



**FACULTEIT ECONOMIE
EN BEDRIJFSKUNDE**

**HOVENIERSBERG 24
B-9000 GENT**

Tel. : 32 - (0)9 – 264.34.61

Fax. : 32 - (0)9 – 264.35.92

WORKING PAPER

A CLASSIFICATION OF PROGRAMMES AND ITS MANAGERIAL IMPACT

Ann Vereecke¹

Ghent University and Vlerick Leuven Gent Management School

Marleen Stevens

Vlerick Leuven Gent Management School

Els Pandelaere

Ghent University and Vlerick Leuven Gent Management School

Dirk Deschoolmeester

Ghent University and Vlerick Leuven Gent Management School

June 2003

2003/185

¹ Correspondence to: Ghent University – Faculty of Economics and Business Administration, Hoveniersberg 24, 9000 Gent, Belgium; E-mail: ann.vereecke@UGent.be

Abstract

The paper describes the results of an exploratory research study on the application of programme management in six companies. A classification of programmes is developed that may help in understanding the differences between programmes and the managerial impact of these differences.

The research shows that the formalised and rigorous approach as described in most programme management handbooks is not widely adopted. The cases show less centralisation, less formalisation and less management of the interdependencies between the projects in the programme than one would expect on the basis of the programme management literature. This is especially the case in programmes that originate as a grouping of a set of existing projects. Yet, formalisation is mentioned as the main success factor in managing programmes.

Keywords:

Programme management, project management, management of change

Introduction

Contrary to project management, which is a concept that is clearly understood by both academics and practitioners, programme management seems to be a term that hasn't reached this maturity yet. The results of a survey carried out by e-Programme.com early 2001 illustrate the confusion. Visitors to the e-Programme web-site were asked what programme management means to them. Approximately 50% of the respondents agreed that programme management is "the management of organisational change through projects that bring about change", rather than "the management of multiple projects". 40% of the respondents on the other hand, agreed that programme management is "the management of multiple projects, regardless of the purpose of these projects". Although anecdotal, this disagreement on the definition of programme management shows that the field is in an early stage and that it merits researchers' attention.

It has been our objective to gain a better understanding of programme management and to identify some of the reasons for success or failure of programme management. Six case studies have been carried out in companies located in Belgium. This paper reports on the conclusions from these case studies.

Programme management

In the literature, many definitions have been given of programme management, ranging from the management of a collection of projects to the management of change.

Russell describes it as "a tool that has evolved out of project management, ... that helps organise many interrelated projects". (Russell, 1998) Reiss states that programme management is "the co-ordinated management of a portfolio of projects to achieve a set of business objectives". (Reiss, 1996)

Pellegrinelli stresses the benefits of programme management. He defines a programme as a framework for grouping existing projects or defining new projects, and for focusing all the activities required to achieve a set of major benefits. He adds to it "the projects are managed

in a co-ordinated way, either to achieve a common goal, or to extract benefits which would otherwise not be realised if they were managed independently”. (Pellegrinelli, 1997)

The OGC (Office of Government Commerce in the UK) provides a similar definition, but adds the notion of change management and the strategic nature of the pursued benefits to it: “the co-ordinated management of a portfolio of projects that change organisations to achieve benefits that are of strategic importance”. (1999) The idea of a change process is stressed even more by Ribbers and Schoo, who argue that programme management is “a controlling instance for a transformation process, i.e. the design, development, and deployment of changes to the organisation and IT, following a result path, that in turn is governed by projects.” (Ribbers and Schoo, 2002)

The wide range of definitions of programme management may be a symptom of the early stage in which the field of research is. It may also indicate, however, that different types of programmes exist. A clear classification of programmes would help us understand the differences in programmes and in the approach taken to programme management. Pellegrinelli has developed an interesting classification. He distinguishes between “portfolio, goal-oriented and heartbeat programmes”. (Pellegrinelli, 1997) The “portfolio programmes” group relatively independent projects that have a common theme. The “goal-oriented programmes”, according to Pellegrinelli, enable the management of initiatives or developments outside the existing infrastructure or routine. As an example, he mentions the development of a commercial application from a new technology. The “heartbeat programmes” enable the regular, incremental improvement of existing systems, infrastructure or business processes.

Although Pellegrinelli’s classification has high face-validity, it fails to provide a conceptual basis that allows us to understand why these three categories would be sufficient for describing and categorising all programmes. Analysis of the descriptions of the three categories shows that Pellegrinelli’s classification implicitly builds on two dimensions. On the one hand there is the extent to which the projects already exist at the launching of the programme. Whereas the “portfolio programmes” start by grouping fairly independent, existing projects, the “goal-oriented programmes” seem to refer to the start of a new initiative. On the other hand, there is the impact the programme will have on the business. “Goal-oriented programmes” aim at something radical, which may ultimately replace existing core business processes, whereas the “heartbeat programmes” try to change processes incrementally. This observation has led us to the definition of a new conceptual classification of programmes, on the basis of two dimensions:

- the extent to which projects exist at the launching of the programme, and
- the business impact of the programme

This results in four distinct types of programmes, as shown in Figure 1.

