2000; Opfer *et*
31
32 *al.*, 2002; Cheng *et al.*, 2005; Cicmil, 2006; Andersen, 2008; Stevenson and Starkweather, 2010;
33
34 Starkweather and Stevenson, 2011; Fisher, 2011).
35
36

37
38 **Strategic directiveness** refers to the skills and ability to provide strategic direction, providing
39
40 goals and definition (Crawford, 2000; Opfer *et al.*, 2002; Cheng *et al.*, 2005; Geoghegan and
41
42 Dulewicz, 2008).
43
44

45
46 Within the social competence ('know-how to behave') dimension we find that **leading**
47
48 competence, which relates to personal empowerment, delegation, rewarding and interpersonal
49
50 understanding, has been widely noted in the literature (Anderson, 1992; Wateridge, 1997;
51
52 Jurison, 1999; Crawford, 2000; El-Sabaa, 2001; Opfer *et al.*, 2002; Cheng *et al.*, 2005; Andersen,
53
54 2008; Geoghegan and Dulewicz, 2008; Thomas and Mengel, 2008; Taylor and Woelfer, 2009;
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Müller and Turner, 2010a, 2010b, 2010c; Stevenson and Starkweather, 2010; Skulmoski and
4
5 Hartman, 2010; Fisher, 2011; Gomes *et al.*, 2012; Pauget and Wald, 2013; Zhang *et al.*, 2013;
6
7 Galvin *et al.*, 2014; Brière *et al.*, 2015).

8
9
10 Competence in **managing stakeholders** including customers has been identified in a few studies
11
12 (Crawford, 2000; El-Sabaa, 2001; Cheng *et al.*, 2005; Zhang *et al.*, 2013). **Communicating**, the
13
14 importance of being able to manage relevant organisational and inter-organisational connections,
15
16 to build, maintain and manage relationships, has been particularly emphasised in the literature
17
18 and is closely aligned with managing stakeholders (Wateridge, 1997; Jurison, 1999; Crawford,
19
20 2000; El-Sabaa, 2001; Opfer *et al.*, 2002; Henderson, 2004; Andersen, 2008; Silvius, 2009;
21
22 Müller and Turner, 2010a, 2010b, 2010c; Stevenson and Starkweather, 2010; Skulmoski and
23
24 Hartman, 2010; Fisher, 2011; Pauget and Wald, 2013; Dillon and Taylor, 2015).

25
26
27 Contextual awareness has also been identified as a key competence in the literature. For example,
28
29
30 **cultural and social awareness** refers to understanding the culture of organisations (internal and
31
32 external), cultural variance and fit (Cicmil, 2006; Stevenson and Starkweather, 2010; Fisher,
33
34 2011; Zhang *et al.*, 2013). Research has also highlighted a number of attitudes or behaviours:
35
36 these include **Conscientiousness**, the ability and observed behaviour of promoting managerial
37
38 transparency (Geoghen and Dulewicz, 2008; Müller and Turner, 2010a, 2010b); **emotional**
39
40 **resilience**, the ability to manage emotions and display energetic attitudes (Opfer *et al.*, 2002;
41
42 Cheng *et al.*, 2005; Cicmil, 2006; Anderson, 2008; Geoghegan and Dulweicz, 2008; Müller and
43
44 Tuner, 2010a, 2010b; Fisher, 2011); and **self-inspiration**, the personal attitudes and behaviours
45
46 of self motivation, and self-confidence (Bander and Giber, 1995; El-Sabaa, 2001; Opfer *et al.*,
47
48 2002; Cheng *et al.*, 2005; Geoghegan and Dulewicz, 2008; Clarke, 2010; Müller and Turner
49
50 2010a, 2010b).

1
2
3 Finally, within the meta-competence ('know-thyself') we find **managing self-knowledge** has
4 also been identified as an important competence (Söderlund *et al.*, 2008; Müller and Turner,
5 2010a, 2010b, 2010c; Huang *et al.*, 2015). This is the ability to reflect on experience, recognise
6 the lessons learned, and to apply them as the project progresses through its life-cycle and in
7 future projects.
8
9

10
11
12 The review of this literature indicates that research on PM competences has been an important
13 area of research focus over the past 17 years. We note that there is no common agreement on a
14 single set of PM competences (Nijhuis, 2015), nor is there clarity about PM competence
15 importance across the project life cycle.
16
17

18
19
20 This wide-ranging body of literature has enabled us to consolidate and synthesise 20 PM
21 competences across four competence dimensions (Le Deist and Winterton, 2005). This offers a
22 more holistic approach to PM competence research and provides a foundation to address RQ1
23 and RQ2.
24
25

26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 **Research Method**

36
37
38 We consolidate 20 PM competences across 4 competence dimensions in a 'theoretical' manner.
39
40 Based on this, we aim to find out the 'empirical' evidence of the relative importance of PM
41 competencies across the project life cycle. To fulfil the purpose of this study, a deductive and
42 quantitative approach was adopted. We echo Crawford's argument that only a limited number of
43 PM studies - mostly qualitative - have addressed the area of PM competence (Crawford,
44 2005). In regard to data collection, a survey method was used to collect project practitioners'
45 perceptions who have had valuable extensive experiences (Erickson and Gutierrez, 2002) and the
46 insights of members of the community of PM practice (Fisher, 2011); "the knowledge of
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 practitioners and of research specialists must grow together in new ways” (Erickson and
4
5 Gutierrez, 2002, pp. 23). Thus, we methodologically follow the significance of securing a
6
7 synergised balance between the knowledge of practitioners and researchers.
8
9

