

Trust is good, control is better

An explorative research about the relationship between trust and autonomy of a project team on the change capacity of the project team and the role of intrinsic motivation

Master Thesis, MSc BA Change Management

University of Groningen, Faculty of Economics and Business

January 2015

Lucas van Leeuwen

Student number: 1835556

Supervisor:

Dr. J. Rupert

Co-assessor:

Dr. J.F.J. Vos

ABSTRACT

Project goals are always not met due to the ambiguity regarding the responsibilities of the project team members towards the project. These responsibilities can be linked to the trust and the autonomy that a project team experiences from the line organization. To better understand this ambiguity, this study aimed to explore the mechanism between the experienced trust and autonomy of a project team and the change capacity of the project team. This research was conducted by making use of qualitative research, hence a multiple case study. Data was obtained from a total of 33 interviews among five different projects in the infrastructural context. Results indicated that intrinsic motivation is functioning as a mechanism between the experienced autonomy of a project team and their change capacity, whereas both intrinsic motivation and self-confidence are functioning as mechanisms between the experienced trust of a project team and the change capacity of the team. Intrinsic motivation was in this study not solely based upon enjoyable and interesting work, yet a pro-active attitude towards work arose as a possible new concept of intrinsic motivation.

Word count (incl. appendices): 26.033

Keywords: Change; autonomy; trust; intrinsic motivation; project team; line organization; change capacity.

Acknowledgements

There are a number of people from whom I have received a great deal of support throughout the process of writing this thesis that I would like to express my gratitude to. First of all, I would like to thank my thesis supervisor dr. Joyce Rupert for her feedback and guidance. Secondly, I would like to thank Maarten Kraneveld for providing an opportunity to meet very interesting people that I have interviewed during this study. I would also like to thank all project managers, project team members, and members from the line organizations for their time and contribution. Finally, many thanks to my girlfriend, brother, and parents for their support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	2
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	5
2.1 The concept of organizational change during infrastructural projects	5
2.2 Autonomy	6
2.3 Intrinsic motivation	7
2.4 Relationship autonomy and motivation	8
2.5 Trust	9
2.6 Relationship trust and motivation	10
3. METHODOLOGY	12
3.1 Research design	12
3.2 Case selection criteria	13
3.3 Case description	13
3.4 Purposive sample	13
3.5 Data collection procedure.....	14
3.6 Actual sample.....	16
3.7 Measures.....	16
3.8 Data analysis	18
4. RESULTS.....	19
4.1 Project V.....	19
4.2 Project W.....	25
4.3 Project X.....	30
4.4 Project Y	35
4.5 Project Z	40
4.6 Cross-case analysis.....	46
5. CONCLUSION & DISCUSSION	49
5.1 General conclusion.....	49
5.2 Practical implications	52
5.3 Limitations & suggestions for future research.....	53
REFERENCES	55
APPENDICES	i
APPENDIX A Information form	ii

APPENDIX B	Interview start-up	iv
APPENDIX C	Interview protocol project organization	v
APPENDIX D	Interview protocol line organization.....	vii
APPENDIX E	Coding scheme	x

1. INTRODUCTION

Our tax money is unnecessarily lost. Public projects' goals are not met as a result of the fragmentation of the project chain (Dusseldorp, Van der Put & Rupert, 2012). In the contemporary turbulent environment, organizations are enduringly seeking for cooperation with other organizations. It is no longer an exception that these kinds of cooperation are often ventilated by project teams consisting of employees of several participating organizations. In the infrastructural context, the situation is no different. The length of a project in the infrastructural environment can (due to e.g. the size of the project, politics), take up to several years or even decades. During such a project, many stakeholders have to be dealt with by the project manager (Wang & Ko, 2012). Furthermore, the project's progress is often determined by a great amount of factors, either directly or indirectly influencing the project. These projects are therefore highly subject to change. In order to efficaciously manage projects like these, a steady relationship between the contractor and the client is often perceived to be a key factor of success (Dusseldorp et al., 2012). Moreover, multiple studies have emphasized trust as an essential factor for inter-organizational collaboration in the infrastructure (Fischer, 2004; Ngowi & Pienaar, 2005; Love, Mistry, & Davis, 2010).

Trust is also seen as an important factor due to the 'level playing field'. Over the last couple of years, project teams have been subjected to changes in several ways. Within the European Union, legislation to promote the free market has for instance initiated a competition element that has accelerated trends towards fragmentation (Pries & Kuhlman, 2010). This has led to equal opportunities regarding public tenders, also referred to as 'level playing field', which hinders long-term relationships between different parties. The concept of trust is therefore of essential importance during the start of a project (Dusseldorp et al., 2012). The 'level playing field' also results in parties competing with one another to obtain certain contracts. Since employees are generally becoming more specialized, projects are progressively consisting of phases in which different specialized employees contribute. This leads to employees being less motivated regarding the project, and thus less motivated to share unique knowledge and to think of innovative solutions (Bronder & Pritzl, 1992). Moreover, there is the risk that the members are only feeling responsible for the part of the project he or she has been assigned to (Dusseldorp et al., 2012).

Since 2006, the infrastructural sector has been characterized by the presence of Integrated Project Management (IPM) teams, consisting of five employees, usually originating from different organizations yet working together for the mutual project for the duration of the project (Integraal

projectmanagement, 2012). These teams are characterized by clear objectives and tasks for each of its members during each of the project phases. In essence, these teams should experience autonomy – or freedom to make own decisions - from the line to a high degree because of the pre-established rules and instructions. In the current context, these IPM teams are being controlled by the line organization, whose task also consist of setting up these projects. In a study by Van den Broeck, Vansteenkiste, De Witte, Lens & Andriessen (2009), besides a personal preference for a certain goal, the environment can also promote and influence the intrinsic motivation of human beings. As aforementioned, a project team in the infrastructural sector has to deal with many factors and parties that are capable of influencing the project. One of these parties that can influence the project (team) concerns the line. This relationship may induce tensions and misunderstandings due to the influence that the line has on the project team. Tensions might also occur since project managers and project team members may not always agree with the line, yet a low degree of autonomy or even lack of autonomy forces them to just do what they have been told. In addition, the aforementioned trust may play an important role on the intrinsic motivation of the project team members towards the project. Therefore, in addition to previous research by Van den Broeck et al. (2009), the intrinsic motivation towards the project by the project team members might be influenced by the experienced trust and the experienced autonomy from other parties, in casu the line.

1.1 Aim of this research

Due to the (new) project teams – IPM teams – and the newness regarding studying the relationship between the project team and the line organization, this research aims to investigate the influence of the relationship between project organization and line organization on the intrinsic motivation of IPM project team members towards the project. In more detail, this study aims to investigate how trust and autonomy relate to the intrinsic motivation of project team members towards the project. Furthermore, this study investigates how the intrinsic motivation relates to how the project team deals with change(s). In order to achieve this, a case study will be performed within several projects operating in the infrastructural context. This study was therefore conducted at Neerlands diep, an organization which is specialized in training project managers in achieving maximum efficiency of projects.

1.2 Significance of the study

The significance of this study consists of studying a new phenomenon in the infrastructural project team context, namely the relationship between the project team and the line, with a focus on how

trust and autonomy from the line influences the team motivation. Because of the lack of knowledge and experience in the field and the lack of literature regarding the relationship how intrinsic motivation is related to the change capacity of the project team, this study investigates both the theoretical as well as the practical 'gap' regarding this phenomenon. Furthermore, the significance of this study consists of exploring the mechanism between the experienced trust and autonomy of project team members and how the project team deals with change(s). By conducting research in an infrastructural context, where projects have a high chance of being exposed to one or multiple changes (e.g. organizational or political), the dynamic perspective may also show more insight into how this relationship may be affected over time.

1.3 Research question and sub questions

On the premises of the aforementioned, the main research question has been formulated: *"How do autonomy and trust of a project team associate with the intrinsic motivation towards the project and how is this intrinsic motivation associated with the change capacity of a project team?"*.

In order to answer the aforementioned question, the following sub questions have been established:

1. *How much autonomy does the project team experience from the line and how is this degree of team autonomy associated with the intrinsic motivation towards the project?*
2. *How much trust does the project team experience from the line and how is this experienced trust associated with the intrinsic motivation towards the project?*
3. *How is the intrinsic motivation of a project team associated with the change capacity of the project team?*

1.4 Outline of this study

This report is structured as follows. The next chapter (chapter 2) comprises a literature review, which will provide the reader with more insights about the concept of change capacity, autonomy, trust, (intrinsic) motivation, and related theories. Subsequently, the methodology chapter (chapter 3) will provide the reader with an overview of the applied methods in this study. The results of this study are presented in chapter 4. In chapter 5, the conclusion and discussion, the results will subsequently be linked to existing literature and conclusions will be drawn. In this chapter, the limitations and suggestions for further research are outlined as well.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter highlights *the concepts of change capacity, autonomy, trust, intrinsic motivation, and related theories*. To begin with, the concept of organizational change during infrastructural projects will be presented complemented with a definition of change capacity. Then, an elaboration of autonomy and trust will be presented which will be linked to intrinsic motivation.

2.1 The concept of organizational change during infrastructural projects

In today's complex business environment, the requests and expectations of project owners and all other stakeholders of a project change constantly (Wang & Ko, 2012). The influence of these unexpected changes in a project's scope on project team performance cannot be overlooked. One of the factors that has impact on whether or not and how often a project team is faced with change is the length of the project. The duration of a project is also dependent upon several conditions (e.g. deadlines). Project teams that work in the infrastructural sector can work several decades on the project. With a time span that long, the project team will be hindered by change(s) during the length of the project.

For project teams working for the infrastructural sector, there are several changes that a project team most likely will have to face. These changes do not necessarily express themselves coming from the organization who controls the project (team), changes coming from stakeholders, political changes, changing from the public or private sector are all possible changes that a project team in the infrastructural sector may have to cope with. In this study, the focus will lie at how the autonomy and trust that a project team is given is associated with the intrinsic motivation, and how the intrinsic motivation is related to the change capacity of the project team.

2.1.1 Change capacity

Not many definitions of change capacity exist in the current literature. According to Bennebroek Gravenhorst, Werkman and Boonstra (2003), change capacity refers to "...the degree to which aspects of an organization and aspects of a change process contribute to or hinder change" (p. 86). According to these authors, the change capacity is dependent upon both aspects of the organization (in terms of goals and strategy, structure, culture, technology, job characteristics, and power relations) and aspects of the change process (design and management of the change processes). Change capacity can be seen as an ability of an organization or team to change not just once, but as a normal course of events in response to change(s). Because of the highly dynamic environment an infrastructural project is working in and the degree of being autonomous, the change capacity of the project team is more related to concepts such as flexibility and creativity, because of the plurality of

changes a project in an infrastructural environment is subject to. As Gagné, Koestner and Zuckerman (2000) concluded in their research, employees who were satisfied in their three psychological needs (competence, relatedness, and autonomy) were more accepting towards organizational change. This implies that these employees were more capable of accepting organizational change. In a later study by Lynch, Plant and Ryan (2005) this finding was echoed. Therefore, it is suggested that employees whose need for autonomy and trust are satisfied are more capable of dealing with changes.

2.2 Autonomy

The literature provides several definitions for the concept of autonomy. For example, DeCharms (1968) and Deci (1971) define autonomy as the desire to be psychologically free to act. Karasek (1979) defines autonomy in terms of decision space and control capabilities, whereas Hackman and Oldham (1976) define construed autonomy with personal freedom and independence. In this study, the term that will be used to describe autonomy is a more detailed definition of autonomy by Hackman and Oldham (1980). According to these authors, the term autonomy tends to be used to refer to “the degree to which the job provides substantial freedom, independence, and discretion to the individual in scheduling the work and in determining the procedure to be used in carrying it out” (p. 79). Autonomy is thus the degree to which a person has the freedom to decide how to perform his or her tasks.

The extent to act autonomously is firmly impacted by several factors. One of these factors concerns social environments (Ryan, Williams, Patrick & Deci, 2009). These social environments can vary from being controlling and forced to an environment that is in support of autonomy. According to Ryan et al. (2009), a person’s autonomy may be comprised by the imposition of controlling reward or punishment contingences, whereas the extent to act autonomously can be facilitated when others appreciate a person’s frame of reference. To use this as an example in the current study, a project team whose members have no influence at all on the project but only have to work as been told faces low autonomy, whereas a project team that is able to make changes and see these changes be implemented experiences high autonomy.

The effects of experiencing high or low autonomy have been highlighted in the literature (e.g. Deci & Ryan, 2000; Ryan, Deci, Grolnick & LaGuardia, 2006). Autonomy can lead to a profusion of reactions in human beings. Both lack of autonomy as well as being autonomous may affect the way that employees behave in several aspects. Being autonomous, one experiences several advantages such as employees being less likely to adopt a “this is not my job” approach to their work environment and instead are proactive and creative (Morgeson, Delaney-Klinger & Hemingway, 2005; Parker, Wall & Jackson, 1997). Another important advantage is that the greater the relative

autonomy of one's behaviors the more likely the person is to persist in the face of obstacles, to perform better, and to have a positive experience in relation to the activity (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Ryan et al., 2006). Additionally, being autonomous can also lead to an increase in motivation at work and enhancement of company success due to employees working more effectively. On the contrary, lack of autonomy may result in low motivation and not feeling a part of the organization. Therefore, the level of experienced autonomy can lead to certain behaviors or mindsets.

One of the associations that autonomy has been linked to in the existing literature is the concept of motivation (e.g. Hackman & Oldham, 1976; 1980). According to the Job Characteristics Model (JCM) (Hackman & Oldham, 1976; 1980), it is prescribed that autonomy affects a psychological state, the experienced responsibility. In turn, this responsibility (or responsibilities) leads to three outcomes according to the JCM. These outcomes consist of high motivation, high performance, and high satisfaction towards the job.

2.3 Intrinsic motivation

Motivation has been linked to being of essential importance within organizations since it contributes to good business results (Pinder, 2008). There are multiple theories regarding motivation that might explain the relationship between autonomy and motivation (e.g. Expectancy-Value Theory by Vroom, 1964; Regulatory Focus Theory by Higgins, 1997) yet the Self-Determination Theory (SDT) (Ryan & Deci, 2000) is most suitable in this study for the following reason: The SDT focuses on the quality of motivation, whereas the Regulatory Focus Theory (Higgins, 1997) and the Expectancy-Value Theory (Vroom, 1964) both focus on the amount of quantitative motivation. For this research however, it is not about the amount of motivation, yet the quality – in casu, intrinsic – motivation.

The SDT investigates people's inherent growth tendencies and innate psychological needs that are the basis for their self-motivation, as well as for the conditions that foster these positive processes (Ryan, Kuhl & Deci, 1997). Over the last decade, this theory has become very popular in the context of work (e.g. Gagné & Deci, 2005). In the SDT, a distinction is made between two forms of motivation. Intrinsic motivation describes the innate propensity to pursue interesting tasks that challenge one's skills and foster growth (Deci & Ryan, 1985). Intrinsic motivation exists in the relationship between individuals and activities. More specifically, being intrinsically motivated pertains to being engaged in an activity because of the inherent pleasures and satisfaction that this activity brings along (Ryan et al., 2009). On the contrary, engaging in activities when extrinsically motivated is not often perceived as fun and enjoyable as this is the case while being intrinsically motivated (Ryan et al., 2009). For this study, the intrinsic form motivation resembles the motivation of the project team members towards the project.

2.4 Relationship autonomy and motivation

A basic tenet of SDT is that in order to have a high quality of motivation, a person needs to experience specific psychological needs (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Ryan, 1995). In a sub theory of the SDT called Basic Psychological Needs Theory (BPNT), it is proposed that there are three basic needs to be considered: The need for competence, autonomy, and relatedness. Satisfying all needs is no stipulation in order to be optimally motivated, however, research shows ambiguous results regarding these needs (e.g. Ilardi, Leone, Kasser & Ryan, 1993). Unfortunately, to this day it is not yet fully self-explanatory which factor or factors in the social context facilitate or undermine intrinsic motivation for an activity or area of endeavor (Ryan, Rigby & Pryzbylski, 2006). For that reason, this study will investigate the social context, in casu the relationship between the project organization and the line organization and how this relationship is associated with intrinsic motivation of project team members towards the project.

