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ABSTRACT

As markets are getting more dynamic and complex, there is the need to focus on alignment and adaptability simultaneously within an entire business unit, either on an individual or team level. Besides that, to respond quickly to changes on the market and specific requirements, the implementation of a more flexible organization form is vital to stay competitive and survive on the volatile external market. This can be reached by implementing self-organizing teams that are empowered and handling customer projects on their own. This thesis has the aim to identify important influencing factors and the organizational context factors for the development and collaboration of contextual ambidextrous self-organizing teams. Besides that, important HR practices and the role of the top management within such flexible organizations are found and discussed. In this thesis, the results were obtained by conducting qualitative interviews within a medium-sized organization, which is operating within the industry of multimedia and internet. The interviews were conducted within this organization, as they changed their structures from a classic top-down hierarchy to two self-managing teams that are handling the customer projects on their own in small project teams. The findings show that important influencing factors for the successful collaboration and development of contextual ambidextrous self-organizing teams are the following ones: organizational factors (structure and culture), team factors, individual factors, external factors and human resource practices. Additionally, the role of the top management is on the one hand to ensure efficiency by handling performance management, giving the overall strategic direction and making clear boundaries for decision-making. On the other hand, the management has to support the project teams whenever they need help and building trust to them, to foster flexibility and creativity. Are these influencing factors there within an organization, then contextual ambidextrous self-organizing teams can high perform and contribute to the success of the whole organization.
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1 INTRODUCTION

The environment, in which organizations are operating, is getting more and more complex and dynamic. Moreover, the markets rapidly change and as a result, successful organizations that want to stay competitive and profitable, have to react on changes and requirements of the external environment. Therefore, organizational ambidexterity can help to balance the efficiency and flexibility of firms. In addition, self-organizing teams can help to react to very volatile and dynamic markets and to overcome upcoming challenges in a quick way. As these are two important theoretical topics, they are combined and both discussed within this thesis to answer the underlying research question.

1.1 Definition of problem and relevance

In recent years, the research about ambidexterity increased dramatically. Therefore, lots of articles are dealing with this research topic from several different authors. Successful organizations are nowadays ambidextrous, which means that they are aligned and adaptive simultaneously. In detail, this means that organizations are on the one hand stable enough to operate in their business quite efficient and on the other hand flexible enough, to react to changes on the market and to be innovative and creative (Duncan, 1976; Gibson and Birkinshaw, 2004; Tushman and O’Reilly, 1996).

Thus, there exist different approaches and concepts within the current literature that developed and arised over time. Duncan (1976) was the first who mentioned the term ambidexterity within the literature and March (1991) first uses the two terms exploitation and exploration in relation with ambidexterity. Therefore, these authors can be seen as building the roots of ambidexterity. One of the first and early concepts within the literature of ambidexterity is the structural approach, which indicates that ambidexterity can be implemented within an organization by structurally separate exploration and exploitation on a corporate or business unit level (O’Reilly and Tushman, 2004). After this approach, the concept of contextual ambidexterity was discussed, which is a contrary concept. Therefore, exploitative and explorative tasks are not structurally separated, but are implemented simultaneously within an entire organization. Therefore, the building of an appropriate organizational context is very important, where alignment and adaptability can be pursued simultaneously (Gibson
This is an important approach, especially for small to medium-sized organizations, the implementation of this concept is really essential. The reason for that is that these organizations are confronted with high pressure from the market and the external environment and therefore, balancing flexibility and stability is from high importance. Moreover, smaller organizations, compared to larger ones, are often not able to structurally separate several units to focus on either exploitation or exploration as they often do not have slack or available resources and so, the contextual ambidextrous approach is very vital for small to medium-sized organizations (Lubatkin et al., 2006; Schudy and Bruch, 2010). Besides the already mentioned approaches, the focus in literature also already was on certain leadership solutions to balance exploitation and exploration, which were discussed in detail from several authors (Raisch and Birkinshaw, 2008; Smith and Tushman, 2005).

In the literature of ambidexterity, there also exist papers that are dealing especially with teams and the ambidextrous approach. Implementing ambidexterity on a project team level can contribute to the overall performance of a team and the organization in a positive way and for that, it is discussed in literature. In specific, some contextual and influencing factors (Konlechner and Güttel, 2009; Wang and Rafiq, 2014; Pearce and Manz, 2005; Pelagio Rodriguez and Hechanova, 2014), possible practices (Garaus et al., 2016; Jorgensen and Becker, 2017; Parmentier and Picq, 2016) as well as certain behaviours of leaders and team members (Rosing et al., 2011; Turner et al., 2015; Tempelaar and Rosenkranz, 2017; Fiset and Dostaler, 2017) are highlighted in the existing literature.