Insert Figure 1

Type A- programmes are defined as a group of several existing projects, each with relatively limited business impact. These projects are relatively independent initiatives, which have been set up in different parts of the organisation, and are brought together under the new programme. The goal of the programme is to benefit from the synergies between these projects, realising that the projects share some common objectives. Type B-programmes are also launched by grouping several existing projects. However, given the high business impact

of the projects, the risk of going into very different directions with the existing projects dictates the need for timely integration of these projects into a unified programme. At the time of launch of type C and D programmes, no projects associated with the objectives of the programme are being carried out in the company. These programmes start “from scratch” as new initiatives. As the programme is initiated, the portfolio of projects that are part of the programme is defined. Depending on the extent to which the programme impacts the business, we categorise the programme under type C (relatively limited impact) or type D (high, business-wide impact).

The research is exploratory. It is our objective to explore the aspects of management that differ across the four categories of programmes, irrespective of the industry in which the company is active. Previous research has shown that for ERP-implementations the way the programme is managed should differ depending on the degree of complexity of the programme. (Ribbers and Schoo, 2002) The question raised in our research is whether other variables, especially those extracted from Pellegrinelli’s framework, matter in determining how to manage the programme. A second objective of the research is to understand the problems encountered by programme managers and to identify some of the critical success factors of programme management.

Research Methodology

Given the exploratory nature of the research, case research has been conducted. Six large companies located in Belgium have participated in the research. The companies have been selected from three different industries: banking and insurance, telecom and electronics manufacturing. In each company, one programme has been studied. The programmes are of a very different nature:

- e-business development in an international electronics company (programme 1),
- e-business development in an insurance company (programme 2),
- the exploitation of synergies between the insurance and the banking division of a large financial company (programme 5)
- the development of a new pricing structure for a major product range in a telecom company (programme 4).
- the development of a new technology for a new market in a telecom company (programme 5)
- the merger of two large banks (programme 6)

Semi-structured interviews have been conducted with managers in each of the six companies, at different organisational levels: top management, programme management, project management, and project execution. In total 36 people have been interviewed. The interviews have been conducted by a team of two researcher. One of the researchers has assisted in all interviews, in order to guarantee a standard approach across all cases and in all interviews.

In order to obtain rich insights into the approach taken to programme management for these six programmes, most of the questions asked during the interviews were open-ended. A written report has been made for each of the interviews. Three researchers have then coded this report independently, searching for the variables that had been discussed by the interviewees. The list of codes that emerged from this exercise has then been compared and discussed by the researchers upon completion of each case study. In doing so, the list of topics discussed during the interviews has grown and the format of the reports has standardised. This

has allowed us to gradually build an understanding of the approach to programme management developed in the distinct cases. (Eisenhardt, 1989)

The final list of topics that have been analysed across the six cases is shown in Appendix 1.

The assignment of the six cases to the four categories of the framework has been done by each of the researchers independently, and has subsequently been discussed until agreement was obtained.

Research Results

The six cases are distributed over the four categories of programmes, as is shown in Figure 1.

As stated earlier, our hypothesis is that the different types of programmes are managed differently. In order to detect the management variables that differ across the four categories, the cases have been compared on the set of programme management variables that have been discussed during the interviews (listed in Appendix 1). Most of these variables did not show important differences across the four types of programmes. However, we observed clear differences in the following variables:

- the extent to which the interfaces between the projects that are part of the programme are managed tightly
- the degree of centralisation of the management of the programme
- the degree of formalisation of the programme methodology

In the programmes with a high number of projects at the start (type A and B) the interfaces between the projects are managed loosely, whereas in the programmes with a low number of projects at the start (type C and D) the interfaces between the projects are managed strongly. One case forms an exception to this observation. It is one of the D-type programmes, where we would expect strong management of the interfaces between the projects. This is not the case. Our assumption is that this is caused by the lack of experience this young and high-growth company has with programme management. Managers in this company stated that their objective is to strengthen the management of the interfaces between the projects, which supports our assumption.

The programmes with a high number of projects at the start (type A and B) are managed in a less centralised way than the programmes with a low number of projects at the start (type C and D).

The degree of formalisation of the programme methodology is low in all cases. It was striking that a formal approach was usually limited to the first stages of the projects in the programme, that is the project request and project definition phase. We did however observe a higher degree of formalisation of the programme methodology in programmes with a low number of projects (type C and D) than in programmes with a high number of projects at the start (type A and B). Apparently, the history of the existing projects at the start of a programme hinders centralised and formalised management of the programme.

As far as performance measurement is concerned, we have observed that the focus of the programme managers appears to be more on the follow-up of time and quality performance than on the cost of the programme. It is striking that, irrespective of the type of programme, we have observed very few aspects of benefit management. This certainly conflicts with the belief in the literature that “benefit management is a core activity and a continuous management process running throughout the programme”. (1999)

Finally, we have investigated the determinants of success and failure of the programme, as perceived by the interviewees. About fifteen issues have been mentioned as critical success factors by the interviewees, and even more pitfalls have been mentioned. Ranking these issues according to the frequency with which they have been mentioned shows the top-three success factors and pitfalls in programme management in the six cases. This top-three is listed in Table 1.