10 *Data Collection*

11
12 We designed a web-based survey as our data collection instrument. The survey design consisted
13
14 of two components. First, we used the 20 competences identified through the literature review.
15
16 Second, eight software project life cycle stages (initiation; requirement analysis; planning;
17
18 prototyping; analysis and design; implementation; test and transition; and closing) were
19
20 identified by reviewing life cycle models, standards and PM guides (Bennatan, 1995; IEEE
21
22 Standard, 1997; IEEE/EIA, 1998; Royce, 1998; Jurison, 1999; OGC, 2009; Favaro, 2010; PMI,
23
24 2013). The survey had three sections (see appendix 1).
25
26
27
28
29

30
31 The first section aimed to address RQ1; to establish and validate the level of importance of each
32
33 competence. To ensure a common understanding of terms we provided the definitions of the 20
34
35 competences and then asked participants to rate their level of importance on a six-point Likert
36
37 scale from 1 (not at all important) to 6 (essential). This scale was adopted to minimise common
38
39 method biases in terms of scale format (Podsakoff *et al.*, 2003), and to reduce an error of central
40
41 tendency (Blumberg *et al.*, 2008).
42
43
44

45
46 The second section aimed to address RQ2 to identify and prioritise the five most important
47
48 competences at each stage of the software project life cycle. To ensure a common understanding
49
50 of project life cycle stages we provided information about key management activities at each life
51
52 cycle stage. We then asked participants to select and rank the five most important competences at
53
54 each stage of the software project life cycle.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The third section aimed to collect basic demographic information about the participants. The
4
5 survey was designed to take no more than 15 minutes.
6
7

8 The survey was piloted to ensure clarity and coherence. Two software project managers, each
9
10 with 20-year experience in the discipline, completed the survey and provided feedback on the
11
12 content and structure. The survey was amended to clarify the definition of 'activity' in relation to
13
14 each life cycle stage, and its structure and format to provide more coherence. The pilot
15
16 participants reviewed the revised survey before the final version of the survey was administered.
17
18
19

20 21 *Participants*

22
23 The survey was administered during a two-month period to software project managers and
24
25 practitioners with a minimum of one year of work experience. The web-based survey was
26
27 distributed in two ways. First, the survey was sent as a web link via e-mail to more than 100
28
29 software project managers through one of the author's professional networks. Second, the survey
30
31 web link was posted on the Project Management Institute's (PMI) project manager community
32
33 pages and the discussion boards on PM communities. To increase the number of responses,
34
35 reminders were sent and posted twice. Of the 82 responses received, 57 (22 female, 35 male)
36
37 were fully completed, and these were the responses that we analysed. Anonymity of participants
38
39 and their responses was maintained.
40
41
42
43
44

45 Over three-fifths of participants (63.1%) had software project experience of more than seven
46
47 years; almost half (49%) were from South Korea; just under a third (30%) from the UK; and
48
49 roughly a tenth each from India (10.5%) and from other countries (10.5%). Most participants
50
51 (79%) had experience in managing software projects in the IT/IS industries and financial sectors,
52
53 and nearly one third of participants were also in the area of telecommunication and the public
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

sector. Over half of the participants (54.3%) are in a project manager role, while the remaining (45.7%) are in a practitioner role (analyst, consultant, system/software architect, programmer). Finally, a quarter of the participants have PM certification (e.g. PMP, PRINCE2, PROJECT+).

Perceived Importance of Project Management Competences (RQ1)

Figure 1 plots the average importance ratings of PM competences by participants for section 1 of the questionnaire. By and large, four competences received highest average scores of 5 or more. These are: 'managing risk & uncertainty' (5.23), 'planning' (5.12), 'leading' (5.05) and 'decision making' (5.04). While 'training and certification' and 'education background' were scored the lowest, receiving average scores between 3.00 and 4.00.

Aligned with the literature review, the twenty competences that were identified are categorised by four competence dimensions: cognitive, functional, social and meta competences. Among the four competence dimensions, functional competences tended to receive a higher score (average score = 4.87) compared to the other three competence dimensions. Functional competences include two of the top scoring competences such as 'managing risk & uncertainty' and 'decision making'.

The meta-competence dimension scored the second highest among the four dimensions (average score 4.74). Social competences scored the third highest among the four dimensions (average score = 4.63). With the 'leading' competence recording the highest score (5.05) in this dimension. Cognitive competences scored the third highest (average score = 4.31); these cover technical knowledge, PM process knowledge, training and certification, prior projects experience, educational background and planning competences. The competences in this dimension show wider variations relatively than competences in other dimensions.

[insert Figure 1 about here]

Relative Importance of Competences across the Project Life Cycle (RQ2)

Table 2 shows the relative importance of PM competences across the project life cycle stages. Participants identified and rank ordered (1-5) the most important competences for each project life cycle stage: initiation, requirements analysis, planning, prototyping, analysis and design, implementation, test and transition, and closing.

Analysis by Life Cycle Stages

Looking across the project life cycle, due to technological similarities across software projects, prior relevant project experience as well as long-term judicious thinking about how the project aims will be achieved is considered significant in the early stages. During the requirements analysis stage three competences were considered the most important: ‘managing stakeholders’, ‘planning’, and ‘communicating’. Here the project managers build lines of communication and facilitate communication with the client and other stakeholders to capture and create a clear and comprehensive requirements statement.

During the planning stage, ‘planning’ and ‘decision making’ continue to be within the top competences; ‘PM process knowledge’ is also a high priority competence at this stage. Due to the specific characteristics of software projects, participants considered technical proficiency (‘technical knowledge’) as the most important competence for the next four stages: prototyping, analysis and design, implementation, and test and transition.

