Literature Review

Project performance

Defining project outcomes in massive infrastructure developments– in which the project size is big and the set completion schedule is protracted – is difficult since a variety of factors might influence the success of a project. Furthermore, there is also no agreement inside the project management field as to what criteria should be used to evaluate projects. This is because such a metric is frequently based on the opinions of construction professionals or other relevant parties (Wu et al., 2017; Zhang & Fan, 2013). Alternative indicators of performance measurement, like user satisfaction as well as the human assets and competencies of project team members or participants, have lately been offered by academics. Stakeholder satisfaction, for example, has been advocated as a metric for project success (Chou & Ngo, 2014; Dvir et al., 2006).

Furthermore, project success can be viewed to be a subjective concept that varies depending on the project kind and situation, as well as the perspectives of project stakeholders (Iyer & Jha, 2006). For example, various studies have emphasized the role of participants in large-scale initiatives and lengthy company performance (Atkinson, 1999; Beringer et al., 2013; Mir & Pinnington, 2014; R. Turner & Zolin, 2012).

Stakeholder satisfaction contributes to long-term corporate performance, according to their research. As a result, it is plausible to assume that a mix of important success variables should be used to evaluate massive project performance (Rezvani et al., 2017; Wu et al., 2017; Zhang & Fan, 2013; Zwikael & Meredith, 2021).

Projects and project management must be at the core of putting an organization's plan into action. As a result, evaluating and monitoring projects is crucial for businesses (Pinto & Slevin, 1987). However, because each project is unique, there are inherent risks in managing projects (Aaltonen et al., 2010), the usage of indicators in managing projects is fraught with problems (Fortune & White, 2006; Jugdev & Müller, 2006; Shenhar et al., 2001; Westerveld, 2003). Although there are obstacles to accurately monitoring the progress of the work and no agreed-upon measures (Fortune & White, 2006), the most commonly mentioned indicators for measuring project performance are schedule adherence, implementation expense, and outcome quality (Atkinson, 1999). In addition to the indicators listed earlier, it is also vital to consider the

perspectives of many stakeholders, as every one of them evaluates the project's success differently based on their objectives (J. R. Turner & Müller, 2005).

Scholars in the field of project management are already trying to figure out what criteria predict project outcome since the 1960s (Cooke-Davies, 2002). To the usual pyramid of project performance criteria of price, duration, and competence, scholars included the aspect of customer satisfaction. Resultantly, the array of criteria becomes the overall project criterion. (Ika, 2009): price, time, competence, and customer happiness. Then, different authors like (Shenhar et al., 1997), Baccarini, (1999), and Lim & Mohamed, (1999) included more matrix in the typical aspects of measuring outcome, incorporating acceptance of the customer organization's goals at the outset of the project, consumer satisfaction, and stakeholder value.

Although the existing studies agree on critical success factors, these standards have been heavily questioned, especially in the case of complicated projects (Rezvani et al., 2016). This is because all such standards are likely to be based on naive assumptions which do not resemble the realities of huge, complicated undertakings (Toor & Ogunlana, 2010). Furthermore, more substantial factors such as behavioral skills and strategy formulation target requirements are not addressed by these criteria (Jugdev & Müller, 2006). Researchers started to undertake researches in the 1990s indicating that project achievement is a non-linear framework, and as a result, new versions for program performance improvement should reflect the program's multi-dimensional nature (Todorović et al., 2015). Success is measured based on the employees' behavioral and cognitive abilities, and also a stakeholder and customer pleasure, in this much more people-focused perspective (Jugdev & Müller, 2006; Mazur et al., 2014). Bryde, (2005) illustrates that determining critical success factors without regard for the development team or the organizational structure in which the venture is performed can cause severe roadblocks to improve project performance. These are the factors why success aspects must be considered.

Measures associated with a monitoring system that has a significant impact on a successful project are known as performance indicators (A. de Wit, 1988). Success elements revolve around "soft" problems including a project team's behavioral skills and shareholder and consumer pleasure (Rezvani et al., 2016); as a result, success criteria show a more genuine and dynamic approach to project success. (Jugdev & Müller, 2006). The study of crucial success elements began with a focus on various aspects of project governance. A criterion dubbed "perceived

success" was suggested as a replacement for the pyramid of budget, duration, and quality. Afterward, Pinto & Slevin, (1987) presented a scientific foundation for project performance that the development team can control (Ika, 2009). Project goals, supervisory support, project timelines, user involvement, personnel, technical duties, client approval, evaluation of performance, problem resolution, and communication are all part of this scientific foundation for the success of the project. Following that, four more factors were added to the list by Pinto & Slevin, (1987): Institutional pressures, situational factors, and urgency are all qualities of the project manager.

Cooke-Davies, (2002), Jugdev & Müller, (2006), Fortune & White, (2006), and Ika et al., (2012) presented the listings of the most frequently mentioned vital success variables. Yet, the overall assumption is that there is no universally applicable list of crucial success variables for all ventures. (Todorović et al., 2015).

Emotional Intelligence

When opposed to IQ, EI is recognized as an important subject in the industry because of its enormous impact on performance (Goleman, 1996). Mayer and Salovey (1997) explained emotional intelligence like the capability to recognize, assimilate, comprehend, and manage emotions in oneself and many others about the four elements. Ashkanasy & Daus, (2005) EI research has been divided into three "streams." The MSCEIT or Mayer-Salovey EI Test is utilized in first stream to develop a test design (Mayer, Caruso & Salovey, 2000). The second perspective utilizes a self-directed or interpersonal evaluation of emotional intelligence and uses the Mayer-Salovey four-dimensional framework. The 3rd phase examines EI characteristics other than the Mayer-Salovey approach, like self-esteem, compassion, aggressiveness, and autonomy. The current study used a self-evaluation tool depending on Mayer and Salovey's concept of EI (“Stream 2”).

Even though studies have inclined to overlook the influence of emotional intelligence, in particular, situations (Müller & Turner, 2007). Jordan, Dasborough, and Daus (2010) suggested that assessing EI's impact in various circumstances is critical. Infrastructure projects, that appeared to be a particularly good environment with which to investigate difficulties linked to EI interactions, have proved the necessity and relevancy of aesthetic skills like as emotional

intelligence regarding the effective achievement of those projects, according to research (Müller & Turner, 2007; Wu et al., 2017).

Furthermore, although construction project groups are typically transient, their workers are project-oriented, demonstrate variable basic abilities, and feel both good and unpleasant thoughts (Maqbool et al., 2017). Positive feelings, for example, help project teams function better in high-uncertainty contexts, but negative emotions like interpersonal pressure, rage, and disappointment can hinder real-time knowledge transfer, impacting negatively (Troth et al., 2012; Wu et al., 2017). To conclude, better understanding emotional intelligence in construction project management should increase awareness of the way these teams can complete difficult tasks based on long period objectives (Clarke, 2010; Maqbool et al., 2017).

Emotional intelligence is important in generating positive outcomes, according to existing studies (e.g., Clarke, 2010; Maqbool et al., 2017; Mazur et al., 2014; Müller & Turner, 2007). Although EI appears to have been mostly disregarded in the perspective of infrastructure developments, research in non-project situations have shown that it can be beneficial (e.g., Barczak et al., 2010; Jordan et al., 2002; Troth et al., 2012) has discovered that EI performs significant role in group members' innovation and problem-solving abilities. As an example, Jordan & Troth, (2009) and Barczak et al., (2010) discovered a connection between emotional intelligence and efficiency in pupils performing cognitive activities. Jordan & Troth, (2009) also stated that members with high emotional intelligence levels prefer to tackle challenging challenges rather than engage in conflict. In the same way, amongst student groups, Rapisarda, (2002) discovered that EI and productivity had a good relationship.

Although the findings appear encouraging, such research is based on the reality that material was obtained from learners instead of real workgroups, which can lead to significant group processes bias. In addition, neither of this research looked at the close connection among emotional intelligence and conflict mechanisms in major projects. As a result, the current study explores the influence of EI amongst construction team participants on construction projects utilizing variables like conflict and trustworthiness.

Individual competencies are at the center of most EI discussions in large-scale ventures. In project-based organizations, though, a large number of activities are accomplished by teams; that

is, processes are done by a team of persons who share a feeling of dedication to finishing work and aim for synergy (Clarke, 2010).

Additionally, previous studies (Clarke, 2010; Mazur et al., 2014; Müller & Turner, 2007; Rezvani et al., 2017) He has demonstrated the value of EI in achieving effective outcomes; nevertheless, the studies of project administration is rife with unsupported generalizations, together with most of the available research exploring the influence of emotional intelligence for project leaders at the personal level. Consequently, it seems that the measurement of emotional intelligence for teammates in huge construction ventures at the group level was missed in this research. Eventually, non-project-based organization studies represent that group emotional intelligence can improve group members' capability to interact with each other, to be receptive to competing perspectives and views, and to utilize emotion to improve team judgment, efficiency, confidence, conflict management, and performance (Jordan et al., 2002; Jordan & Troth, 2009; Troth et al., 2012). For example, Jordan & Troth, (2009) and Barczak et al. (2010) At the group level, discovered a correlation between EI and success on a cognition test, but this connection did not show at the personal level.