According to the SDT, in order to experience autonomy, it is not important to control everything yourself, however, being able to function without pressure from anyone else is what is essential in order to experience autonomy (Van den Broeck et al., 2009). This feeling of psychological freedom can be established when employees are given the opportunity to make decisions and whether they are able to make choices regarding an important decision. Besides, experiencing autonomy can also be established when tasks are being assigned on an empathic manner and with 'sufficient' responsibilities (Van den Broeck et al., 2009). These responsibilities lead to the experience of autonomy since it gives the person (or team) a feeling of functioning without pressure.

Numerous studies have shown that employees who feel autonomous and competent perform better than colleagues of whom their needs were not or not sufficiently satisfied. For example, research has shown that the former employees are more satisfied with their work (e.g. Ilardi et al., 1993). Research has shown that the needs for autonomy and competence are being satisfied in a generally supportive working environment (Deci, Ryan, Gagné, Leone, Usunov & Kornazheva, 2001; Gagné, 2003). These needs are also satisfied when executives behave empathic, offer choices, provide information and supportive initiatives (Baard, Deci & Ryan, 2004; Deci, Connell & Ryan, 1989). In the current study, this would imply that when the relationship between project management and line management is based on support, this will satisfy the need for autonomy and competence. The satisfaction of both needs may contribute in (more) intrinsic motivation. In sum, the satisfaction of the needs is an important condition for optimal functioning of employees, both in terms of welfare, positive attitudes as well as cooperative and productive behavior (Van den Broeck et al., 2009). This leads to the following sub question:

Sub question 1: *How much autonomy does the project team experience from the line and how is this degree of autonomy associated with the intrinsic motivation towards the project?*

2.5 Trust

The literature provides a plurality of definitions for the concept of trust. In the light of this knowledge, it is important to conceptualize trust. Several definitions of trust are presented in the literature. As Coleman (1990) writes, trust is defined as ‘committing yourself to an exchange without knowing whether the other party will do the same’. Despite the heterogeneity in theoretical orientations and claims that trust has never been precisely defined (Hosmer, 1995) most researchers agree that at its core trust is an expectation concerning the intentions or behaviours of others (Mayer, Davis & Schoorman, 1995; Rousseau, Sitkin, Burt & Camerer, 1998). In the context of the current study, trust refers to an “...attitude of optimism that goodwill and competence will extend to cover the domain of interaction with her, together with the expectation that the one trusted will be directly and favorably moved by the thought that we are counting on her” (Jones, 1996, p.1).

Several studies have indicated that trust is a significant success factor regarding interorganisational conjunction in the infrastructure (Ngowi & Pienaar, 2005; Fischer, 2004). Trust can help to strengthen and improve the relationship between project partners which, in turn, entails a variety of benefits for the project as a whole (Wong, Cheung, Yiu & Pang, 2008). By means of trust, it is possible to facilitate the alignment of partner interests (Atkinson, Crawford & Ward, 2006), enhance the satisfaction of stakeholders (Bresnen & Marshall, 2000) and support the achievement of project goals. Furthermore, trust improves access to knowledge by increasing project partners’ motivation to share knowledge (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998). In the current context, gained trust based upon the relationship between project organization and line organization may result in increased motivation towards the project.

While emphasizing the various benefits of trust, research is well aware of the difficulties in establishing trust in interorganizational projects (Maurer, 2009). The concept of trust rests on mutual expectations and predictions of a collaboration partner’s good intent and behavior (Mayer et al., 1995; Rousseau et al., 1998). However, in the context of a project setting, a lack of prior collaboration experience exists between project partners on which they could ground their expectations and predictions (Gulati, 1995). At the same time, these project partners have limited time and regularly suffer from time pressure throughout the time span of the project (Nordqvist, Hovmark & Zika-Viktorsson, 2004). Research has shown that the needs for autonomy and competence are being satisfied in a generally supportive working environment (Deci et al., 2001; Gagné, 2003). These needs are also satisfied when executives behave empathic, offer choices,

provide information and supportive initiatives (Baard et al., 2004; Deci et al., 1989). In the current study, this would imply that when the relationship between project management and line management is based on support, this will satisfy the need for autonomy and competence. The satisfaction of both needs may contribute in (more) intrinsic motivation.

2.6 Relationship trust and motivation

When people are constantly checked, put under pressure, or curtailed in their freedom, then this occurs often at the expense of the job satisfaction which leads to a decrease in intrinsic motivation (Bijlsma-Frankema, 2007). This is called 'crowding out', and this occurs not only at the expense of intrinsic motivation but also at the expense of creativity and inspiration of the employees (Bijlsma-Frankema, 2007). Most of the research on the effects of environmental effects in intrinsic motivation has focused on the issue of autonomy versus control rather than that of competence.

According to the Basic Psychological Needs Theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000), the three needs (competence, autonomy, and relatedness) contribute to being optimally motivated. Research by Deci et al. (2001) and Gagné (2003) has shown that the needs for autonomy and competence are being satisfied in a generally supportive working environment. The need for competence is defined as the desire to deal effectively with the environment (Deci & Ryan, 2000) which is similar to the definition of trust used in this study. Therefore, trust contributes to being optimally motivated.

The Cognitive Evaluation Theory (CET) (Deci, 1975) focuses on the determinants of intrinsic motivation. This theory is not concerned with what factor(s) cause intrinsic motivation, yet this theory is concerned with the conditions that facilitate or undermine intrinsic motivation. According to CET, it is argued that certain events or triggers that are perceived to negatively impact a person's experience of autonomy or competence will diminish intrinsic motivation, whereas events that support feelings of autonomy and competence will enhance intrinsic motivation. In this study, this would imply that events or triggers that negatively impact a person's experienced trust will lead to a low degree of intrinsic motivation, whereas events that support feelings of trust will enhance intrinsic motivation. Unfortunately, to this day it is not yet fully self-explanatory which factor or factors in the social context facilitate or undermine intrinsic motivation for an activity or area of endeavor (Ryan et al., 2006). For that reason, this study will investigate the social context, in casu the relationship between the project organization and the line organization and how this relationship is associated with intrinsic motivation of project team members towards the project.

Furthermore, CET specifies that feelings of competence will not maintain or enhance intrinsic motivation unless they are in the context of autonomy (Ryan, 1982; Deci, 1975). Thus, according to CET, people must not only experience competence or efficacy, they must also

experience their behavior as self-determined for intrinsic motivation to be in evidence. This requires either immediate contextual supports for autonomy and competence or abiding inner resources (Reeve, 1996) that are typically the result of prior developmental supports for perceived autonomy and competence. In sum, the CET suggests that social environments can facilitate or forestall intrinsic motivation by supporting versus thwarting people's innate psychological needs.

Both autonomy and competence are experiences that are readily affected by conditions in the social environment. To put this in an example for the current context, while being an active member in a project team may be highly interesting to that member, being controlled from higher members who pressures and orders can easily diminish a person's interest and joy of engagement. In a study about sports, it was found that when coaches or fellow players become critical, it can undermine feelings of competence and autonomy that are the foundations of sustained motivation (Ryan et al., 2009). In the current context, this would imply that when project team members get commented on, their feelings of competence can be diminished and trust can be decreased. Therefore, the relationship between the line management and project management is capable of influencing trust and in turn influence intrinsic motivation.

As specified with CET, autonomy and competence are necessary conditions for intrinsic motivation. In order to act a person needs to experience some level of effectiveness and confidence. Within SDT this sense of competence can be related not only to a person's skills and history within the domain of behavior in focus, but also to aspects of the social environment. Thus, when people around the actor provide meaningful positive feedback, feelings of competence can be enhanced and therefore motivation can be increased. Conversely, when others are critical or supply ongoing negative feedback, feelings of competence diminish and a person's likelihood of becoming discouraged and disengaged is heightened. This would in the current study that when project team members hear positive feedback and experience high trust, they feel more competent in their task(s) and this may result in an increase in intrinsic motivation. On the other hand, when project team members hear negative feedback, the feelings of competence diminish which may result in a heightened likelihood of being discouraged and disengaged. This leads to the following sub question combined with the latter sub question:

Sub question 2: How much trust does the project team experience from the line and how is this degree of trust associated with the intrinsic motivation towards the project?

Sub question 3: How is the intrinsic motivation of a project team associated with the change capacity of the project team?

3. METHODOLOGY

This chapter highlights the key aspects of the methodology applied. These include the description and justification of the research design, selection criteria, the case description and the actual sample. Subsequently, the reader will be provided with the procedure used in this study, followed by measures to obtain data. Furthermore, the reader will be presented with an overview of the tactics applied to increase the validity and reliability of this study. Finally, an overview of the data analysis will be presented.

3.1 Research design

The (current) literature on project organizations abounds with examples of trust and autonomy within a project team operating in a line organization. However, no research has focused on the associations between intrinsic motivation and the change capacity of a project team. The goal of this study is thus to explore how trust and autonomy of a project team within a line organization associate with the intrinsic motivation towards the project and how this form of motivation is associated with the change capacity of the project team. Explorative research was believed to be a feasible method to address this particularity, as it is aimed at developing concepts, hypotheses or a theory (Baarda, De Goede & Teunissen, 2005).

In order to study the aforementioned mechanism, a qualitative research is used in order to obtain an in-depth analysis with recognition to the contextual aspect (Miles & Huberman, 1994) to uncover the meanings that people assign to their experiences (Eisenhardt, 1989; Hignett, 2003). Other reasons that support the use of qualitative research contrary to quantitative research, are the overview of the entire process, understanding the rationale underlying relationships (Baarda et al., 2005), and studying a phenomenon within its own context. In sum, qualitative research, contrarily to quantitative research, is suitable when exploring underlying constructs within its own context where this research focuses on.

Case studies are part of the qualitative spectrum and are often used for the establishment of a new theory (Eisenhardt, 1989). For this study, a multiple case study has been conducted over a single case study to “deepen the understanding of patterns and contingencies related to theory” (p. 10) (Woodside, 2010). This is important, as cross-case comparisons might realize new knowledge and insights regarding the studied phenomenon. A more detailed description of the cases and the data collection measures will be elaborated on in the succeeding sections.

3.2 Case selection criteria

The cases of this study had to meet several criteria. Not only did all cases operate in an infrastructural environment, all cases – projects – were also operating in a line organization, and were thus accountable by a line. In this way, both employees from the project (organization) and the line (organization) could be interviewed. Besides the aforementioned, all projects had to be subject to either planned or emergent change since change capacity of the project team is one of the variables in this study. Since the projects in this research last for several years and are being exposed to multiple changes, this latter criterion was not hard to realize.

3.3 Case description

In order to allow a case study to be realized, one needs to make use of a suitable intermediary. This study was therefore conducted at Neerlands Diep, a company which was assumed to be a suitable partner for the scope of this research. This organization is specialized in training project managers in order to achieve maximum efficiency of the projects where these project managers will be sent to. The focus of this study lies on six different projects that operate under the umbrella of Neerlands Diep. These projects are considered as different cases, because of the different clients and different goals these projects are focusing on.

3.4 Purposive sample

In this study, the purposive sample was aimed at obtaining data from six projects. Of every project, the IPM team in combination with the line was taken as a guidance for obtaining data. As already mentioned in the introduction, IPM teams are fulfilling five roles. For this study, all members of the IPM teams were taken into account. For the projects that did not work with IPM teams, all members of the project teams – with roles similar to that of roles within an IPM team - were taken into account for this study. Regarding the line organization, the two, sometimes three, most relevant employees – i.e. employees that the project team have to report to and have relevant influence on the team - were selected to obtain data from. The choice for the employees from the line organization was made by the project managers of each project since these project managers could give a clear view on to whom the project manager and his team have to report to. In sum, the aim was to obtain data from a total of eight to nine employees per project. This amount would deliver the most credible and reliable information, since every view of employees with a significant involvement in the project is collected within this study (Creswell, 2007).

3.5 Data collection procedure

This research has been conducted in cooperation with two colleagues at Rijksuniversiteit Groningen. Data collection has been a common process, performed by all researchers. Every single researcher has however written his and her own thesis. In order to answer the research question, a suitable source of interview partners needed to be located. By the end of September 2014, a visit was made to Neerlands Diep for a meeting with the manager of “Knowledge & Development”. During this meeting, an overview of the problems between the line organization and the project organization that were perceived by Neerlands Diep were outlined which fit the scope of this study. After discussing this background information, Neerlands Diep has internally assessed the suitability and availability of potential interview partners.

An information form (appendix A) was sent to the projects, containing an explanation of this study. Early November, a list of six projects has been received. This list also contained the names of several associated project managers that responded positively to the inquiry request. The six project managers were contacted by telephone and arrangements were made between the 11th of November and 21st of November 2014 to meet and to understand the relationship between the project and the line. Unfortunately, one project countermanded its participation in this study for unknown reasons. A new project was looked for, but its successor also cancelled its commitment. Five projects remained.

Next, interviews were planned and conducted. As mentioned before, data collection has been carried out by multiple researchers. It is worth noting that serious efforts have been made to verify that the interviews were taken by at least two researchers. Although no research up to this day has studied the influence of multiple researchers in terms of data collection, the author of this study is of the opinion that conducting interviews by two researchers minimizes researcher bias and increases the validity of the study. This is achieved by an extra focus on the interview questions and seeing more possibilities to ask questions. Due to the rather (peripheral) geographic distribution of the interviewees, combined with the heavy schedules of the interview partners, a handful of interviews were conducted by only one researcher. To balance the (lack of) time that interviewees from both the project organization and the line organization had, choices were made which questions – and therefore, which studies – were asked during the interviews.

Every interview was started according to a repeating procedure: A short cover story was held by the researcher(s) about the study, subsequently followed by the remark whether the interviewee had any questions left. Providing the interviewee with a good and clear cover story minimized the chance of bias. Successively, the interviewees were asked whether they allowed the interviews to be recorded. Recording would increase the validity of this study. The interview start-up

that has been used prior to all interviews can be found in appendix B. This procedure also reduced bias. All interviews have started by asking the function of the interviewee, followed by how the relationship between the line organization and the project organization was perceived by the interviewee.

A total of 34 interviews have been held between the 9th of December 2014 and the 6th of January 2015, of which 27 interviews were conducted by the author. An interview lasted on average 57 minutes, whereas the shortest conducted interview lasted 44 minutes and the longest interview 81 minutes. Seven interviews were held by the telephone and two interviews were held via e-mail whereas one of these interviews was continued by e-mail. Due to unforeseen scenes (e.g. illness, the interviewees' business schedules, and the busy interview schedule of the researchers), it was agreed upon interviewing these interviewees via telephone and e-mail. All interviewees were offered anonymity prior to the interviews. All interviews were held individually, in which an open atmosphere was stimulated and realized in which the interviewee could talk in an open manner about his or her feelings (Baxter & Babbie, 2004). This effect was reinforced since the interviews were held in a safe environment, *videlicet* at work (Rapley, 2004). Thirty four interviews were recorded and digitally stored to enhance the validity. From each interview, a verbatim transcript was generated by the author which was translated into English by a native speaker. An overview of the applied tactics to minimize bias and enhance the validity and reliability can be found in table 1.

Table 1
Overview of the Applied Methods (Validity, Reliability, & Bias)

Reliability	Validity	Bias
Making use of field notes and memo's	Recording and storing the interviews	Avoiding the adoption of leading questions during the interviews
Using the same interview protocol for every interviewee	Making use of a coding scheme	Providing the interviewee with a good and clear cover story prior to the interview
Checking coding schema by another researcher	Using both within-case analysis and cross case analysis	Using sub questions leading to expressing opinions and less answer bias

3.6 Actual sample

The actual sample of this study slightly differed from the purposive sample. Because of last minute cancellations of both projects and interviewees, the actual sample (35) was smaller than the purposive sample (42). A total of 5 projects participated in this study. In total, 35 employees were interviewed, of which 29 males and 6 females. Of the 35 interviewees, 12 were working in the line organization, whereas the remaining 23 interviewees were working in the project (organization). Two projects (V + Z) used the IPM structure whereas the other projects did not and used a different – undisclosed - structure. An overview of the actual sample can be found in table 2 below.