‘PM process knowledge’ and ‘prior projects experience’ are considered within the top three important competences of software PM during the prototyping stage. This can be due to the special features of prototyping activities, such as the role of input data in the success of

1
2
3 prototyping process based on previous experience. 'Managing risk & uncertainty' are ranked
4
5 second during the implementation and test and transition stages and third during the closing stage,
6
7 as this is where the performance gaps between the previous stages start to become evident.
8
9 During the closing stage of a project the relative priorities of competences change, so that
10
11 'negotiation' and 'managing stakeholders' are ranked among the top two competences.
12
13

14
15 [insert Table 2 about here]
16
17

18 *Analysis by Competence Dimensions*

19

20
21 To assess the relative importance of PM competences, we took the importance rating score (1-5
22
23 given by the survey participants) for each competence across the software project life cycle; then,
24
25 the score was converted into a percentage. Figure 2 captures this where the X-axis represents the
26
27 eight life cycle stages, and the values on the Y-axis represent the relative importance in
28
29 percentage. Therefore, the higher the percentage score, the higher the relative importance of PM
30
31 competence at a certain life cycle stage.
32
33

34
35 The cognitive competence dimension, relating as it does to acquiring PM knowledge and
36
37 experience: technical knowledge, PM process knowledge, training and certification, prior
38
39 projects experience, education background and planning. The 'technical knowledge' score
40
41 increases by almost 50% between the planning and prototyping stage, and then decreases to
42
43 between 50-60% for the following stages up to the test and transition stage. By contrast the
44
45 knowledge about planning was considered more important than the other three competences
46
47 during the first three stages of the project life cycle (initiation, requirements analysis and
48
49 planning), peaking at planning (70%) and then declining to around 20% in the following two
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 stages (prototyping and analysis and design) before tailing off in the last two stages (test and
4 transition and closing).
5
6

7
8 The relative importance of 'PM Process knowledge' in the life cycle ranges from 10% to 40%,
9 peaking during the planning and prototyping stages. The relative importance of 'prior projects
10 experience' was recognised as significantly more important than the other two aspects (education
11 background, and training and certification) across the project life cycle.
12
13
14
15
16

17
18 Previous project experience was considered as the most important at 45% during the initiation
19 stage, with its importance decreasing to a range of between 23-34% up to the implementation
20 stage, and further decreasing to under 20% in the last two stages of transition and testing and
21 closing. 'Education background' and 'training and certification' show a continuous score below
22 6% across the whole project life cycle, that is relatively less important than other competences.
23
24
25
26
27
28

29
30 The second dimension (linked to decision making, strategic directiveness, managing risk &
31 uncertainty, assembling the team, negotiating and informative power competences) can be
32 considered as functional competences. The relative importance of decision-making competence
33 fluctuates greatly across the software project life cycle. It peaks at between 30-40% during the
34 initiation, planning, analysis and design, and test and transition and closing (10-20%).
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42
43 Another two competences, 'strategic directiveness' and 'managing risk & uncertainty', show the
44 opposite tendency. 'Managing risk & uncertainty's score of around 10% during the initiation
45 stage gradually increases during the following stages up to the test and transition stage, peaking
46 at just under 50%, and then dropping slightly to just under 40% at the closing stage. 'Strategic
47 directiveness' high score of 27% during the initiation stage slightly decreases during the three
48 stages, and then shows a stable trend between 13-17% in the last stages.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 'Assembling the team' has a marked variation during the planning stage (at around 20%) and its
4 relative importance slightly decreases in the following stages. 'Negotiating' competence, at 45%,
5 was recognised as being particularly important at the closing stage. 'Informative power's relative
6 importance was perceived as being at its highest both at the early stages (requirements analysis)
7 and middle stages; between the prototyping and implementation.
8
9

10
11
12 Third, the social competence dimension covers seven competences, and four of them show a
13 relatively stable trend. The importance of 'leading' was rated more consistently (at 5-12%)
14 across the project life cycle, increasing in perceived importance to between 15-27% at the last
15 three stages. 'Managing stakeholders' is regarded as important during the initiation stage (31%),
16 peaks at requirements analysis (47%) and then again at the closing stage (37%).
17
18

19
20 Competence in 'communicating', which is highly relevant for interactive relationships, generally
21 tends to be perceived as of higher priority during the last stage of the software project life-cycle.
22 The importance of 'communicating' increases to around 30% during the requirement analysis
23 and closing stages.
24
25

26
27 Among the four other stable competences (cultural/social awareness, conscientiousness,
28 emotional resilience and self-inspiration), 'conscientiousness' recorded exceptionally the high
29 score of 11% at the closing stage. By contrast, 'cultural/social awareness' competence received
30 higher scores during the early stages, initiation and requirement analysis. 'Cultural and social
31 awareness' scored less than 8% across the whole life-cycle, but received relatively higher scores
32 during the initiation and requirement analysis stages.
33
34

35
36 The fourth dimension, associated with 'managing self-knowledge' competence, can be seen as
37 meta-competence. 'Managing self-knowledge' competence fluctuates below 20% across the
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

software project life-cycle, decreasing during the planning and analysis and design stages and increasing during the prototyping and test and transition stages.

[insert Figure 2 about here]

Project Management Competence Development Opportunities

Through the analysis of twenty PM competences in four competence dimensions, competence development opportunities can be identified with clear evidence from the results. This section discusses three PM competence ‘development opportunities’ based on the analysis of cognitive, functional, social and meta competences.