Additional to the literature of ambidexterity, in specific contextual and team ambidexterity, another important literature approach is discussed within this thesis, which is the research topic about self-organizing teams. Self-organizing teams are very essential, especially for organizations that have to face upcoming challenges and changes from, for instance, the market and the external environment in a quick way. One of the most important conditions for self-managing teams is to switch from a hierarchical approach to a bottom-up approach, where flat structures are existing and authority and responsibility is distributed from leaders and managers to these self-managing teams (Pircher, 2017). As in the literature of team ambidexterity, self-managing teams also need some factors and a certain organizational context, within they can successfully operate and which influence their performance and
collaboration (Pearce and Manz, 2005; Magpili and Pazos, 2018). Moreover, leadership is quite important for self-managing teams, as this influence the performance autonomy of the teams significantly and therefore, structures have to be very flat and hierarchy should only exist on a competence level (Purser and Cabana, 1999; Druskat and Wheeler, 2004). To successfully perform in such teams, dividing roles between members and showing certain behaviours is also very vital (Hoda et al., 2013; Bernstein et al., 2016).

Summing up, both research topics are quite vital and important for organizations to stay competitive and to be successful. To summarize the main issues of both research topics within this thesis, several academic papers and research articles from well established journals are used (for example: Academy of Management Journal, Human Relations, Journal of Management, Organization Science). However, there are some topics that are not discussed in depth and in detail and therefore, they need further research. This is the reason why this thesis discusses these two research topics in combination. In the following chapter 1.2 Research question, the research gap and as a result, the research question and the results for this research question are summarized briefly.

1.2 Research question

As already mentioned, team ambidexterity and self-managing teams are very important research topics in the literature. As the dynamic and complexity of markets is increasing, this literature is very essential. Especially the industry of multimedia and internet is quite fast moving and there is the necessity to quickly react to certain requirements and changes. This is also the industry, in which the organization is operating, where the qualitative interviews for this thesis were conducted. Due to the complexity and the fact that one single person is not able to implement and manage a whole customer project alone, they changed their structures from a classical top-down hierarchy to self-managing teams, to get more flexibility into the organization. With such an agile project management form, they are able to react very fast to external changes, requirements and special customer wishes based on small project management teams. Therefore, this organization is a good case to investigate, as they are a medium-sized organization and very flexible besides their stability to be
still efficient enough. Moreover, the change was made about two years ago and therefore, self-managing teams have already developed and are well established.

As already mentioned, especially for such small to medium-sized organizations, the contextual ambidextrous approach is very important, as they often do not have available resources as large organizations to separately structure alignment and adaptability within different business units (Lubatkin et al., 2006; Schudy and Bruch, 2010).

Besides this very interesting research setting, there is also a gap within the existing literature. First, as mentioned by Tarody (2016), there is little known about how smaller organizations can create such an ambidextrous context and how managers manage these processes. Moreover, there are no articles that are dealing with the topics team ambidexterity and explicitly self-managing teams. It is often unclear, which teams in detail are meant within these articles and as a result, there can only be assumed that these are self-managing teams. This shows that it is a major gap within the existing literature. Therefore, there is the need to combine these two research topics and investigate team ambidexterity and self-managing teams and to identify important factors that influence such teams and how the management is dealing with reorganizations, as the following research questions focus on:

Which factors influence the development and collaboration of contextual ambidextrous self-organizing teams in medium-sized organizations?

- Which context do self-organizing teams need to be ambidextrous?

- What is the role of the top management in such contextual ambidextrous organizations?

Concrete, the aim of this research questions and thesis is to identify important influencing factors that influence the development and collaboration of contextual ambidextrous self-organizing teams. In specific, important factors and an appropriate context for such self-managing teams is included. There is identified the context, which such teams need to feel confident, motivated and that they are able to balance their work and projects. Moreover, this thesis gives results and answers on how managers are dealing with this processes and what their role is within such organizations.
Summing up shortly, this thesis shows that organizational (structure and culture), team, individual as well as external factors are very important for the successful collaboration and development of contextual ambidextrous self-managing teams and that these factors have influence on the performance of these empowered teams. Moreover, important HR practices are discussed that also have an influence on these teams. In addition to that, the role of the top management is identified, which is on the one hand to support those teams if they need their help and build trust to ensure flexibility and creativity. On the other hand, performance management, giving the strategic overall orientation and making clear boundaries for decision-making are also important to ensure efficiency and to stay competitive on the external market.

