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Abstract

Organizational Influences is an umbrella concept that refers to factors in the social and organizational context that impact the project setting. Shared values are organizational influences and a level of organizational culture. This paper explores the impact of three shared values, namely conformity and commitment, on the organization and project performance in the Norwegian project management practice. The exploration was done by means of semi-structured interviews. The findings show that although conformity is not a promoted value, it is rather a practiced value that decreases project team performance and causes irrational selection of project personnel. Commitment on the other hand is a promoted and practiced value that becomes critical during troubleshooting and problem solving when projects meet challenges. This investigation is aimed to provide insights into the impacts of shared values so that the project managers can use this knowledge to deal with the complex social context where the project is submerged.
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1. Introduction

In the last years, there has been an increasing tendency among project management researchers to move away from the traditional views of predictability and linearity in project practice to one that highlights the complex nature of human interrelations (Small & Walker, 2011). The underlying assumption under this tendency is that the project is a complex setting embedded in a social-cultural and project organizational context and characterized by human interactions and tension between predictability and control (Cicmil, Williams, Thomas, & Hodgson, 2006). Considering the projects as submerged in such complicated context, there are factors that impact the project development. These factors are referred as Organizational Influences (Project Management Institute, 2013). We believe that exploring them, contributes to the understanding of the project as a complex social process. Thus, this study has resulted from our desire of contributing to such understanding; and our objective is to provide the project practitioners with better understanding and awareness of the possible impacts of organizational influences, so that
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such knowledge can help them to improve their day-to-day work and deal with the complexity of the social context.

The concept of organizational influences is of such broadness that we had to limit our scope of work. After we had comprehensively reviewed the organizational literature, we came to the conclusion that most of the organizational influence listed by the Project Management Institute (2013) are artifacts of organizational culture. Therefore, we limited the research to organizational culture; and consequently, taking as theoretical framework Schein (1990) levels of culture, we narrow it down to shared values. However, shared values were still an extremely broad concept, thus we selected a set of values meaningful for the project management praxis. In a literature synthesis conducted by Gutierrez and Hussein (2013), conformity and commitment are factors influencing managerial complexity (Hussein, 2012). Taking the perspective of shared values, we decided to explore the influence of conformity and commitment. Moreover, commitment is a project success factor (Pinto & Prescott, 1988) and, thus, its meaningfulness for the project management praxis.

2. Literature Review

The Project Management Institute (2013) uses the term organizational influences to describe factors that affecting the methods for staffing, managing and executing the project. The Project Management Institute (2013, p. 19) lists the following organizational influences: Organizational culture and Style, Organizational structure, Organizational process assets, Organizational communications and Enterprise environmental factors. It is evident that this is a concept of such broadness that it would not be realistic to explore all the listed factors in one single research. Furthermore, various organizational researches (i.e. Hofstede, 1998; Schein, 1990) suggest frameworks to understand organizational culture, where organizational structure, style, communication and process assets are manifestations of deeper assumptions or values, and these altogether constitute the organizational culture. We believe that these frameworks are a more appropriate approach to the subject of organizational influences.

2.1. Organizational culture

Various definitions of organizational culture have been proposed in literature, some examples are shown in Table 1. However, a general consensus has not been achieved because researchers use diverse theoretical approached, assumptions, and interpret similar cultural phenomena in different ways (Belassi, Kondra, & Tukel, 2007).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literature</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schein (1990)</td>
<td>A pattern of basic assumptions that are invented, discovered, or developed by a given group as it learns to cope with problems of external adaptation and internal integration and that have worked well enough to be considered valid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hofstede (1991)</td>
<td>The collective programming of the mind that distinguishes the members of one organization from others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alvesson (2002)</td>
<td>An umbrella concept for a way of thinking which takes a serious interest in cultural and symbolic phenomena.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We will approach the subject of organizational culture based on Schein (1990) who proposed three levels of culture that vary in the degree of visibility to an external agent to the organization. According to Schein (1990), each level is described as follows:

- **Artifacts**: These are more tangible products or practices that describe how the organization works, for example organizational structure, processes and published values.
- **Espoused beliefs**: Correspond to shared values and/or beliefs. They are born from individual’s own assumptions, for example leaders or founders, who are able to influence the group to adopt his/her assumptions as shared values or beliefs about what the right or wrong approach to a problem is.
• **Basic underlying assumptions:** These are taken for granted beliefs. They are non-confrontable, non-debatable, and unconscious, which makes them very difficult to be changed.