Top-three	Success factors	Pitfalls
n°1	formalisation of the programme methodology	lack of formalisation of the programme methodology
n°2	role and capabilities of the programme manager	company culture not change-minded
n°3	presence and role of a programme support group or office	extent to which information technology is part of the programme

Table 1. Success factors and pitfalls in programme management

Most surprising on this list is the perceived importance of formalisation in programme management. We recall that we have concluded earlier that the programmes studied are not managed in a very formalised way, and that this is especially the case in those programmes that originate as a grouping of existing projects. Table 1 shows however that the programme and project managers acknowledge the importance of formalisation. Several interviewees have mentioned the involvement of consultants as an important means to introduce formalised programme management techniques and methodologies into the programme.

Discussion

The definitions of programme management discussed in this paper stress the co-ordination of the projects that constitute the programme. We have indeed observed a strong management of the interfaces between the projects in the C and D programmes. However, in the set of programmes established by grouping existing projects (A and B), we find less co-ordination of interrelated projects. The explanation can be that the co-ordination between projects is difficult to achieve if not set up at the start of the projects. Consequently, the major advantage of programmes, that is to benefit from synergies between projects, is hard to achieve if the programme is created as a grouping and alignment of projects that already existed. Another possible explanation goes back to our initial remark that programme management is still a young area in management research and is often misunderstood. The question then is whether all cases that have been mentioned to us by the practitioners as examples of programmes are indeed programmes according to the strict definition. While this discussion questions the definition of programmes and strengthens the argument that there are different types and probably different degrees of programmes, it doesn't help the practitioner who is looking for advice on how to manage a programme. It is clear that in order to achieve the full benefits of a programme the synergies between the distinct projects need to be exploited. Our advice to the practitioner then is to give extra care to the exploitation of these synergies in programmes that are set up as a grouping of existing projects, since the co-ordination will be hindered by the history of the projects.

The cases also illustrate the difficulty in managing programmes in a central and formalised way if the programme finds its origin in the grouping of existing projects.

Overall, we can conclude that the extent to which projects exist at the start of the programme is much more a determinant for the way the programmes are managed than the business impact of the programme. Managers hoping to achieve stronger benefits by grouping existing projects under the “umbrella” of a new programme will have to realise the difficulties they will face as they try to manage the interdependencies between the projects, apply a common methodology to these projects, and centralise some decision making.

It is striking that the degree of formalisation of programme management methodology is low in all cases, despite the fact that formalisation is cited as the number one success factor, and lack of formalisation is mentioned as the top reason for failure. This is even more surprising if one looks at the offer of programme management methodologies in the literature. See for example (Wideman, 1986; Reiss, 1996; 1999; Springer, 2001) As in project management, the methodological expertise available in consulting companies is a valuable complement to the technical and business expertise available in the company that engages in the programme. (Brown, 2000)

It is also intriguing that the degree of formalisation is limited to the early stages of the programme, especially to the definition phase of the projects and is less applied in the project execution phase. This confirms Payne’s argument that a consistent approach and standard procedures are required at the strategic level in the programme, that is where project definitions are developed and where milestone plans and project responsibilities are set for each of the projects in the programme. At the detailed, tactical level he suggests that a tailored approach depending on the type of the project is more appropriate. (Payne and Turner, 1998) On the other hand it seems to contradict the findings of Ribbers and Schoo, who argue that in ERP programmes there should be room for innovation and experimenting in the initial, preparatory phases of the programme. In the programme roll-out phase on the other hand, a strict policy should be followed. We believe the confusion may come from the need for a sharper identification of the unit of analysis in programme and project management research. A highly formalised programme management methodology does not necessarily imply a highly formalised project management methodology for each of the subprojects in the programme. Nor does it automatically imply that project methodologies are identical across the different projects in the programme.

The interviewees have not stressed benefit management and have only seldom mentioned it spontaneously. Rather, the performance of the programme has been illustrated through extensive discussions of cost, quality and time performance, at all management levels we have interviewed. Very few discussions arose related to the benefits achieved through the programme, and how these benefits are measured. While this doesn’t mean that there would be no benefit management in the programmes, it illustrates that the managers tend to focus much more on the traditional project performance measures of cost, quality and time than on the overall programme benefits.

Limitations and future research

The research reported here is exploratory. It raises questions and sets hypotheses, it doesn’t give any answers. The low degree of formalisation, the relationship between the degree of formalisation and the phase of the programme, and the relationship between the number of projects at the start of the programme and the way the programme is managed are observations that need to be tested in future, larger scale studies.

Most of the variables discussed in this paper have been drawn from the interviews with project and programme managers. An important element in our future research will be to define the constructs in a rigid way and to develop reliable and valid instruments for measuring these constructs.

Another limitation is the restriction to companies located in Belgium. Culture might play a role in the programme management approach and style. Comparison of our conclusions with observations in companies in other countries is necessary to improve the external validity of the research. We conclude from our observations that programme management is still in its infancy. While we have no indications to believe that this would hold specifically for Belgian companies, research on a larger geographical scale is needed to confirm our conclusion.