Jordan and Troth (2002) mentioned that organizations with a significant level of emotional intelligence favored cooperative dispute settlement tactics, while groups with a reduced level of emotional intelligence chose avoidance strategies, according to him. Rapisarda, (2002) also discovered a link amongst "empathy" (a sub-category of emotional intelligence) and participant teamwork. Lee & Wong, (2017) studied 79 groups and discovered that collective emotional intelligence causes a bad moderating influence on task, interpersonal conflict, and productivity and that this is inversely correlated to dispute and team efficiency. Although these outcomes seem promising, this research is still limited. However, the majority of this research are depending on artificially generated student teams rather than actual workgroups, which can severely skew the characteristics of the teams. Furthermore, past research looked into the direct link between EI, dispute, and trust. In task-based enterprises, the mediating implications of trust and interpersonal conflict on emotional intelligence and group performance were not investigated. As a result, the emphasis of this study is on the emotional intelligence of building project members as aspects of a teamwork environment that affect team members' confidence and dispute toward team effectiveness.

As a result, team EI is crucial in creating a favorable environment of acceptance and excellent performance in groups (Stephens & Carmeli, 2016). According to research, group members' capabilities to regulate and comprehend their moods, feelings, and feelings, including those of their teammates, helped them outperform groups with poor emotional intelligence (Lindsjørn et al., 2016). A workforce with a greater level of emotional intelligence creates a good and supportive social and intellectual environment for supporting cohesion and efficiency (Maqbool et al., 2017; Troth et al., 2012). Improved rates of a workforce's emotional intelligence may promote perceptions of sympathy and understanding when awarding materials and equipment, which can contribute to simpler teamwork and better output (Ayoko et al., 2008; Jordan & Troth, 2009).

Relationship Conflict

Interrelations and a lack of coordination and interaction across project workgroups can lead to conflict in infrastructure development projects (Wu et al., 2017). Project dispute is exacerbated by aspects of the construction sector, such as fragmentation, poor manufacturing, and budget overruns (Liu et al., 2011). Because of the joint influence of personal traits, communication, design, and participants' concerns, disputes do have a substantial influence on project success. Liu et al., (2011) emphasized that shareholders' desires are contradictory and different, that can potentially cause clashes and disagreements. Conflicts are inevitable in major ventures for a wide range of reasons, involving differing interests, viewpoints, competence, and project members' opposing requirements. As a result, managing dispute is critical to achieving desired results. Rezvani et al., (2017) claim that conflicts must be tackled and managed to utilize persons' soft abilities since they impede team effectiveness and performance outcomes.

(Chen, Zhang, and Zhang (2014) presented that conflict is any battle or disagreement over concepts, opinions, finances, or responsibilities. (O'Neill et al., 2013). The focus of this study is on task, procedure, and relational conflict patterns.

Relationship conflict is defined as disagreements over relational incompatibility that cause irritation, rage, and stress (Y. Q. Chen et al., 2014a; John & Chatman, 2000; Vaux & Kirk, 2018). This clash mode occurs in construction projects when several project workers disagree about perspectives, ideas, responsibilities, or ambitions. Relationship conflict impedes project team effectiveness by reducing common understanding. Anger and unhappiness connected with

this form of the dispute have also been proven in earlier studies (Y. Chen et al., 2017; Jehn, 1995; O'Neill et al., 2013; Wu et al., 2017) to inhibit teammates from completing tasks.

It could be claimed, depending on new project team studies, that relationship friction in a working team decreases team effectiveness. In new enterprise partnerships, relationship conflict is widespread, and it has been shown to have negative implications (Steffens et al., 2011) (Klotz et al., 2014). Vanaelst et al. (2017), for example, have discovered that interpersonal emotional conflict is the primary cause of team members leaving the company. Relationship tension also has a detrimental impact on new company profit, selling, and growth. Relationship tension is also being demonstrated to be damaging to a variety of attributes in the research on management teams. It, for example, diminishes collaborative problem resolution and teammates' commitment while also increasing the likelihood of turnover (F. R. C. De Wit et al., 2012). It also harms group members' happiness, creativity, and productivity (F. R. C. De Wit et al., 2012). In conclusion, it is widely known that relationship conflict causes a detrimental impact on the abilities and skills of new venture groups (Klotz et al., 2013).

In this essay, we recognize emotional intelligence as a talent (Goleman, 1996). Similarly, we may anticipate PMs with significant levels of such an ability to assist their staff members in developing their competence and confidence (Lin et al., 2019). Conflicts, though, are unavoidable in project circumstances marked by uncertainty and instability. Although disputes can be useful when they are connected to work performance, they can also be detrimental when they are linked to the uniformity of conceptions, since they can help to generate new ideologies and opinions, as well as improve interaction and innovation in the workforce (Wu et al., 2017). This environment can also foster excellent social connection interactions, resulting in a greater partnership with strong trust, fairness, and commitment. Depending on the foregoing, we can deduce that PMs by a high level of emotional consciousness and capability to recognize emotions are better able to separate positive and constructive disputes from interpersonal conflicts, strengthening the group's emotional tie (Clarke, 2010; Maqbool et al., 2017; Müller & Turner, 2007; Rezvani et al., 2017).

Relationship conflict represents "a knowledge of interpersonal mismatch with emotive elements like anxiety and discomfort (Y. Q. Chen et al., 2014a)". In broader terms, task conflict improves team effectiveness. However, if the degree of perceived conflict becomes too great, it may have a

negative influence on performance (Y. Q. Chen et al., 2014a; De Dreu & Weingart, 2003). Relationship conflict mostly causes decreased performance. Additionally, process conflict shows the differing perspectives of every project manager on the entire project task organization, which is directly linked to venture team privileges, obligations, and rewards. (Y. Q. Chen et al., 2014b).

Relationship conflict is also more prevalent in cross-organizational groups, as team participants from various organizations have different organizational cultures, technical viewpoints, and strategic objectives (Gelfand et al., 2006; Shapiro et al., 2002). According to a previous study, team members with different perceptions of organizational values were much more expected to feel mistrust and problems than those with more homogeneous value interpretations (McClure, 2010). Furthermore, officials from various organizations would likely engage in conversations that result in controversies during the judgment process due to differing opinions about the choices of strategic priorities. These squabbles have the potential to lay the foundations of relationship strife between partners (Zhou et al., 2007). Project teams, for instance, frequently involve designers and builders from various firms. Even though contractors and engineers have contractual relationships with property and infrastructure developers, they often coordinate and bargain during the whole development process (Lui et al., 2006). Contractors can strive to minimize expense and save money, but architects do prioritize technological advancement, provided that coordination partners got varied information, techniques, and monetary resources. The cognitive disparity can be intractable, causing an increased mutual hatred.

Other research subjects include performance and quality of relationships. Yeung et al., (2009) separated relationship-based objective metrics from relationship-oriented subjective criteria in his relationship performance metric. The phenomenon and amplitude of claims, disputes, and lawsuits, as well as the initiation of facilitated workshops, were relationship-oriented standards, while relationship-oriented qualitative approaches included support and loyalty, efficient communication, pleasant work arrangements, lengthy business, managerial support, employee satisfaction, and reduced paperwork. The rating can be used by project leaders to assess, track, and optimize the effectiveness of relationship-building activities. On the contrary, Jelodar et al., (2016) mentioned that when establishing the relation quality system, the three aspects of service quality discovered were teamwork, dedication, and trust, all of that cannot be accomplished without the assistance of the management team.

Relationship conflict comprises friction, dissatisfaction, and sometimes hatred, as well as interpersonal tensions centered on interpersonal mismatches and has been shown to harm teams (Amason, 1996; P. L. Costa et al., 2015; De Dreu & Weingart, 2003; F. R. C. de Wit et al., 2013; Jehn & Bendersky, 2003; Lau & Cobb, 2010). During the project lifecycle, people in the management team and important stakeholders frequently suffer relational conflict, which can alienate individuals concerned, impair cognitive functioning, reduce enthusiasm, and create a project highly tough at best.

Because of the complexities of construction, every project necessitates accurate and timely collaboration, effective communication, and collaboration to ensure smooth execution. Moreover, due to the faster speed of interrelated tasks, timetable stress, and the aggressive mentality prevalent in the infrastructure industry, communication failures and high degrees of relationship conflict frequently occur, which can have a substantial impact on the results and productivity (Wu et al., 2017). The purpose of this research is to learn who usually starts interpersonal conflict in a building project, what causes conflict, and what infrastructure project management professionals may do to prevent it.