Table 2

Overview Actual Sample

Organization	Members project	Members line	Interviewed for this study
Organization V	5	2	5 project; 2 line
Organization W	4	2	4 project; 2 line
Organization X	4	2	4 project; 2 line
Organization Y	5	3	5 project; 2 line
Organization Z	5	3	4 project; 3 line
Total	23	12	33

3.7 Measures

3.7.1 Interviews

The use of in-depth semi-structured interviews consisted of the biggest data source in this study. An overview of the semi-structured interview protocol for the employees working in the project organization can be found in appendix C, whereas an overview of the semi-structured interview protocol for employees working in the line organization can be found in appendix D. Most of the interview questions had (a set of) sub questions that contributed in a sufficient understanding of the question by the interviewee, which resulted in more expressed opinions and prevents answer bias (Van Aken, Berends & Van der Bij, 2012). Making use of a semi-structured interview protocol also left room for guidance along the variables of the study and ensures comprehensiveness. Using the same interview protocol for all interviewees enhanced the reliability of this study.

The interview formats that were used are self-developed and partially based on questionnaires. An example of a questionnaire statement that has been turned into an interview question is *“When I am working I often do not feel very capable”* (Basic Psychological Needs Scales; Deci & Ryan, 2000) which led to the following interview question *“To what extent is the project team capable of independently performing its task?”*. It was made sure that no leading questions were

asked in an attempt to manage bias. The interview questions reflect the following main variables of this study:

Autonomy was assessed by elaborating on questions that were focused at how much 'freedom' the project team experienced from the line. These questions were based upon the Work Climate Questionnaire (Baard, Deci & Ryan, 2004). An example of an autonomy-related question for the project team was *"To what extent do you experience freedom to make your own choices and decisions regarding the project?"*.

Trust was assessed by elaborating on questions that were focused at how much trust the project team experienced. Questions that measured the degree of trust were based upon the Basic Psychological Needs Scale by Deci and Ryan (2000). An example of a trust-related question for the project team was *"To what extent does your project team gain trust from the line to perform working on the project at its own discretion and knowledge?"*.

Intrinsic motivation was assessed by elaborating on questions that were focused at to what extent the project team was motivated towards working on the project. Questions regarding intrinsic motivation were only asked to members of the project organization since employees working in the line organization cannot provide an answer how the project team is motivated towards the project. Questions regarding intrinsic motivation were based upon the Intrinsic Motivation Inventory questionnaire (Deci, Koestner & Ryan, 1999). An example of a question that covered intrinsic motivation was *"How does the trust from the line in working independently influence the team motivation?"*.

Prior to the questions regarding **organizational change**, a short introduction was held in which an explanation of organizational change and a short distinction between planned and emergent change was provided. Afterwards, the following questions were asked to members of the project organization: *"Is the project team often subject to organizational change during the course of a project, and can you provide us with a recent example?"* and *"How does your project team cope with changes within the project?"*. Subsequently, sub questions were asked in order to get a more detailed view.

Change capacity (and the association between trust, autonomy and change capacity) was assessed by elaborating on questions that were focused at how the project team deals with organizational change. As mentioned above, one of the questions to measure the project's change capacity was *"How does your project team cope with changes within the project?"*. Furthermore, examples of questions that project team members were asked were *"To what extent does the gained trust from the line influence how the project team deals with organizational change?"* and

“To what extent does the freedom that your project team has influence how the project team deals with organizational change?”.

3.7.2 Project status updates

During the interviews with the project managers, it was asked whether one could obtain project status updates. This form of data could be used in this study as another form of objective data. Unfortunately, it quickly became apparent that multiple project managers were not willing to hand over these updates. For that reason, this data source has been disregarded in this study.

3.8 Data analysis

The collection of the data is followed by an intense analysis of the data. Analyzing the data is seen as the core of theory building from case studies (Eisenhardt, 1989). However, it is also seen as the most challenging part of the process. All interviews that were held were literally transcribed. This also applies for the field notes. Both have been analyzed and coded using Microsoft Word. The process of coding was performed on an individual basis by the author, however, reliability was enhanced when another researcher checked the codes for one interviewee. By using a priori specifications, a coding scheme was set up in which the most relevant variables were defined. This deductive approach allowed the researcher to switch between emerging concepts and the framework which acted as a basis for this study (Miles & Huberman, 1994). This contributed in more accurate measurement and enhanced the validity of this study. The coding scheme based on the definition of the constructs and with matching quotes can be found in appendix E. During the data analysis, several inductive codes established which can be found in appendix E. All transcripts combined consisted of 376 pages of which the average transcript consisted of 11,4 pages. The field notes consisted of a total of 8 pages, which is an average of 1,6 pages per project. The transcripts were used using both open and selective coding: To begin with, a within-case-analysis has been made for each project. Within these analyses, open coding techniques were used to label concepts. Subsequently, selective coding was used to combine categories and interrelationships in order to get a clear understanding on the results (Van Aken et al., 2012). Afterwards, cross-case analysis among the projects was performed in addition to within-case analysis to enhance internal validity to compare the projects and to find similarities and dissimilarities. These will be discussed in the following chapter.

4. RESULTS

In this chapter, the reader will be presented with an overview of the results that arose from the data analysis. This chapter starts with the within-case analyses of five cases (V,W,X,Y, & Z) in which the results from each case will be elaborated upon. Every case analysis will provide a short description of the project, followed by the degree of autonomy and trust that is experienced by the project team members. Then, the actual trust and autonomy that is 'given' by the line will be presented as the interviews with the members from the line organization will be shortly presented. Subsequently, possible factors that project team members have indicated that influence how the project team deals with change are presented. Then, the relationship between the experienced autonomy and trust from the line and the change capacity of the project team will be presented, followed by a conclusion of the within-case analysis. One will quickly notice that certain parts of this chapter have been underlined. The latter has been done in order to indicate the most relevant quotes. This chapter concludes with a cross-case analysis in which the results from the cases will be compared to one another.

4.1 Project V

Project V concerns a project which focuses at improving sluices at one of the Netherlands' most well-known dikes. The project team was set up in 2007 and has been subject to many changes. The team consists of five main members: besides the project manager, a technical manager, area manager, contract manager, and a manager project management are operating within this project. The structure of the members in the project team is known as an IPM structure. The project team is being controlled by two members of a line organization. However, caution should be applied here, since 'line' is difficult to conceptualize because a project of this magnitude has a plurality of 'lines'. In consultation with the project manager of this project, the line was set for two individuals working in the line organization whom the project has the most to deal with. For one of the project team members (further referred to as #5), there was no relationship with the line as described by the project manager. Therefore, the interview questions were based upon what this member perceived as his 'own' line.

4.1.1 Autonomy

Within this project team, all five members experience a high degree of autonomy from the line. As one project team member (#1) explained: *"I believe I experience, looking at what is necessary to manage a project, sufficient trust and authorization".* This member emphasized that part of this freedom is related to the experienced trust from the line: *"A part is also informal authorization and*

that has to do with confidence". Another project member (#2) commented: "Well, I experience quite a lot of freedom". An interesting note here concerns the fact that this team member explained that the freedom to make own decisions was based upon having things well organized and involving the line at a moment in which decisions can still be made: "It is building credit by having things well organized". As with project member (#1), project team member (#4) also indicated that the experienced autonomy was related to trust: "As a project, we have quite a lot of freedom. I believe that this is partially due to the confidence that a client has in his project...and I think there is so much confidence and openness that we also have enough confidence of the client to make our own decisions". For the project team member with its own line (#5), experienced autonomy was also of a high degree: "Damn lot of freedom". An important note is that all project team members emphasized that the experienced freedom is set within certain preconditions. As one project team member (#3) stated: "Lots of freedom, yes...where it enters our authorization".

4.1.2 Trust

Besides autonomy, all members of the IPM project team also experience a high degree of trust from the line. As one project team member (#1) commented: "I have the illusion that I experience that confidence". High trust was also experienced by another project team member (#3): "We experience a high degree of confidence". This was echoed by project team member #2 who emphasized that high trust is related to a low control from the line: "We experience full confidence. We get few control questions". Another team member (#4) emphasized that trust is something that can be gained and achieved: "I think the point is that we show that we are in control. That means we control the risks, make progress, working within budget and so on".

4.1.3 Trust and autonomy: line

Both line members indicated that freedom that the project team experiences from the line is of a high degree within the preconditions. As one line member (#2) indicated: "Well, it's actually all decisions that fall within scope and within the preconditions". The other line member (#1) stated: "...the project manager makes the decisions as long as they are within time, scope and budget of the agreed conditions". Regarding trust, both line members indicate to have a very high degree of trust in the project team. As one line member (#1) commented: "This project team is very capable to work independently...IPM team....it can switch quickly, is able to work proactively...so this team has quality, capacity and skill on board". This trust was not only based upon the good team, lack of time was also related to his trust: "Yes, the line relies on the team. This is also coupled with little time for

the administrator, and *if you are short of time, then you need to have a lot of confidence*". His colleague (#2) stated: "*...very capable. I am really confident that this team will complete its task*".

4.1.4 Dealing with change

The project team members mentioned several factors which facilitated or impeded how the project team deals with change. Having 'short lines' with the members from the line (#1), having a colleague who is not involved in this project look at the change (#2), a tight scope and planning (#3), and having support from the client (#5) were mentioned as factors that facilitate how this project team deals with change. Two factors that impede dealing with change concern the lack of capacity for this project and the client (#4), and lack of time (#5). An overview of the most mentioned factors that facilitate or impede dealing with change in all projects can be found in appendix E, whereas an overview of the most mentioned factors in project V can be found in table 3 below.

Table 3

Project V: Mentioned factors that influence how the project team deals with change.

Interviewee	Factors mentioned
#1	+ short lines with 'the line'
#2	+ involving a colleague that is not involved in the project
#3	+ a tight scope and planning
#4	- limited capacity
#5	- time

4.1.5 Autonomy and dealing with change

Four out of 5 project team members mentioned intrinsic motivation as a mechanism between the experienced autonomy and how the project team deals with change. Two (#1 and #5) out of these four members indicated that the experienced high degree of autonomy leads to more enjoyable work which is also reflected in how the project team deals with change. As one member commented (#1): "*For me, when you perceive freedom within a project, I enjoy working more than I do not get this freedom. The extent to which I get freedom helps in such a way that I can give other people freedom. Therefore, team members will also think about the changes and also put forward options*". His colleague (#5) – who perceives his 'own' line - commented: "*When you may take decisions, then that is really nice for both yourself as your team. It makes it easier, a lot easier. And it also is more fun. The freedom you have, it provides pleasure in your work*". One out of four project team members (#2) indicated that a high degree of autonomy leads to a more proactive attitude when it comes to dealing with change: "*I believe it will help in such a way, that once you think 'Well, I am able to make this decisions' then this will result in a more active approach about how to deal with a*

change. When you believe you are not in control, you will just lean back and do nothing". For another project team member (#4), motivation is acting as the mechanism between experiencing high autonomy and dealing with change: "If you are able to take more decisions, then you also have the idea that you have influence or power. For those reasons, you become extra motivated to solve certain problems or issues". An interesting note regarding this latter project team member concerns the turning point of too having much autonomy which can result in a negative effect on dealing with change. As this member commented: "A side note here concerns that this also has a turning point. Well, in case when you impute yourself with more powers to deal with changes. This means, that you take decisions that you actually should have submitted to your client". One project member (#3) did not mention how autonomy was related to dealing with change because this member did not understand the associated interview question.

4.1.6 Trust and dealing with change

Four out of 5 project team members indicated intrinsic motivation to be a mechanism between experienced trust and dealing with organizational change. For 2 out of 5 project team members (#1 and #2), the experienced high degree of trust leads to a proactive behavior towards work which is also reflected in how the project team deals with change. As one member (#1) stated: "The moment you experience trust from the line and a change is about to be implemented, you are going to proactively approach and deal with this change". His colleague (#2) expressed that high trust from the line results in a more proactive behavior towards the change since the team believes that the line will provide support in case of a misstep during the change: "Trust is of a major influence....And if there is no trust, then we also do not trust to get support from the line in case we make an error during change. This will result in being very restrained regarding the change". One out of five members (#3) indicated that the experienced high degree of trust leads to more enjoyable work which is reflected in a more flexible attitude towards change: "...if they would not receive trust, they would have less pleasure in their work. Once you experience trust, you have a broader view of the situation. Let me put it in other way, if you turn it around, there is a suspicious situation in which your client has an image of 'They will never reach that milestone, they are not good enough', well, then you will do your best for the minimum you have to achieve. But this is no good for the flexibility of the team. However, if you manage the project in a different way than how it is supposed to be, you will not make a good breeding ground for flexibility". Intrinsic motivation is also acting as a mechanism for another project team member (#5): "...if you do not experience from your line, then you become insecure. Uncertainty within your team creates uncertainty regarding how the team deals with change. This results in no longer accepting changes due to a decreased team motivation". One out of

five members (#4) expressed that self-confidence is the mechanism between experienced autonomy and how the project team deals with change. According to this member, trust facilitates dealing with change due to the feeling that better choices are being made that satisfy the client: *“The moment that you experience trust from your client, makes you better able to deal with changes because you feel that you will make the good decisions which get supported by your client than when you do not experience trust from your client”*.

4.1.7 Conclusion project V

In sum, a high degree of both autonomy and trust is experienced by all the five project team members, yet trust and autonomy seem to be interdependent according to several project team members (#1 and #4). Both line members indicate to have a high degree of trust in the project team and that this team has a lot of freedom within certain preconditions. Regarding the mechanism how autonomy is related to dealing with change, 4 out of 5 project team members indicated that intrinsic motivation is the mechanism between this relationship. One member (#3) did not provide an answer during the interview since he was not able to answer the research question due to not understanding the associated question. Regarding the mechanism how trust is related to dealing with change, 4 out of 5 team members indicated that intrinsic motivation is the mechanism between this relationship. One project team member (#4) indicated that self-confidence is the mechanism that explains how trust is related to dealing with change. An overview of the within-case analysis of project V can be found in table 4 below.

Table 4

Project V: Overview Project Team Members

Interviewee	Experiences autonomy	Experiences trust	Mechanism Autonomy -> dealing with change	Quotes	Mechanism Trust -> dealing with change	Quotes
#1	High	High	Intrinsic motivation 'more enjoyable'	<i>"...enjoy working more"</i>	Intrinsic motivation 'proactive behavior'	<i>"...proactively approach and deal with this change"</i>
#2	High	High	Intrinsic motivation 'proactive behavior'	<i>"...a more active approach about how to deal with a change"</i>	Intrinsic motivation 'proactive behavior'	<i>"...no trust...being very restrained regarding the change"</i>
#3	High	High	X	X	Intrinsic motivation 'more enjoyable'	<i>"...not receive trust, they would have less pleasure in their work"</i>
#4	High	High	Intrinsic motivation 'more motivated'	<i>"...you become extra motivated to solve certain problems"</i>	Self-confidence 'trust in self'	<i>"trust...better able to deal...feel that you will make the good decisions"</i>
#5*	High	High	Intrinsic motivation 'more enjoyable'	<i>"It makes it easier, a lot easier. And it also is more fun...provides pleasure"</i>	Intrinsic motivation 'team motivation'	<i>"no longer accepting changes due to a decreased team motivation"</i>

Note. *= personal line.

Note. X = not answered due to not understanding the associated question.

4.2 Project W

Project W concerns a project which is focused at building a tunnel for traffic in the southwestern part of the Netherlands. This project is subject to many changes. The data analysis was held over 6 individuals working for this project, which consisted of four project team members and two members of the line organization. Just like project X, this project is also being controlled by multiple 'lines'. In consultation with the project manager of this project, the line was set for two individuals working in the line organization whom the project has the most to deal with. For one of the project team members (#4), there was no relationship with the line as described by the project manager due to the function (quality and risk manager) this member has in the project team. For this member, the interview questions were based upon what this member perceived as his 'own' line. Unfortunately, due to last minute illness, a full agenda, and upcoming holidays, one of the project team members was not interviewed in person, yet this interview was conducted by email.

