

# In this issue

How worthy or wicked is it to implement a change in a project and its project team? This question implies tremendous organizational effort to acquire flexibility while retaining high performance, an aspect that is increasingly demanded by the market. In other words, is it really bad to conduct changes in large dynamic environments or in relationships among stakeholders, or in requirements during the project, in the turn-over teams, in the project estimation, in the level of competitiveness? Or can these be considered as new opportunities?

What is observed in the current literature is that the legal claims<sup>1</sup>, negotiating and leadership skills, benefits management<sup>2</sup>, and innovations in collaboration frameworks<sup>3</sup> have shown that there are always two ways to deal with such situations and guide decision-making; one is based on a tight control over the commitments established and the other is focused on seeing it as an opportunity for new benefits. These are different ways of conducting business that can impact customer-perceived value in the long term.

The organizational effort to adapt to a culture of project management that allows high flexibility, performance, advanced risk and financial management, building a technological infrastructure that promotes the integration of schedules, communication and suppliers is extremely positive, because it allows striving for improved profitability, higher contingencies, and perhaps a market leadership and finally prosperity in business. However, the inevitable presence of changes in the course of projects, in varying proportions, makes it necessary to establish a management style to guide the way to deal with a reality in day-to-day projects – not only aiming for timely success, but also to develop a virtuous cycle with the customers' demand and long-term presence in the market.

The different management styles, one based on control and another on benefits, are legitimate and have their strong and weak points. The balance between them is what can be called a challenge because they originate from different organizational cultures, thus it is not simple to adopt one or another style in such timely

situations in the same project, since it would require to simultaneously trigger a whole new organizational structure, hence threatening the historical relationship and understandings of the question at hand. Undoubtedly a challenge provides that balance.

The question is the bias that managers see in the changes that emerge during the project. At the beginning of the project concept it is crucial to assume a style to lead the entire operation of the initiative. All items mentioned in the first paragraph of this editorial are critical success factors in a project, but having the perception that a request for change can be transformed into an opportunity that can improve the benefit achieved is a way to manage the situation. In many cases, this style can generate results that are different from those traditionally found with strict commitment controls. Essentially the rationale of the differences in management styles lies in the innate reality that people make mistakes, especially when faced with new situations, under pressure, and often unaware of all the possible implications of the initiative, and then look for ways to repair that which was initially perceived differently. Needless to say the market is not for amateurs, and requires experienced professionals to act in critical situations, but often even the experts aren't able to predict situations due to the inherent complexity of the operation, therefore the need to regenerate this understanding from time to time in order to deal with unforeseen situations only seems natural, it is part of human nature.

At the same time the over control style seems to be perfectly applied when there is a high predictability of the scenario in the short-term, requiring more accurate performance and results. Thus the life cycle of a program/project management necessitates different reactions and organizational structures tailored to every moment. Management styles can be applied in the same initiative, but this requires the managers' accurate perception so that they can allocate the correct resources at every point of the cycle.

The closer to the natural human essence the management styles are, the more cohesive the delivery results will be, and the decision-making and the initiatives will flow more freely.

## Zózimo – Editor in Chief



On behalf of Academic Editor:  
Steven Eppinger –  
MIT Sloan School of Management.

1 Jyh-Bin Yang, Mei-Yi Chu, and Kuei-Mei Huang, (2013). "An Empirical Study of Schedule Delay Causes Based on Taiwan's Litigation Cases", *Project Management Journal*, Vol. 44, No. 3, pp. 21-31.

2 Hedley Smyth (2013). "Deviation, Emergent Requirements and Value Delivery: a marketing and 'business development' perspective", in *IRNOP 2013: 11th Conference*, June 16-19, Oslo, Norway.

3 Gwenola, B., Petetin, F., Bocquet, J-C., (2013). "Supporting Decisions in SMEs projects of disruptive technological innovation by balancing values and risks related to stakeholders", *Journal of Modern Project Management*, Vol. 01, No. 2, pp. 94-111.