Personal mismatches and controversy are at the heart of relationship conflict, which has been demonstrated to have a significant impact on team efficiency (Brockman, 2014; Lau & Cobb, 2010). Impaired decision quality due to lessened information exchange and lower functional capacity, a lack of agreement among policymakers, and a decreased loyalty towards the organization or group are all examples of reduction in performance caused by interpersonal conflict (Brockman, 2014; Lau & Cobb, 2010; Simons & Peterson, 2000).

Trust

Scholars from diverse professions and theoretical origins have been drawn to the topic of trust. They've mostly concentrated on the many types and rewards of trust (Child, Faulkner, & Tallman, 2005). Most people agree that throughout the domain of construction projects, trust is indeed anticipation of others' behavior and actions (Maurer, 2010; Wu et al., 2017).

Trust is often seen to be an organizational concept which provides particular advantages to teamsmembers, such as increased productivity and favorable behavioral outcomes (Maurer, 2010; Pinjani & Palvia, 2013). It organizes cooperation and interaction, as well as facilitates project coordinators to offer valuable resources (Cheung, Yiu, & Lam, 2013). Such findings are

used in the current study to construction projects having long-term poor performance and profitability, as well as inconsistencies among staff members and project administrators, which necessitate trust (Rezvani et al., 2018). In these type of initiatives, stakeholders frequently rely on a recognized colleague or project leader to make the necessary changes to accomplish the required results.

Furthermore, while trust is not the issue, team members are more accommodating of opposing viewpoints (Pinjani & Palvia, 2013). As a result, they are much more able to generate cooperative relationships that result in great project outcomes in a trustworthy situation (De Jong et al., 2016; Khosravi et al., 2019; Maurer, 2010; Pinjani & Palvia, 2013). In the construction projects environment, on the other hand, the absence of trust may lead to protective behaviors, decreased social cooperation, and information sharing. As a result, trust improves project staff members' ability to communicate and share information effectively. To summarise, trust has the potential to help teammates organize and support horizontal working connections and productive collaboration (Maurer, 2010).

The notion of workforce trust is a communal one (A. C. Costa & Anderson, 2010). Gambetta, (1988) explained it as members' trust in "another member will conduct a behavior that is good or at least not detrimental...to contemplate participating in some sort of collaboration with him," according to him (p. 217). According to studies, knowledge transfer is positively associated with trust (Wiewiora et al., 2014), project efficiency (Webber & Klimoski, 2004), productivity (Barczak et al., 2010), and workforce competence (DeOrtentiis et al., 2013). IT teams working on computer, web, and application development are typically smaller (with only a few individuals) and operate as a single unit (Chiocchio & Essiembre, 2009). Members that have faith in their teammates deepen their bonds with them, which motivates the staff to work together to obtain their objectives (DeOrtentiis et al., 2013). Failure to build trust with project team members, on the other hand, detracts from the group's cohesiveness and prevents members from engaging in meaningful discussions, resulting in project delays – or even malfunction (Lencioni, 2002).

While members are working on difficult jobs, they are more likely to acquire a system of common and common expectations (for example, information sharing) (e.g., coding). Likewise, members' engagement grows as a result of their faith in the organization(Gillespie & Mann,

2004), and is linked to authenticity and the sharing of project-relevant facts (Zand, 1972). It's important to remember that the level of trust together in the development team might affect information sharing. The formalized channel for information exchange is a standard procedure, but individuals who have a high level of trust inside the team are more likely to use another informal channel (Lesko & Hollingsworth, 2010). According to recent research, a greater amount of trust in a workforce boosts interaction, improves security, and ultimately boosts project success (Bond-Barnard et al., 2018; Stephens & Carmeli, 2016). Because the IT sector is so knowledge-intensive, sharing specialist knowledge is vital to addressing the needs of clients. We contend that workforce trust moderates the link between information sharing and organization performance, since trusted people work as facilitators for one another, enhancing information sharing and increasing powerful results - both essential prerequisites of an information technology program (Gerbasi et al., 2015).

For Pinto et al. (2009), there is indeed a significant impact of trust on construction industry project administration, involving better customer linkages, reduced lead time to end-user, shorter investment assessments in outsourcing, and thus reduced project expenses, as well as more efficient communication. Nonetheless, the authors argue that the last point, communication, makes it worthwhile to investigate the phenomena of trust since communication problems are to blame for the majority, if not most of, project delays. The deployment of activities that build stakeholder confidence should happen at the start of the venture since they've been proved to have an impact on the program's result (Strahorn et al., 2015). As per the authors, demonstrating trustworthiness just at the start of every exchange relationship has certain risks, and the advantages of trust were undermined if there is proof of goals other than those agreed upon.

It is critical within a project setting for participants to display a commitment to work for the benefit of another; this feature defines the level of trust connections (Strahorn et al., 2015). Sharing one's vision and goals aids in the practice of good communication, which allows the construction of concepts and encourages innovative solutions in unexpected situations, both of which are necessary components for developing trust and cooperation in collaborations (Dervitsiotis, 2010).

Organizational Culture

Members of the organization want to comprehend the company's aims and mission and incorporate themselves as an essential component of the organizational culture, so members of the organization must provide comprehension and establish the beliefs of organizational culture, both official and non-official.

Collaboration or collaboration of views and beliefs characterizes the organizational environment. Organizational culture is viewed as a prerequisite for membership in the organization (Oluwafemi & Idowu, 2016). Organizational culture is what makes a company successful, and it also provides a set of rules (Umrani et al., 2017). When speaking with individuals, organizational norms like principles, objectives, symbols and courteous language apply. Organizational culture means a set of beliefs and values which the company has formed. By collaborating to address problems, organizational culture was capable of overcoming environmental problems.

Management's role in organizational culture is carrying out the organization's behavior or norms that occur in companies that collaborate to achieve common goals (Ahmed & Shafiq, 2014). The pioneers or leaders set organizational culture, and also the tradition in the organization is built by the team as it learns to deal with external and internal adaption difficulties (Odiakaose ODOR, 2018).

Organizational culture, on the other hand, is defined by common values and standards, according to Robert. Team members who are engaged in all aspects of the organization constitute an effective organizational culture. As a result, corporate culture is inextricably linked to the environment. Organizational culture is critical inside any operation, like educational establishments, to instill pleasure in the actions that organizational leaders have intended.

How successfully fundamental ideas are lived, how clearly regulations are implemented, and how broadly they are distributed throughout educational organizations determine the efficacy of organizational culture. The larger the quantity of individuals who recognize and practice the basic regulations, the more loyal the firm’s leaders are with the firm's society's strength.

A mature organizational structure (having a consistent membership, getting capable to coordinate, and embedding deep beliefs) and an effective organizational culture that clarifies the behavior that should be adopted or executed are two examples of organizational culture qualities.

A good corporate culture has a bigger impact on members and teachers than those of a weak one. High moral values will be supported if the environment is robust. Efficiency that is adaptable to changing external situations is a key aspect of organizational culture's power. As a result, organizational culture is created to establish the behaviors that contribute to desired results (Joseph & Kibera, 2019). The organization is effective because the leadership shares the same views and ideals as the person who leads the organization, and management likewise believes that members are more essential than the firm's policies (Salehipour & Ah, 2018).

A positive culture is viewed as a powerful channel for communicating desired behavior to organizational groupings. High organizational performance is linked to a strong tradition. That a positive culture should be reinforced and passed down to the next generation members, and it would be put into practice as quickly as possible. Since the habits which develop in organizations represent the standards of behavior that are adopted by employees of the group, organizational culture in institutions is crucial to run. A successful culture is one in which the organization is robust and the state's aims are well-executed (PM & RW, 2019).

The construction venture organization can also be described as a structure of interconnections, authority, and obligation produces among the participants (that is, client, administrator, and contractor) for fulfilling the project customer’s needs (Walker, 2015). Resultantly, in establishing the project based organization’s culture, a variation of current organizational culture information is justifiable.

Although culture has indeed been researched at various levels, including cultural heritage, corporate structure, and organizational culture, there seems to be no consensus on a conventional meaning of the concept. The majority of organizational culture definitions include aspects relating to fundamental premises (Schein, 1985), beliefs and norms (Eldridge & Crombie, 2013), beliefs (Eldridge & Crombie, 2013), and mental projects (Geert Hofstede et al., 1991). Furthermore, organizational culture is characterized as a collection of artifacts (Khan et al., 2012), behavioral etiquette (Mullins, 2005), as well as working methods (Khan et al., 2012). Smircich, (1983), who acknowledged that the organizational culture notion was rooted in anthropology, recognized the disparity of such definitions. As a result of the lack of consensus on the definition of civilization in anthropology, it's not strange that there are numerous definitions and uses in the area of corporate research. People are either completely unaware of

cultural expressions or are acutely aware of them. Principles, attitudes, and basic beliefs are examples of intangible qualities (Schein, 1985), objects, creations, and behavioral standards are examples of tangible characteristics (Schein, 1985), that are termed as "practices" by (Geert, Hofstede, 2010). Values and practices are two aspects of culture when evaluated together. Values are described as a user's individual opinions in work or life-relevant concerns, per (Hofstede, 2010) whereas practices are described as the individual's descriptive impressions of parts of the workplace environment or real work scenario. As a result, these explanations make culture much accessible.