4.2.1 Autonomy

Within this project team, all four members experience a high degree of autonomy in the project team from the line. As one project team member (#1) explained: *"Yes, I do experience that freedom"*. Another project team member (#2) echoed this statement and emphasized the preconditions in which freedom was experienced: *"Within the agreed framework I use the maximum freedom"*. A high degree of autonomy was also experienced by another member of the project team (#3) who explained that freedom is also taken when it is not being given: *"I experience sufficient freedom to make our own decisions. Partly, that freedom is awarded, but is also being taken. This is demonstrated by the few threads there are regarding decisions"*. An interesting note here concerns the fact that autonomy is 'taken' and utilized by project members (#2 and #3) when they opine that more freedom is necessary.

4.2.2 Trust

For another project team member (#4), there was a minimal relationship with the line. Therefore, it could not be measured to what degree this member experiences trust from the line. For the remaining members, trust – like autonomy – was also experienced to a high degree. As one project team member (#1) commented: *"Yes, I experience a lot of trust... Again, trust is good, control is better. There is great confidence from the line organization, but one should not forget to check"*. Communication was an important factor related to trust according to another project team member (#2): *"There is a high degree of confidence from the client regarding the project team. As we communicate well, we get all the support."*

4.2.3 Trust and autonomy: line

The line members reported that a high degree of autonomy is 'given' by the line towards the project team. As one line member (#1) commented: "Within those limits, the project manager can manage his project, so he does not have to link back every detail. As long as it remains within the boundaries that were agreed upon in advance". A colleague line member (#2) stated: "In principle, all project content...in practice, it appears that the line and the content are separated". Both line members also agreed upon the high amount of trust that they have in the project team. As one member (#2) commented: "Full trust. *If we had no faith in this project manager, we would not do business with him. It is a combination of knowledge and experience*". For his colleague (#1), trust was based upon the situation that only the project knows what is going on, so trust is more or less forced: "Very much...*only the project team knows that is going on and we do not. In that sense, it is the kind of trust you have*".

4.2.4 Dealing with change

Several factors were mentioned by the project team members that facilitated or impeded how the team deals with change. Having knowledge, experience and an objective view of the change (#1), having a good project manager with a lot of experience (#2), perceiving the line having knowledge about the project (#3), and flexibility (#4) were mentioned as facilitators in dealing with change, whereas 'the line' was mentioned as a factor which impedes dealing with change. An overview of the mentioned factors can be found in table 5 below.

Table 5

Project W: Mentioned factors that influence how the project team deals with change.

Interviewee	Factors mentioned
#1	+ knowledge and experience + an objective view
#2	+ good and experienced project manager - the line
#3	+ knowledge of the line about the project
#4	+ flexibility

4.2.5 Autonomy and dealing with change

For 3 out of 4 project team members, intrinsic motivation is acting as a mechanism between the experienced autonomy and how the project team deals with change. For 2 out of 3 members (#1 and #4), the experienced high degree of autonomy leads to more enjoyable work which is also

reflected in how the project team deals with change. According to one project team member (#1): *“Making decisions on your own has a positive influence on the team motivation and how the project is being enjoyed...and sure, if you are allowed to make your own decisions within a given space, this has a motivating effect”*. This member emphasized that this mechanism is based upon the nature of the change: *“If it concerns a small change, then it is easy if you are allowed to do it yourself, however if it concerns a big change which will impact the line organization, then you do have to link it back to the line”*. For the other project team member (#4), a high degree of autonomy results in a higher team motivation and more enjoyable work which is also reflected in how the team deals with change: *“What I just mentioned, many specialists work here and they bring their knowledge to this place. If that would be inhibited because people are making demands...well, they would not enjoy working here and will look for another project”*. A colleague (#2) mentioned that a high degree of autonomy is related to high professional pride which is reflected in an interesting approach towards change: *“That is high. As you can display more independence, professional pride will grow. But these people are used to seeing opportunities....colleagues within the team see chances not as a threat, but as an opportunity to see what can be different, better, or more efficient”*. For another project team member (#3), the experienced autonomy is of such a high degree, and has always been high in previous projects, that dealing with change is something that has not been an issue for a long period. The associated question was answered by e-mail with: *“Not, because we are autonomous”*.

4.2.6 Trust and dealing with change

Two out of four project team members (#1 and #4) indicated that intrinsic motivation is acting as a mechanism between the experienced trust and how the team deals with change. For one of the project members (#1), experiencing trust results in more enjoyable work. A project team that enjoys work and is motivated results in more facilitation regarding dealing with change: *“It is always nice to hear you are doing it right. I believe this is important....if you say to me ‘Hey, nice’. If you have a highly motivated team, then changes become easier. In contrast to when you have tensions with each other. If there is great confidence, then it is easier to change”*. For the project team member with its own line (#4), intrinsic motivation also plays an important role in this relationship: *“I would say that it is of influence.....So in that sense, it is good for the trust which gives you trust that you are on the right track. This gives you more motivation to continue, so to make additional steps”*. For 2 out of 4 project team members (#2 and #3), the experienced trust from the line was not related to how the project team deals with change. For one project team member (#2), the line has no influence on changes that arise from processes that are managed from within the project: *“Well, as far as the changes result from the processes that we can manage within the project, the line has no*

influence on these". For his colleague (#3), experienced trust from the line does not influence how the project team deals with change due to high degree of autonomy that the team experiences: *"Trust is not important because they are quite autonomous"*.

4.2.7 Conclusion project W

In conclusion, a high degree of autonomy is experienced by 4 out of 4 project team members. A high degree of trust is experienced by 3 out of 4 project team members, since one member could not provide an answer due to the minimal relationship with the line. Both line members indicate to have a high degree of trust in the project team and that this team has a lot of freedom within certain preconditions. Three out of four members indicated that intrinsic motivation is acting as a mechanism between the experienced autonomy from the line and dealing with change by the project team. One member (#3) did not specify his answer in the email regarding the associated question. Two members from the project team (#1 and #4) indicated that intrinsic motivation is acting as a mechanism between the experienced trust from the line and dealing with change by the project team, whereas the remaining members (#2 and #3) indicated that the experienced trust is not related to dealing with change by the project team. An overview of the within-case analysis of project W can be found in table 6 below.

Table 6

Project W: Overview Project Team Members

Interviewee	Experiences autonomy	Experiences trust	Mechanism Autonomy -> dealing with change	Quotes	Mechanism Trust -> dealing with change	Quotes
#1	High	High	Intrinsic motivation 'more enjoyable'	<i>"...positive influence on how the project is being enjoyed"</i>	Intrinsic motivation 'enjoyable work'	<i>"...a highly motivated team then changes become easier. If there is great confidence, then it is easier to change"</i>
#2	High	High	Intrinsic motivation 'interesting work'	<i>"...see chances...as an opportunity to see what can be different, better, or more efficient"</i>	X ²	X ²
#3	High	High	X ¹	X ¹	No relationship because this team is autonomous	<i>"Trust is not important because they are quite autonomous"</i>
#4*	High	X	Intrinsic motivation 'enjoyable work'	<i>"...if that would be inhibited...they would not enjoy working here"</i>	Intrinsic motivation 'more motivated'	<i>...gives you more motivation to continue, so to make additional steps"</i>

Note. *= personal line.

Note. X = not answered because of the minimal relationship with the line.

Note. X¹ = not specified in email.

Note. X² = no influence because the line has no influence on changes that arise from processes that are managed within the project.

4.3 Project X

Project X concerns a project which focuses at expanding one of the busiest railway stations in the Netherlands. The project has been running for several years and has been highly subject to changes. The data analysis was held over 6 individuals working for this project, which consisted of four project team members and two members of the line organization. Just like project X and Y, this project is also being controlled by multiple 'lines'. In consultation with the project manager of this project, the line was set for two individuals working in the line organization whom the project has the most to deal with. For two project team members (#1 and #4), there was no relationship with the line as described by the project manager. For these members, the interview questions were based upon what these members perceived as their 'own' line.

4.3.1 Autonomy

Within this project team there was a high consensus regarding the degree of freedom that is being experienced from the line. All four members experienced a high degree of autonomy from the line. However, as was the case with the aforementioned projects, the autonomy was based upon the preconditions. As one member (#1) commented on his own line: *"Yes, a lot of freedom...we have clear agreements in general, as long as we stay in there, it is just fine"*. This was echoed by another team member (#3): *"I experience a lot of freedom...within the established frameworks"*.

4.3.2 Trust

Three out of four members experience a high degree of trust. One of the project team members (#1) commented that the high degree of trust that is being experienced from the personal line resulted from the work experience this person has: *"A lot of trust, but I think that...look I am pretty experienced in this work."*. Another project team member (#2) commented: *"In the daily routine we operate quite independently. So yes, in that sense we experience high trust and it has to be, because you cannot let a project team function if you do not have that trust in the team"*. For another project team member (#3) trust was derived from the achievement of milestones and running the project on schedule: *"I believe there is a lot of trust at the moment. That also has to do with the fact that we run on schedule, within budget"*. One member (#4) experiences a low degree of trust from his personal line: *"I experience a low degree of trust. There is also a feeling, look everything is going right and they do not say anything, but I do have a feeling 'What if it is not going the right way, will I get support from the line?'"*.

4.3.3 Trust and autonomy: line

An interesting result in this project concerns the high autonomy of the project team. Both line members indicate that the project team is fully autonomous. As one line member (#2) commented: *“Basically, within this organization, all projects operate completely autonomous. So the project manager is the person that has to take care of everything”*. This was echoed by his colleague (#1): *“The function that I have within this organization has no other authorities than the authorities of the project manager”*. Trust from the line was also ‘given’ to a high degree towards the project team. As one line member (#1) indicated, trust is given automatically until it is betrayed: *“I always say, I have trust until it appears that for whatever reason, it is being ashamed”*. His colleague (#2) indicated that trust is given by means of the performance of the project team: *“...this project is fully capable. This is clear from the progress reports, the satisfaction of stakeholders and the fact that there are only few environmental, safety and decommissioning incidents”*.

4.3.4 Dealing with change

The project team members mentioned several factors which facilitated or impeded how the project team deals with change. Factors that facilitated dealing with change consisted of a good cover story (#1), weekly meetings for consultation (#2), time, capacity and a good cover story (#3), and having rest and an overview of the situation (#4). This latter member also emphasized that listening to each other is also a facilitator. Internal procedures (#1) was mentioned as a factor which impedes dealing with change because one cannot quickly adapt to the change. An overview of the mentioned factors can be found in table 7 below.

Table 7

Project X: Mentioned factors that influence how the project team deals with change.

Interviewee	Factors mentioned
#1	+ good cover story - procedures
#2	+ weekly meetings
#3	+ time, capacity, and a good cover story
#4	+ having rest and overview + listen to each other

4.3.5 Autonomy and dealing with change

Two out of four project team members (#3 and #4) indicated that intrinsic motivation is acting as a mechanism between the experienced autonomy from the line and how the project team deals with change. One member (#3) indicated that the experienced high degree of autonomy leads to more

enjoyable work which is also reflected in how the team deals with change: *"I believe that when a project team is allowed to make more decisions, they have more energy and more fun in their job. We deal faster and easier with change if we can make our own decisions. So more autonomy means more flexibility regarding dealing with changes".* For his colleague (#4), experiencing a high degree of autonomy results in a more proactive attitude regarding dealing with change: *"...then you are in control and that is good. Because when faced with the other response 'Yes, I cannot help it', then you will not do anything. If a problem occurs, there are two options. You either do something about it, or you cannot do something about it and someone else will....but otherwise you should just do it".* Two out of four (#1 and #2) members did not understand the associated interview question and mentioned irrelevant answers. In combination with a lack of time and thus no possibility to re-ask the question, these answers were not taken into account for this relation.

4.3.6 Trust and dealing with change

Two out of four project team members (#1 and #2) indicated that self-confidence is acting as a mechanism between the experienced autonomy from the line and how the project team deals with change. According to one of these members (#1): *"...trust is a type of credit. If I am very afraid of change, uncertainties will always occur....imagine my line manager has no confidence in me, it works a lot more difficult. When you experience confidence from your line manager, you are less scared to make errors and approach the change more positively".* This mechanism was echoed by another project team member (#2): *"...if you experience that confidence, then you also have confidence that you can tackle changes yourself".* For another project team member (#3), intrinsic motivation is acting as a mechanism but only when the team has influence on the change. When changes are being implemented that result in more control from the line, then trust is no longer relevant: *"If you know that the line will support you, understand you and accepts you, then you are faster prepared to approach the change than when you know it will be a battle to get something done. I am talking about situations in which you have a choice whether or not to implement a change. But sometimes, changes just need to be implemented.Do we see it as useful or as extra weight? For example...extra work, more checks...then the trust from the line can be very high, but the important question arises: 'Do they want us to work or do they want to control us?'".* For the project team member who experiences low trust (#4), this lack of trust results in involving the line more during changes. For this member, self-protection is acting as a mechanism between the experienced (lack of) trust and how he deals with change: *"...what I did was to involve the line with the change to not get accused for not involving them in the change. For me, a piece of self-protection. Because I do not*

experience trust, you try to involve the line, because afterwards you do not want to hear them talking 'They made a mess again'. So I involved them and explained what I did".

4.3.7 Conclusion project X

In sum, project X is subject to a lot of changes. All four project members experience a high degree of autonomy. Three out of four members of the project team experience a high degree of trust from the line, whereas one member (#4) experiences low trust. Both line members indicate to have a high degree of trust in the project team and that this team has a lot of freedom regarding decision making in the project. Regarding the mechanism how autonomy is related to dealing with change, 2 out of 4 project team members indicate that intrinsic motivation is the mechanism. Two project team members (#1 and #2) did not understand the associated question. Regarding the relationship how trust is related to dealing with change, 2 out of 4 members mentioned self-confidence as the mechanism. Another project team member (#3) indicated that intrinsic motivation is acting as a mechanism yet this mechanism is dependent upon the change, since changes which can be influenced by the team can be influenced by trust which is reflected in motivation, yet trust – no matter how high – does not change how the project team deals with changes which are aimed at increased control of the project team by the line. For one project team member (#4), self-protection was mentioned as a mechanism between experienced trust and dealing with change. An overview of the within-case analysis of project X can be found in table 8 below.

Table 8

Project X: Overview Project Team Members

Interviewee	Experiences autonomy	Experiences trust	Mechanism Autonomy -> dealing with change	Quotes	Mechanism Trust -> dealing with change	Quotes
#1*	High	High	X	X	Self-confidence	<i>"When you experience confidence...you are less scared to make errors and approach the change more positively"</i>
#2	High	High	X	X	Self-confidence	<i>"...if you experience that confidence, then you also have confidence that you can tackle changes yourself"</i>
#3	High	High	Intrinsic motivation 'more enjoyable'	<i>"...allowed to make decisions...more energy and more fun in their job"</i>	Intrinsic motivation 'proactive behavior' X ¹	<i>"...then you are faster prepared to approach the change"</i>
#4*	High	Low	Intrinsic motivation 'proactive behavior'	<i>"...then you are in control and that is good...you should just do it"</i>	Self-protection	<i>"Because I do not experience trust, you try to involve the line, because afterwards you do not want to hear them talking"</i>

Note. *= personal line.

Note. X = not answered due to not understanding the question.

Note. X¹ = but dependent upon the change. When the project team can influence the change, then the experienced trust results in proactive behavior (intrinsic motivation), however changes aimed at increasing control are not dependent upon the experienced trust from the line.

4.4 Project Y

Project Y concerns a project which has been established in order to improve the accessibility towards the northern provinces in the Netherlands. The project has been running for several years and has been highly subject to change. The data analysis was held over seven interviewees in this project, which consisted of five project team members and two members of the line organization. A total of three members in the line organization were named by the project manager during a first meeting, however, due to unforeseen circumstances only two members of the line organization could be interviewed. For one of the project team members (#4), there was no relationship with the line as described by the project manager. For this member, the interview questions were based upon what this member perceived as his 'own' line.