Conclusion

The literature defines programme management as the co-ordinated management of a set of projects with a common, strategic objective. Highly formalised methodologies for programme management have been described in the literature. One can argue that in order to achieve maximum benefits through programme management, it is necessary to manage the interdependencies between the projects in a strong way, to formalise the programme methodology, to centralise or at least co-ordinate the programme efforts, and to focus heavily on benefit management. Our cases confirm this description only partially. Most of our cases are less formalised and less integrated than dictated by the literature. This may be an indication of a lack of experience with programme management. If this hypothesis is correct, it implies that we will find more examples of “strong programme management” in the future. Another explanation may be that the company or national culture plays a role. A formal and integrated approach may be more successful in some companies or in some countries than in others. Or maybe we should conclude that Payne’s argument that different projects require different managerial approaches (Payne and Turner, 1998) may well hold also at the level of programme management.

Our development of a classification of programmes has been a first step in our study of contingencies in programme management.

Appendix 1 Interview topics

	Issues discussed
Related to the programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Priority of the programme - Strategic significance of the programme - Top management involvement - Clarity of programme objectives - Scope of the programme - Perceived usefulness of the programme - Feasibility of the programme - Programme risks - Programme structure - Size (budget, time frame, number of people) - Role of IT in the programme - Feeling of urgency - Stage the programme is currently in - Extent to which the programme came (un)expectedly - Personality of the programme manager (skills, vision, approach, experience, characteristics)
Related to programme management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Allocation of people to the programme (full-time or part-time, temporarily or permanently) - Extent to which interfaces between projects are managed - Expertise at programme management level - (de)centralisation - formalisation of methodology - planning - output and behaviour control - formalisation of communication - sustaining lateral relations - socialisation - incentive policy - criteria for selection of team members
Related to the people involved in the programme and its projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Slack capacity - Promotion opportunities - Perception of conflict and approach to handling conflict - Resistance to change - Extent to which programme is planned in career plan - Preference for routine or new tasks - Role within the programme - Preference for certain types of rewards - Prior experience with project work and programmes

Related to the organisational context	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- age of the company- complexity of the organisation- management of innovation- approach to knowledge management- visibility given to programmes in the organisation- presence/role of programme support- organisation structure- technical expertise in the company- project management expertise in the company- programme management expertise in the company
---------------------------------------	---

Extent to which projects exist at launch	high	<i>A</i> Grouping of existing projects with limited impact <i>case 1</i>	<i>B</i> Grouping of existing projects with company-wide impact <i>case 2</i>
	low	<i>C</i> New initiative with limited impact <i>case 3 & 4</i>	<i>D</i> New initiative with company-wide impact <i>case 5 & 6</i>
		low	High
		Business impact	

Figure 1

REFERENCES

The Programme Management Website, .www.e-programme.com.

Brown, K. L. (2000), "Analyzing the role of the project consultant: Cultural change implementation" *Project Management Journal*, Vol. No. September, pp. 52-55.

Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989), "Building theories from case study research" *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 14 No. 4, pp. 532-550.

Office of Government Commerce (1999), *Managing successful programmes*, The Stationary Office, London.

Payne, J. H. and Turner, J. R. (1998), "Company-wide project management: the planning and control of programmes of projects of different type" *International Journal of Project Management*, Vol. 17 No. 1, pp. 55-59.

Pellegrinelli, S. (1997), "Programma Management: organising project-based change" *International Journal of Project Management*, Vol. 15 No. 3, pp. 141-149.

Reiss, G. (1996), *Programme Management Demystified*, E & FN Spon.

Ribbers, P. M. A. and Schoo, K.-C. (2002), "Program management and complexity of ERP implementations" *Engineering Management Journal*, Vol. 14 No. 2, pp. 45-52.

Russell, E. (1998), "Programme Management: The new technique" *Automotive Engineer*, Vol. July No. , .

Springer, M. L. (2001), *Program Management: A Comprehensive Overview of the Discipline*, Purdue University Press.

Wideman, M. (1986), *A Framework for Project and Program Management Integration*, The Project Management Institute.