3.1. EI and Project performance

According to the study by Ley & Albert, (2003), it is believed that individual abilities (like emotional intelligence) can be used to anticipate project success. As per Ley and Albert (2003), employee abilities and competencies causes a major influence on job outcome. Numerous researches has supported the core principles (Maqbool et al., 2017; Mazur et al., 2014). As an example, Mazur et al., (2014) identified that project participants' capabilities and competencies are important to the achievement of complex initiatives.

Prior huge project empirical investigation (Lindsjørn et al., 2016) has proven that EI does have a favorable impact on a variety of outcomes, and also that group members' ability to control, perceive, and comprehend their thoughts and feelings, along with their teammates, is linked to the job performances. In the same way, Maqbool et al., (2017) group members having high level of emotional intelligence establish behavioral–emotional conditions that assist collaboration and performance, according to the findings (Rapisarda, 2002), while Rezvani et al., (2018) the emotional abilities of teammates have been found to have an impact on a team's success. This research backs up Ayoko, Callann, and H€artel's (2008) findings, which demonstrate that greater group member EI leads to feelings of compassion and support, which leads to improved team performance and efficiency (Jordan et al., 2002).

Staff members with higher emotional intelligence scores are also more likely to instill pleasant feelings during their job (Ashkanasy & Dorris, 2017; Urda & Loch, 2013) to help alleviate emotional issues such as stress and fatigue (improving overall group performance) (Greenidge et al., 2014). These findings support the importance of emotional intelligence as a trait that might promote pleasant emotions and teamwork in project working groups (Urda & Loch, 2013), and

seems to be a valuable ability that teams may utilize to collect and share knowledge to obtain their objectives and improve their outcomes (Barczak et al., 2010; Kaufmann & Wagner, 2017).

An absence of emotional intelligence, on the other hand, leads to increased team tension, conflict, negative feelings, dissatisfaction, rejection, and poor performance (Rezvani et al., 2017; Sheldon et al., 2014). Other authors (Kirchoff et al., 2016; Stanczyk et al., 2015) discovered that groups with lower emotional intelligence does not act fairly; rather, they rely on sentiments and instinct to direct their behaviors and judgments, resulting in bad performance.

As contrasted with IQ, emotional intelligence is viewed as a critical idea in the industry, as proven by its large impact on execution (Goleman, 1996). Mayer et al., (2011) characterized eager awareness in four ways: the capacity to watch, adapt, enjoy, and monitor one's own and others' feelings. (Beldoch, 1964) coined the term "emotional intelligence," which was described as "the capability to recognize and exhibit emotion concerning several other personal attributes, and also the simplicity or difficulty with where someone can explain his concealed sentiments." Afterward, Daniel (Goleman, 1995) expanded on the concept, claiming that emotional intelligence might work as a stimulant for improved physiological and behavioral health through appropriate sensory direction, organization, and regulation. Employees encounter both pleasant and bad feelings at work. Good emotions improve a person's strengths and expertise, which has a beneficial impact and improves worker performance, resulting in greater success (J. D. Mayer et al., 2011).

Task implementation can also be perceived as an emotive phrase, depending on kinds of projects and situations, as well as key stakeholders' viewpoints (Iyer & Jha, 2006). For example, just scientists have concentrated on the commitment by participants, and long lasting corporate achievement is based on massive initiatives (Atkinson, 1999). Their findings support the importance of investor satisfaction in long-term corporate success. As a result, it is justifiable to assume that the assessment of mega construction project execution must depend on a collection of basic success components (Rezvani et al., 2018; Zhang & Fan, 2013; Zwikael & Meredith, 2021).

Project members with good emotional intelligence develop an emotional atmosphere at work that fosters cooperation and integration among individuals, as well as increased work efficiency and project success (Maqbool et al., 2017). Team members with greater emotional intelligence have

more sympathy and understanding for one another, which leads to better team development and functioning (Jordan et al., 2002). Positive emotions are brought to the workplace by those with greater emotional intelligence, while negative emotions are reduced, resulting in improved project outcomes (Ashkanasy & Dorris, 2017).

Rezvani et al. (2018) Emotional intelligence is seen as a significant aspect in accelerating project status and improving project success in big and complex projects. As a result, depending on the previously described writing, the first hypothesis is as follows: However, a lack of emotional intelligence leads to substantial levels of social pressures, unrest, unpleasant feelings, discontent, dismissal, and poor execution (Khosravi et al., 2019). Other researchers (Kirchoff et al., 2016; Stanczyk et al., 2015) have suggested that people with less emotional intelligence don't behave normally; given the same circumstances, they constantly rely on their actions and processes on emotions and instinct.

Hence, we hypothesize that:

H1. Emotional intelligence has positive association with project success.

3.2. Emotional Intelligence and Relationship Conflict

Conflict amongst group mates can disrupt excellent teamwork in large infrastructure projects by causing hatred, distrust, antagonism, and annoyance (Wu et al., 2017). Evidences relating to the relationship among emotional intelligence and violence in construction project teams reveals that groups with high emotional intelligence are aware of and capable of managing their own and other teammates' sentiments in the face of conflict (Chan et al., 2014; Rezvani et al., 2018; Zhang & Fan, 2013). Emotional competence and regulation capabilities are critical competencies for handling conflicts and function in this regard, as they provide an environment wherein project members may communicate and share their problems to foster strong bonds (Jordan et al., 2002; Rapisarda, 2002).

Due to the participation of different shareholders and organizations in massive construction projects, talks amongst teamwork can become heated, evoking unpleasant emotions and sensations such as animosity, rage, and pressure. In such cases, controlling and comprehending emotions can reduce unpleasant emotions while reinforcing positive ones (Karimi et al., 2014). As a result, project participants are urged to communicate essential

information as soon as possible to address challenging work and obtain achievement. In the same way, Druskat & Wolff, (2001) discovered that teammates' work involvement is influenced by their ability to regulate and comprehend their emotions. The capability to comprehend and control emotions, in particular, allows project workers to refocus on more important tasks and difficulties, resulting in improved construction projects' results and cohesiveness (Jordan & Troth, 2009; Wu et al., 2017).

Various researchers (Ashkanasy & Dorris, 2017; Jordan et al., 2002; Karimi et al., 2014; Zhang & Fan, 2013) mentioned that the ability to manage feelings helps to reduce marital conflict. Emotional intelligence, in particular, improves shared understanding and generosity, reducing conflict and tension between project teammates. Jordan & Troth, (2009) discovered that staff members with greater emotional intelligence are encouraged to settle conflicts as soon as it gets possible to reduce problems among their formal and private relationships. As an outcome, it is believed that developers with greater emotional intelligence have lower and much less stressful connection, work, and process conflicts. Hence, it is hypothesized that

H2. Emotional intelligence has negative connection with relationship conflict.

3.3. Relationship Conflict and project Success

Depending on the theory of IPT (Carnevale & Probst, 1998), it is believed that conflict may stymie informed judgement and implementation due to mental exhaustion, which limits information programming and decision-making accuracy. As mentioned by (Carnevale & Probst, 1998), the conflict has an impact on the learning processes that are required to generate constructive judgments after processing information. According to IPT, all three kinds of conflict result in individual discontent and frustration.

The study is scarce on the influence of relationship conflict in the sector of construction. Brockman, (2014) looked at the impact of intergroup conflict among the workforce and the costs connected with it. Studies contributed to the firm's understanding of the consequences and expenses of disagreement, as well as conflict drivers, but it failed to distinguish between work and personal conflict, which is important to distinguish positive from destructive conflict. In the construction sector in China, Zhang & Huo, (2015) indicated negative sentiments as sentiments to venture outcome causing from the impact of relationship conflict. It is claimed that political

acumen helps to temper unpleasant emotions brought on by interpersonal conflict. The implications of owner-contractor disputes on cost management are being investigated in the research. Relationship conflict Chen et al., (2014) claimed, had a disproportionately unfavorable effect on project cost control. Studies reveal that management team disagreement lowers project teams' perceptions of the efficiency of construction programs due to reasons like leaving, lower satisfaction, and reduced productivity. They also claimed that the more teammates argued about the allocation of tasks, accountability, and execution, the more negative individuals' opinions toward the group became and the less efficient the team was at achieving their objectives.

Hypothesis 3. Relationship conflict is negatively linked to project outcomes.