### 1.3 Structure of the thesis

This thesis is divided into five main parts. First of all, the theoretical background gives an overview of the literature that is used within this thesis to answer the research question. As already mentioned, ambidexterity, in specific contextual and team ambidexterity as well as the literature of self-managing teams are discussed and summarized. Therefore, within this chapter, the research gap is identified and the importance of filling this gap is described. Second, the methodology is summarized. The aim of this chapter is to describe the methodology that is used for gaining the results. Moreover, the chapter includes information about how the data was analyzed and includes a short description about the research setting and therefore, about the investigated organization. In addition to that, this part also includes the trustworthiness of this thesis, as it has to be ensured that the quality of the results is quite high and objective.

The third chapter deals with the results of this thesis, which is one of the most important chapters, as the findings of the qualitative interviews are discussed and summarized within this part. All the important factors that came out of the interviews and analysis are presented within there. Furthermore, the fourth chapter is the discussion part, which includes important information about the results within this thesis and the already existing literature. Therefore, these outcoming results are compared with the theory. As a result, similarities, differences and additions to the already existing literature are identified. Moreover, important contributions and implications for theory as well as practical ones are included within the discussion.
chapter. To get a good overview and summary of the important outcome and results of this thesis and research, the last chapter is the conclusion. As it is already self-speaking, this chapter gives a conclusion of the thesis and overall results.
2 THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

To be able to answer the mentioned research questions in Chapter 1.2 Research question, this chapter summarizes and overviews the underlying theoretical backgrounds and highlights the most important issues, outcomes and different discussions in literature. Summing up, the theory is from importance, as it is necessary to be able to combine this literature background with the qualitative results from the conducted interviews, which are held within a medium-sized organization in the industry of multimedia and internet, to be able to answer the underlying research question within this thesis.

2.1 Ambidexterity

In the last years, the research and discussion about ambidexterity increased significantly and there exist many different academic articles, papers, literature reviews and practical studies, which are dealing with ambidexterity. Thus, there are different definitions, concepts and point of views as well as different investigations and practical studies from several authors. Therefore, it is necessary to review and comment on different approaches and diverse views on ambidexterity. Duncan (1976) was one of the first authors, who wrote about the importance of dual structures and the implementation of ambidexterity within organizations as well as March (1991) mentioned the essential learning modes exploration and exploitation and therefore, they created the roots of ambidexterity. To discuss different concepts and examine diverse approaches, leading articles such as the one from March (1991), Tushman and O’Reilly (1996) and Gibson and Birkinshaw (2004) are discussed. Starting with a broader view, including antecedents and different concepts of ambidexterity, the focus at the end of this chapter is more specific and narrow, such as the context development in ambidextrous organizations, to be able to find an answer to the underlying research question.

2.1.1 Antecedents and development

Starting from the roots of ambidexterity, Duncan (1976) was the first one, who mentioned organizational ambidexterity in literature. He proposes that successful organizations are ambidextrous. Therefore, it is necessary for them to have two different structures within their firm. In this dual structure concept, organizations are
on the one hand organic to be able to build innovations within a firm and for that, creativity is very important. On the other hand, organizations are mechanistic, which means that a firm is able to implement innovations and use them in an efficient way to be profitable as an organization. Implementing separate units at different organizational levels, for example the corporate or business unit level, helps to overcome the trade-off problem, as there are formed single units, which are following the exploitative or the explorative way (Duncan, 1976; as cited in Raisch and Birkinshaw, 2008: 375ff). Such a separation within an organization, which implements ambidexterity in a spatial way, can be related to the concept of structural ambidexterity (Raisch and Birkinshaw, 2008: 389). Besides that, the literature increased over time and there are also other organizational solutions to implement exploitation and exploration. One concept is contextual ambidexterity, which is about implementing exploration and exploitation simultaneously (Gibson and Birkinshaw, 2004: 209). Furthermore, research focused on leadership solutions to manage ambidexterity (Lubatkin, Simsek, Ling and Veiga, 2006; Smith and Tushman, 2005).