As the first development opportunity, a considerable awareness by software project practitioners regarding the value of **PM education, training and certification** was found. The importance results of cognitive competences highlight a gap between the distinguishable level of importance between PM knowledge itself and a means of acquiring the PM knowledge. The questionnaire results show that the importance level of competences in terms of knowledge about software technology (technical knowledge), PM process (PM process knowledge) and planning was scored relatively higher than other cognitive and meta competences. In particular, possessing technical knowledge (cognitive) and managing relevant self-knowledge (meta) were regarded as critical during the prototyping, test and transition stages due to the unusual nature of the software project life-cycle.

Compared to PM knowledge itself, however, the means of obtaining knowledge were rated significantly low across the project life-cycle such as training, certification and education background.

1
2
3 The gap between the perceived higher importance of PM knowledge and the lower importance of
4 PM training seems paradoxical: PM education/training programmes are mainly composed of PM
5 knowledge. This finding mirrors those identified by previous studies that there is a gap between
6 PM training and practice (Wateridge, 1997; Thomas and Mengel, 2008; Egginton, 2010, 2012).
7
8 Our practitioners perceive 'practice' in managing software projects as more significant than
9 'theory'. This should not come as a surprise and reflects the findings of Ramazani and Jergeas
10 (2015), whose qualitative study points out that PM education and training systems need to be
11 improved to prepare project managers on their journey from good to great. Furthermore, instead
12 of the theoretical training and education, previous project experience was perceived to have more
13 relevance to the tasks across the software project life cycle. Software project managers and
14 practitioners in particular have more concern for the level of project relevance during the early
15 project stage to maximise their management performance by drawing on previous PM experience.
16 This finding echoes that of Stevenson and Starkweather (2010) with regard to IT projects more
17 generally. Therefore, recognition of the value-added PM training, education and certification in a
18 more substantive and practical way can be one of the competence development opportunities
19 emphasised in this study.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 The second competence development opportunity is related to the importance of continuous **risk**
42 **management competence**. From the importance results of functional competences, we found
43 that the relative importance of the 'managing risk & uncertainty' competence significantly and
44 consistently increases during the middle and last stages of software project. This is in contrast to
45 what academic literature indicates. Theoretically, it is generally acknowledged that project risks
46 are high at the early stage due to a high level of uncertainty and decrease as we progress through
47 the lifecycle (Atkinson *et al.*, 2006; APM, 2012; PMI, 2013). However, responses from the
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 participants gave us a different viewpoint. This interesting result from our empirical data
4
5 indicates more understanding about how risks are managed across the life cycle in the sector or a
6
7 misunderstanding in practice of the difference between the concepts of risk, problems and issues:
8
9 this also leads to the need of negotiation skill for customer acceptance and satisfaction.
10
11 ‘Negotiating’ competence also scored very high at the closing stage. This may imply that
12
13 responding to the escalated risks through the early and middle stages or new risks during the
14
15 systems test and transition stage is critical for the successful closing of project. Moreover,
16
17 practitioners may consider negotiation competence during the last stage as one of critical abilities
18
19 to minimise the project risks. Thus, this second opportunity refers to a need of developing on-
20
21 going risk management competences in the long-term approach throughout the software project
22
23 life-cycle.
24
25
26
27
28

29 Third, the importance of social and meta-competences can be another competence development
30
31 opportunity. One noticeable finding is that there is a real need to diversify the concept of **PM**
32
33 **leadership**. Normally, the existing context of PM leadership has tended to focus heavily on
34
35 developing cognitive and functional competences (PMI, 2007, 2013; APM, 2012). However, the
36
37 empirical evidence in this study emphasises the necessity of widening the context of leadership
38
39 including social and meta aspects. Hence, and similarly to the first opportunity, the educational
40
41 contents regarding PM leadership or executive management need to address more diverse PM
42
43 competence development opportunities.
44
45
46
47

48 The relative importance of other social competences also shows a high dependency on certain
49
50 life-cycle stages. Our empirical results indicate that the early and close-out stages of a software
51
52 project require the deployment of key competences, particularly with regard to the social aspects
53
54 (e.g. managing stakeholders, communicating and leading), and this goes some way to addressing
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the critique by Havila *et al.* (2013) of previous research on project competence for focusing only
4
5 on the early and middle stages of managing projects.
6
7

8 We also found that consensus with senior managers and many project stakeholders should be
9
10 finalised based on a certain level of satisfaction and agreement (managing stakeholders); again,
11
12 this reflects findings from other research (e.g. Henderson, 2004, 2008; Havila *et al.*, 2013).
13
14
15

16 **Conclusion**

17
18
19 The aim of this study was to analyse the perceived relative importance of PM competences
20
21 across the life cycle in a software project environment.
22
23

24 The two research questions addressed were: 1) what is the perceived level of importance of
25
26 existing project management competences for managing software projects? and 2) what is the
27
28 level of prioritisation of PM competences across the software project life cycle?
29
30

31 To answer these questions, previous literature addressing individual competences for managing
32
33 projects was extensively reviewed; twenty PM competences were identified. Survey responses
34
35 from 57 software project managers and practitioners were collected, and the perceived level of
36
37 importance of each of the 20 competences was identified. A relative importance analysis was
38
39 also carried out.
40
41
42
43

44 As a result, we identified current PM competence development gaps and opportunities (i.e.
45
46 perceived gaps from software project practitioners' expectations regarding PM education,
47
48 training and certification, risk management strategy in the long-term approach, diversification of
49
50 PM leadership).
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 This study makes original contributions. First, a set of 20 PM competences within four
4 competence categories was identified and they were prioritised based on their relative
5 importance across the life cycle stages. This draws our attention to the significance of inter-
6 relationship between PM competences and project life cycle.
7
8
9
10
11