In Schein (1990) framework, organizational structure, style, communications and assets correspond to more visible manifestations of organizational culture at the level of artifacts; therefore, the essential organizational influence is, in fact, organizational culture. Furthermore, we believe that most of the research done on organizational culture is at the middle level of Schein’s framework. Alvesson (2002) argues that many organizational researches have generalized the concept of organizational culture when in fact they are only referring to particular aspects such as shared values. We believe that this situation is evident in the classifications of organizational culture; for example, Cooke and Szumal (1993) classify organizational culture based on promoted norms and expectations; and Goffee and Jones (1998) based on solidarity and sociability.

2.2. **The impact of shared values**

To keep a realistic scope of work, we chose a set of shared values meaningful in project management praxis. These are conformity and commitment.

2.2.1. **Conformity**

Conformity is *a subject’s behavior or attitude following those of the object* (Song, Ma, Wu, & Li, 2012). The object can be organizations, individuals or subgroups. Conformity involves social pressures, which relate to the influence that individuals have over one other (DeZoort & Lord, 1997); examples are compliance pressures, obedience and peer pressure.

Conformity has been described in terms of normative influence (i.e. Hornsey, Majkut, Terry, & McKimmie, 2003) Normative conformity is the result of normative influence and has been given significant attention in literature. Normative conformity is the result of a strategic effort of the individual to be accepted and to avoid social rejection, hostility or disapproval from others (Hornsey et al., 2003), regardless of whether the object of conformity is right of wrong (DeZoort & Lord, 1997). Normative conformity has a direct impact on the organization’s creative and innovative capacity, and consequently it affects the organization’s responses to stressful situations and changes, as Pech (2001) suggests. The author (ibid) explains that a dominant culture of conformity perpetuates the status quo and followership. Hussein and Hafseld (2013) explore the case of a conformist organization. This organization stigmatized as uncooperative anyone who tried to provide critical comments or to stick-out. To cope with such a demand of compliance and diminish the risk of being punished by top management, people learned to remain silent when having different opinions or comments, becoming conformist due to conformist pressure. With regard to the project manager role, Chong and Syarifuddin (2010) suggest that a project manager that experience conformity pressure has more tendency to continue a failing project.

2.2.2. **Commitment**

According to Nijhof, de Jong, and Beukhof (1998) commitment can be defined as “*a sense of loyalty to and identification with the organization, the work and the group to which one belongs.*” This definition of commitment involves identification. The literature has denominated Attitudinal or Affective Organizational Commitment (AOC) to the phenomenon that occurs when the goals of the individuals and the organizations become increasingly integrated or the identity of the individual is linked to the organization (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979). AOC is believed to encourage behaviors that are beneficial for the organization such as performance and intention to stay in the organization (Riketta & Landerer, 2002). Other forms of commitment have been proposed in the organizational literature (i.e. Allen & Meyer, 1996; Wiener, 1982) such as continuance and normative commitment. However, affective commitment is considered the one with the strongest and most consistent relation to desirable outcomes (Mei-Yung, Chong, Ng, & Cheung, 2004).

The impact of commitment on project performance has been given significant attention in the project management literature. Mei-Yung et al. (2004) argue that affective commitment improves the project performance because people are more attached and involved in the project, and also want to stay in the organizational for the
particular project. Fowler and Horan (2007) identify a combination of top management commitment and project team commitment as a force driving the successful development of IS projects. Pinto and Prescott (1988) identified top management support as a critical success factor and suggested its dominance in the planning phase of the project life cycle. McLeod and MacDonell (2011) emphasize the importance of top management in projects as it plays various roles in the organization, for example influencing attitudes, creating a positive context for change, overseeing the development of the project, and ensuring the availability of resources.

Table 2 summarizes the impacts of conformity, commitment and trust according to the literature. In this table the impacts are considering a high level of each value.