4.4.1 Autonomy

All five members of the project team indicate to experience a high degree of autonomy from the line within certain preconditions. As one member (#1) expressed: *"Yes, I do believe that we have a lot of freedom to make our own decisions within the project. If you have agreed on good frameworks in advance, you also have enough freedom".* Another project team member (#2) echoed this statement: *"Regarding how, we experience a lot of freedom as long as you keep to the rules".*

4.4.2 Trust

Like autonomy, trust is also experienced to a high degree among all five project team members. As one member (#1) expressed: *"Much trust from the line".* A high degree of trust was also experienced according to his colleague (#3): *"I believe the line completely trusts the project team. It is also necessary because the line operates at a greater distance from the project".* Project team member #4 commented: *"I experience a lot of trust, but within the established framework. If you want to deviate from it....always willing to talk about that".*

4.4.3 Trust and autonomy: line

Like the aforementioned projects, high trust and high autonomy is also 'given' towards the project team members in this project by both line members. Regarding the high degree of autonomy, this is within certain preconditions. As one line member (#1) commented: *"From my point of view, the project team can do anything as long as they remain within the scope".* His colleague (#2) echoed this statement: *"Actually all the decisions, within the preconditions".* Regarding trust, one of the line members (#1) stated: *"Well, they are very capable as long as they stay within their scope...project".*

manager is completely independent....of course he has to regularly deliver a progress report, but there is little discussion about that". His colleague (#2) commented: "Perfectly competent".

4.4.4 Dealing with change

Several reasons were mentioned by the project team members that facilitated or impeded how the team deals with change. Factors that facilitated dealing with change consisted of flexibility and a good cover story (#1), method of the project (#3), trust from the line (#4), and stability in the project (#5). Only one member (#3) mentioned internal rules of the organization that impedes dealing with change. Individual character was mentioned by one project team member (#2) which can both facilitate and impede how the team deals with change. An overview of the mentioned factors can be found in table 9 below.

Table 9

Project Y: Mentioned factors that influence how the project team deals with change.

Interviewee	Factors mentioned
#1	+ flexibility + good information
#2	Individual character
#3	+ method of the project - internal rules
#4	+ trust from the line
#5	+ stability in the project

4.4.5 Autonomy and dealing with change

For 3 out of 5 project team members (#1, #3, and #4), intrinsic motivation was mentioned as a mechanism how the experienced autonomy is related to how the project team deals with change. For one member (#1), autonomy leads to a proactive approach towards the change: "...they themselves also have more influence and make decisions about how to deal with change. A motivated employee has a certain position like 'I want to achieve something'. So when he or she is well motivated and a change occurs, then they are faster prepared to deal with the change, think about the change and integrate it into the project". For his colleague (#3), a low degree of autonomy results in less commitment and motivation of the project team members to the change since this change is being implemented at another level: "I believe that people are then less involved and motivated regarding the project since the decision is taken elsewhere". According to his colleague (#4), more autonomy leads to more enjoyable working: "I definitely think that a high degree of freedom contributes in more enjoyable working regarding the project". For two members (#2 and

#5), this relation remained unanswered. According to one member (#2), autonomy is not related to dealing with change and emphasized that it is the personal character and character of the individuals in the team that determine how the team deals with change: *“One of the fun things that I do now is that everything changes. But it is also about how your team deals with change. This is dependent upon the person”*. For his colleague (#5), the associated question was difficult to answer due to problems understanding the question.

4.4.6 Trust and dealing with change

Three out of five members (#2, #3, and #4) indicated that intrinsic motivation is the mechanism between experienced trust and how the project team deals with change. According to one member (#2): *“But not experiencing sufficient trust works quite crippling. It may even go so far that your own motivation and commitment disappears. That is really ‘killing’”*. Motivation is also the mechanism according to project team member #3: *“Of essential importance, because when there is no trust, you would not make any decisions. If the line only judges you based on mistakes, you do not dare to make decisions, so you make fewer decisions”*. His colleague (#4) commented: *“I see that as very positive. For me, doing a project is fun. You do not want the line looking over your shoulder. That does not work”*. For 1 out of 5 members (#1), trust is related to confidence in oneself since a low degree of trust experienced from the line results in insecurity: *“Trust is of a major influence. Well, I notice resistance. It is difficult to deal with change under normal conditions. And when a project team experiences no trust, then people become cramped which results in perceiving a change as annoying which leads to even more resistance”*. For another member (#5), experiencing trust is not related to how the project team deals with change: *“Many of those changes....that is a journey no one wanted. That is just imposed. Trust is not that important here. It is just ‘That is it’. You cannot get around it”*.

4.4.7 Conclusion project Y

In sum, project Y is highly subject to change. A high degree of both autonomy and trust is experienced by all five project team members. Both line members indicate to have a high degree of trust in the project team and that this team has a lot of freedom regarding decision making in the project. Three out of five project team members mentioned intrinsic motivation as a mechanism between the experienced autonomy and how the project team deals with change. One out of five members (#2) mentioned that it is not the team, but a combination of single characters that influences how the team deals with change. For one member (#5), the associated question was difficult to understand and did therefore not answer the question. Regarding how trust is related to how the project team deals with change, 3 out of 5 project team members mentioned intrinsic

motivation as the mechanism. One out of five members (#1) mentioned self-confidence, whereas another member (#5) mentioned that change is part of the job and is not influenced by trust from the line. An overview of the within-case analysis of project Y can be found in table 10 below.

Table 10

Project Y: Overview Project Team Members

Interviewee	Experiences autonomy	Experiences trust	Mechanism Autonomy -> dealing with change	Quotes	Mechanism Trust -> dealing with change	Quotes
#1*	High	High	Intrinsic motivation 'proactive behavior'	<i>"...faster prepared to deal with the change, think and integrate it"</i>	Self-confidence	<i>"Trust is of major influence...no trust, then people become cramped"</i>
#2	High	High	No influence X ¹	<i>"...how your team deals with change. This is dependent upon the person"</i>	Intrinsic motivation 'more motivated'	<i>"But not experiencing sufficient trust works quite crippling...motivation disappears"</i>
#3	High	High	Intrinsic motivation 'more motivated'	<i>"...are less involved and motivated"</i>	Intrinsic motivation 'more motivated'	<i>"you do not dare to make decisions, so you make fewer"</i>
#4*	High	High	Intrinsic motivation 'more enjoyable'	<i>"a high degree of freedom contributes in more enjoyable working"</i>	Intrinsic motivation 'more enjoyable'	<i>"..doing a project is fun. You do not want the line looking over your shoulder"</i>
#5	High	High	X	X	No influence X ²	<i>"It is just: That's it"</i>

Note. *= personal line.

Note. X = did not understand the question.

Note. X¹ = dependent upon own character and character of the individuals in the team.

Note. X² = no influence because many changes are imposed from the line and is part of the job.

4.5 Project Z

Project Z concerns a project which focuses at rebuilding a giant underground parking in the center of the Netherlands. The project has a start-up, since the original project was scheduled over 10 years ago but was never finished due to other projects that got prioritized. Recently, this project has been restarted with a new project team. This project team consists of five members who represent an IPM team. Due to the newness of this project and project team, and the phase ('initial phase') this project is in, this team has hardly been subject to any form of change. The project is being controlled by three members of a line organization. Due to unforeseen circumstances, only four members from the IPM team and three members from the line were interviewed. An important note here concerns the fact that during the interviews, it became clear that the role of the line was of a very low level. Whereas the line in the aforementioned projects consisted of a guiding and controlling role, the role of the line in this project only consisted of supplying capacity (project team members) and guidance during an escalation. Unfortunately, this was not known at the beginning of the interviews. Furthermore, the relationship with the line differed among the project team members. For two project team members (#1 and #2), the three members from the line organization were seen as 'line'. For the remaining two project team members (#3 and #4), the client will be used as 'line' since, according to these project team members, the line as the author mentioned has hardly any influence on these members and on the team for as far they experience.

4.5.1 Autonomy

A high degree of freedom to make decisions was experienced by all four project team members. As one of the members (#1) indicated: *"In substantive terms to a high degree"*. For another member (#2), a high degree of autonomy was experienced by the line due to the distance the line had regarding the project: *"My line organization has little to no project interests, so all the freedom I want"*.

4.5.2 Trust

Like autonomy, experienced trust from the line and client also rated high among all four project team members. Project team member #1 argued that trust was related to the process of the project: *"Normally, pretty much. You must ensure you control the quality and validation of the process"*. For project team member #2, the trust is derived for a full 100%: *"The full trust"*. For project team member #3, the line was defined as the client of this project. This member experienced full trust from the line: *"Full trust, otherwise he will interfere in the team"*.

4.5.3 Trust and autonomy: line

Autonomy is 'given' towards the project team members to a high degree according to all three line members. As one line member (#1) commented: *"Yes, all decisions regarding the project content"*. His colleague (#3) emphasized the preconditions: *"Everything that remains within the preconditions"*. Regarding trust, one line member (#1) commented: *"Tricky question, because if I say they are not capable, then I have not provided the right members"*. According to his colleague (#3), supplying capacity is related to trust: *"I believe all project positions are filled with capable people. Well, some positions are not filled yet...there is no contract manager, so I guess they are 80% capable"*. For another line member (#2), this question could not be answered due to the distance towards the project team: *"That is very difficult for me to tell"*. Therefore, 2 out of 3 line members indicated that trust is given to a moderate or high degree, whereas one member (#2) could not answer the associated question due to the distance towards the project team.

4.5.4 Dealing with change

Several reasons were mentioned by the project team members that facilitated or impeded how the team deals with change. Factors that facilitated dealing with change consisted of a clear scope (#2, #3, and #4), the members in the project team (#1), the phase of the project (#1), and a good project manager (#2). No factors were mentioned that impede how the project team deals with change. An overview of the mentioned factors can be found in table 11 below.

Table 11

Project Z: Mentioned factors that influence how the project team deals with change.

Interviewee	Factors mentioned
#1	+ the phase of the project + the project team members
#2	+ a good project manager + a clear scope
#3	+ a clear scope
#4	+ a clear scope

4.5.5 Autonomy and dealing with change

For 3 out of 4 project team members (#1, #3, and #4), intrinsic motivation was mentioned as a mechanism how the experienced autonomy is related to how the project team deals with change. As one member (#1) commented: *"Of course that is of importance. Ambitious people, and we have them in this team, like this. So when they have no freedom, they will become unmotivated regarding both working on the project and dealing with change"*. His colleague (#3) argued that an increase in

the ability to make decisions relates to more motivation and power towards the job and towards change: “Very important relation. Having authority increases the motivation to both work and dealing with changes”. Another project team member (#4) indicated that the autonomy from the line is related to dealing with change by the team by means of responsibilities which is related to motivation. As this member commented: “...you need to lay responsibilities where they belong...An official client is in this sense so far distanced from the content, you can only hold him responsible for the process, not the content. So, if you have to do things, but you have no authority and are not responsible, then this is directly related to motivation”. For another project team member (#2), no relation could be given because of the difficulty of the question and the lack of time during the interview.

4.5.6 Trust and dealing with change

For 2 out of 4 project team members (#3 and #4), intrinsic motivation is acting as a mechanism between the experienced trust from the line and how the project team deals with change. For one of the members (#3), experiencing trust results in motivation which leads to more motivation regards dealing with change: “It is a sign of confidence when advice from the project team is being accepted. This enhances the motivation regarding both working on the project and dealing with change”. His colleague (#4) – who also sees the client as the line - commented that trust from the line is related to how the team deals with change by means of motivation, however also emphasizes that a good project manager can mediate this relationship: “It is nice to have confidence from the client, however, in the daily routine we are working more with the team and the project manager. I believe that is also more important. Look, it is obvious of importance if you have a client that trusts you, because lack of trust will result in a low degree of motivation, however in this case, the project manager who motivates the team is of crucial importance”. For two out of four members (#1 and #2), the experienced trust was not related to how the project team deals with change. For one member (#2), no relation could be given because the line has no influence on the project: “What I just said, this project is not that much subject to change. The trust from the line is high, however the relationship with the line is very limited. Therefore, I do not see a relationship”. His colleague (#1) commented: “I know that you are looking for a correlation but I wonder whether this exists”.

4.5.7 Conclusion project Z

In conclusion, project Z is not subject to many changes because of the phase this project is in. The ‘line’ is defined ambiguously in this project, since two project team members experience the members who provide capacity for the project team as the line, whereas two other project team

members experience the client as the line, because of the impact this person has on the project team. A distinction was made between these two 'lines'. Regarding the two project team members (#1 and #2) that perceived the client as the line, both members experienced high trust and high autonomy from the line. The lines for project team members #1 and #2 indicated that they have high trust and 'give' high autonomy towards the team, however one line member indicated that trust was difficult to analyze because of the distance this member had towards the project. Three out of four project team members indicate that intrinsic motivation is the mechanism between experienced autonomy and how the project team deals with change. For the other project team member (#2), no relation could be given because of the difficulty of the question and the lack of time during the interview. For 2 out of 4 project team members (#3 and #4), intrinsic motivation is acting as a mechanism between the experienced trust from the line and how the project team deals with change. Two out of four members (#1 and #2) indicated that the experienced trust was not related to how the project team deals with change because of low impact of the line on the team (#1) and not seeing a relation (#2). An overview of the within-case analysis of project Z can be found in table 12 below.

Table 12

Project Z: Overview Project Team Members

Interviewee	Experiences autonomy	Experiences trust	Mechanism Autonomy -> dealing with change	Quotes	Mechanism Trust -> dealing with change	Quotes
#1*	High	High	Intrinsic motivation 'more motivated	<i>"So when they have no freedom, they will become unmotivated dealing with change"</i>	X ¹	<i>"I know that you are looking for a correlation but I wonder whether this exists"</i>
#2*	High	High	X	X	X ²	<i>"The trust from the line is high, however the relationship with the line is limited. Therefore, I do not see a relationship"</i>
#3/	High	High	Intrinsic motivation 'more motivated	<i>"Having authority increases the motivation to both work and dealing with changes"</i>	Intrinsic motivation 'more motivated'	<i>"This enhances the motivation regarding both working on the project and dealing with change"</i>
#4/	High	High	Intrinsic motivation 'more motivated'	<i>"...but when you have no authority and are not responsible, then this is directly related to motivation"</i>	Intrinsic motivation 'more enjoyable' X ³	<i>"...it is obvious of importance if you have a client that trusts you, because lack of trust will result in a low degree of motivation"</i>

Note. * = members from the line organization were perceived as 'line'.

Note. / = the client was perceived as 'line'.

Note. X = did not understand the question.

Note. X^1 = no relation according to this member.

Note. X^2 = no relation because this project is not that much subject to change and the influence of the line is to a minimal degree.

Note. X^3 = this member indicated that it is of more importance to have a good project manager that motivates the team, especially in this project because of the minimal influence of the line.

4.6 Cross-case analysis

In this section, the reader will be presented with an overview of the analysis across the cases in order to integrate results, appoint patterns and deduct differences and similarities across cases. When analyzing and comparing the five cases, it became apparent that all projects have a collection of both differences and similarities. Across all cases, there was a high consensus regarding the high degree of both autonomy and trust from the line. During the cross-case analysis, two interesting results arose from the data which will be discussed below. To begin with, cases will be distinguished regarding the hierarchical responsibilities of the many lines. Because it became apparent during the interviews that 'the line' as the author described was not the line for all project team members, a cross case analysis will be held over the cases to look for patterns among these projects. Subsequently, the projects will be divided into the status the project is in and will be compared to each other. As several project team members mentioned that the status of the project is related to how often the project is subject to change, interesting findings might be found here.

4.6.1 Clear line/single line versus unclear line/multiple lines

While data was obtained by means of interviews, it became apparent that in most project teams it is not easily to answer 'Who is the line?'. Especially in large projects, there are multiple lines that a project team has to report to or is influenced by. Even though initial meetings with the project managers of each project were helpful in determining *who is the line*, during the interviews, it became apparent that it differs per project how these lines are determined. In all projects, of the 21 project team members that were interviewed, a total of 6 project team members argued that the line – as described by the author and obtained during the initial meetings with the project manager – was not similar to the line these project team members had in mind. An interesting note here concerns the fact that all 6 project team members were spread over all 5 projects (project V, #5; project W, #4; Project X, #1; Project Y, #4; Project Z, #3 and #4). Thus, in all teams that were interviewed, there is at least one member who experiences trust and autonomy from a different line than the other members in the project team do.