3.4. Relationship Conflict act as a mediator between emotional intelligence and project performance

As previously mentioned, there are links between emotional intelligence and conflict, as well as conflict and task performance. It means that disagreement between project teammates functions as a filter for EI's impact on project success. The intermediating path is dependent on the effect of psychologically competent group mates on conflict. Group members who perform important role in regulating and comprehending the sentiments that arise due to conflict situations are much more inclined to perform forward towards a beneficial result like this in an environment. Resultantly, the societal setting of complex tasks within working groups is made convenient (Azmy et al., 2012; Rezvani et al., 2016).

Other research by Rezvani et al. (2016) has proved the role of emotional intelligence (EI) in creating excellent interpersonal relationships. As a result, it encourages conflict de-escalation in development team interactions, especially when there are inconsistencies and doubts in a huge project. Rezvani et al. (2016) also discovered that employees with greater emotional intelligence have the potential to encourage team assistance and encouragement, resulting in a cooperative learning atmosphere and a high-performing workforce. Moreover, emotionally savvy teams communicate their feelings in a constructive manner, which reduces stress, anxiety, and dissatisfaction (Barczak et al., 2010). In accordance with this, it is possibly to impress rational thinking and better decision-making. Therefore, we hypothesize that:

Hypothesis 4. (a) Relationship conflict mediates the positive association between emotional intelligence and project outcome.

3.5. Trust plays moderating role on the relationship conflict-performance link

Though there is a dispute between venture teammates on ideologies and knowledge, the existence of trust reduces the adverse influences of disagreement. Whenever trust is absent, however, relational resistance between project staff over different viewpoints and assumptions, and also communication problems, can escalate (Jiang et al., 2016; Khosravi et al., 2019). Project purposes will get difficult to obtain if staff members need not have comparable traditions and beliefs, that may result in variations in project tasks and boundaries. Project teammates having low confidence and trust in their coworkers will fail to adequately apply mentioned procedures, hence influencing project outcome (Rezvani et al., 2018). Even though conflict emphasizes the significance of achieving project objectives in a variety of methods, individuals are unlikely to attain such aims without sharing their experiences and depending on the assistance of other members of the team (Wu et al., 2017). Even if the conflict between project team participants remains unresolved, its effect on efficiency is decreased in the existence of trust (Chiocchio et al., 2011). Moreover, if there is a lack of trust, project staff may be hesitant to share their strategies and conventions with the rest of the team (Massey & Dawes, 2007). When it comes to conflict, it occurs when project participants dispute clearly defined procedural rules. When confidence is poor, project leaders and senior staff members are less likely to embrace the project, causing team members to divert their efforts and investments to other ventures (Han & Harms, 2010). Due to the shortage of confidence and belief in their coworkers, the project team's goals and ideals may change. Group members will fail to recognize agreed standards and norms in these types of conditions. As a result, it is acceptable to believe that building trust between project members could reduce conflict levels.

Without any of the presence of a relationship, it is impossible to create trust. As a result, rather than a personality feature shared by both parties (Karlsen, 2008), the elements considered by somebody who trusts as to the traits of someone who gets the trust influence the bond of trust. Such attributes for (Dervitsiotis, 2010) are: Sincerity is explained as the extent to which individuals mean whatever they speak; Skills are defined as the ability to keep a commitment; Commitment is defined as the extent to which one has a genuine interest in another.

Mayer et al. (1995) identify three characteristics that influence expected trust: A collection of talents that enable persons who are committed to having power in a given subject is known as ability. Benevolence refers to how much the recipient of the trust desires the person who placed the trust, while Integrity refers to the ideals and rules that someone who was entrusted is supposed to follow.

In the same way, (Hartmann & Hietbrink, 2013) mentions three attributes: authenticity, competence, and intuition are three qualities that stand out. The authenticity trust relates to what kind of a genuine relationship among the performers is regarded. The training and education of the players involved provide the foundation for competency trust. Perception trust is founded on the performers' cognitive perceptions, which are influenced by their looks and presence. Within the balanced existence of such three sorts of trust foundations, teams can generate results.

Hence, it is hypothesized that:

H5. Trust among project stakeholders in massive construction projects moderates the negative connection amongst relationship conflicts and project outcomes, in a way that substantial extents of trust diminish these linkages.

References

Aaltonen, K., Kujala, J., Aaltonen, K., & Kujala, J. (2010). A project lifecycle perspective on stakeholder influence strategies in global projects. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, *26*(4), 381–397. https://econpapers.repec.org/RePEc:eee:scaman:v:26:y:2010:i:4:p:381-397

Ahmed, M., & Shafiq, S. (2014). The Impact of Organizational Culture on Organizational Performance:A Case Study on Telecom Sector. *Global Journal of Management And Business Research*, *14*. https://journalofbusiness.org/index.php/GJMBR/article/view/1254

Amason, A. C. (1996). Distinguishing the effects of functional and dysfunctional conflict on strategic decision making: Resolving a paradox for top management teams. *Academy of Management Journal*, *39*(1), 123–148. https://doi.org/10.2307/256633

Ashkanasy, N. M., & Daus, C. S. (2005). Rumors of the death of emotional intelligence in organizational behavior are vastly exaggerated. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *26*(4), 441–452. https://doi.org/10.1002/JOB.320

Ashkanasy, N. M., & Dorris, A. D. (2017). Emotions in the Workplace. *Http://Dx.Doi.Org/10.1146/Annurev-Orgpsych-032516-113231*, *4*, 67–90. https://doi.org/10.1146/ANNUREV-ORGPSYCH-032516-113231

Atkinson, R. (1999). Project management: cost, time and quality, two best guesses and a phenomenon, its time to accept other success criteria. *International Journal of Project Management*, *17*(6), 337–342. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0263-7863(98)00069-6

Ayoko, O. B., Callan, V. J., & Hrtel, C. E. J. (2008). The Influence of Team Emotional Intelligence Climate on Conflict and Team Members' Reactions to Conflict: *Http://Dx.Doi.Org/10.1177/1046496407304921*, *39*(2), 121–149. https://doi.org/10.1177/1046496407304921

Azmy, N., Shane, J. S., Strong, K. C., Jaselskis, E. J., Stout, T. B., & Morrow, P. C. (2012). *The role of team effectiveness in construction project teams and project performance*.

Baccarini, D. (1999). The Logical Framework Method for Defining Project Success: *Https://Doi.Org/10.1177/875697289903000405*, *30*(4), 25–32. https://doi.org/10.1177/875697289903000405

Barczak, G., Lassk, F., & Mulki, J. (2010). Antecedents of Team Creativity: An Examination of Team Emotional Intelligence, Team Trust and Collaborative Culture. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, *19*(4), 332–345. https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1467-8691.2010.00574.X

Beringer, C., Jonas, D., & Kock, A. (2013). Behavior of internal stakeholders in project portfolio management and its impact on success. *International Journal of Project Management*, *31*(6), 830–846. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.IJPROMAN.2012.11.006

Bond-Barnard, T. J., Fletcher, L., & Steyn, H. (2018). Linking trust and collaboration in project teams to project management success. *International Journal of Managing Projects in Business*, *11*(2), 432–457. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJMPB-06-2017-0068/FULL/PDF

Brockman, J. L. (2014). Interpersonal Conflict in Construction: Cost, Cause, and Consequence. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, *140*(2), 04013050. https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)CO.1943-7862.0000805

Bryde, D. J. (2005). Methods for Managing Different Perspectives of Project Success. *British Journal of Management*, *16*(2), 119–131. https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1467-8551.2005.00438.X

Carnevale, P. J., & Probst, T. M. (1998). Social values and social conflict in creative problem solving and categorization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *74*(5), 1300–1309. https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.74.5.1300

Chan, J. C. Y., Sit, E. N. M., & Lau, W. M. (2014). Conflict management styles, emotional intelligence and implicit theories of personality of nursing students: A cross-sectional study. *Nurse Education Today*, *34*(6), 934–939. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.NEDT.2013.10.012

Chen, Y., Mccabe, B., Asce, M., & Hyatt, D. (2017). Relationship between Individual Resilience, Interpersonal Conflicts at Work, and Safety Outcomes of Construction Workers. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, *143*(8), 04017042. https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)CO.1943-7862.0001338

Chen, Y. Q., Zhang, Y. B., & Zhang, S. J. (2014a). Impacts of Different Types of Owner-Contractor Conflict on Cost Performance in Construction Projects. *Journal of Construction*

Engineering and Management, *140*(6), 04014017. https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)CO.1943-7862.0000852

Chen, Y. Q., Zhang, Y. B., & Zhang, S. J. (2014b). Impacts of Different Types of Owner-Contractor Conflict on Cost Performance in Construction Projects. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, *140*(6), 04014017. https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)CO.1943-7862.0000852