**Exploration and exploitation**

March (1991) is one of the most important authors concerning the roots of ambidexterity, as he first uses the terms exploration and exploitation in combination with ambidexterity. According to him, exploration and exploitation are equal important for every organization (March, 1991: 71). However, the implementation is a challenge, as both learning modes, exploration and exploitation, compete for the same or scarce resources in a firm (March, 1991: 71; He and Wong, 2004: 482; Simsek, Heavey, Veiga and Souder, 2009: 867). Nevertheless, the balance of exploration and exploitation is very essential for firms to survive and be successful over a long period. The two learning modes should not only be both present in a firm, but organizations have to manage and balance both exploration and exploitation, as they are equal important for organizational learning. O’Reilly and Tushman (2007: 41f) also emphasize the importance of the strategically integration of exploration and exploitation, because otherwise, ambidexterity is not seen as a dynamic capability of a firm. Exploitation consists of the following terms: “refinement, choice, production, efficiency, selection, implementation, execution”, while exploration comprises the terms: “search, variation, risk taking, experimentation, play, flexibility, discovery, innovation” (March, 1991: 71). The different learning modes (exploration and
exploitation) are illustrated and explained in more detail in Figure 1. The illustration shows the huge difference between the two learning modes and their diverse requirements and thus it is quite obvious that a balancing of both is very challenging, but also essential for the success of a firm. As mentioned in Figure 1, the explorative and the exploitative tasks are held together through a senior-team integration, a vision that is accepted and lived within an organization and communicated by the senior team management. Important here is that the senior team is committed to an ambidextrous design within their organization, even if they are not ambidextrous on their own and resistance in management levels against an ambidextrous organization has to be avoided, as they are in an important function within the whole system (O’Reilly and Tushman, 2004: 81).

As already mentioned, it is very important for organizations to find the right balance between the exploration of new possibilities and the exploitation of existing products and patterns, as it is one of the major factors for the survival of an existing system. Is the focus of a firm solely on the exploitation part without noticing that there should also be attention on exploration, they may fall into a trap and do not use their whole internal potential. Thus, exploitation is more beneficial in the short-run, it is not always good in the long-run, if organizations do not manage to adapt in the future (March, 1991: 71f). This trap is called success trap, as organizations gain early success through exploitation, whereas exploration and new products lead to reduced results in the short-run (Gupta, Smith and Shalley, 2006: 695; Levinthal and March, 1993: 106). To the contrary, if an organization engage completely in exploration without giving attention to exploitation, then the experimentation costs are too high and cannot be compensated by its benefits. The problem, which then occurs, is that there are several new ideas, but they are not well developed and therefore, cannot contribute to the competence improvement and the success of a firm (March, 1991: 71f). This can be related to the failure trap, which means that exploration is very uncertain and has a broad spreading of the outcomes and therefore, failure within an organization is often the result. To overcome the failure, more search and investment into more new ideas is the result, which leads again to failure (Gupta, Smith and Shalley, 2006: 695; Levinthal and March, 1993: 105f).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alignment of:</th>
<th>Exploration</th>
<th>Exploitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic intent</td>
<td>cost, profit</td>
<td>innovation, growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical tasks</td>
<td>operations, efficiency, incremental innovation</td>
<td>adaptability, new products, breakthrough/radical innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competencies</td>
<td>operational</td>
<td>entrepreunerial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>formal, mechanistic</td>
<td>adaptive, loose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls, rewards</td>
<td>margins, productivity</td>
<td>milestones, growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>efficiency, low risk, quality, customers</td>
<td>risk taking, speed, flexibility, experimentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership role</td>
<td>authoritative, top down</td>
<td>visionary, involved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ambidextrous leadership**

Different alignments (exploration and exploitation) held together through senior-team integration, common vision and values and common senior-team rewards.

**Figure 1:** Conceptualizing exploration and exploitation (adopted from O’Reilly and Tushman, 2004: 80)

**Organizational outcome and performance**

As the literature increased significantly regarding the concept of ambidexterity, there are diverse views on the relation between structural or contextual ambidexterity and the firm performance. Ebben and Johnson (2005: 1249) examine sample firms and come to the result that in some cases, organizations that are implementing ambidexterity, considerably underperformed. However, most of the research about ambidexterity shows that there is a positive correlation between the performance of an organization and the use of an ambidextrous design.

At the very beginning, Tushman and O’Reilly (1996: 8) already highlight that ambidexterity is necessary for an organization’s long-term survival and success and
so the performance is much better and more superior if organizations simultaneously use exploitation and exploration and not focusing on only one learning mode with the expense of the other. Gibson and Birkinshaw (2004: 221) evidenced with their study the positive influence of contextual ambidexterity on an organization’s performance. Moreover, Lubatkin et al. (2006: 666) also point out the importance of an ambidextrous orientation, as there is shown an effect on performance in their short-term empirical study. Additionally, He and Wong (2004) show positive correlations between the concept of ambidexterity, which means the interaction of explorative and exploitative innovation approaches, and the sales growth rate with a sample of more than 200 manufacturing firms. In addition to that, an imbalance between those two strategies is negatively connected to the sales growth rate of an organization (He and Wong, 2004: 492). Besides that, there is another empirical study, which states out that following exploitation, and therefore innovations on already existing products, has a positive influence on the financial performance in competitive surroundings. In contrast, applying exploration on absolute new ideas is positively related to the performance of an organization in more dynamic environments (Jansen, Van den Bosch and Volberda, 2006: 1669ff). Such environmental factors influence exploration and exploitation with differing pressure. Looking to a local environment, which is very dynamic and high competitive, multiunit organizations progress ambidextrous units, focusing exploitative and explorative tasks simultaneously. In detail, this means that in such environments, organizations do not develop separate units for exploration and exploitation within their system. They focus on exploitation and exploration at once, if such an environment is given (Jansen, Van den Bosch and Volberda, 2005: 359).