Table 2. Impact of conformity, commitment and trust (literature review) *Assuming a high level of value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shared value</th>
<th>Impact on the organization*</th>
<th>Impact Project development*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td>Loss of creativity capacity</td>
<td>Negatively affects project team performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loss of innovative capacity</td>
<td>Negatively impacts assigment of tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loss of capacity to respond and adapt to changes</td>
<td>Negatively impacts allocation of project team members and project manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increases resistance to change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>Increases motivation</td>
<td>Positively impacts allocation of resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduces resistance to change</td>
<td>Improves project team performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Methodology

We used a qualitative phenomenology methodology given the organizational character of organizational influences as research area, and the exploratory nature of this study.

Data collection was done throughout nine individual interviews that lasted between 1 to 1 ½ hours. We developed a research instrument of 10 open-ended questions to conduct semi-structured interviews. The research instrument was divided into three sections consisting of informant’s demographic profile, and two exploratory sections to discuss the impact of shared values on the organization and the project performance. The sampling method involved both convenience and purposive. The criterion we used to select the informants was that they should hold or had held a managerial position in projects. We did not target the research because it was complicated to get managers willing to speak openly about their organizations, which was truly needed to effectively explore organizational influences. The final sample of informants consisted of nine managers currently holding a managerial position within project management. Seven of the informants were international managers working in Norway, one a Norwegian manager working in Norway, and one international manager working in USA. Our priority throughout this research was to ensure the anonymity of our informants and their organizations. Thus, we refer to the informants throughout this research as informants 1 to 9. All the interviews were recorded upon informants’ acceptance, and we guaranteed the elimination of the recordings after five months.

We used a thematic analysis method for data analysis. First, we transcribed the interviews. Second, we read the transcripts several times to get familiarized with the information. Third, we identified patterns in the informants’ answers. Fourth, we labelled sections according to those patterns. After clustering the information, we were able to organize, compare, and analyze it. This study presented limitations that affect its generalizability. This is because it is strongly context specific, as it was mostly performed within the Norwegian context. Secondly, the majority of our informants were international managers, so the data we have gathered is mainly the perception of internationals within a Norwegian context.
4. Findings and Discussions

In this section we present the results we obtained and, simultaneously, we discuss them by drawing upon organizational and project management literature. The data obtained from the informants provided us with a vast amount of information, to the extent that we uncovered unforeseen data strongly related to the subject of study. We have therefore decided to shed the light on these uncovered data as well, thus, this section is presented in two parts:
1. The contextual factors that appear to shape the shared values
2. The impact of the shared values on the organization and project performance

4.1. Contextual factors shaping the shared values

The findings show that three factors influence how the organization understands the shared values, which in turn shapes the organizational artifacts. These are national context, cultural diversity and leaders and values promoted by top management influences.

4.1.1. National Context
The findings show that, within Norwegian organizations, the understanding and practice of shared values correspond to the meaning of those values in the Norwegian culture. These organizations might need to teach those meanings and practices to the international employees. For example, informant 7 explained about openness:

“Some of us are not open by nature so it is kind of hard to be open to try to communicate in a good manner with people. So we are trying to be open because we are not born like that”.

In international organizations with a majority of international employees, the impact of the Norwegian context is rather on the artifacts; thus, the organizations have to adapt their practices to what is believed in the Norwegian society.

4.1.2. Cultural diversity
Seven of our informants claimed that cultural diversity is factor that influences their work and organizations. Diversity is seen as strength but it also comes with challenges because the different understandings and worldviews may lead to conflicts, confusion, and/or misunderstanding. These challenges emerge because each person has own national values, which are very difficult to change; as informant 7 expressed:

“Although we have the organization values, each of us has values that come with the culture, and each of use refers to them as normal or accepted. Then, it varies sometimes on how we perceive the information and the actions from different people.”

4.1.3. Leaders and top management
The findings show that when leaders and top management promote shared values, they add their personal understanding. The findings revealed that people in the organization could end up adapting wrong beliefs when the leaders and top management’ distort the real meaning of values. Informant 1 said about this:

“People take over certain behaviors that are not nice, and may be they are not that kind of people but the system is that. So the system is maintained by this attitudes zipping through the whole organization.”