FACULTEIT ECONOMIE EN BEDRIJFSKUNDE
HOVENIERSBERG 24
9000 GENT

Tel. : 32 - (0)9 - 264.34.61
Fax. : 32 - (0)9 - 264.35.92

WORKING PAPER SERIES

5

- 00/80 **K. DE WULF, G. ODEKERKEN-SCHRÖDER**, The influence of seller relationship orientation and buyer relationship proneness on trust, commitment, and behavioral loyalty in a consumer environment, January 2000, 27p. (published as 'Investments in consumer relationships: a cross-country and cross-industry exploration', *Journal of Marketing*, 2001)
- 00/81 **R. VANDER VENNET**, Cost and profit efficiency of financial conglomerates and universal banks in Europe., February 2000, 33 p. (published in *Journal of Money, Credit, and Banking*, 2002)
- 00/82 **J. BOUCKAERT**, Bargaining in markets with simultaneous and sequential suppliers, April 2000, 23 p. (published in *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 2002)
- 00/83 **N. HOUTHOOFD, A. HEENE**, A systems view on what matters to excel, May 2000, 22 p.
- 00/84 **D. VAN DE GAER, E. SCHOKKAERT, M. MARTINEZ**, Three meanings of intergenerational mobility, May 2000, 20 p. (published in *Economica*, 2001)
- 00/85 **G. DHAENE, E. SCHOKKAERT, C. VAN DE VOORDE**, Best affine unbiased response decomposition, May 2000, 9 p. (forthcoming in *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 2003)
- 00/86 **D. BUYENS, A. DE VOS**, The added value of the HR-department : empirical study and development of an integrated framework, June 2000, 37 p. (published as 'Personnel and human resource managers: Power, prestige and potential - Perceptions of the value of the HR function', in *Human Resource Management Journal*, 2001).
- 00/87 **K. CAMPO, E. GIJSBRECHTS, P. NISOL**, The impact of stock-outs on whether, how much and what to buy, June 2000, 50 p.
- 00/88 **K. CAMPO, E. GIJSBRECHTS, P. NISOL**, Towards understanding consumer response to stock-outs, June 2000, 40 p. (published in *Journal of Retailing*, 2000)
- 00/89 **K. DE WULF, G. ODEKERKEN-SCHRÖDER, P. SCHUMACHER**, Why it takes two to build succesful buyer-seller relationships July 2000, 31 p. (published as 'Strengthening Retailer-Consumer Relationships: The Dual Impact of Relationship Marketing Tactics and Consumer Personality', in *Journal of Business Research*, 2002)
- 00/90 **J. CROMBEZ, R. VANDER VENNET**, Exact factor pricing in a European framework, September 2000, 38 p.
- 00/91 **J. CAMERLYNCK, H. OOGHE**, Pre-acquisition profile of privately held companies involved in takeovers : an empirical study, October 2000, 34 p.
- 00/92 **K. DENECKER, S. VAN ASSCHE, J. CROMBEZ, R. VANDER VENNET, I. LEMAHIEU**, Value-at-risk prediction using context modeling, November 2000, 24 p. (published in *European Physical Journal B*, 2001)
- 00/93 **P. VAN KENHOVE, I. VERMEIR, S. VERNIERS**, An empirical investigation of the relationships between ethical beliefs, ethical ideology, political preference and need for closure of Dutch-speaking consumers in Belgium, November 2000, 37 p. (published in *Journal of Business Ethics*, 2001)
- 00/94 **P. VAN KENHOVE, K. WIJNEN, K. DE WULF**, The influence of topic involvement on mail survey response behavior, November 2000, 40 p. (published in *Psychology & Marketing*, 2002).
- 00/95 **A. BOSMANS, P. VAN KENHOVE, P. VLERICK, H. HENDRICKX**, The effect of mood on self-referencing in a persuasion context, November 2000, 26p. (published in *Advances in Consumer Research*, vol.28, 2001, p.115-121)
- 00/96 **P. EVERAERT, G. BOËR, W. BRUGGEMAN**, The Impact of Target Costing on Cost, Quality and Development Time of New Products: Conflicting Evidence from Lab Experiments, December 2000, 47 p.
- 00/97 **G. EVERAERT**, Balanced growth and public capital: An empirical analysis with I(2)-trends in capital stock data, December 2000, 29 p. (forthcoming in *Economic Modelling*, 2003).
- 00/98 **G. EVERAERT, F. HEYLEN**, Public capital and labour market performance in Belgium, December 2000, 45 p. (forthcoming in *Journal of Policy Modeling*, 2004)
- 00/99 **G. DHAENE, O. SCAILLET**, Reversed Score and Likelihood Ratio Tests, December 2000, 16 p.