Chiocchio, F., & Essiembre, H. (2009). Cohesion and Performance: A Meta-Analytic Review of Disparities Between Project Teams, Production Teams, and Service Teams. *Http://Dx.Doi.Org/10.1177/1046496409335103*, *40*(4), 382–420. https://doi.org/10.1177/1046496409335103

Chiocchio, F., Forgues, D., Paradis, D., & Iordanova, I. (2011). Teamwork in Integrated Design Projects: Understanding the Effects of Trust, Conflict, and Collaboration on Performance: *Https://Doi.Org/10.1002/Pmj.20268*, *42*(6), 78–91. https://doi.org/10.1002/PMJ.20268

Chou, J. S., & Ngo, N. T. (2014). Identifying critical project management techniques and skills for construction professionals to achieving project success. *IEEE International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Engineering Management*, *2015-January*, 1204–1208. https://doi.org/10.1109/IEEM.2014.7058829

Clarke, N. (2010). Emotional intelligence abilities and their relationships with team processes. *Team Performance Management: An International Journal*, *16*, 6–32. https://doi.org/10.1108/13527591011028906/FULL/XML

Cooke-Davies, T. (2002). The "real" success factors on projects. *International Journal of Project Management*, *20*(3), 185–190. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0263-7863(01)00067-9

Cooperative Strategy - John Child, David Faulkner, Stephen Tallman, Stephen B. Tallman - Google Books. (n.d.). Retrieved December 31, 2021, from https://books.google.com.pk/books?hl=en&lr=&id=K-RgEN-euNgC&oi=fnd&pg=PR5&ots=FTsSwkhrEx&sig=sfDluCaniq1Qm37T21SCHSQYris&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false

Costa, A. C., & Anderson, N. (2010). Measuring trust in teams: Development and validation of a

multifaceted measure of formative and reflective indicators of team trust. *Https://Doi.Org/10.1080/13594320903272083*, *20*(1), 119–154. https://doi.org/10.1080/13594320903272083

Costa, P. L., Passos, A. M., & Bakker, A. B. (2015). Direct and Contextual Influence of Team Conflict on Team Resources, Team Work Engagement, and Team Performance. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research*, *8*(4), 211–227. https://doi.org/10.1111/NCMR.12061

De Dreu, C. K. W., & Weingart, L. R. (2003). Task versus relationship conflict, team performance, and team member satisfaction: a meta-analysis. *Undefined*, *88*(4), 741–749. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.4.741

De Jong, B. A., Dirks, K. T., & Gillespie, N. (2016). Trust and team performance: A meta-analysis of main effects, moderators, and covariates. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *101*(8), 1134–1150. https://doi.org/10.1037/APL0000110

de Wit, A. (1988). Measurement of project success. *International Journal of Project Management*, *6*(3), 164–170. https://doi.org/10.1016/0263-7863(88)90043-9

De Wit, F. R. C., Greer, L. L., & Jehn, K. A. (2012). The paradox of intragroup conflict: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *97*(2), 360–390. https://doi.org/10.1037/A0024844

de Wit, F. R. C., Jehn, K. A., Scheepers, D., de Wit, F. R. C., Jehn, K. A., & Scheepers, D. (2013). Task conflict, information processing, and decision-making: The damaging effect of relationship conflict. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *122*(2), 177–189. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.OBHDP.2013.07.002

DeOrtentiis, P. S., Summers, J. K., Ammeter, A. P., Douglas, C., & Ferris, G. R. (2013). Cohesion and satisfaction as mediators of the team trust - team effectiveness relationship: An interdependence theory perspective. *Career Development International*, *18*(5), 521–543. https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-03-2013-0035

Dervitsiotis, K. N. (2010). Beyond stakeholder satisfaction: Aiming for a new frontier of sustainable stakeholder trust. *Http://Dx.Doi.Org/10.1080/1478336032000053555*, *14*(5), 515–528. https://doi.org/10.1080/1478336032000053555

Druskat, V., & Wolff, S. (2001). Building the emotional intelligence of groups. *Undefined*.

Dvir, D., Ben-David, A., Sadeh, A., & Shenhar, A. J. (2006). Critical managerial factors affecting defense projects success: A comparison between neural network and regression analysis. *Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence*, *19*(5), 535–543. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ENGAPPAI.2005.12.002

Eldridge, J. E. T., & Crombie, A. D. (2013). A sociology of organisations (RLE: Organizations). *A Sociology of Organisations (RLE: Organizations)*, *13*, 1–218. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203545867/SOCIOLOGY-ORGANISATIONS-RLE-ORGANIZATIONS-ELDRIDGE-CROMBIE

Fortune, J., & White, D. (2006). Framing of project critical success factors by a systems model. *International Journal of Project Management*, *24*(1), 53–65. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.IJPROMAN.2005.07.004

Gambetta, D. (1988). *Trust: Making and Breaking Cooperative Relations*.

Gelfand, M. J., Erez, M., & Aycan, Z. (2006). Cross-Cultural Organizational Behavior. *Https://Doi.Org/10.1146/Annurev.Psych.58.110405.085559*, *58*, 479–514. https://doi.org/10.1146/ANNUREV.PSYCH.58.110405.085559

Gerbasi, A., Porath, C. L., Parker, A., Spreitzer, G., & Cross, R. (2015). Destructive de-energizing relationships: How thriving buffers their effect on performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *100*(5), 1423–1433. https://doi.org/10.1037/APL0000015

Gillespie, N. A., & Mann, L. (2004). Transformational leadership and shared values: The building blocks of trust. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *19*(6), 588–607. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940410551507/FULL/XML

Goleman, D. (1996). *Emotional intelligence : why it can matter more than IQ*. 352. https://books.google.com/books/about/Emotional_Intelligence.html?id=znk9PgAACAAJ

Greenidge, D., Devonish, D., & Alleyne, P. (2014). The Relationship Between Ability-Based Emotional Intelligence and Contextual Performance and Counterproductive Work Behaviors: A Test of the Mediating Effects of Job Satisfaction. *Http://Dx.Doi.Org/10.1080/08959285.2014.913591*, *27*(3), 225–242.

https://doi.org/10.1080/08959285.2014.913591

Han, G., & Harms, P. D. (2010). Team identification, trust and conflict: A mediation model. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, *21*(1), 20–43. https://doi.org/10.1108/10444061011016614/FULL/XML

Hartmann, A., & Hietbrink, M. (2013). An exploratory study on the relationship between stakeholder expectations, experiences and satisfaction in road maintenance. *Construction Management and Economics*, *31*(4), 345–358. https://doi.org/10.1080/01446193.2013.768772

Hofstede, Geert,. (2010). Cultures and organizations : software of the mind : intercultural cooperation and its importance for survival /. In *Cultures Consequences* (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill,. http://www.mendeley.com/research/sensemaking-in-organizations-foundations-for-organizational-science/

Hofstede, Geert, York, N., Louis, S., Francisco, S., Lisbon, C., Delhi, N., Paris, P., Juan, S., & Paulo, S. (1991). *Cultures and Organizations Software of the mind MpGRAW-HILL BOOK COMPANY*.

Ika, L. A. (2009). Project Success as a Topic in Project Management Journals: *Https://Doi.Org/10.1002/Pmj.20137*, *40*(4), 6–19. https://doi.org/10.1002/PMJ.20137

Ika, L. A., Diallo, A., & Thuillier, D. (2012). Critical success factors for World Bank projects: An empirical investigation. *International Journal of Project Management*, *30*(1), 105–116. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.IJPROMAN.2011.03.005

Iyer, K. C., & Jha, K. N. (2006). Critical Factors Affecting Schedule Performance: Evidence from Indian Construction Projects. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, *132*(8), 871–881. https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)0733-9364(2006)132:8(871)

Jehn, K. A. (1995). A Multimethod Examination of the Benefits and Detriments of Intragroup Conflict. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *40*(2), 256. https://doi.org/10.2307/2393638

Jehn, K. A., & Bendersky, C. (2003). INTRAGROUP CONFLICT IN ORGANIZATIONS: A CONTINGENCY PERSPECTIVE ON THE CONFLICT-OUTCOME RELATIONSHIP. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *25*, 187–242. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-

3085(03)25005-X

Jehn, K. A., & Chatman, J. A. (2000). The influence of proportional and perceptual conflict composition on team performance. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, *11*(1), 56–73. https://doi.org/10.1108/EB022835/FULL/XML

Jelodar, M. B., Yiu, T. W., & Wilkinson, S. (2016). A conceptualisation of relationship quality in construction procurement. *International Journal of Project Management*, *34*(6), 997–1011. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.IJPROMAN.2016.03.005

Jiang, W., Lu, Y., & Le, Y. (2016). Trust and Project Success: A Twofold Perspective between Owners and Contractors. *Journal of Management in Engineering*, *32*(6), 04016022. https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)ME.1943-5479.0000469