Knowing that shared values are a dimension of organizational culture, the findings support the notion of the influence of contextual factors on organizational culture, which has been acknowledged in the general management literature (i.e. Hofstede, 1991, 1998). Hofstede (2014) suggests that national culture and personality of founder are factors shaping organizational culture. In the project management literature, Shore (2008) states that the organizational culture develops within the context of executive leadership and national culture.

4.2. The impact of shared values on the organization and project performance

We consider necessary to clarify three concepts as we use them throughout this study; these are promoted value, practiced value, and congruence, as described in Table 3.
In general, the findings show that shared values, shaped by national context, diversity and leaders and top management, impact the project performance. This supports Shore (2008) who suggests that the outcome of a project is influenced by cultural, leadership, project, management, and behavioral factors.

Table 3. Promoted, practiced and congruence concepts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promoted values</td>
<td>These are what the organization is ought to be, correspond to the values written in policies or ethics codes, or openly fomented by leaders and top management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practiced Values</td>
<td>These are what the organization really is, and could be both negative and positive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>Occurs when the values are promoted and practiced. The reason for non-congruence is individual perception (leaders and top management) distorting the meaning of a value.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We clarify that we do not aim to predict outcomes because the values proved to be interconnected with each other and with other values that we did not explore in this research; for example commitment and integrity improve communication between stakeholders in the project setting, consequently the level of trust is increased and feeds back to more open and transparent communication. Therefore, we strongly consider that the impacts are difficult to predict due to interconnectedness and dynamics. Nevertheless, our aim is provide insights on the possible impacts of these values. These impacts are summarized in Error! Reference source not found..

Table 4. Impacts of conformity and commitment, * Assuming a high level value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shared value</th>
<th>Key aspects</th>
<th>Impact on the organization*</th>
<th>Impact Project performance*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td>Conformity pressures lead to normative conformity, Response to fear to be stigmatized, rejected, censured and/or punished</td>
<td>Loss of motivation, Loss of engagement, Loss of confidence on own capabilities, Negatively impacts continuous improvement capacity</td>
<td>Irrational allocation of resources, Irrational assignation of project manager and team members, Negatively affects project team performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>Multilayered, Can evolve to loyalty or affective commitment, Requires rewards</td>
<td>Improves employee performance, Reduces attrition</td>
<td>Facilitates troubleshooting, Encourages honest reporting, Encourages openness and transparency in communication, Better project team performance, Enhances allocation of resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.1. Impact of conformity

The findings show that conformity pressures, exerted by top management, may lead to a shared value of normative conformity among the staff. Such pressures include the use of authority, punishment and threatening to make people think and behave in a way that is aligned with top management’s interpretation of promoted values, as informant 1 claimed:

“People take over certain behaviors that are not nice, and may be they are not that kind of people but the system is that”

The findings reveal that the main reason for normative conformity is apprehension. People fear the consequences of not conforming such as getting resources cut, being demoted, stigmatized, or not being included in good projects. Informant 2 provided us with insights into this situation:

“From the staff perspective you better be careful about who you criticize and what you say because it can reflect bad on you; you can be taken out of projects, or projects are not given to you.”
The previous finding supports the notion of normative conformity as a strategic effort to avoid rejection, punishment, or being stigmatized (i.e., DeZoort & Lord, 1997; Hornsey et al., 2003). Additional, it provides evidence of the use of conformity as a selection criterion (Pech, 2001). Informant 1 said about this situation:

“If you stay in favor you will get some nicer work and more money because it is about funding, you have to do a lot of internal politics as well to get your own project or you own ideas promoted.”

According with Pech (2001) the use of conformity as a selection and promotion criterion is an organizational performance anomaly that discourages individualism and leadership, and consequently hinders creativity and innovation. The data did not explicitly expose loss of creativity or innovation because the organization where we strongly evidenced this value, conducts inter-organizational projects; thus, creativity takes place outside the focal organization. However, we believe that the findings show that the use of conformity as a selection criterion hinders individualism, because of two circumstances:

Normative conformity fosters homogeneity because people have found their selves obligated to remain silent and behave alike to avoid not being included in good projects or not getting resources. The ideas of people who do not conformity are ignored.