2.1.2 Concepts for achieving ambidexterity

As already mentioned in this thesis, the research topic ambidexterity has gained significant interest within the last decades. Thus, there are different approaches and concepts of how organizations manage to balance exploitation and exploration to be successful over a long time. Concepts, which are discussed the most in literature, are the following ones: structural ambidexterity (Tushman and O’Reilly, 1996; Smith and Tushman, 2005), contextual ambidexterity (Gibson and Birkinshaw, 2004; Güttel and Konlechner, 2009) and leadership solutions (Smith and Tushman, 2005; Lubatkin et al., 2006). Structural ambidexterity can be divided into spatial and temporal
separation of exploitation and exploration, which are two different approaches for handling the learning types. Spatial separation has its roots in the work of Duncan in 1976, who argues, as already mentioned, that a dual structure system is necessary. This means that separate units are formed, which focus either on exploitative or explorative tasks (Duncan, 1976; as cited in Raisch and Birkinshaw, 2008: 375ff). Contrary, temporal separation implements ambidexterity by temporally switching between the two modes (McDonough and Leifer, 1983: 733). Different to structural ambidexterity is the approach from Gibson and Birkinshaw (2004:209), who mention the importance of implementing exploitation and exploration simultaneously. More recent research also focus on the combination of both approaches, which means that there are papers focusing on the issue how structurally separated organizations are able to create a framework, where the advantages of structural and contextual ambidexterity are combined (Güttel and Konlechner, 2015).

In the following chapters, all three approaches for achieving ambidexterity (structural, contextual and leadership solutions), are discussed in more detail.

**Structural ambidexterity**

Structural ambidexterity was one of the earliest approaches for achieving ambidexterity and implements exploitation and exploration into a system by structural separation on a corporate or business unit level. In more detail, this means that separate structures are formed, which are focusing either on adaptability or alignment within a firm, to be able to overcome the problem of competing resources of an organization (Gibson and Birkinshaw, 2004: 211). All structural suggestions that are existing in literature can be basically related to one of the two main approaches within structural ambidexterity, which are the spatial and the temporal separation of exploitation and exploration (Raisch and Birkinshaw, 2008: 389).

As highlighted in the literature review of Raisch and Birkinshaw (2008: 390), structures in an organization can be grouped in primary and secondary structures. Primary structures include routine tasks of a firm and therefore, the focus is on efficiency of the business and on stability. Contrary to that, secondary structures include non-routine tasks and therefore, innovation, creativity and flexibility are very important for these teams of a firm (Adler et al., 1999: 43ff; Raisch and Birkinshaw, 2008: 390).
Spatial separation is discussed to a large extent in the existing literature and it basically is about building separate business or corporate level units within a system, which implement exploitative or explorative tasks, to overcome the trade-off problem between those two learning modes (Duncan, 1976; as cited in Raisch and Birkinshaw, 2008: 375ff). It is assumed that “the exploratory units are small and decentralized, with loose cultures and processes, the exploitation units are larger and more centralized, with tight cultures and processes” (Benner and Tushman, 2003: 247). O’Reilly and Tushman (2004) also emphasize the importance of structural ambidextrous organizations. In their article, the authors suggest that ambidextrous organizations can be defined as “establish project teams that are structurally independent units, each having its own processes, structures, and cultures, but are integrated into the existing management hierarchy” (O’Reilly and Tushman, 2004: 79). To be able to be radical innovative and efficient in the core business at the same time, there is the need for several different subunits, which are loosely coupled, but tightly combined and coordinated as well as perfectly integrated at the senior management level (O’Reilly and Tushman, 2004: 75ff; Benner and Tushman, 2003: 252).