12
13 Moreover, perceived PM competence deployment gaps were highlighted to suggest possible
14 competence development opportunities. For instance, a theoretical understanding of PM
15 knowledge was rated as one of the most important competences to managing software projects;
16 the completion of relevant education and training was identified as the least important one. This
17 appears to be something of a paradox, since the main contents of PM education and training
18 usually comprise theories, and abstract or conceptual ideas.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- Ahadzie, D.K., Proverbs, D.G. and Sarkodie-Poku, I. (2014), "Competencies required of project managers at the design phase of mass house building projects", *International Journal of Project Management*, Vol. 32 No. 6, pp. 958-969.
- Ahsan, K., Ho, M. and Khan, S. (2013), "Recruiting project managers: a comparative analysis of competencies and recruitment signals from job advertisements", *Project Management Journal*, Vol. 44 No. 5, pp. 36-54.
- Andersen, E.S. (2008), *Rethinking Project Management: An Organisational Perspective*, Harlow: FT Prentice Hall.
- Anderson, S.D. (1992), "Project quality and project managers", *International Journal of Project Management*, Vol. 10 No. 3, pp. 138-144.
- Andoh-Baidoo, F., Villarreal, M.A., Koong, K.S., Cornejo, H., Schmidt, N., Colunga, H. and Mesa, R. (2011), "Key competencies for global project managers: a cross cultural study of the UK and India", *International Journal of Business and Systems Research*, Vol. 5 No. 3, pp. 223-243.
- Association for Project Management (APM). (2008), *APM Competence framework*, Association for Project Management.
- Association for Project Management (APM). (2012), *APM Body of Knowledge*, 6th ed., Association for Project Management, High Wycombe.

- 1
2
3 Atkinson, R., Crawford, L. and Ward, S. (2006), "Fundamental uncertainties in projects and the
4 scope of project management", *International Journal of Project Management*, Vol. 24 No.
5 8, pp. 687-698.
6
7
8
9
10 Bander, D.O. and Giber, D.J. (1995), "Competency-based project management", *Data Training*,
11 Vol. January-February, pp. 14-15.
12
13
14
15 Bennatan, E.M. (1995), *Software Project Management: A Practitioner's Approach*, 2nd ed.,
16 McGraw-Hill, London.
17
18
19
20
21 Blumberg, B., Cooper, D.R. and Schindler, P.S. (2008), *Business Research Methods*, 2nd ed.,
22 McGraw-Hill, London.
23
24
25
26
27 Boyatzis, R.E. (1982), *The Competent Manager: A Model for Effective Performance*, John Wiley
28 & Sons.
29
30
31
32 Boyatzis, R.E. (2008), "Competencies in the 21st Century", *Journal of Management*
33 *Development*, Vol. 27 No. 1, pp. 5-12.
34
35
36
37 Brière, S. Proulx, D. Flores, O.N. and Laporte, M. (2015), "Competencies of project managers in
38 international NGOs: perceptions of practitioners", *International Journal of Project*
39 *Management*, Vol. 33 No. 1, pp. 116-125.
40
41
42
43
44
45 Brill, J.M., Bishop, J.M. and Walker, A.E. (2006), "The competencies and characteristics
46 required of an effective project manager: a web-based delphi study", *Educational*
47 *Technology Research and Development*, Vol. 54 No. 2, pp. 115-140.
48
49
50
51
52 Buchanan, D.A. (1991), "Beyond content and control: project vulnerability and the process
53 agenda", *International Journal of Project Management*, Vol. 9 No. 4, pp. 233-239.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Cave, E. and McKeown, P. (1993), “Managerial effectiveness: the identification of need”,
4
5
6 *Management Education and Development*, Vol. 24 No. 2, pp. 122-137.
7
- 8
9 Cave, E. and Wilkinson, C. (1992), “Developing managerial capabilities in education”, in:
10
11 Bennet, N., Crawford, M. and Riches, C. (Eds), *Managing Change in Education:*
12
13 *Individual and Organisational Perspectives*, Paul Chapman Publishing. England, pp. 34-45.
14
15
- 16 Cheng, M., Dainty, A. and Moore, D. (2005), “What makes a good project manager?”. *Human*
17
18 *Resource Management Journal*, Vol. 15 No. 1, pp. 25–37.
19
20
- 21 Cicmil, S. (2006), “Understanding project management practice through interpretative and
22
23 critical research perspectives”, *Project Management Journal*, Vol. 37 No. 2, pp. 27-37.
24
25
- 26 Clarke, N. (2010), “Emotional intelligence and its relationship to transformational leadership and
27
28 key project manager competences”, *Project Management Journal*, Vol. 4 No. 2, pp. 5-20.
29
30
- 31 Crawford, L. (2000), “Profiling the competent project manager”, *Proceedings of PMI Research*
32
33 *Conference, Paris, France, Project Management Institute*, pp. 3-15.
34
35
36
- 37 Crawford, L. (2002), “Profiling the competent project manager”, in: Slevin, D.P., Cleland, D.I.
38
39 and Pinto, J.K. (Eds), *The Frontiers of Project Management Research*, Project
40
41 Management Institute, Newtown Square, Pennsylvania, pp. 151-176.
42
43
44
- 45 Crawford, L. (2003), “Assessing and developing the project management competence of
46
47 individuals”, in: Turner, J.R. (Ed), *People in Project Management*, Gower, Aldershot, pp.
48
49 13-29.
50
51
- 52 Crawford, L. (2005), “Senior management perceptions of project management competence”,
53
54
55 *International Journal of Project Management*, Vol. 23 No. 1, pp. 7-16.
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Crawford, L. and Nahmias, A.H. (2010), "Competences for managing change", *International*
4 *Journal of Project Management*, Vol. 28 No. 4, pp. 405-412.
5
6
7
8
9 Dillon, S. and Taylor, H. (2015), "Employing grounded theory to uncover behavioral
10 competencies of information technology project managers", *Project Management Journal*,
11 Vol. 46 No. 4, pp. 90-104.
12
13
14
15
16 Durach, C.F, Kembro, J. and Wieland, A. (2017), "A new paradigm for systematic literature
17 reviews in supply chain management", *Journal of Supply Chain Management*, Vol. 53 No.
18 4, pp. 67-85.
19
20
21
22
23
24 Edum-Fotwe, F.T. and McCaffer, R. (2000), "Developing project management competency:
25 perspectives from the construction industry", *International Journal of Project Management*,
26 Vol. 18 No. 2, pp. 111-124.
27
28
29
30
31
32 Egginton, B.E. (2010), "Project management education, training, working & learning: a
33 longitudinal study into the experiences of British Army officers in UK defence related
34 projects", *Proceedings of PMI Research Conference, Washington, DC*. Newtown Square,
35 PA: Project Management Institute.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42 Egginton, B.E. (2012), "Realising the benefits of investment in project management training:
43 evidence supporting the need for a more strategic approach", *International Journal of*
44 *Managing Projects in Business*, Vol. 5 No. 3, pp.508-527.
45
46
47
48
49 Ekrot, B., Kock, A. and Gemunden, H.G. (2016), "Retaining project management competence-
50 antecedents and consequences", *International Journal of Project Management*, Vol. 34 No.
51 2, pp. 145-157.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 El-Sabaa, S. (2001), "The skills and career path of an effective project manager", *International*
4 *Journal of Project Management*, Vol. 19 No. 1, pp. 1-7.
5
6
7
8 Erickson, F. and Gutierrez, K. (2002), "Culture, rigor, and science in educational research",
9 *Educational Researcher*, Vol. 31 No. 8, pp. 21-24.
10
11
12
13 Favaro, J. (2010), "Guest editor's introduction: renewing the software project management life
14 cycle", *Software IEEE*, Vol. 27 No. 1, pp. 17-19.
15
16
17
18 Fisher, E. (2011), "What practitioners consider to be the skills and behaviours of an effective
19 people project manager", *International Journal of Project Management*, Vol. 29 No. 8, pp.
20 994-1002.
21
22
23
24
25
26 Fong, P.S.W. and Chan, C. (2004), "Learning behaviours of project managers", *Proceeding of*
27 *IRNOP VI Project Research Conference, Turku, Finland*, pp. 200-219.
28
29
30
31 Galvin, T., Gibbs, M., Sullivan, J. and Williams, C. (2014), "Leadership competencies of project
32 managers: An empirical study of emotional, intellectual, and managerial dimensions",
33 *Journal of Economic Development, Management, IT, Finance, and Marketing*, Vol. 6 No.
34 1, pp. 35-60.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41 Geoghegan, L. and Dulewicz, V. (2008), "Do project managers' leadership competencies
42 contribute to project success?", *Project Management Journal*, Vol. 39 No. 4, pp. 58-67.
43
44
45
46 Gillard, S. and Price, J. (2005), "The competencies of effective project managers: a conceptual
47 analysis", *International Journal of Management*, Vol. 22 No. 1, pp. 48-53.
48
49
50
51
52 Gomes, C.F., Yasin, M.M. and Small, M.H. (2012), "Discerning interrelationships among the
53 knowledge, competencies, and roles of project managers in the planning and
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 implementation of public sector projects”, *International Journal of Public Administration*,
4
5 Vol. 35 No. 5, pp. 315-328.
6
7