The analysis did not show any resemblance among these team members in terms of function, sex, or tenure. All six members had a different function (e.g. quality and risk manager, manager project management, technical manager) and their tenure ranged from 1 to almost 8 years. A clarifying comment was made by one of the interviewees (#4) from project Y who commented that having different lines than colleague project team members results in uncertainty within the project team. This project team member strives to have a clear definition of 'the line': "*When the line gives me extra work or information, then it is of importance that other project team members also receive*

this information from their line, so we all know what to do with the project. This does not always occur and sometimes the information is not consistent from what I hear from a colleague. You can talk with each other how to deal with it, but it is difficult if you do not have the same starting point”.

Interestingly, project Z had a clear distinction regarding ambiguities in determining who is the line, since half of the project team members saw the line organization as the line, whereas the other half saw the client as the line due to the fact that for these project team members, it is this client – consisting of one person – who tells the project team what needs to be done and not the members from the line organization. An interesting note here concerns a couple of project team members who mentioned the phase of the project and the function of the line organization in this project as the cause who they perceived as ‘line’.

In conclusion, all projects that participated in this study, had at least one member who perceived one (or more) member(s) as ‘the line’, contrarily to who – in consultation with the project managers of the projects - was determined as the line in this study. The analysis showed no resemblance among these project team members regarding sex, tenure or function. According to one of the project team members, the phase of the project might explain who is perceived as ‘line’. This reason lays a bridge to the following cross-case analysis.

4.6.2 Status of the project

Another interesting finding that arose from the data analysis concerns the fact how much the project was subject to change. It became apparent from the analysis that the amount of change a project experiences might be related to the phase the project was in. Four out of five projects are in an intermediate or advanced stage, however one project, project Z, was still in the initiative phase. During this phase, a project is in the preliminary design and grows towards a final design.

It became apparent from the analysis that project team members from project Z were hardly subject to any change and had little contact with the line. Even though the line in this project was determined as client for two project team members, and members from the line organization for the remaining two project team members, project Z resulted from the analysis as the project with the least mentioned mechanisms how trust was related to how the project team deals with change (2 out of 4). However, the type of mechanisms were not different than in the other projects. The results show that the more the project team is subject to change, the more trust from the line is associated with how the project team deals with change.

This may be explained by the fact that – according to multiple project team members over multiple projects – trust that is experienced or ‘given’ by the line is partially based upon the progress status of the project. As one project team member (#1, project Z) mentioned: *“You must ensure you*

control the quality and validation of the process". When a project is still in an initiative phase, the project team has not yet had a change to proof its strengths and qualities. For that reason, the experienced trust by the line may not be of influence regarding how the team deals with change.

In conclusion, the status of the project might play a role in determining the mechanism between experienced trust and how the project team deals with change since a project in an initiative phase cannot prove its qualities contrarily to a project team in an advanced stage. An overview of the projects and mentioned mechanisms can be found in table 13 below.

Table 13

Overview Projects and Mechanisms Mentioned (Trust)

Project	Mechanisms mentioned (trust -> dealing with change)
Project V [IPM]	5/5
Project W	3/4
Project X	4/4
Project Y	4/5
Project Z [IPM]	2/4

5. CONCLUSION & DISCUSSION

This chapter will provide an overview of the general conclusion in this study. Subsequently, the author will link the findings in this study with existing literature. In addition, managerial implications will be presented that can be used by managers in the infrastructural context. Finally, the author will conclude this chapter with the limitations of this study and recommendations for future research.

5.1 General conclusion

This study aimed to answer the following main research question: *“How do autonomy and trust of a project team associate with the intrinsic motivation towards the project and how is this intrinsic motivation associated with the change capacity of a project team?”*.

The findings of this study indicate that both experiencing a high degree of autonomy and a high degree of trust from the line results in an enhanced motivation from the project team members towards the project. Additionally, the findings indicate the existence of intrinsic motivation and self-confidence as mechanisms between both the experienced trust and autonomy from the line and the change capacity of the project team. An interesting note concerns the fact that in this study, intrinsic motivation has had a plurality of manifestations. The intrinsic motivation does not only manifest itself when a person perceives work as interesting or enjoyable, yet intrinsic motivation is also related to proactive behavior. Since only one interviewee experienced low trust from the line, whereas all other members experienced a high degree of trust, no relevant comparisons could be made between experiencing a high or low degree of trust from the line. Therefore, the conclusion and discussion is based upon the experienced high degree of both trust and autonomy, supplemented by the mechanism between the experienced trust and autonomy and the change capacity of the project team. Regarding the mechanism between trust and autonomy and the change capacity of the team, intrinsic motivation was indicated as being the most important mechanism, followed by self-confidence.

Experienced autonomy

An interesting finding of this study concerns the relationship between the high experienced degree of autonomy and the project team's change capacity. With regards to this matter, it is worth noting that all interviewees, with the exception of a handful interviewees that did not understand the question, had intrinsic motivation to be the applicable mechanism. This intrinsic motivation was mostly expressed upon enjoyable and interesting work. Within all projects, the experienced high

degree of autonomy was within certain preconditions. This is in line with Van den Broeck et al. (2009) in which it is stated that to experience autonomy it is not important to control everything yourself, however functioning without pressure is essential. Additionally, experiencing a high degree of autonomy has led to an increase in motivation at work. An interesting note here concerns the fact that the experienced high degree of autonomy has also led to intrinsic motivation by means of an active and pro-active attitude towards the project. When provided with more project authority, the project members have mentioned to feel both more responsible for the project and more active in the project. According to earlier literature, experiencing a high degree of autonomy can also lead to an increase in motivation at work and enhancement of company success due to employees working more effectively according to previous research (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Ryan et al., 2000). This conclusion is also acknowledged by the findings of the underlying study. The findings of this study also support the work of Morgeson et al. (2005). In the latter study, it is argued that when feeling autonomous, one is experiencing several advantages. These involve a reduced tendency to adopt a “this is not my job” approach and an increased tendency towards proactivity and creativity.

The results show that intrinsic motivation is serving as a mechanism between the experienced autonomy and the change capacity of the project team. The intrinsic motivation has stimulated the project members to be more flexible. The project team members have furthermore taken a more active role when it comes to thinking about the project. These findings support earlier research by Amabile et al. (1990), who claimed that intrinsic motivation is associated with creativity, cognitive flexibility, and problem solving. These factors are considered to be key factors in how to deal with organizational change. This study’s intrinsic motivation is therefore serving as a mechanism regarding the outcome of change capacity.

Experienced trust

The results show that the experienced high trust from the line to the project team associates with enhanced intrinsic motivation and self-confidence towards the project. As aforementioned, intrinsic motivation has a plurality of manifestations. Regarding trust, both enjoyable work and a pro-active attitude were the most mentioned forms of intrinsic motivation that resulted from the experienced high degree of trust. By means of the perceived trust, the project team members experienced that they could take their own initiatives which lead to a proactive attitude towards and more enjoyable working on the project. These findings are in line with Ryan et al. (2009) in which it was found that when trust is given to a person, it can strengthen feelings of competence that is the foundation of sustained motivation. The results are also in line with Deci and Ryan (2000), in which satisfaction of competence is necessary for the enjoyment of the activity – in casu, working on the project. The

proactive behavior is in line with previous research by Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995), in which trust results in taking on additional responsibilities within the organization.

An interesting note here concerns the fact that all project team members who mentioned that their high experienced degree of trust was related to intrinsic motivation, also experienced a high degree of autonomy. These findings are in line with Ryan (1982) and Deci and Ryan (2000) in which it is suggested in the CET that feelings of competence will not maintain or enhance intrinsic motivation unless they are in the context of autonomy. However, it cannot be concluded in this study that the supportive environment in terms of autonomy has impacted the relation between experienced trust and intrinsic motivation. Further research is necessary to investigate whether and how trust is related to intrinsic motivation in a non-autonomous supportive environment.

Regarding the interviewees who mentioned how their experienced high degree of trust was related to the change capacity, intrinsic motivation was mentioned as the most important mechanism. Just as with the relationship between the experienced autonomy and the change capacity of the project team, the results regarding intrinsic motivation are similar compared to the experienced trust and the change capacity of the team. Also here, the findings support Amabile et al. (1990) in such a way that both in their study as in this study, intrinsic motivation functions as a mechanism due to the associations with creativity, (cognitive) flexibility, and problem solving which are key factors regarding the change capacity of the project team. In addition, proactivity also leads to an enhanced change capability of the project team since it is aimed at improving and challenge status quo in an organization (Bindl & Parker, 2010). Because there are very few studies that have researched the associations between intrinsic motivation and change capacity, these findings contribute to the existing literature. Furthermore, more insights about this association can be an interesting phenomenon for future research. In addition, future research might take proactive behavior into account when exploring intrinsic motivation since the results show that intrinsic motivation is not only related to enjoying work and more interesting work, a proactive behavior might also be a new concept of intrinsic motivation.

In conclusion, the findings indicate that a high degree of experienced trust from the line towards the project team results in more motivation and a more pro-active attitude towards the project. In turn, this intrinsic motivation functions as a mechanism regarding the change capacity of the project team.

Another interesting point that emerged from the data, concerns the finding that a handful of project team members had mentioned that self-confidence is acting as the mechanism between the experienced trust and the way the project team is dealing with change. According to these

members, the experienced trust from the line is transferred to the project team and reflected into the capacity to deal with change. This is in line with previous research by Deci and Ryan (1985) and Ryan and Deci (2002) in which it is stated that the need for competence is not a desire to the right skills, yet a desire to experiencing trust in a person's own actions. When a person experiences more competence, he or she has a feeling of making the best use of their abilities (Ryan & Deci, 2002).

An unexpected finding of this study concerns the difficulty with conceptualizing 'line'. In this study, it became apparent that a project is often influenced and controlled by multiple lines; this also applies to the project team. Even though it exceeds the boundaries of this study, it is worth noting that all interviewed line members had indicated that the experienced trust and autonomy of the project managers matched the degree to which trust and autonomy was 'given' by the line members. This study has helped exposing the difficult structure of project teams that operate in a line organization. An interesting note here concerns the fact that the project team member who experienced a low degree of trust from the line, was based upon his personal line. However, due to the sole presence of only one statement in this context, no relevant conclusions can be drawn. For future research, it might nevertheless be interesting to shed more light on the extent to which a low degree of trust and autonomy are associated with the change capacity of a project team.

5.2 Practical implications

There are several practical implications that arose from this study. This study shows the importance of experiencing a high degree of trust and autonomy from the line on the change capacity of the project team by means of an enhanced intrinsic motivation and self-confidence. For line managers, a practical implication therefore concerns emphasizing the trust towards the project team. Periodic controls are considered to be necessary by the line in order to know the status of the project; project team members have acknowledged this by indicating that they understand the importance of these updates. However, line managers should emphasize the trust that they have in the project team. This can be achieved by establishing a climate, in which constructive feedback is provided. Furthermore, adequately rewarding accomplishments of the project team can also result in an enhanced feeling of trust among the project team members. In addition, good and clear communication, and thus a promotion of transparency can stimulate the feeling of trust.

Another practical implication for the line managers concerns the expression of autonomy of the project team. As many project team members have indicated, the 'what' of the project is determined by the line (or the client), yet the 'how' is mostly left to the project team. Therefore, project team members experience a high degree of autonomy. However, there are some tips that

line managers might use to enhance the feeling of autonomy. First of all, the project team members need to know why the goal they have been assigned to has a certain value. The feeling of autonomy can be enhanced by explaining what is important since project team members might not be committed that well if they do not see a goal that is desirable to them. Furthermore, allowing the project team members to tailor their approach to their preferences and abilities will give these members a sense of control over the situation. In addition, the line managers can invite the project team when they face a particular problem. By inviting the project team and asking for their opinion, both feelings of autonomy and trust of the project team might be enhanced which results in a better change capacity of the project team.

Finally, and also suggested by one of the interviewees who perceived another line as 'the line', it might be of importance to have 'one line' for the entire project team. During this study, it became apparent that there are 'different lines' within a project team and therefore, different people that updates regarding the project are being reported to. However, this is a very difficult scenario, as the project's complexity can sometime result in a plurality of lines. It is recommended to have the same line for all project team members – or to have all the different line members be in contact with each other – yet, this is difficult to say with the limited information gained from this study. More research is necessary to look at the relation with the several lines and how these lines are related to each other.

5.3 Limitations & suggestions for future research

Inevitably, this study was also subject to several limitations. The application of qualitative research has been mentioned as a strength; this form of research however also comes with its limitations. To begin with, by conducting interviews, transcripts with a total amount of 376 pages have been written. Analyzing these transcripts introduces the susceptibility to researcher bias. Another limitation concerns the fact that although the majority of the used interviews has been undertaken and transcribed by the author of this research, a minor part of the applied interviews have been obtained via colleague researchers. This concerns the following interviewees: Project Z, line member #1, project members #2 and #4 and project Y, project member #1. The author cannot personally verify whether the content of these interviews is correct and therefore verify the validity and trustworthiness of this study. However, efforts were made to verify whether the transcripts matched the data recordings (taking multiple test samples). Therefore, the author assumed the transcripts to be executed correctly. Another limitation concerns unforeseen circumstances combined with time pressure of both the researcher and the interviewees which resulted in a number of seven interviews that were held over the telephone and two interviews that were partly processed via e-

mail. These interviews have been treated with caution; it might however be the case that essential information is lacking due to the nature of communication by phone and e-mail. Unforeseen circumstances have also led to projects (X, Y, and Z) in which not all members could be interviewed. For example, in one project (Z) only four out of five IPM members were interviewed. Even though it is not assumed that this member would provide a totally different image of the relationship with the line, interviewing an 'entire team' enhances the richness of data. Another limitation concerns the definition of 'line'. The results show that a project is often influenced and controlled by multiple lines. For some interviewees, interview questions were asked in relation to their own line instead of the line for the project team. This may have affected the validity of the study because both the personal lines and the group lines were taken into the data analysis. Furthermore, selection bias cannot be excluded, since the line was defined and chosen by the project managers during the initial meetings.

Multiple avenues for further research exist. To begin with, the researcher recommends further research in order to analyze whether the findings of this study also apply in other, non-infrastructure contexts. The infrastructure sector is characterized by dependency upon many factors (e.g. politics, society) and is highly subject to change. The whole story might be different in another context, where other mechanisms between the experienced autonomy and trust and the change capacity of the team might be more relevant. Secondly, it might be of addition to study multiple projects which are in different phases of the project. It might be of addition to research how the relationship between the line and the project team members holds and whether the phase that the project team is in is of influence in how the team deals with organizational change. Thirdly, during the interviews, the interviewees indicated several factors besides trust and autonomy that are of importance regarding how a project team deals with change (e.g. tight scope and planning, good project manager). The author suggests it might be of special interest for future research to investigate how these factors influence the change capacity of a project team. Finally, in this study the experienced degree of trust and autonomy were of a high degree. Another suggestion for further research concerns a focus at project teams who experience a low degree of trust and autonomy and compare the outcomes with project teams who experience a high degree of trust and autonomy.

REFERENCES

- Aken, J.E. van, Berends, H., & Bij, H. van der. (2012). *Problem solving in Organizations: A methodological handbook for business and management students*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: University Press.
- Amabile, T.M., Goldfarb, P., & Brackfield, S.C. (1990). Social influences on creativity: Evaluation, coaction, and surveillance. *Creativity Research Journal*, 3, 6-21.
- Atkinson, R., Crawford, L., & Ward, S. (2006). Fundamental uncertainties in projects and the scope of project management. *International Journal of Project Management*, 24, 687-698.
- Baard, P., Deci, E.L., & Ryan, R.M. (2004). Intrinsic need satisfaction: A motivational basis of performance and well-being in two work settings. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 34, 2045-2068.
- (In Dutch) Baarda, D.B., Goede, M.P.M. de, & Teunissen, J. (2005). *Basisboek kwalitatief onderzoek* Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff.
- Baxter, L. A., & Babbie, E. R. (2004). *The basics of communication research*. New York: Wadsworth/Thomson.
- Bennebroek Gravenhorst, K.M., Werkman, R.A., & Boonstra, J.J. (2003). The change capacity of organisations: General assesment and interpreting five configurations. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 52, 83-105.
- (In Dutch) Bijlsma-Frankema, K.M. (2007). Controle is goed, vertrouwen is beter. *Gids voor personeelsmanagement*, 86(2), 9-11.
- Bindl, U.K., & Parker, S.K. (2010). Proactive work behavior: Forward-thinking and change oriented action in organizations. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*. Washington: American Psychological Association.