The other suggestion besides spatial separation for achieving a balance between exploration and exploitation is temporal separation, which means to temporarily switch between the two learning modes. Earlier studies focused on this approach and described this as different concept for structural ambidexterity (Raisch and Birkinshaw, 2008: 390). Contrary to the approach of implementing several organizational units, which are focusing simultaneously on the two learning modes, temporal separation achieves adaptability and alignment through temporally switching between them. This means that organizations use parallel structures, which allows employees to switch back and forward between the structures of a system. According to that, employees can focus on exploitation this day and can switch to the exploration mode the next days, if it is necessary and their daily task requires a switch to another learning mode (McDonough and Leifer, 1983: 727ff; Adler, Goldoftas and Levine, 1999: 43ff). According to Siggelkow and Levinthal (2003: 665), a temporal switch between organizational structures can bring success and higher performance than pursuing only one form. This means that a temporary limited decentralization is stopped by a reintegration.
It is useful and an advantage to choose the structural way for implementing exploitation and exploration at the same time within a firm, when there can be reached an advantage over competitors with a high specialization of employee’s competencies. This means that if high expertise within a special field can an organization distinguish from other firms and this high knowledge within a special field can bring competitive advantage in the external environment, it is a good decision to implement ambidexterity in a structural way. It would not be efficient if these employees focus simultaneously on the two different learning modes. Another reason for focusing on structural ambidexterity is if it is not possible or only with the use of high costs that employees focus on explorative and exploitative tasks at the same time. Is such a dual qualification not possible for the mentioned reasons, the implementation of a structural way is the best solution to balance the two learning modes. Then, it is better for organizations to divide units in a structural and cultural way and be successful through structural separation (Konlechner and Güttel, 2009: 49).

**Contextual ambidexterity**

After the approach of structural ambidexterity, the literature also focused on a contrary concept. It was developed by Gibson and Birkinshaw (2004: 209) and is called “contextual ambidexterity – contextual because it arises from features of its organizational context. Contextual ambidexterity is the behavioural capacity to simultaneously demonstrate alignment and adaptability across an entire business unit.” (Gibson and Birkinshaw, 2004: 209). Their paper consists of a study including a large number of employees in 41 business units with different and individual contexts, which was quite different to previous findings and studies in literature about the topic ambidexterity, as there were used single-case-studies. On the one hand, alignment, which can be related to exploitation of the existing business of a firm, is about being efficient at fulfilling a company’s goal together. On the other hand, adaptability, which is about exploration of new opportunities, brings in reconfiguration and innovation into units to be able to rapidly meet new requirements and changes, which are demanded from the external market and customers and therefore, it is quite important to react to changes on the market to stay competitive (Gibson and Birkinshaw, 2004: 209ff.). In Figure 2, important factors about the
concept of contextual ambidexterity are described and the illustration gives a short overview and summarizes main points of the approach.

Figure 2: Overview of factors of contextual ambidexterity (adopted from Konlechner and Güttel, 2009: 51)

As already mentioned above, contextual ambidexterity is quite different to the concept of structural ambidexterity, as contextual ambidexterity is not about splitting up and creating own units for explorative and exploitative tasks. Gibson and Birkinshaw (2004: 210) propose that contextual ambidextrous organizations should create processes and systems, where every employee of a firm can decide on their own if they are working on explorative or exploitative activities and how they organize their work and time. Therefore, organizations provide a context, where they can work on either adaptability or alignment (Gibson and Birkinshaw, 2004: 210). Important is that instead of a separation of structures, tasks or a temporal switching, the building and development of an organizational context is essential, where each individual divides the work. To implement a contextual way of achieving a simultaneous balance of exploitation and exploration, it is necessary to create a meta-level of exploitation and exploration, which combines all functions within one unit, rather than separating them. In detail, this means that focusing on the concept of contextual ambidexterity is a multidimensional approach, where exploitation (alignment) and exploration (adaptability) are established separately, but at the
same time interconnected and nonsubstitutable. According to that, every employee in a firm is very important for the value creation of the whole organization. Consequently, each individual is able to focus on value increase of already existing customers in their function, but also on changes and demands from the environment and therefore, is responsible for reacting to recognized changes and trends (Gibson and Birkinshaw, 2004: 211). Summing up, contextual ambidexterity is responsible for bringing all activities within an organization into the direction of fulfilling these two important general goals (Schudy and Bruch, 2010: 2). Moreover, contextual ambidexterity influences the strategic renewal of an organization. As a result, if contextual ambidexterity is created within a firm, then the doors are open for implementing strategic renewal. Therefore, ambidexterity should be formed through a suitable organizational context, which faces all environmental conditions. If organizations keep this in mind, than renewal can be implemented within a firm with high success (Dutta, 2013: 39).

