

QUAD-MONTHLY | MAY - AUGUST ISSUE | 2014

ACADEMIC EDITOR

Steven D. Eppinger
MIT Sloan School of Management

EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

Christophe N. Bredillet
Queensland University of Technology

Darren Dalcher
Hertfordshire Business School (UK)

Edward J. Hoffman
Ask Journal (US)

Joana Geraldi
University College London

Kalle Kähkönen
Tampere University of Technology (Finland)

Marly Monteiro de Carvalho
São Paulo University

P. John Clarkson FREng
University of Cambridge

Pierre Bonnal
CERN Switzerland

Sam Savage
Stanford University

Young Hoon Kwak
The George Washington University

MANAGING EDITORS BOARD

Abdelaziz Bouras
Qatar University

Bernard Yannou
Ecole Centrale Paris

Darli Rodrigues Vieira
UQTR Canada

EDITORIAL REVIEW BOARD

Eugenio Pellicer
Polytechnic University of Valencia

Franco Carom
Polytechnic of Milan

Hsueh-Ming S. Wang
University of Alaska

Jui-Sheng Chou
Taiwan Tech

Mario Vanhoucke
University of Gent (Belgium)

Philip Huang
Peking University

Tyson R. Browning
Texas Christian University

Xiaobo Xu
American University of Sharjah (United Arab Emirates)

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

Osmar Zózimo
zozimo@journalmodernpm.com

PUBLISHING STAFF

PUBLISHER

Osmar Zózimo de Souza Jr.
Mundo Press

PUBLISHER ASSISTANTS

Américo Pinto

Larissa S. Romualdo Suzuki

J. A. Vianna Tavares

Mário Henrique Trentim

GRAPHIC DESIGN

Ricardo Martins
ricardo@journalmodernpm.com

ENGLISH JOURNAL REVIEWER

Beverly Victoria Young

SUBSCRIPTIONS

subscriptions@journalmodernpm.com

SUBMISSION OF ARTICLES

Outside referee's judge selected submissions.

Submit manuscripts and article proposals as

Microsoft Word files to papers@journalmodernpm.com

Guidelines are on the JPM website.

CUSTOMER SERVICE

For subscription, reprints, permissions or back issue orders, or service information:

email: info@journalmodernpm.com and web site about

www.journalmodernpm.com

Call +55 41 3029-9397

Customer privacy policy posted at

www.journalmodernpm.com/privacy

The JPM Publishing House



Rua Fernando Simas, 705/72
Curitiba-PR, Brazil, Postal code: 80430-190
ISSN 2317-3963

Reprints, Permissions, Back Issues

To reproduce or transmit one or more JPM articles by electronic or mechanical means (including photo-copying or archiving in any information storage retrieval system) requires written permission. Search for articles and order PDFs permissions or back issues at JPM services on website. Or contact customer service.

In this issue

Motivations are the ingrained rudiments of individuals who through their leaders unleash and venture into projects, programs, megaprojects and thus conceive a legitimate initiative.

But where does the control balance and scale proportions of such initiatives reside? Especially those classified as megaprojects? An empirical reply is that such initiatives are self-regulated by the interests of their leaders. Although many scientific studies have shown progress in this matter, the previous answer is still a lingering gap that lacks academic analysis, hence a potential and implied case study – A research agenda to improve the companies' business directions and their relationship with society.

An insight into the relationship of size vs. control regarding megaprojects and their limits. The order of magnitudes of a project derives from the magnitude of the leaders' representations. An example of the leaders' amplitude range could be: a technical team leader, a community leader, neighborhood leader, representatives of classes, the mayor of a city, state governors, trade coalition sectors, representatives of political parties, or heads of entities that represent global economic leaders and etc. These are leaderships that express very different interests and intensities. Furthermore, there is a direct correlation between personal interest and motivation, which determines the intensity of the movements at each occasion. Both leaderships as well as their motivations reside in multilateral aspects, which multiply the diversity of interests involved in a project. The size scale is also impacted by the type of initiative, the ones that have societal public interest, besides increasing the number of leaders involved, also add more complexity because it increases the array of factors to be considered in the project design.

The enthusiasm triggered by multilateral motivations determines how large a project can be or even which results are acceptable for this initiative. This frontier is not as deterministic as it might seem, because the interests of the leaders are calibrated by multilateral aspects that are also temporal. The control over the projects tends to be more accurate when such enthusiasm stabilizes, which may denote that the leadership's interests are changing, hence the focus on the project turns into control until its completion. The important thing is to understand that the way interests move is volatile and lasts for as long as the strength of the leaders' interests is greater than other emerging demands and thus execution priority continues with a greater focus on controlling the project.

The challenge lies in providing an environment that allows the intelligent use of resources without limiting the potential of the initiative. Especially in megaprojects, the boundaries must be understood and established to create manageable structures. It is intrinsic to organized initiatives that motivation originates from economic aspects, although this is not always obvious, but the fact is that the movements of interest groups and their leaders directly or indirectly impact the core of economic interests. And this same force that moves the leaders is decisive in determining their grouping into smaller, more manageable programs because such groups represent the same motivation and interest, which should become commitments through programs and projects. Hence, a self-regu-

lating system for the motivation-interest-commitment relationship among all stakeholders.

This system envisions a type of organization that makes transparent to the stakeholders or to a company the essential elements for management at this level of complexity and proportions, as megaprojects are characterized. They are: motivations, common interests groups, and the correlated commitments. These elements idealize a line of thought for the division and relationship structure to be adopted in the programs by the stakeholders in order to make them more visible and identifiable in every part of the resource management of the megaproject. Hence giving way to a greater balance of power between the active interest groups in the megaprojects and also creating traceability of participation of the leaders involved.

Particularly in megaprojects, we have not found a rational incentive to select the priorities of projects or even their size. What lies behind such stimulus are the interests of the leaders and their representatives, and as explained by neuroscience, individuals make emotional and unconscious decisions because they use the limbic system, in other words, humans transfer their intrinsic motivations to decisions and this influences their behavior, which in turn determines how activities are performed. The point is that people's motivations are related to rewards, foremost personal and later collective. Moreover, an individual's unconscious affects his decisions in a very particular way because it is based on his personality and previous experiences. The challenge is to influence the behavior of those involved in decision making and that means dealing with the limbic system, thereby trying to guide the decision choices to a more realistic context and toward collective goals.

The success or failure of a megaproject should be measured through the stakeholder leaders, those who represent the interest groups. The results, which are often reported as unsatisfactory, may have been interesting to other interest groups, generally just a few, but with strong representation in the list of stakeholders, and at times are even peripheral to the core business of the project groups. The key issue is that megaprojects will continue to exist and not always behaving as rational as desired and the results will not always express the success that was expected, but the fact remains that they move the base of the economy and will be led by the stronger and more active groups in that time and place, and they play a strong role in persuading the other stakeholders, who in order to not be left out of the economic movement, do not insist on being as rational in their decisions as they ought to be.

Zózimo – Editor in Chief



Erratum Notes: Last issues print errors check on the website *Information – For Readers*.