Jordan, P. J., Ashkanasy, N. M., Härtel, C. E. J., & Hooper, G. S. (2002). Workgroup emotional intelligence: Scale development and relationship to team process effectiveness and goal focus. *Human Resource Management Review*, *12*(2), 195–214. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822(02)00046-3

Jordan, P. J., Dasborough, M. T., Daus, C. S., & Ashkanasy, N. M. (2010). A Call to Context. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, *3*(2), 145–148. https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1754-9434.2010.01215.X

Jordan, P. J., & Troth, A. C. (2009). Managing Emotions During Team Problem Solving: Emotional Intelligence and Conflict Resolution. *Https://Doi.Org/10.1207/S15327043hup1702_4*, *17*(2), 195–218. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327043HUP1702_4

Joseph, O. O., & Kibera, F. (2019). Organizational Culture and Performance: Evidence From Microfinance Institutions in Kenya: *Https://Doi.Org/10.1177/2158244019835934*, *9*(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019835934

Jugdev, K., & Müller, R. (2006). A retrospective look at our evolving understanding of project success. *IEEE Engineering Management Review*. https://www.academia.edu/2882994/A_retrospective_look_at_our_evolving_understanding_of_project_success

Karimi, L., Leggat, S. G., Donohue, L., Farrell, G., & Couper, G. E. (2014). Emotional rescue: the role of emotional intelligence and emotional labour on well-being and job-stress among community nurses. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, *70*(1), 176–186. https://doi.org/10.1111/JAN.12185

Karlsen, J. T. (2008). Forming relationships with stakeholders in engineering projects. *European Journal of Industrial Engineering*, *2*(1), 35–49. https://ideas.repec.org/a/ids/eujine/v2y2008i1p35-49.html

Kaufmann, L., & Wagner, C. M. (2017). Affective diversity and emotional intelligence in cross-functional sourcing teams. *Journal of Purchasing and Supply Management*, *23*(1), 5–16. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.PURSUP.2016.07.004

Khan, I. U., Usoro, A., & Majewski, G. (2012). An Organisational Culture Model for Comparative Studies and Assessment of IT Projects. *International Journal of Human Capital and Information Technology Professionals*, *3*(2), 63–83. https://doi.org/10.4018/JHCITP.2012040105

Khosravi, P., Newton, C., & Rezvani, A. (2019). Management innovation: A systematic review and meta-analysis of past decades of research. *European Management Journal*, *37*(6), 694–707. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.EMJ.2019.03.003

Kirchoff, J. F., Omar, A., & Fugate, B. S. (2016). A Behavioral Theory of Sustainable Supply Chain Management Decision Making in Non-exemplar Firms. *Journal of Supply Chain Management*, *52*(1), 41–65. https://doi.org/10.1111/JSCM.12098

Klotz, A. C., Hmieleski, K. M., Bradley, B. H., & Busenitz, L. W. (2013). New Venture Teams: A Review of the Literature and Roadmap for Future Research. *Https://Doi.Org/10.1177/0149206313493325*, *40*(1), 226–255. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206313493325

Lau, R. S., & Cobb, A. T. (2010). Understanding the connections between relationship conflict and performance: The intervening roles of trust and exchange. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *31*(6), 898–917. https://doi.org/10.1002/JOB.674

Lee, C., & Wong, C. S. (2019). The effect of team emotional intelligence on team process and

effectiveness. *Journal of Management and Organization*, *25*(6), 844–859. https://doi.org/10.1017/JMO.2017.43

Lencioni, P. M. (2002). *Make Your Values Mean Something*.

Lesko, C. J., & Hollingsworth, Y. (2010). Number 1 View project Immersive Technologies View project. *Journal of Cybersecurity Education, Research and Practice, 2019*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/275580326

Ley, T., & Albert, D. (2003). Identifying Employee Competencies in Dynamic Work Domains: Methodological Considerations and a Case Study. *Undefined*. https://doi.org/10.3217/JUCS-009-12-1500

Lim, C. S., & Mohamed, M. Z. (1999). Criteria of project success: an exploratory re-examination. *International Journal of Project Management*, *17*(4), 243–248. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0263-7863(98)00040-4

Lin, C. P., Wang, C. C., Chen, S. C., & Chen, J. Y. (2019). Modeling leadership and team performance: The mediation of collective efficacy and the moderation of team justice. *Personnel Review*, *48*(2), 471–491. https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-10-2017-0313/FULL/XML

Lindsjørn, Y., Sjøberg, D. I. K., Dingsøyr, T., Bergersen, G. R., & Dybå, T. (2016). Teamwork quality and project success in software development: A survey of agile development teams. *Journal of Systems and Software*, *122*, 274–286. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JSS.2016.09.028

Liu, J. Y. C., Chiang, J. C., Yang, M. H., & Klein, G. (2011). Partnering effects on user–developer conflict and role ambiguity in information system projects. *Information and Software Technology*, *53*(7), 722–729. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.INFSOF.2011.01.002

Lui, S. S., Ngo, H. Y., & Hon, A. H. Y. (2006). Coercive strategy in interfirm cooperation: Mediating roles of interpersonal and interorganizational trust. *Journal of Business Research*, *59*(4), 466–474. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JBUSRES.2005.09.001

Maqbool, R., Sudong, Y., Manzoor, N., & Rashid, Y. (2017). The Impact of Emotional Intelligence, Project Managers' Competencies, and Transformational Leadership on Project Success: An Empirical Perspective: *Https://Doi.Org/10.1177/875697281704800304*, *48*(3), 58–75. https://doi.org/10.1177/875697281704800304

Massey, G. R., & Dawes, P. L. (2007). Personal characteristics, trust, conflict, and effectiveness in marketing/sales working relationships. *European Journal of Marketing*, *41*(9–10), 1117–1145. https://doi.org/10.1108/03090560710773372/FULL/XML

Maurer, I. (2010). How to build trust in inter-organizational projects: The impact of project staffing and project rewards on the formation of trust, knowledge acquisition and product innovation. *International Journal of Project Management*, *28*(7), 629–637. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.IJPROMAN.2009.11.006

Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., Caruso, D. R., & Cherkasskiy, L. (2011). *Emotional Intelligence*.

Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An Integrative Model of Organizational Trust. *The Academy of Management Review*, *20*(3), 709. https://doi.org/10.2307/258792

Mazur, A., Pisarski, A., Chang, A., & Ashkanasy, N. M. (2014). Rating defence major project success: The role of personal attributes and stakeholder relationships. *International Journal of Project Management*, *32*(6), 944–957. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.IJPROMAN.2013.10.018

McClure, R. E. (2010). The influence of organizational culture and conflict on market orientation. *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing*, *25*(7), 514–524. https://doi.org/10.1108/08858621011077745

Mir, F. A., & Pinnington, A. H. (2014). Exploring the value of project management: Linking Project Management Performance and Project Success. *International Journal of Project Management*, *32*(2), 202–217. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.IJPROMAN.2013.05.012

Müller, R., & Turner, J. R. (2007). Matching the project manager's leadership style to project type. *International Journal of Project Management*, *25*(1), 21–32. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.IJPROMAN.2006.04.003

Mullins, L. J. (2005). *Management and organisational behaviour* (7th ed.). Prentice Hall/Financial Times.

O'Neill, T. A., Allen, N. J., & Hastings, S. E. (2013). Examining the "Pros" and "Cons" of Team Conflict: A Team-Level Meta-Analysis of Task, Relationship, and Process Conflict. *Http://Dx.Doi.Org/10.1080/08959285.2013.795573*, *26*(3), 236–260. https://doi.org/10.1080/08959285.2013.795573

Odiakaose ODOR, H. (2018). Organisational Culture and Dynamics. *International Journal of Scientific Research and Management*, *6*(01). https://doi.org/10.18535/IJSRM/V6I1.EM05

Oluwafemi, D., & Idowu, E. (2016). Understanding Organisational Culture and Organisational Performance: Are They Two Sides of the Same Coin? *Journal of Management Research*, *9*(1), 12–21. https://doi.org/10.5296/JMR.V9I1.10261

Pinjani, P., & Palvia, P. (2013). Trust and knowledge sharing in diverse global virtual teams. *Information & Management*, *50*(4), 144–153. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.IM.2012.10.002

Pinto, J. K., & Slevin, D. P. (1987). CRITICAL FACTORS IN SUCCESSFUL PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*, *EM-34*(1), 22–27. https://doi.org/10.1109/TEM.1987.6498856

Pinto, J. K., Slevin, D. P., & English, B. (2009). Trust in projects: An empirical assessment of owner/contractor relationships. *International Journal of Project Management*, *27*(6), 638–648. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.IJPROMAN.2008.09.010

PM, K., & RW, W. (2019). Corporate culture and organizational performance: A case of Mayfair casino, Nairobi city county, Kenya. *Global Journal of Commerce & Management Perspective*, *8*(1), 8–17. https://www.longdom.org/articles/corporate-culture-and-organizational-performance-a-case-of-mayfair-casino-nairobi-city-county-kenya-18105.html