8 Havila, V., Medlin, C.J. and Salmi, A. (2013), “Project-ending competence in premature project
9
10 closures”, *International Journal of Project Management*, Vol. 31 No. 1, pp. 90-99.
11
12

13 Henderson, L.S. (2004), “Encoding and decoding communication competencies in project
14
15 management - an exploratory study”, *International Journal of Project Management*, Vol.
16
17 22 No. 6, pp. 469-476.
18
19
20

21 Henderson, L.S. (2008), “The impact of project managers' communication competencies:
22
23 validation and extension of a research model for virtuality, satisfaction, and productivity on
24
25 project teams”, *Project Management Journal*, Vol. 39 No. 2, pp. 48–59.
26
27
28

29 Heywood, L., Gonczi, A. and Hager, P. (1992), *A Guide to Development of Competency*
30
31 *Standards for Professions*, Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra.
32
33

34 Hölzle, K. (2010), “Designing and implementing a career path for project managers”,
35
36 *International Journal of Project Management*, Vol. 28 No. 8, pp. 779-786.
37
38

39 Huang, Y-C, Ma, R. and Lee, K-W. (2015), “Exploitative learning in project teams: do cognitive
40
41 capability and strategic orientations act as moderator variables?” *International Journal of*
42
43 *Project Management*, Vol. 33 No.3, pp.760-771.
44
45
46

47 IEEE Standard Association. (1997), 1074-1997 - IEEE standard for developing software life
48
49 cycle processes.
50
51