The findings show that normative conformity directly impacts employee performance. The three most relevant impacts exposed in the findings are loss of motivation, engagement and confidence on own abilities and contributions. Informant 2 said about this:

“They [people] become cynical and unengaged. They do not care about the job. Cynical is when you do not believe in positive development, new ideas, the value of your contributions, your work.”

Consequently, loss of motivation, engagement and confidence appear to hinder learning and continuous improving ability, as informant 2 stated:

“People do not do anything, they do not say anything, they do not show up to staff meeting; they do their job like 90% so they do not get fired.”

These findings support the notion of conformity as a motivational factor that influences learning and continuous improvement (Ahmed, Loh, & Zairi, 1999). Furthermore, we believe that, as it has been already suggested in the literature (Jetu & Riedl, 2013), the impacts of conformity on motivation, engagement, confidence, learning and continuous improvement capacity, are reflected in the overall project team performance.

According to Jetu and Riedl (2013), conformity provides a weak contribution to project team performance and it may negatively influence beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors of the project team. In line with this thoughts, the project management literature has acknowledged the strong link between motivation and project performance (i.e., Peterson, 2007), and the Project Management Institute (2013) has recognized that the overall success of the project depends upon the project’s team commitment, and this in turn is directly related to their level of motivation. Therefore, we suggest that conformity has a dominant role as motivational value, adversely affecting engagement, confidence, learning and continuous improvement; which in turn negatively influence the project team performance and overall project success.

4.2.2. Impact of commitment

The findings show that commitment is a heavily promoted shared value throughout the sample organizations. Although we inquired about the level of commitment as a shared value, the informants emphasized that commitment varies from person to person, as Informant 6 explained:

“I think it [commitment] varies. You always have people who are just interested on doing the minimum and people go out of their way to show the best service quality, so I cannot really generalize at the staff level.”

The findings suggest that loyalty and commitment are perceived as equal constructs. For example, informant 5 explained in connection to commitment:

“We are proud of what we are doing and we are proud to say that we work for this organization, and to do the job they do. Being proud is a value that is really experienced in a worldwide scale to a point that we fight for what we believe.”

We argue that the previous statement provides evidence of a shared value of loyalty. Niehoff, Moorman, Blakely, and Fuller (2001) define loyalty in terms of behaviors that demonstrate pride in the organization and defend it towards criticism, as the findings showed. Nevertheless, same as in the findings, some authors have
treated loyalty and commitment as synonymous (Coughlan, 2005). We agree with some authors that conceptualize loyalty as affective commitment (i.e. Wallace, 1997), given the high degree of attachment and identification with the organization showed by several informants.

The findings show that commitment requires rewards. For example, informant 5 stated:

"You are not complaining because you have to work, the other way around you feel like working. I think everybody recognizes that we work hard but that we recognize that we get compensated the way we want. So the rewards come with the high working."

The need of rewards to build commitment has been acknowledged in the organizational literature, for example Wallace (1997) argues that affective commitment is formed as an emotional response on the basis of rewards. Similarly, Powers (2000) suggest that employee loyalty will only result from perceived increase in employee outcomes$, such as benefits, recognition, or status. In this regard, the findings show that commitment decreases when people are betrayed by the organization; meaning that when the employee outcomes are negatively impacted. Informant 4 explained about this:

"When you are betrayed you feel you spend too many time, years, hours, you lose so many things for this company, and you are just another number. Unfortunately this is what we are: just a number in the system."

Additionally, the findings suggest that a high level of commitment helps to reduce attrition in the organization. Informant 6 said about this:

"I think you will see a high level of commitment from management up because if the people would not get align with the company ideas, then they would have left the company before reaching a senior level"

This finding support previous studies that suggest that increased commitment decreases turnover intentions and, consequently, lowers attrition (i.e. Erickson & Roloff, 2007).