Bresnen, M., & Marshall, N. (2000). Building partnerships: case studies of client-contractor collaboration in the UK construction industry. *Construction Management and Economics*, 18(7), 819-32.

(In Dutch) Broeck, A. van den, Vansteenkiste, M., Witte, H. de, Lens, W., & Andriessen, M. (2009). De Zelf-Determinatie Theorie: Kwalitatief Goed Motiveren op de Werkvloer. *Gedrag en Organisatie*, 22, 316-335.

Bronder, C., & Pritzl, R. (1992). Developing strategic alliances: A conceptual framework for successful co-operation, *European Management Journal*, 10(4), 412-421.

Coleman, J. (1990). *Foundations of Social Theory*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Creswell, J.W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design*. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

DeCharms, R. (1968). *Personal causation: The internal affective determinants of behavior*. New York: Academic Press.

Deci, E. L. (1971). The effects of externally mediated rewards on intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 18, 105-115.

Deci, E. L. (1975). *Intrinsic motivation*. New York: Plenum.

Deci, E. L., Connell, J. P., & Ryan, R.M. (1989). Self-determination in a work organization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 580-590.

Deci, E.L., Koestner, R., & Ryan, R.M. (1999). A meta-analytic review of experiments examining the effects of extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125, 627-668.

Deci, E.L., & Ryan, R.M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum.

Deci, E.L., & Ryan, R.M. (2000). The 'what' and 'why' of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behaviour. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11, 227-268.

Deci, E.L., Ryan, R.M., Gagné, M., Leone, D.R., Usunov, J., & Kornazheva, B.P. (2001). Need satisfaction, motivation, and well-being in the work organizations of a former Eastern Bloc country. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27, 930-942.

(In Dutch) Dusseldorp, T., Put, Van der Put, J. & Rupert, J. (2012). Naar een gezonde spanning in projectenland. In: Van Muijen, J., Rupert, J. & Tours, H. (Red). *Spanningen in en rondom organisaties*. Deventer: Kluwer.

Eisenhardt, K.M. (1989). Building Theories from Case Study Research. *Academy Of Management Review*, 14(4), 532-550.

Fischer, R. (2004). Rewarding employee loyalty: An organizational justice approach. *International Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 8(3), 486-503.

Gagné, M. (2003). The role of autonomy support and autonomy orientation in prosocial behavior engagement. *Motivation and Emotion*, 27 (3), 199-223.

Gagné, M., & Deci, E.L. (2005). Self-determination theory and work motivation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26, 331-362.

Gagné, M., Koestner, R., & Zuckerman, M. (2000). Facilitating acceptance of organizational change: The importance of self-determination. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 30, 1843-1852.

Graen, G.B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Development of Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) Theory of Leadership Over 25 Years: Applying a Multi-Level Multi-Domain Perspective. *Leadership Quarterly*, 6, 219-247.

Gulati R. (1995). Does familiarity breed trust? The implications of repeated ties for contractual choice in alliances. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 85-112.

Hackman, J.R., & Oldham, G.R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a survey. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 16, 250-279.

Hackman J.R., & Oldham, G.R. (1980). *Work Redesign*. Reading: Addison-Wesley.

Higgins, E.T. (1997). Beyond pleasure and pain. *American Psychologist*, 52, 1280-1300.

Hignett, S. (2003). Hospital ergonomics: a qualitative study to explore the organizational and cultural factors. *Ergonomics*, 46 (9), 882-903.

Hosmer, L.T. (1995). Trust: The connecting link between organizational theory and philosophical ethics. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(2), 379-403.

Ilardi, B.C., Leone, D., Kasser, R., & Ryan, R.M. (1993). Employee and supervisor ratings of motivation: Main effects and discrepancies associated with job satisfaction and adjustment in a factory setting. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 23, 1789-1805.

Integraal projectmanagement. In *Rijkswaterstaat*. Retrieved from http://www.rijkswaterstaat.nl/zakelijk/zakendoen_met_rws/werkwijzen/gww/werken_projecten/integraal_projectmanagement.

Jones, K. (1996): Trust as an Affective Attitude, *Ethics*, 107, 4-25.

Karasek, R.A. (1979). Job demands, job decision latitude and mental strain: Implications for job redesign. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24, 285-308.

Love, P.E.D., Mistry, D., & Davis, P.R. (2010). Price competitive alliance projects: Identification of success factors for public clients. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 136, 947-956.

Lynch, M.F., Plant, R.W., & Ryan, R.M. (2005). Psychological needs and threat to safety: Implications for staff and patients in a psychiatric hospital for youth. *Professional Psychology*, 36, 415-425.

Maurer, I. (2009). 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, 629-637.

- Mayer, R.C., Davis, J.H., & Schoorman, F.D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 20, 709-734.
- Miles, M.B., & Huberman, A.M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Morgeson, F.P., Delaney-Klinger, K.A., & Hemingway, M.A. (2005). The importance of job autonomy, cognitive ability, and job-related skill for predicting role breadth and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 399-406.
- Nahapiet, J. & Ghoshal, S. (1998). Social capital, intellectual capital, and the organizational advantage, *Academy of Management Review*, 23(2),242-266.
- Ngowi, A.B. & Pienaar, E. (2005). Trust factor in construction alliances. *Building Research and Information*, 33(3), 267-278.
- Nordqvist, S., Hovmark, S., & Zika-Viktorsson, A. (2004). Perceived time pressure and social processes in project teams. *International Journal of Project Management*, 22, 463-468.
- Parker, S.K., Wall, T.D., & Jackson, P.R. (1997). That's not my job: Developing flexible employee work orientations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40, 899-929.
- Pinder, C. (2008). *Work Motivation in Organizational Behavior*, 2nd ed. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall.
- (In Dutch) Pries, F. & Kuhlman, M. (2010). Hoe fragmentatie onze grootste vijand is geworden. *Building business*, 24-26.
- Rapley, T. (2004). Interviews. In: Seale, C., Gobo, G., Gubrium J.F. & Silverman, D. *Qualitative Research Practice*. London: Sage.
- Reeve, J. (1996). *Motivating others: Nurturing inner motivational resources*. Needham Heights: Allyn & Bacon.

Rousseau, D., Sitkin, S., Burt, R., & Camerer, C. (1998). Not so different after all: A cross-discipline view of trust. *The Academy of Management Review*, 23(3), 393-404.

Ryan, R.M. (1982). Control and information in the intrapersonal sphere: An extension of cognitive evaluation theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 43, 450-461.

Ryan, R.M. (1995). Psychological needs and the facilitation of integrative processes. *Journal of Personality*, 63, 397-427.

Ryan, R.M., & Deci, E.L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55, 68-78.

Ryan, R.M., & Deci, E.L. (2002). An overview of self-determination theory: An organismic dialectical perspective. In E.L. Deci & R.M. Ryan (Eds.), *Handbook of self-determination research*. Rochester: University of Rochester.

Ryan, R.M., Deci, E.L., Grolnick, W.S., & LaGuardia, J.G. (2006). The significance of autonomy and autonomy support in psychological development and psychopathology. In D. Cicchetti & D. Cohen (Eds.) *Developmental Psychopathology: Volume 1, Theory and Methods* (2nd Edition) (pp. 295-849). New York: Wiley.

Ryan, R.M., Kuhl, J., & Deci, E.L. (1997). Nature and autonomy: Organizational view of social and neurobiological aspects of self-regulation in behavior and development. *Development and Psychopathology*, 9, 701-728.

Ryan, R.M., Rigby, C.S., & Przybylski, A. (2006). The motivational pull of video games: A self-determination theory approach. *Motivational Emotion*, 30, 347-363.

Ryan, R.M., Williams, G.C., Patrick, H., & Deci, E.L. (2009). Self-determination theory and physical activity: The dynamics of motivation in development and wellness. *Hellenic Journal of Psychology*, 6, 107-124.

Tafarodi, R.W. & Swann, W.B. (1996). Individualism Collectivism and Global Self-Esteem. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 27(6), 651-72.

Vroom, V.H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York: Wiley.

Wang, T.W. & Ko, Y.N. (2012). Knowledge sharing practices of project teams when encountering changes in project scope: A contingency approach. *Journal of Information Science*, 38(5), 423-441.

Wong, W.K., Cheung, S.O., Yiu, T.W. & Pang, H.Y. (2008). A Framework for Trust in Construction Contracting. *International Journal of Project Management*, 26, 821-829.

Woodside, A.G. (2010). *Case study research. Theory, methods, practice*. Bingley: Emerald Group.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A Information form

Onderzoeksvoorstel Rijksuniversiteit Groningen i.s.m. Neerlands Diep

Aanleiding en inhoud van het onderzoek

Aan de master Change Management van de faculteit der Economie en Bedrijfskunde van de Rijksuniversiteit Groningen werken studenten in themagroepen aan hun afstudeeronderzoek. Dr. Joyce Rupert is als afstudeerbegeleidster verbonden aan deze master en heeft de samenwerking opgezocht met Neerlands Diep, met als doel een actueel en relevant thema te onderzoeken dat inzichten oplevert, zowel voor de praktijk van projectmanagement als voor de wetenschap. Dit najaar zullen drie studenten onderzoek gaan doen naar de volgende thematiek.

Het centrale onderzoeksthema betreft de relatie tussen de lijn- en projectorganisaties die in de praktijk vaak veel spanningen en wederzijds onbegrip met zich meebrengt. Het traditionele management paradigma is dat van controle en beheersing; de sturing van bovenaf. Echter, steeds meer onderzoek laat zien dat een beweging van onderaf, waarbij beslissingen onderin de organisatie worden genomen door de specialisten, positief is voor de motivatie en inzet van betrokkenen. Dit vraagt echter om een ander leiderschapsconcept: meer dienend en met ruimte en oog voor een diversiteit in opvattingen en oplossingen. De bijbehorende relatie kenmerkt zich door vertrouwen en gelijkwaardigheid. Onderzoek laat zien dat meer autonomie en zelfsturing niet alleen motiverender is, maar ook zorgt voor meer innovatie en flexibiliteit bij het omgaan met veranderingen.

In de praktijk ontstaan steeds meer voorbeelden van autonomie en zelfsturing. Een bekend voorbeeld is de zorginstelling Buurtzorg die inmiddels sinds een aantal jaren werkt met zelfsturende teams. Maar ook in de infrawereld ontstaan steeds meer voorbeelden, zoals directeur Van As die NedTrain van een linksdraaiende naar een rechtsdraaiende organisatie maakte. Echter, in veel projecten wordt nog vanuit een traditioneel management paradigma gewerkt. In dit onderzoek willen we een aantal projecten met elkaar vergelijken aan de hand van de vraag hoe de relatie tussen lijn- en projectorganisatie vanuit beide kanten wordt ervaren en wat de invloed hiervan is op het dagelijks functioneren van het team in een complexe en veranderende omgeving. Meer specifiek worden er, op basis van eerder wetenschappelijk onderzoek, drie deelvragen onder de loep genomen:

- a) Diversiteitsonderzoek laat zien dat gelijksoortige mensen naar elkaar aantrekken en homogene subgroepen ('faultlines') kunnen vormen, die breuken kunnen veroorzaken tussen (groepen) mensen in de organisatie. Deze deelvraag gaat over de vraag in hoeverre het onderscheid tussen lijn- en projectorganisatie als een breuklijn wordt ervaren en hoe dit van invloed is op de samenwerking tussen de lijn en het projectteam in een veranderende omgeving.
- b) In een tweede deelvraag wordt de verhouding lijn- en projectorganisatie bekeken vanuit een macht- en belangenperspectief. Wat zijn de belangen van de verschillende organisatieonderdelen en hoe zijn middelen verdeeld? Door wie worden belangrijke beslissingen genomen en wie beschikt er over relevante bronnen? En hoe beïnvloedt het type relatie tussen lijn- en projectorganisatie de samenwerking in projecten?

- c) Een derde deelvraag gaat over de mate waarin projectteams autonomie en vertrouwen ervaren van de lijn en hoe dit gerelateerd is aan intrinsieke motivatie en betrokkenheid bij het project. Daarbij wordt in kaart gebracht hoe de relatie lijn- en projectorganisatie van invloed is op het gevoel van autonomie en zelfsturing.

Methode

Het onderzoek betreft een meervoudige casestudie, waarbij interviews zullen worden gehouden met leden van de project- en de lijnorganisatie. Er zal een vergelijking worden gemaakt tussen verschillende typen projecten, waarbij gestreefd wordt naar een gelijkwaardige afspiegeling van verschillende opdrachtgever en opdrachtnemer relaties. Op dit moment hebben zich onder meer projecten aangemeld vanuit Rijkswaterstaat, Gemeenten en ProRail.

Wat kost het en wat levert het op?

Het onderzoek vraagt om een korte tijdsinvestering van leden van het IPM team en een of enkele leden vanuit de lijnorganisatie in verband met de afname van een interview. Dit interview zal maximaal 1,5 uur duren. De looptijd van de interviews is vanaf de tweede helft van november tot en met de eerste helft van december. De studenten zullen de onderzoeksresultaten en de praktijkimplicaties en bijbehorende adviezen terugkoppelen aan de projecten die zij hebben onderzocht. Het voordeel van de vergelijking over verschillende projecten heen is dat de verschillende praktijkervaringen via het onderzoek kunnen worden uitgewisseld. De conclusies van het onderzoek kunnen daarmee gebruikt worden om de relatie lijn- en projectorganisatie verder te verbeteren.

Hoe gaat het in zijn werk?

Indien u besluit mee te werken aan het onderzoek zal een kennismakingsgesprek plaatsvinden met een of meerdere van de studenten, waarin u uw nadere wensen en interesses kenbaar kunt maken en waarin verdere afspraken gemaakt worden over het verloop van het onderzoek. We zullen zoveel mogelijk rekening houden met uw wensen en de eventuele beperkingen die er vanuit uw project zijn.

Mocht u naar aanleiding van dit voorstel vragen hebben, aarzel dan niet om contact op te nemen met Joyce Rupert: email j.rupert@rug.nl; telefoon 06-20561627.

APPENDIX B Interview start-up

Allereerst willen wij u hartelijk bedanken voor de mogelijkheid om u te interviewen, zoals u weet zal dit interview ongeveer één tot anderhalf uur duren. Om de interviews later uit te kunnen werken vragen wij u of wij de **interviews mogen opnemen**, uiteraard is uw **anonimiteit** hierbij gewaarborgd (er zullen geen namen in onze scripties worden vermeld, ook niet van uw organisatie). Verder zullen deze met uiterste **discretie en in alle vertrouwelijkheid** behandeld worden.

Wij willen dit laatste graag extra benadrukken; deze interviews nemen wij binnen meerdere projecten om **naar patronen in de samenwerking van projectteams te kunnen kijken**. Naderhand zullen onze bevindingen teruggekoppeld worden in de vorm van **aanbevelingen voor projecten** en naar Neerlands Diep. In deze terugkoppeling zullen algemene patronen worden beschreven die wij vonden in de relatie lijn- en projectorganisatie die **niet herleidbaar zullen zijn tot bepaalde projecten**.

Zoals eerder aan u is medegedeeld voeren wij in het kader van ons afstuderen een onderzoek uit dat betrekking heeft op de **relatie tussen lijn en project**, die vanuit verschillende invalshoeken wordt benaderd. Daarbij zijn we geïnteresseerd in de vraag hoe dit de teamsamenwerking van het projectteam beïnvloedt en hoe en het omgaan met veranderingen tijdens een project. Tevens zullen wij na het interview graag een **korte vragenlijst** bij u af willen nemen, dit zal ongeveer 5 tot 10 minuten in beslag nemen.