WORKING PAPER SERIES

6

- 01/100 **A. DE VOS, D. BUYENS**, Managing the psychological contract of graduate recruits: a challenge for human resource management, January 2001, 35 p.
- 01/101 **J. CHRISTIAENS**, Financial Accounting Reform in Flemish Universities: An Empirical Study of the implementation, February 2001, 22 p.
- 01/102 **S. VIAENE, B. BAESENS, D. VAN DEN POEL, G. DEDENE, J. VANTHIENEN**, Wrapped Input Selection using Multilayer Perceptrons for Repeat-Purchase Modeling in Direct Marketing, June 2001, 23 p. (published in *International Journal of Intelligent Systems in Accounting, Finance & Management*, 2001).
- 01/103 **J. ANNAERT, J. VAN DEN BROECK, R. VANDER VENNET**, Determinants of Mutual Fund Performance: A Bayesian Stochastic Frontier Approach, June 2001, 31 p. (forthcoming in *European Journal of Operational Research*, 2003)
- 01/104 **S. VIAENE, B. BAESENS, T. VAN GESTEL, J.A.K. SUYKENS, D. VAN DEN POEL, J. VANTHIENEN, B. DE MOOR, G. DEDENE**, Knowledge Discovery in a Direct Marketing Case using Least Square Support Vector Machines, June 2001, 27 p. (published in *International Journal of Intelligent Systems*, 2001).
- 01/105 **S. VIAENE, B. BAESENS, D. VAN DEN POEL, J. VANTHIENEN, G. DEDENE**, Bayesian Neural Network Learning for Repeat Purchase Modelling in Direct Marketing, June 2001, 33 p. (published in *European Journal of Operational Research*, 2002).
- 01/106 **H.P. HUIZINGA, J.H.M. NELISSEN, R. VANDER VENNET**, Efficiency Effects of Bank Mergers and Acquisitions in Europe, June 2001, 33 p.
- 01/107 **H. OOGHE, J. CAMERLYNCK, S. BALCAEN**, The Ooghe-Joos-De Vos Failure Prediction Models: a Cross-Industry Validation, July 2001, 42 p.
- 01/108 **D. BUYENS, K. DE WITTE, G. MARTENS**, Building a Conceptual Framework on the Exploratory Job Search, July 2001, 31 p.
- 01/109 **J. BOUCKAERT**, Recente inzichten in de industriële economie op de ontwikkelingen in de telecommunicatie, augustus 2001, 26 p. (published in *Economisch en Sociaal Tijdschrift*, 2001).
- 01/110 **A. VEREECKE, R. VAN DIERDONCK**, The Strategic Role of the Plant: Testing Ferdows' Model, August 2001, 31 p. (published in *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, 2002)
- 01/111 **S. MANIGART, C. BEUSELINCK**, Supply of Venture Capital by European Governments, August 2001, 20 p.
- 01/112 **S. MANIGART, K. BAEYENS, W. VAN HYFTE**, The survival of venture capital backed companies, September 2001, 32 p. (published in *Venture Capital*, 2002)
- 01/113 **J. CHRISTIAENS, C. VANHEE**, Innovations in Governmental Accounting Systems: the Concept of a "Mega General Ledger" in Belgian Provinces, September 2001, 20 p. (published in V. Montesinos and J.M. Vela, *Innovations in governmental accounting*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2002).
- 01/114 **M. GEUENS, P. DE PELSMACKER**, Validity and reliability of scores on the reduced Emotional Intensity Scale, September 2001, 25 p. (published in *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 2001)
- 01/115 **B. CLARYSSE, N. MORAY**, A process study of entrepreneurial team formation: the case of a research based spin off, October 2001, 29 p.
- 01/116 **F. HEYLEN, L. DOBBELAERE, A. SCHOLLAERT**, Inflation, human capital and long-run growth. An empirical analysis, October 2001, 17 p.
- 01/117 **S. DOBBELAERE**, Insider power and wage determination in Bulgaria. An econometric investigation, October 2001, 30 p. (forthcoming in *International Journal of Manpower*, 2003)
- 01/118 **L. POZZI**, The coefficient of relative risk aversion: a Monte Carlo study investigating small sample estimator problems, October 2001, 21 p. (forthcoming in *Economic Modelling*, 2003).



WORKING PAPER SERIES

7

- 01/119 **N. GOBBIN, B. VAN AARLE**, Fiscal Adjustments and Their Effects during the Transition to the EMU, October 2001, 28 p. (published in *Public Choice*, 2001).
- 01/120 **A. DE VOS, D. BUYENS, R. SCHALK**, Antecedents of the Psychological Contract: The Impact of Work Values and Exchange Orientation on Organizational Newcomers' Psychological Contracts, November 2001, 41 p.
- 01/121 **A. VAN LANDSCHOOT**, Sovereign Credit Spreads and the Composition of the Government Budget, November 2001, 29 p.
- 01/122 **K. SCHOORS**, The fate of Russia's former state banks: Chronicle of a restructuring postponed and a crisis foretold, November 2001, 54 p. (published in *Europe-Asia Studies*, 2003)
- 01/123 **J. ALBRECHT, D. FRANÇOIS, K. SCHOORS**, A Shapley Decomposition of Carbon Emissions without Residuals, December 2001, 21 p. (published in *Energy Policy*, 2002).
- 01/124 **T. DE LANGHE, H. OOGHE**, Are Acquisitions Worthwhile? An Empirical Study of the Post-Acquisition Performance of Privately Held Belgian Companies Involved in Take-overs, December 2001, 29 p.
- 01/125 **L. POZZI**, Government debt, imperfect information and fiscal policy effects on private consumption. Evidence for 2 high debt countries, December 2001, 34 p.
- 02/126 **G. RAYP, W. MEEUSEN**, Social Protection Competition in the EMU, January 2002, 20 p.
- 02/127 **S. DE MAN, P. GEMMEL, P. VLERICK, P. VAN RIJK, R. DIERCKX**, Patients' and personnel's perceptions of service quality and patient satisfaction in nuclear medicine, January 2002, 21 p.
- 02/128 **T. VERBEKE, M. DE CLERCQ**, Environmental Quality and Economic Growth, January 2002, 48 p.
- 02/129 **T. VERBEKE, M. DE CLERCQ**, Environmental policy, policy uncertainty and relocation decisions, January 2002, 33 p.
- 02/130 **W. BRUGGEMAN, V. DECOENE**, An Empirical Study of the Influence of Balanced Scorecard-Based Variable Remuneration on the Performance Motivation of Operating Managers, January 2002, 19 p.
- 02/131 **B. CLARYSSE, N. MORAY, A. HEIRMAN**, Transferring Technology by Spinning off Ventures: Towards an empirically based understanding of the spin off process, January 2002, 32 p.
- 02/132 **H. OOGHE, S. BALCAEN**, Are Failure Prediction Models Transferable From One Country to Another? An Empirical Study Using Belgian Financial Statements, February 2002, 42 p.
- 02/133 **M. VANHOUCHE, E. DEMEULEMEESTER, W. HERROELEN**, Discrete Time/Cost Trade-offs in Project scheduling with Time-Switch Constraints? February 2002, 23 p. (published in *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, 2002)
- 02/134 **C. MAYER, K. SCHOORS, Y. YAFEH**, Sources of Funds and Investment Activities of Venture Capital Funds: Evidence from Germany, Israel, Japan and the UK?, February 2002, 31 p.
- 02/135 **K. DEWETTINCK, D. BUYENS**, Employment implications of downsizing strategies and reorientation practices: an empirical exploration, February 2002, 22 p.
- 02/136 **M. DELOOF, M. DE MAESENEIRE, K. INGHELBRECHT**, The Valuation of IPOs by Investment Banks and the Stock Market: Empirical Evidence, February 2002, 24 p.
- 02/137 **P. EVERAERT, W. BRUGGEMAN**, Cost Targets and Time Pressure during New Product Development, March 2002, 21 p. (published in *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, 2002).
- 02/138 **D. O'NEILL, O. SWEETMAN, D. VAN DE GAER**, The impact of cognitive skills on the distribution of the black-white wage gap, March 2002, 14 p.
- 02/139 **W. DE MAESENEIRE, S. MANIGART**, Initial returns: underpricing or overvaluation? Evidence from Easdaq and EuroNM, March 2002, 36 p.