Rapisarda, B. A. (2002). THE IMPACT OF EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE ON WORK TEAM COHESIVENESS AND PERFORMANCE. *The International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, *10*(4), 363–379. https://doi.org/10.1108/EB028958

Rezvani, A., Chang, A., Wiewiora, A., Ashkanasy, N. M., Jordan, P. J., & Zolin, R. (2016). Manager emotional intelligence and project success: The mediating role of job satisfaction and trust. *International Journal of Project Management*, *34*(7), 1112–1122. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.IJPROMAN.2016.05.012

Rezvani, A., Khosravi, P., & Ashkanasy, N. M. (2018). Examining the interdependencies among emotional intelligence, trust, and performance in infrastructure projects: A multilevel study. *International Journal of Project Management*, *36*(8), 1034–1046.

https://doi.org/10.1016/J.IJPROMAN.2018.08.002

Rezvani, A., Khosravi, P., & Dong, L. (2017). Motivating users toward continued usage of information systems: Self-determination theory perspective. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *76*, 263–275. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.CHB.2017.07.032

Salehipour, A., & Ah, A. (2018). The Impact of Organizational Culture and Performance Work System on Employees' Performance. *International Business Research*, *11*(6). https://doi.org/10.5539/ibr.v11n6p199

Schein, E. H. (1985). Organizational culture and leadership. In *Organizational Culture & Leadership* (1st ed.). Jossey-Bass Publishers. http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bth&AN=15590926&site=ehost-live

Selecting a measure of emotional intelligence: The case for ability scales. - PsycNET. (n.d.). Retrieved January 3, 2022, from https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2001-00355-015

Shapiro, D. L., Furst, S. A., Spreitzer, G. M., & Von Glinow, M. A. (2002). Transnational teams in the electronic age: Are team identity and high performance at risk? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *23*(SPEC. ISS.), 455–467. https://doi.org/10.1002/JOB.149

Sheldon, O. J., Dunning, D., & Ames, D. R. (2014). Emotionally unskilled, unaware, and uninterested in learning more: Reactions to feedback about deficits in emotional intelligence. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *99*(1), 125–137. https://doi.org/10.1037/A0034138

Shenhar, A. J., Dvir, D., Levy, O., & Maltz, A. C. (2001). Project success: A multidimensional strategic concept. *Long Range Planning*, *34*(6), 699–725. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0024-6301(01)00097-8

Shenhar, A. J., Levy, O., & Dvir, D. (1997). Mapping the Dimensions of Project Success. *Project Management Journal : PMJ*, *28*(2).

Simons, T. L., & Peterson, R. S. (2000). Task conflict and relationship conflict in top management teams: The pivotal role of intragroup trust. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *85*(1), 102–111. https://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.85.1.102

Smircich, L. (1983). Concepts of Culture and Organizational Analysis. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *28*(3), 339. https://doi.org/10.2307/2392246

Stanczyk, A., Foerstl, K., Busse, C., & Blome, C. (2015). Global Sourcing Decision-Making Processes: Politics, Intuition, and Procedural Rationality. *Journal of Business Logistics*, *36*(2), 160–181. https://doi.org/10.1111/JBL.12090

Steffens, P., Terjesen, S., & Davidsson, P. (2011). Birds of a feather get lost together: new venture team composition and performance. *Small Business Economics 2011 39:3*, *39*(3), 727–743. https://doi.org/10.1007/S11187-011-9358-Z

Stephens, J. P., & Carmeli, A. (2016). The positive effect of expressing negative emotions on knowledge creation capability and performance of project teams. *International Journal of Project Management*, *34*(5), 862–873. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.IJPROMAN.2016.03.003

Strahorn, S., Gajendran, T., & Brewer, G. (2015). The influence of trust in traditional contracting: Investigating the "lived experience" of stakeholders. *Construction Economics and Building*, *15*(2), 81–101. https://doi.org/10.5130/AJCEB.V15I2.4408

Todorović, M. L., Petrović, D. T., Mihić, M. M., Obradović, V. L., & Bushuyev, S. D. (2015). Project success analysis framework: A knowledge-based approach in project management. *International Journal of Project Management*, *33*(4), 772–783. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.IJPROMAN.2014.10.009

Toor, S. ur R., & Ogunlana, S. O. (2010). Beyond the 'iron triangle': Stakeholder perception of key performance indicators (KPIs) for large-scale public sector development projects. *International Journal of Project Management*, *28*(3), 228–236. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.IJPROMAN.2009.05.005

Troth, A. C., Jordan, P. J., Lawrence, S. A., & Tse, H. H. M. (2012). A multilevel model of emotional skills, communication performance, and task performance in teams. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *33*(5), 700–722. https://doi.org/10.1002/JOB.785

Turner, J. R., & Müller, R. (2005). The Project Manager's Leadership Style as a Success Factor on Projects: A Literature Review. *Undefined*, *36*(2), 49–61. https://doi.org/10.1177/875697280503600206

Turner, R., & Zolin, R. (2012). Forecasting Success on Large Projects: Developing Reliable Scales to Predict Multiple Perspectives by Multiple Stakeholders over Multiple Time Frames: *Https://Doi.Org/10.1002/Pmj.21289*, *43*(5), 87–99. https://doi.org/10.1002/PMJ.21289

Umrani, W. A., Shah, S. M. M., Memon, P. A., & Samo, A. H. (2017). Organizational Culture and Business Performance: An Empirical Investigation in the Pakistani Context. *International Journal of Academic Research in Economics and Management Sciences*, *6*(1). https://doi.org/10.6007/IJAREMS/V6-I1/2575

Urda, J., & Loch, C. H. (2013). Social preferences and emotions as regulators of behavior in processes. *Journal of Operations Management*, *31*(1–2), 6–23. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JOM.2012.11.007

Vanaelst, I., Clarysse, B., Wright, M., Lockett, A., Moray, N., & S'Jegers, R. (2017). Entrepreneurial Team Development in Academic Spinouts: An Examination of Team Heterogeneity: *Https://Doi.Org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2006.00120.X*, *30*(2), 249–271. https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1540-6520.2006.00120.X

Vaux, J. S., & Kirk, W. M. (2018). Relationship Conflict in Construction Management: Performance and Productivity Problem. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, *144*(6), 04018032. https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)CO.1943-7862.0001478

Walker, A. (n.d.). *Project management in construction*. Retrieved December 31, 2021, from https://www.wiley.com/en-us/Project+Management+in+Construction%2C+6th+Edition-p-9781118500392

Webber, S. S., & Klimoski, R. J. (2004). Client–project manager engagements, trust, and loyalty. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *25*(8), 997–1013. https://doi.org/10.1002/JOB.294

Westerveld, E. (2003). The Project Excellence Model®: linking success criteria and critical success factors. *International Journal of Project Management*, *21*(6), 411–418. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0263-7863(02)00112-6

Wiewiora, A., Murphy, G., Trigunarsyah, B., & Brown, K. (2014). Interactions between Organizational Culture, Trustworthiness, and Mechanisms for Inter-Project Knowledge

Sharing: *Https://Doi.Org/10.1002/Pmj.21407*, *45*(2), 48–65. https://doi.org/10.1002/PMJ.21407

Wu, G., Liu, C., Zhao, X., & Zuo, J. (2017). Investigating the relationship between communication-conflict interaction and project success among construction project teams. *International Journal of Project Management*, *35*(8), 1466–1482. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.IJPROMAN.2017.08.006

Yeung, J. F., Chan, A. P., & Chan, D. W. (2009). Developing a Performance Index for Relationship-Based Construction Projects in Australia: Delphi Study. *Journal of Management in Engineering*, *25*(2), 59–68. https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)0742-597X(2009)25:2(59)

Zand, D. E. (1972). Trust and Managerial Problem Solving. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *17*(2), 229. https://doi.org/10.2307/2393957

Zhang, L., & Fan, W. (2013). Improving performance of construction projects: A project manager's emotional intelligence approach. *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management*, *20*(2), 195–207. https://doi.org/10.1108/09699981311303044/FULL/XML

Zhang, L., & Huo, X. (2015). The impact of interpersonal conflict on construction project performance: A moderated mediation study from China. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, *26*(4), 479–498. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCMA-09-2014-0072

Zhou, N., Zhuang, G., & Yip, L. S. chung. (2007). Perceptual difference of dependence and its impact on conflict in marketing channels in China: An empirical study with two-sided data. *Industrial Marketing Management*, *36*(3), 309–321. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.INDMARMAN.2005.10.001

Zwikael, O., & Meredith, J. (2021). Evaluating the Success of a Project and the Performance of Its Leaders. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*, *68*(6), 1745–1757. https://doi.org/10.1109/TEM.2019.2925057