52 IEEE/EIA, (1998), Industry implementation of International Standard ISO/IEC 12207: 1995
53
54 (ISO/IEC 12207), Standard for information technology software life cycle processes.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 International Project Management Association (IPMA). (2006), *IPMA Competence Baseline,*
4
5 *Version 3.0 (ICB 3.0)*, International Project Management Association, The Netherlands:
6
7 Nijkerk.
- 8
9
10
11 Jurison, J. (1999), “Software project management: the manager’s view”, *Communication of the*
12
13 *Association for Information Systems*, Vol. 2 No. 3es, pp. 1-57.
- 14
15
16 Königová, M., Urbancová, H. and Fejfar, J. (2012), “Identification of managerial competencies
17
18 in knowledge-based organizations,” *Journal of Competitiveness*, Vol. 4 No. 1, pp. 129-142.
- 19
20
21 Le Deist, F.D. and Winterton, J. (2005), “What is competence?”, *Human Resource Development*
22
23 *International*, Vol. 8 No. 1, pp. 27-46.
- 24
25
26 Li, Y., Yang, M-H., Klein, G. and Chen, H-G. (2011), “The role of team problem solving
27
28 competency in information system development projects”, *International Journal of Project*
29
30 *Management*, Vol. 29 No. 7, pp. 911-922.
- 31
32
33
34 Mirabile, R.J. (1997), “Everything you wanted to know about competency modelling”, *Training*
35
36 *and Development*, Vol. 51 No. 8, pp. 73-77.
- 37
38
39 Morris, P.W.G. (2013), *Reconstructing Project Management*, Wiley-Blackwell, Oxford.
- 40
41
42 Morris, P.W.G. and Hough, G.H. (1987), *The Anatomy of Major Projects: A Study of the Reality*
43
44 *of Project Management*, Wiley, Chichester.
- 45
46
47 Müller, R. and Turner, J.R. (2010a), “Attitudes and leadership competences for project success”,
48
49 *Baltic Journal of Management*, Vol. 5 No. 3, pp. 307-329.
- 50
51
52 Müller, R. and Turner, J.R. (2010b), “Leadership competency profiles of successful project
53
54 managers”, *International Journal of Project Management*, Vol. 28 No. 5, pp. 437-448.
- 55
56
57
58
59
60

- Müller, R. and Turner, J.R. (2010c), *Project-Oriented Leadership*, Farnham: Gower Publishing Limited.
- Muzio, E., Fisher, D.J., Thomas, R.R. and Peters, V. (2007), “Soft skills quantification (SSQ) for project manager competencies”, *Project Management Journal*, Vol. 38 No. 2, pp. 30-38.
- Nijhuis, S.A., Vrijhoef, R. and Kessels, J.W.M. (2015), “Towards a taxonomy for project management competences”, *Proceeding of Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Rotterdam, Netherlands, pp. 181-191.
- Office of Government Commerce (OGC). (2009), *Managing Successful Projects with PRINCE2*, The Stationery Office, ISBN 978-0-11-331059-3.
- Opfer, W.A., Kloppenberg, T.J. and Shriberg, A. (2002), “Project leadership: setting the stage”, *Proceedings of the PMI Research Conference*, Seattle, Wash, pp. 415-421.
- Palacio-Marqués, D., Cortés-Grao, R. and Lobato Carral, C. (2013), “Outstanding knowledge competences and web 2.0 practices for developing successful e-learning project management”, *International Journal of Project Management*, Vol. 31 No. 1, pp. 14-21.
- Partington, D., Pellegrinelli, S. and Young, M. (2005), “Attributes and levels of programme management competence: an interpretive study”, *International Journal of Project Management*, Vol. 23 No. 2, pp. 87-95.
- Pauget, B. and Wald, A. (2013), “Relational competence in complex temporary organizations: The case of a French hospital construction project network”, *International Journal of Project Management*, Vol. 31 No. 2, pp. 200–211.

- 1
2
3 Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Lee, J.Y. and Podsakoff, N.P. (2003), “Common method
4 biases in behavioral research: a critical review of the literature and recommended
5 remedies”, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 88 No. 5, pp. 879-903.
6
7
8
9
10
11 Project Management Institute (PMI). (2007), *Project Manager Competency Development*
12 *Framework*, 2nd ed., Project Management Institute, Newtown Square, PA.
13
14
15
16 Project Management Institute (PMI). (2013), *A guide to the Project Management Body of*
17 *Knowledge*, 5th ed., Project Management Institute, Newtown Square, PA.
18
19
20
21 Ramazani, J. and Jergeas, G. (2015), “Project managers and the journey from good to great: the
22 benefits of investment in project management training and education”, *International*
23 *Journal of Project Management*, Vol. 33 No. 1, pp. 41–52.
24
25
26
27
28
29 Royce, W. (1998), *Software Project Management: A Unified Framework*, Harlow: Addison-
30 Wesley, Reading.
31
32
33
34 Sandberg, J. (2001), “Understanding competence at work”, *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 79
35 No. 3, pp. 24-28.
36
37
38
39 Seppänen, V. (2002), “Evolution of competence in software subcontracting projects”,
40 *International Journal of Project Management*, Vol. 20 No. 2, pp. 155-164.
41
42
43
44 Silvius, A.J.G. (2009), “Project management 2027: The future of project management”, in: Kidd,
45 T.T. (Ed), *Handbook of Research on Technology Project Management, Planning, and*
46 *Operations*, Information Science Reference. US, pp. 17-36.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Silvius, A.J.G. and Batenburg, R. (2009), "Future development of project management
4 competences", *Proceedings of the 42nd Hawaii International Conference on System*
5
6
7
8 *Sciences*, Waikoloa, Hawaii.
- 9
10
11 Skulmoski, G.J. and Hartman, F.T. (2010), "Information systems project manager soft
12 competences: a project-phase investigation", *Project Management Journal*, Vol. 41 No. 1,
13
14
15 pp. 61-80.
- 16
17
18 Söderlund, J., Vaagaasar, A.L. and Andersen, E.S. (2008), "Relating, reflecting and routinizing:
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Söderlund, J., Vaagaasar, A.L. and Andersen, E.S. (2008), "Relating, reflecting and routinizing:
developing project competence in cooperation with others", *International Journal of
Project Management*, Vol. 26 No. 5, pp. 517-526.
- Stamp, G. (1981), "Levels and types of managerial capability", *Journal of Management Studies*,
Vol. 18 No. 3, pp. 277-298.
- Starkweather, J.A. and Stevenson, D.H. (2011), "PMP® certification as a core competency:
Necessary but not sufficient", *Project Management Journal*, Vol. 42 No. 1, pp. 31-41.
- Stevenson, D.H. and Starkweather, J.A. (2010), "PM critical competency index: IT execs prefer
soft skills", *International Journal of Project Management*, Vol. 28 No. 7, pp. 663-671.
- Suikki, R., Tromstedt, R. and Haapasalo, H. (2006), "Project management competence
development framework in turbulent business environment", *Technovation*, Vol. 26 No. 5,
pp. 723-738.
- Takey, S.M. and Carvalho, M.M. (2015), "Competency mapping in project management: an
action research study in an engineering company", *International Journal of Project
Management*, Vol. 33 No. 4, pp. 784-796.