WORKING PAPER SERIES

8

- 02/140 **K. SCHOORS**, Should the Central and Eastern European accession countries adopt the EURO before or after accession? March 2002, 29p. (published in *Economics of Planning*, 2002).
- 02/141 **D. VERHAEST, E. OMEY**, Overeducation in the Flemish Youth Labour Market, March 2002, 39p.
- 02/142 **L. CUYVERS, M. DUMONT, G. RAYP, K. STEVENS**, Wage and Employment Effects in the EU of International Trade with the Emerging Economies, April 2002, 24 p. (forthcoming in *Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv*, 2003).
- 02/143 **M. GEUENS, P. DE PELSMACKER**, The Role of Humor in the Persuasion of Individuals Varying in Need for Cognition, April 2002, 19 p. (published in *Advances in Consumer Research*, 2002).
- 02/144 **M. VANHOUCKE, E. DEMEULEMEESTER, W. HERROELEN**, Net Present Value Maximization of Projects with Progress Payments, April 2002, 23 p. (published in *European Journal of Operational Research*, 2003)
- 02/145 **E. SCHOKKAERT, D. VAN DE GAER, F. VANDENBROUCKE**, Responsibility-sensitive egalitarianism and optimal linear income taxation, April 2002, 37p.
- 02/146 **J. ANNAERT, J. CROMBEZ, B. SPINEL, F. VAN HOLLE**, Value and size effect: Now you see it, now you don't, May 2002, 31 p.
- 02/147 **N. HOUTHOFD, A. HEENE**, The quest for strategic groups: Overview, and suggestions for future research, July 2002, 22 p.
- 02/148 **G. PEERSMAN**, The transmission of monetary policy in the Euro area: Are the effects different across countries?, July 2002, 35 p.
- 02/149 **G. PEERSMAN, F. SMETS**, The industry effects of monetary policy in the Euro area, July 2002, 30 p.
- 02/150 **J. BOUCKAERT, G. DHAENE**, Inter-Ethnic Trust and Reciprocity: Results of an Experiment with Small Business Entrepreneurs, July 2002, 27 p.
- 02/151 **S. GARRÉ, I. DE BEELDE, Y. LEVANT**, The impact of accounting differences between France and Belgium, August 2002, 28 p. (published in French in *Comptabilité - Contrôle - Audit*, 2002)
- 02/152 **R. VANDER VENNET**, Cross-border mergers in European banking and bank efficiency, September 2002, 42 p.
- 02/153 **K. SCHOORS**, Financial regulation in Central Europe: the role of reserve requirements and capital rules, September 2002, 22 p.
- 02/154 **B. BAESENS, G. VERSTRAETEN, D. VAN DEN POEL, M. EGMONT-PETERSEN, P. VAN KENHOVE, J. VANTHIENEN**, Bayesian Network Classifiers for Identifying the Slope of the Customer Lifecycle of Long-Life Customers, October 2002, 27 p. (forthcoming in *European Journal of Operational Research*, 2003).
- 02/155 **L. POZZI, F. HEYLEN, M. DOSSCHE**, Government debt and the excess sensitivity of private consumption to current income: an empirical analysis for OECD countries, October 2002, 19 p.
- 02/156 **D. O'NEILL, O. SWEETMAN, D. VAN DE GAER**, Consequences of Specification Error for Distributional Analysis With an Application to Intergenerational Mobility, November 2002, 35 p.
- 02/157 **K. SCHOORS, B. VAN DER TOL**, Foreign direct investment spillovers within and between sectors: Evidence from Hungarian data, November 2002, 29 p.
- 02/158 **L. CUYVERS, M. DUMONT, G. RAYP, K. STEVENS**, Home Employment Effects of EU Firms' Activities in Central and Eastern European Countries, November 2002, 25 p.
- 02/159 **M. VANHOUCKE**, Optimal due date assignment in project scheduling, December 2002, 18 p.