Rijksuniversiteit Groningen

Theo Bruins

Lucas van Leeuwen

Olga Poliakova

APPENDIX C Interview protocol project organization

1: Algemene relatie lijn organisatie - project team

- ⇒ Kunt u in het kort een beschrijving geven van uw functie?
- ⇒ Heeft u helder voor ogen welke personen voor uw projectteam 'de lijn' vertegenwoordigen?
- ⇒ Kunt u in het kort vertellen hoe de relatie tussen de lijn en uw projectteam eruit ziet?
- ⇒ Hoe verloopt de samenwerking tussen de lijn en het projectteam in de praktijk? En kunt u hiervan een voorbeeld geven?

2A: Relatie lijn-projectorganisatie, in termen van autonomie en vertrouwen

Autonomie

- ⇒ In hoeverre ervaart u in uw projectteam ruimte van de lijn om zelf beslissingen te nemen en keuzes te maken omtrent het project?
Doorvragen: Waar blijkt dit uit?
- ⇒ Welke beslissingen worden over het algemeen door de lijn overgelaten aan uw projectteam?
Doorvragen: Kunt u dit toelichten met een voorbeeld?
- ⇒ In hoeverre heeft uw projectteam de ruimte om zelfstandig haar eigen functie te vervullen?
Doorvragen: Waar blijkt dit uit? Kunt u dit toelichten aan de hand van een voorbeeld?
- ⇒ In hoeverre wordt het projectteam gestuurd/gecontroleerd door de lijn?
Doorvragen: Waaruit blijkt dit?
Doorvragen: Kunt u een voorbeeld geven?

Vertrouwen

- ⇒ In hoeverre krijgt uw projectteam het vertrouwen van de lijn om het werk (voor het project) naar eigen inzicht en kennis uit te voeren?
Doorvragen: En waarvoor is afstemming met de lijn vereist?
Doorvragen: Waar blijkt dit uit? Kunt u dit toelichten met een voorbeeld?
- ⇒ In hoeverre wordt er door de lijn op het projectteam vertrouwd?
Doorvragen: Waaruit blijkt dit?
Doorvragen: Kunt u een voorbeeld geven?

Projecten hebben vaak te maken met veranderingen die worden geïmplementeerd.

Twee soorten verandering: ene verandering is voorzien (dus gepland) en je hebt veranderingen die plotseling op komen zetten en waarop je niet kan anticiperen.

We zijn benieuwd hoe de lijn en het projectteam hiermee omgaan.

- ⇒ Krijgt het projectteam veel met veranderingen te maken tijdens het verloop van het project?

Doorvragen: Kunt u een recent voorbeeld geven.

- ⇒ Hoe gaat uw projectteam om met veranderingen binnen het project?

Doorvragen: Kunt u dit beargumenteren aan de hand van een voorbeeld?

Doorvragen: Wat gaat goed?

Doorvragen: Wat kan beter?

3: Check terug naar voren

- ⇒ Welke factoren vergemakkelijken of bemoeilijken het omgaan met veranderingen in uw projectteam?

Doorvragen: **Doorvragen:** Zou u een voorbeeld kunnen geven?

4A: Effect op de teamsamenwerking , autonomie en vertrouwen

- ⇒ In hoeverre is (het) vertrouwen dat uw projectteam ontvangt (van de lijn), van invloed op de teammotivatie?

Doorvragen: Indien positief: Waarom?/Kunt u een verklaring geven waarom dit invloed heeft? Waar blijkt dit uit?

Doorvragen: Indien negatief: Waarom? Waar blijkt dit uit?

- ⇒ In hoeverre is (het) vertrouwen dat uw projectteam ontvangt (van de lijn), van invloed op de manier waarop uw projectteam omgaat met veranderingen?

Doorvragen: Waaruit blijkt dit?

Doorvragen: Kunt u verklaren waarom dit deze invloed heeft? + voorbeeld.

- ⇒ In hoeverre is het zelf (kunnen/mogen) nemen van beslissingen door het projectteam van invloed op de teammotivatie?

Doorvragen: Indien positief: Waarom?/Kunt u een verklaring geven waarom dit invloed heeft? Waar blijkt dit uit?

Doorvragen: Indien negatief: Waarom? Waar blijkt dit uit?

- ⇒ In hoeverre is het zelf (mogen/kunnen) nemen van beslissingen, van invloed op de manier waarop het projectteam omgaat met veranderingen?

Doorvragen: Hoe uit zich dat?

Doorvragen: Wat zou hier een verklaring voor kunnen zijn? Kunt u dit toelichten aan de hand van een voorbeeld?

- ⇒ In hoeverre is de teammotivatie van invloed op de manier waarop er door het projectteam wordt om gegaan met veranderingen?

Doorvragen: Hoe uit zich dat?

Doorvragen: Wat zou hier een verklaring voor kunnen zijn? Kunt u dit toelichten aan de hand van een voorbeeld?

APPENDIX D

Interview protocol line organization

Algemene informatie:

- ⇒ Wat is in het kort uw functie?
- ⇒ Hoelang bent u al betrokken bij dit project?

1: Algemeen relatie lijn-project organisatie

- ⇒ Kunt u in het kort vertellen hoe een project doorgaans verloopt?
- ⇒ Kunt u beknopt een beschrijving geven hoe de relatie tussen de lijn en het projectteam eruit ziet?
- ⇒ Hoe ervaart u de samenwerking tussen de lijn en het projectteam in de praktijk?
Doorvragen: En wat is kenmerkend voor de relatie met het projectteam?

2A. Relatie lijn-projectorganisatie, in termen van autonomie en vertrouwen

Autonomie

- ⇒ Welke beslissingen kan de lijn over het algemeen overlaten aan de projectorganisatie?
Doorvragen: Over welke onderwerpen gaan deze beslissingen?
Doorvragen: Kunt u dit toelichten met een voorbeeld?
Doorvragen: Welke reden zit hier (vaak) achter?
- ⇒ Wie neemt er belangrijke beslissingen [beslissing die veel impact heeft] over het project: is dat de project manager van het project of de lijn?
Doorvragen: Waar is dit van afhankelijk?

Vertrouwen

- ⇒ In hoeverre is het projectteam capabel in het zelfstandig uitvoeren van haar taak?
Doorvragen: Waar blijkt dit uit?
Doorvragen: Kunt u een voorbeeld geven?
- ⇒ In hoeverre komt het voor dat het projectteam bijsturing nodig heeft van de lijn?
Doorvragen: Waar blijkt dit uit?
Doorvragen: Hoe wordt er ingegrepen?
Doorvragen: Wat zou hier een reden voor kunnen zijn?
- ⇒ In hoeverre vertrouwt de lijn op het projectteam?
Doorvragen: Waaruit blijkt dit?

Voorafgaand aan het stellen van de volgende vragen, [algemene] introductie geven over **veranderingen**.

Projecten hebben vaak te maken met veranderingen die worden geïmplementeerd.

Twee soorten verandering: ene verandering is voorzien (dus gepland) en je hebt veranderingen die plotseling op komen zetten en waarop je niet kan anticiperen.

We zijn benieuwd hoe de lijn en het projectteam hiermee omgaan.

⇒ Krijgt de lijn veel met veranderingen te maken tijdens het verloop van een project?

Doorvragen: Kunt u een recent voorbeeld geven?

⇒ Hoe vindt de lijn dat het projectteam omgaat met de veranderingen binnen het project?

Doorvragen: Kunt u dit beargumenteren aan de hand van een voorbeeld?

Doorvragen: Wat gaat goed?

Doorvragen: Wat kan beter?

⇒ Wat is de rol van de lijn tijdens een verandering?

Doorvragen: Hoe wordt er door de lijn op een verandering gereageerd?

Doorvragen: Hoe wordt de projectorganisatie geïnformeerd van de verandering?

Doorvragen: Kunt u dit toelichten aan de hand van een voorbeeld?

3: Check terug naar voren

⇒ Welke factoren vergemakkelijken of bemoeilijken het omgaan met veranderingen door het projectteam?

Doorvragen: Waar blijkt dit uit?

⇒ Zijn er factoren waar de lijn invloed op heeft waardoor de omgang met veranderingen door het projectteam kunnen worden vergemakkelijkt/bemoeilijkt?

Doorvragen: Waar blijkt dit uit?

4A: Effect op de teamsamenwerking (verandercapaciteit)

⇒ Wat is de invloed van het [wel of niet] uit handen geven van beslissingen aan het projectteam, op de omgang met veranderingen door het projectteam?

Doorvragen: Waar is dit van afhankelijk dat dit wel/geen invloed heeft?

Doorvragen: Waaruit blijkt dit?

⇒ Wat voor invloed heeft vertrouwen vanuit de lijn naar het projectteam, op de omgang met veranderingen door het projectteam?

Doorvragen: Waar is dit van afhankelijk dat dit wel/geen invloed heeft?

Doorvragen: Waaruit blijkt dit?

⇒ Wat voor invloed heeft de mate waarin de lijn rekent op het projectteam, op de omgang met veranderingen door het projectteam?

Doorvragen: Waar is dit van afhankelijk dat dit wel/geen invloed heeft?

Doorvragen: Waaruit blijkt dit?

Doorvragen: Wat zou een verklaring kunnen zijn waarom dit zich op deze manier uit?

APPENDIX E Coding scheme

Construct	Category	Code	Example	Definition & Source
Autonomy	High autonomy	HAUT (d)	<i>“Binnen de afgesproken kaders benut ik de maximale vrijheid”</i> <i>“In de dagelijkse gang van zaken opereren wij als projectteam heel zelfstandig. Alleen daar waar wij er niet uit komen of betrokkenheid van de lijn nodig hebt, zal je echte issues voorleggen”</i>	The degree to which the job provides substantial freedom, independence, and discretion to the individual in scheduling the work and in determining the procedure to be used in carrying it out. It is the degree to which a person has the freedom to decide how to perform his or her tasks.
	Low autonomy	LAUT (d)	<i>“Ik sta onder druk van een aantal kanten, hé. Er zijn verschillende partijen die proberen invloed uit te oefenen op het team maar dat betreft allemaal verschillende zaken”</i>	(Hackman & Oldham, 1980)

Trust	High trust	HTRU (d)	<p><i>“Ja, ik denk dat er veel vertrouwen is op dit moment. Dat heeft er ook mee te maken dat we binnen planning lopen, binnen budget, dat alles goed is”</i></p> <p><i>“Er is best wel veel vertrouwen vanuit de lijn in het functioneren van het projectteam. Uiteindelijk begint dat aan het begin als je als projectteam begint. Een opdrachtgever moet dan het vertrouwen hebben dat hij de juiste mensen in een team heeft en uiteindelijk ontstaat dit door te laten zien dat je in voldoende mate in controle bent in je project en dat moet blijken uit die controles, uit de audits en uit de t-rapportages, terwijl als je laat zien dat je in controle bent dan krijg je ook meer vertrouwen”</i></p>	<p>An attitude of optimism that goodwill and competence will extend to cover the domain of interaction with her, together with the expectation that the one trusted will be directly and favorably moved by the thought that we are counting on her.</p> <p>(Jones, 1996)</p>
	Low trust	LTRU (d)	<p><i>“Dus ik ervaar weinig vertrouwen...En er zit ook een beetje een gevoel achter van het gaat allemaal wel goed en ze zeggen niks, maar bij mij heerst het gevoel van ‘Maar wat nou als het niet goed gaat, krijg ik dan ook steun?’”</i></p>	

Intrinsic motivation	High intrinsic motivation	HIM (d)	<p><i>“Ik denk dat het de teamspirit wel enorm kan helpen om daar goed mee om te gaan. Ook over veranderingen die niet zo ingrijpen op het project maar misschien wel op een bezuinigingsronde waardoor mensen overbodig raken. Dat maakt mensen onzeker. Dan kun je wel werkmotivatie halen uit een project wat leuk loopt of een team waarin je lol hebt en wat je leuk vindt dan de onzekerheid of je het misschien kunt blijven doen”</i></p> <p><i>“Ik denk dat mensen meer energie krijgen en meer lol in hun werk krijgen naarmate ze meer beslissingen kunnen nemen als team. En dat als je van tevoren al weet dat het heel veel tijd en energie gaat kosten om iets voor elkaar te krijgen, die vraag raakt aan het intrinsieke van motivatie. Heb je het gevoel dat ze je serieus nemen, dat je vertrouwd wordt, dat je macht hebt om beslissingen te nemen, dan leidt dat tot betere beslissingen en minder energie dan wanneer je van tevoren al weet, ik moet eerst allerlei niveaus en lagen weten te overtuigen”</i></p>	<p>The innate propensity to pursue interesting tasks that challenge one’s skills and foster growth. Being intrinsically motivated pertains to being engaged in an activity because of the inherent pleasures and satisfaction that this activity brings along.</p>
	Low intrinsic motivation	LIM (d)	<p><i>“Naja goed, als er continu wordt gezegd van, die capaciteit krijg je niet, dan gaat het vertrouwen natuurlijk wel weg. Ja, en hoe uit zich dat in de motivatie? Kijk, als je het niet krijgt, dan zijn er al teamleden die zeggen dat ze op een andere plek gaan werken. Het werken is dan minder leuk ja, absoluut”</i></p>	<p>(Deci & Ryan, 1985) (Ryan, Williams, Patrick & Deci, 2009)</p>

	A clear scope	DWC1 (i)	<p><i>“...maar als je op een gegeven moment duidelijk je scope vast hebt staan en je projectdoelstellingen en je weet waar je naartoe wil, dan is het op een gegeven moment wel fijn als je je daar ook aan vast kunt houden en dat het niet nog eens alle kanten op gaat”</i></p> <p><i>“Hoe duidelijker de scope hoe gemakkelijker het proces om ermee om te gaan in het team”</i></p>
Dealing with change – DWC*	A good project manager	DWC2 (i)	<p><i>“De projectmanager, door zijn leiderschap, stijl van leidinggeven, denk ik, dat heeft een hoog selecterend vermogen. Of hij zegt van: 'Joh, ik wil jou en jou en jou hebben.' Dat doet hij uit bewezen ervaring, dan weet hij dat hij een team om zich heen formeert waarmee hij gewoon ieder werk kan maken, ongeacht. Dat is zijn gave, het goede team om zich heen verzamelen. Krachtig leiderschap, bewezen expertise en de competentie om bij anderen duidelijk te maken dat het belang van het project daarmee gediend is”</i></p>
	A good cover story	DWC3 (i)	<p><i>“Wat het vergemakkelijkt is dat ik het zelf een redelijk verhaal vind. Dat ik wel snap waarom we iets moeten doen. Ik moet het wel snappen anders ga ik niet mee. Want dan vraag je je af waarom je het doet”</i></p> <p><i>“Kun je het uitgelegd krijgen?”</i></p>

“Op het moment dat jij vertrouwen hebt vanuit je opdrachtgever ben je beter in staat om om te gaan met veranderingen omdat je dan het gevoel hebt dat je eerder de goede keuzes maakt waar je opdrachtgever in mee kan gaan als dat je een opdrachtgever hebt die overal vraagtekens bij zet bij wat je aan het doen bent”

Mechanisms Self-
confidence

MEC1
(i)

“Ja. Positief natuurlijk, want ik krijg vertrouwen, dus ga dan maar wat doen. Het is positief, ik kan dus, als je meer vertrouwen mee krijgt, mijn lijnmanager staat achter me. Ja, het werkt ook wel mee in die zin, kijk vertrouwen is een soort krediet. Als ik heel bang ben om te veranderen, komen onzekerheden bij kijken, wat moet ik nu doen, en als je dan bang bent om fouten te maken, want kijk stel mijn lijnmanager heeft geen vertrouwen in mij, dat werkt, kijk weet je, dat werkt een stuk moeilijker. Het zal juist de omgang met veranderingen, je moet daar toch wat risico in nemen soms, en dat is het positief als je vertrouwen van je lijnmanager al hebt want dan ben je minder bang om fouten te maken”

A dimension of character which reflects the perceived control over a person and the environment and is based on a personal history of successful goal-directed behavior.

(Tafarodi & Swann, 1996)

Note. *(i) = inductive coding

Note. *(d) = deductive coding

Note. DWC* = the three most mentioned factors.