Supporting Fowler and Horan (2007) study, the findings show that a combination of project team commitment and top management commitment is necessary to achieve desirable project outcomes. This situation became more evident during project crisis because commitment appeared to “kick-in”. Informant 5 said on this regard:

"Even under these conditions [limited resources, lack of training], the high level of commitment helped the team to execute the project and meet the client expectations"

Similarly, top management’s level of commitment appears to increase in project crisis because they rapidly act to provide resources to solve such situation. Informant 6 explained about this:

"I was provided with everything I could reasonably ask and expect. I definitely got the support that I needed whenever we have an issue, and we did have major situations, so management was very quick at reacting and helping us."

Therefore, we suggest that a dominant impact of commitment on project performance is on troubleshooting. This critical success factor refers to the ability to handle unexpected crisis and deviations form the plan (Pinto & Prescott, 1988). We argue that commitment becomes more critical during troubleshooting because enhances the ability of handling crisis: it helps the team members to remain focused on the project goals and to find creative solutions using the available resources and current knowledge. The literature refers to this attitude as goal commitment and, it is defined as the personal determination to try for a goal or keep trying for a goal (Mei-Yung et al., 2004).

Furthermore, the findings show that high commitment was demonstrated by means of honest reporting of project status to relevant stakeholders and openness and transparency in communication. Referring to a particular project, informant 5 exemplified this situation:

"During execution there was a big mistake made by the team leader, this person called the client and me immediately and explained the situation"

---

1 Employee outcomes include personal growth, companionship, belonging, experience, pay and satisfaction (Powers, 2000)
5. Conclusions

In this investigation, we explored the impact of conformity and commitment on the organization and project performance. These shared values proved to be complex concepts: there are innumerable definitions in the literature, classifications, the values involve a level of, and change with time. Additionally, diversity, national culture and leaders and top management shape the perception of values and the associated artifacts. These features make the shared values multilayered, multidimensional and dynamic. The exploration of the subject of study was a challenging task because one can incur in methodological issues and confusions due to the variety of definitions and classifications, the disagreement of researches about such concepts (i.e. loyalty and commitment); and because people have different perceptions of what conformity and commitment. Nevertheless, we know that those values exist, regardless of the type or level; thus, our objective was to shed the light on the impacts of conformity, and commitment.

Conformity is a practiced value that causes loss of motivation, engagement and confidence. For obvious reasons, conformity is not a promoted value; instead, through the use of diverse pressures, top management creates an environment of conformity so that the status quo, their beliefs and their power are maintained. By doing so, top management is shaping an organizational culture of homogeneity that hinders learning and the continuous improvement. When conformity is used as a selection and promotion criterion, top management may be punishing and censuring individuals with leadership skills and innovative ideas and, with this, censuring the innovative and creative organizational capacity, and bringing up “leaders” that only can “follow the book”. The consequences on the project are significant: poor project team performance, irrational allocation of resources and irrational assignation of project managers and project team members. Thus, conformity is extremely counterproductive considering its impacts on performance. Moreover, at the long term, the conformity that is the result of rational reflection will become the unchangeless experience (Song et al., 2012) of the organization and, consequently, the organization may become unable to change and adapt to keep up to speed to the rapid pace of the markets.

Commitment is both a promoted and practiced value, but its practice involves a level of the value that depends on the group or individual. Commitment acts as a driving force of individuals’ and project team’s performance, especially in troubleshooting, as it helps people to remain focused on the project goals and find creative solutions with the available resources. Additionally, high contractor commitment is materialized into open communication and honest reporting of project status. We believe that this situation increases the level of trust on the contractor, which in turn increases the client’s support towards the project. Commitment requires rewards that can vary from monetary to experience and recognitions. This means that commitment is reciprocal between the individual and the organization, and as soon as that reciprocity is broken, so is the commitment. Thus, it would be naïve to think that a person would blindly commit without rewards, each person has personal interest and needs that take priority and should be satisfy; thus, the project manager should understand the personal aspirations of project team members to identify how he/she can foster commitment. To conclude, this research adds valuable knowledge for the understanding of the project as a complex social setting. We believe that the knowledge of organizational influences and their impact could help the project manager to deal with the complex social context, the interconnectedness of human relationships and how they affect the project performance; and, consequently, to improve the managerial task.
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