Before conceptualizing the idea of contextual ambidexterity in 2004, there are also some other papers and investigations, which are connected to this approach. Gibson and Birkinshaw (2004: 211) mention the consistency with their concept and the study from Adler et al. (1999). They suggested two mechanisms in their study from 1999 that contribute to unite the existing tension of exploration (flexibility) and exploitation (efficiency), which affect each individual, who then have to decide and manage their time between the two learning modes and make choices. These two mechanisms mentioned in the article are metaroutines and job enrichment. “Metaroutines systematize the creative process. Job enrichment enables workers to become more innovative and flexible even in the course of their routine tasks.” (Adler et al., 1999: 45). Besides the recommendations of Adler et al. (1999), Gibson and Birkinshaw (2004: 215) also build up on the research of Lewis (2000: 770) and mention the importance of managing tensions and therefore, the importance of the behavioural impact of leaders within a system. However, Gibson and Birkinshaw (2004) point out the importance of these mechanisms (metaroutines, job enrichment and leadership behaviour), as they build up on these findings in their paper and developed it further to understand the concept of contextual ambidexterity. Although they developed a new concept regarding to ambidexterity (contextual ambidexterity), it is the same logic as in these papers before (Gibson and Birkinshaw, 2004: 211).
Overall, the approach of contextual ambidexterity helps organizations to understand and know about the existing tensions between exploration and exploitation as well as balances. This is very important for leaders of a firm, as it is their task to manage these factors in an environment, which is very complex and multifaceted (Gibson and Birkinshaw, 2004: 223). Especially for small and medium-sized organizations, the implementation of contextual ambidexterity is from high importance. The reason for this is that small and medium-sized enterprises are confronted with high competitive pressure from the external environment to focus simultaneously on stability and flexibility. Nevertheless, these organizations, compared to larger firms, do not have such resources available and have not implemented the same hierarchical administrations, which affects the contradictory knowledge within a firm to pursue the concept of ambidexterity. In detail, this means that larger firms are able, due to their greater resource base and other processes, that they implement ambidexterity through a structural separation within their organization, where the focus is either on explorative or on exploitative activities. This is often not possible for smaller organizations, as they do not have slack resources and therefore, the implementation of contextual ambidexterity and the creation of an appropriate context for all employees to focus simultaneously on the two learning modes and balance them in a good way is very essential (Lubatkin et al., 2006: 647; Schudy and Bruch, 2010: 1).

**Leadership in ambidextrous organizations**

Senior executives are the key leaders of an organization and therefore, they are very important concerning the fostering or hindering of organizational ambidexterity. Several studies in the ambidexterity literature define processes of leadership as an important issue and argue that leadership influence the implementation of either structural or contextual ambidexterity (Raisch and Birkinshaw, 2008: 391). For instance, Smith and Tushman (2005) discuss the leadership based approach and the integrative mechanisms in relation with structural separation. They point out how to manage the contradictions, which are existing through the existence of separate units within an organization (Smith and Tushman, 2005: 522).

Moreover, to integrate different units, it is quite important that there exists a shared leadership at the top management level. Otherwise, integration of separate units fail and thus, ambidexterity cannot be pursued efficiently (Mihalache, Jansen, Van den
Bosch and Volberda, 2014: 142). For the leadership in organizations with structurally separated units, a convincing strategic intent, which points out the importance of a balance between exploration and exploitation, a common vision and values, a common reward system and the separation, but also alignment of the organizational architectures is quite important (O’Reilly and Tushman, 2011: 9). In addition to that, high commitment within a team, skills for managing different structural units and the skills to solve conflicts arising through the design should be fulfilled (O’Reilly and Tushman, 2008: 202).

Other authors note that for an implementation of organizational ambidexterity, the top management team of a system can manage the tensions between exploration and exploitation by developing and giving new competencies to a part of the units, while using already developed competencies in the other structurally separated units (Volberda, Baden-Fuller and Van den Bosch, 2001: 165). As the separate units share different cultures, incentives and different unit leaders, it is very essential to integrate all subunits at the senior management level and with a corporate culture, which is also illustrated in Figure 1 (O’Reilly and Tushman, 2004: 75ff). This means that implementing ambidexterity in a structural way consists not only of separating several units, which are specialized on exploration or exploitation, but it is also about dissimilar and separate competencies, processes and systems, which have to be aligned within a larger system. Summing up, to integrate all different subunits within a firm, the senior management team is responsible for a common strategic commitment, a corporate set of values and for gaining advantage through shared assets. This contributes to a balancing of exploitation and exploration, as there are contradictory units and strategical trade-offs within a firm (O’Reilly and Tushman, 2008: 193; Smith and Tushman, 2005: 522ff).