- 1
2
3 Taylor, H. and Woelfer, J.P. (2009), "Critical skills for IT project management and how they are
4 learned", *Proceedings of the 47th annual conference on Computer personnel research*,
5
6 Limerick, Ireland, pp. 103-112.
7
8
9
10 Taylor, H. and Woelfer, J.P. (2010), "Critical behavioral competencies for IT project managers:
11 what are they? how are they learned?", *International Journal of Information Technology*
12
13 *Project Management*, Vol. 1 No. 4, pp. 1-19.
14
15
16
17
18 Thomas, J. and Mengel, T. (2008), "Preparing project managers to deal with complexity -
19 Advanced project management education", *International Journal of Project Management*,
20
21 Vol. 26 No. 3, pp. 304-315.
22
23
24
25
26 Wateridge, J. (1997), "Training for IS/IT project managers: a way forward", *International*
27
28 *Journal of Project Management*, Vol. 15 No. 5, pp. 283-288.
29
30
31 Woodruffe, C. (1993), "What is meant by a competency?", *Leadership and Organization*
32
33 *Development Journal*, Vol. 14 No. 1, pp. 29-36.
34
35
36
37 Zhang, F., Zuo, J. and Zillante, G. (2013), "Identification and evaluation of the key social
38 competencies for Chinese construction project managers", *International Journal of Project*
39
40 *Management*, Vol. 31 No. 5, pp. 748-759.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Appendix 1. Sample Questionnaire Items

Section	Topic and Question	Response Range	Note
1. (Q1- Q20)	<u>Importance of Competences</u> Please read and familiarise yourself with the meaning of each project management competence. Please rate the importance of each competence in managing software projects.	6-point scale: - Not at all important - Less important - Important - Very important - Extremely important - Essential	Along with the questions, the definitions of each competence were provided.
2. (Q21- Q28)	<u>Competence Prioritisation</u> Read and familiarise yourself with the eight Stages of software project life cycle and related key management activities. For each stage, select and rank order top five competences from 20 competences (i.e. Rank 1 is the most important competence in your own recognition).	Short-answer questions: - Rank 1 - Rank 2 - Rank 3 - Rank 4 - Rank 5	Along with the question, the definitions and a sample set of key management activities of each life cycle stage were provided.
3. (Q29- Q36)	<u>Demographics</u> 29. What is your gender? 30. Which category below includes your age? 31. How long have you been experienced in software/IT projects? 32. Have you been certified in a project management license or training? 33. State the country you currently work in as a software/IT project manager. 34. In which industry have you carried out software/IT projects? (multiple) 35. What types of projects have you experienced the most? 36. What is your current role in software projects?	Short-answer questions	Demographic information

Prioritising Project Management Competences across the Software Project Life Cycle

Tables

Table 1. Twenty project management competences in four competence dimensions

Dimensions	Cognitive	Functional	Social	Meta
Project management competences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical Knowledge • PM Process Knowledge • Training and Certification • Prior Projects Experience • Education Background • Planning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decision Making • Strategic Directiveness • Managing Risk and Uncertainty • Assembling the Team • Negotiating • Informative Power 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leading • Managing Stakeholders • Communicating • Cultural/Social Awareness • Conscientiousness • Emotional Resilience • Self-inspiration 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managing Self-knowledge

Table 2. Relative importance of top-five project management competences across the life cycle

Rank	Initiation	Requirement Analysis	Planning	Prototyping	Analysis and Design	Implementation	Test and Transition	Closing
#1	Prior Projects Experience	Managing Stakeholders	Planning	Technical Knowledge	Technical Knowledge	Technical Knowledge	Technical Knowledge	Negotiating
#2	Decision Making	Planning	PM Process Knowledge	PM Process Knowledge	Decision Making	Managing Risk & Uncertainty	Managing Risk & Uncertainty	Managing Stakeholders
#3	Planning	Communicating	Decision Making	Prior Projects Experience	Prior Projects Experience	PM Process Knowledge	PM Process Knowledge	Managing Risk & Uncertainty
#4	Managing Stakeholders	PM Process Knowledge	Managing Risk & Uncertainty	Informative Power	Managing Risk & Uncertainty	Prior Projects Experience	Managing Stakeholders	Communicating
#5	Strategic Directiveness	Prior Projects Experience	Prior Projects Experience	Managing Risk & Uncertainty	PM Process Knowledge	Leading	Managing Self-knowledge	Leading

Prioritising Project Management Competences across the Software Project Life Cycle

Figures




Figure 1. Importance rating scores of project management competences




Figure 2. Relative importance of project management competencies across the software project life cycle