WORKING PAPER SERIES

9

- 02/160 **J. ANNAERT, M.J.K. DE CEUSTER, W. VANHYFTE**, The Value of Asset Allocation Advice. Evidence from the Economist's Quarterly Portfolio Poll, December 2002, 35p.
- 02/161 **M. GEUENS, P. DE PELSMACKER**, Developing a Short Affect Intensity Scale, December 2002, 20 p. (published in *Psychological Reports*, 2002).
- 02/162 **P. DE PELSMACKER, M. GEUENS, P. ANCKAERT**, Media context and advertising effectiveness: The role of context appreciation and context-ad similarity, December 2002, 23 p. (published in *Journal of Advertising*, 2002).
- 03/163 **M. GEUENS, D. VANTOMME, G. GOESSAERT, B. WEIJTERS**, Assessing the impact of offline URL advertising, January 2003, 20 p.
- 03/164 **D. VAN DEN POEL, B. LARIVIÈRE**, Customer Attrition Analysis For Financial Services Using Proportional Hazard Models, January 2003, 39 p. (forthcoming in *European Journal of Operational Research*, 2003)
- 03/165 **P. DE PELSMACKER, L. DRIESEN, G. RAYP**, Are fair trade labels good business ? Ethics and coffee buying intentions, January 2003, 20 p.
- 03/166 **D. VANDAELE, P. GEMMEL**, Service Level Agreements – Een literatuuroverzicht, Januari 2003, 31 p. (forthcoming in *Tijdschrift voor Economie en Management*, 2003).
- 03/167 **P. VAN KENHOVE, K. DE WULF AND S. STEENHAUT**, The relationship between consumers' unethical behavior and customer loyalty in a retail environment, February 2003, 27 p.
- 03/168 **P. VAN KENHOVE, K. DE WULF, D. VAN DEN POEL**, Does attitudinal commitment to stores always lead to behavioural loyalty? The moderating effect of age, February 2003, 20 p.
- 03/169 **E. VERHOFSTADT, E. OMEY**, The impact of education on job satisfaction in the first job, March 2003, 16 p.
- 03/170 **S. DOBBELAERE**, Ownership, Firm Size and Rent Sharing in a Transition Country, March 2003, 26 p.
- 03/171 **S. DOBBELAERE**, Joint Estimation of Price-Cost Margins and Union Bargaining Power for Belgian Manufacturing, March 2003, 29 p.
- 03/172 **M. DUMONT, G. RAYP, P. WILLEMÉ, O. THAS**, Correcting Standard Errors in Two-Stage Estimation Procedures with Generated Regressands, April 2003, 12 p.
- 03/173 **L. POZZI**, Imperfect information and the excess sensitivity of private consumption to government expenditures, April 2003, 25 p.
- 03/174 **F. HEYLEN, A. SCHOLLAERT, G. EVERAERT, L. POZZI**, Inflation and human capital formation: theory and panel data evidence, April 2003, 24 p.
- 03/175 **N.A. DENTCHEV, A. HEENE**, Reputation management: Sending the right signal to the right stakeholder, April 2003, 26 p.
- 03/176 **A. WILLEM, M. BUELENS**, Making competencies cross business unit boundaries: the interplay between inter-unit coordination, trust and knowledge transferability, April 2003, 37 p.
- 03/177 **K. SCHOORS, K. SONIN**, Passive creditors, May 2003, 33 p.
- 03/178 **W. BUCKINX, D. VAN DEN POEL**, Customer Base Analysis: Partial Defection of Behaviorally-Loyal Clients in a Non-Contractual FMCG Retail Setting, May 2003, 26 p.
- 03/179 **H. OOGHE, T. DE LANGHE, J. CAMERLYNCK**, Profile of multiple versus single acquirers and their targets : a research note, June 2003, 15 p.



FACULTEIT ECONOMIE EN BEDRIJFSKUNDE
HOVENIERSBERG 24
9000 GENT

Tel. : 32 - (0)9 - 264.34.61
Fax. : 32 - (0)9 - 264.35.92

WORKING PAPER SERIES

10

- 03/180 **M. NEYT, J. ALBRECHT, B. CLARYSSE, V. COCQUYT**, The Cost-Effectiveness of Herceptin® in a Standard Cost Model for Breast-Cancer Treatment in a Belgian University Hospital, June 2003, 20 p.
- 03/181 **M. VANHOUCKE**, New computational results for the discrete time/cost trade-off problem with time-switch constraints, June 2003, 24 p.
- 03/182 **C. SCHLUTER, D. VAN DE GAER**, Mobility as distributional difference, June 2003, 22 p.
- 03/183 **B. MERLEVEDE**, Reform Reversals and Output Growth in Transition Economies, June 2003, 35 p.
- 03/184 **G. POELS**, Functional Size Measurement of Multi-Layer Object-Oriented Conceptual Models, June 2003, 13 p. (forthcoming in *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 2003)