Summing up, leaders have the important task within an organization to create alignment between strategy, culture, processes and structure, but at the same time being prepared for rapid requirements for innovations from the environment. Managers should own the skill to manage these two different approaches, as being competitive is essential, but also focusing on innovation and creating something new should also not be forgotten. Managing these tensions between flexibility, radical innovation and speed on the one hand and efficiency, incremental innovation and cost on the other hand, is the task of the management (Tushman and O’Reilly, 1996:...
11). Tushman, Smith and Binns (2011) discussed three principles for CEO’s and managers within ambidextrous systems, which they derived from the success of the company Misys. The development of an overarching identity as well as holding existing tensions at the top are very essential factors for leading an ambidextrous firm. The third principle is embracing inconsistency, which means to differ standards and processes between the core and the innovation units, to not fall into the trap that not only fostering the core unit, as it shows more efficiency in performance (Tushman, Smith and Binns, 2011: 77ff).

Contrary to the structural approach, Gibson and Birkinshaw (2004) describe the importance of the role of senior leaders in contextual ambidextrous organizations, as they are responsible for creating an appropriate context for all employees, where contextual ambidexterity can be pursued. The reason why senior leaders are that important for a balance of exploitation and exploration is that they build systems within an organization, where supportive context can arise. (Gibson and Birkinshaw, 2004: 223). Smith (2006) notes that it is the task of the top management teams to shift the internal resources between existing products of a firm and completely new innovations, to be able to focus on both learning modes simultaneously (Smith, 2006: 1ff).

According to Mom et al. (2007), a top down knowledge inflow of a leader can be positively related to the extent to pursuing exploitation activities, but they are not related to the explorative tasks of this manager. Contrary, bottom-up and horizontal knowledge inflows have a positive effect on a manager’s explorative tasks, while it has no influence on the exploitative part. This means if the focus is only on top down knowledge inflows without the other two mentioned knowledge inflows possibilities, the focus is only on exploitation and so, exploitation drives out exploration within this organization (Mom, Van den Bosch and Volberda, 2007: 925). Furthermore, Keller and Weibler (2014) discuss that transactional leadership of managers’ supervisors has a positive influence on the engagement into exploitative tasks of these managers. Transactional leadership has the focus on meeting objectives, clear standards and rewarding managers if they meet their goals (Keller and Weibler, 2014: 309ff).

Heavey and Simsek (2017) investigated the relation between organizational ambidexterity and transactive memory systems, which are systems where other team members can be a source of external knowledge and can trust each other in
being responsible for different areas of skills and expertise. First, the authors point out that such a transactive memory system helps organizations and managers to own a cognitive base for differing and integrating strategical issues as well as knowledge for the two learning modes exploration and exploitation. Second, such systems show how the top management establish practices and routines for implementing exploitation and exploration. Third, without investigating a special approach how ambidexterity can be implemented, top managers have a direct and important role in managing the trade off between exploration and exploitation to build an ambidextrous organization (Heavey and Simsek, 2017: 922ff).

2.1.3 Developing an ambidextrous context

To reach high performance within an organization, building a supportive organizational context is very essential. Focusing only on alignment brings good performance in the short-term, whereas activities about adaptability increase performance in the long-term. As already mentioned, there is the need to create a context for all employees so that it is possible to focus on alignment and on adaptability simultaneously to reach superior organizational performance (Gibson and Birkinshaw, 2004: 212).

Important factors for creating an organizational context

Adapted from Ghoshal and Bartlett (1994: 95ff), Gibson and Birkinshaw (2004) focused on four elements, which are essential for the implementation of a contextual approach, which are the following ones: stretch, discipline, trust and support (Gibson and Birkinshaw, 2004: 209). These four dimensions of an organizational context are interrelated and influence individual initiative, collective learning and mutual cooperation (Ghoshal and Bartlett, 1994: 91ff). Contrary to the suggestion from Ghoshal and Bartlett (1994), the contextual ambidexterity concept is extended and highlights the importance of a supportive organizational context. If such an environment is formed, then employees engage in exploration as well as exploitation, which leads to higher performance of an organization (Gibson and Birkinshaw, 2004: 213).

Discipline encourages all employees of an organization to make every effort to support the organization, which results in high success of their firm and to fulfill all tasks in an excellent way without forcing employees to do their tasks. To reach this,
each individual contributes to the high performance of a firm, as they are high committed to the organization, either in an implicit or explicit way. To guarantee and foster the existence of discipline, it is quite important that an organization consist of clear principles, related to the performance outcome and desired and appropriate behaviour. In addition to that, for reaching discipline within a system, it is essential to offer a context with open and fast feedback between all members of an organization as well as transparent and fair sanctions. The second dimension is stretch and is necessary for the context of an organization as it includes aspects such as determined or focused. In detail, the contextual factor stretch helps employees to have high ambitious goals and want to work very hard to reach their set objectives. Factors that define and create a context of stretch are a corporate aspiration and the creation of an identity, of which every individual is convinced and follows the corporate identity in their daily tasks and activities. Support is the third dimension of building a context, in which employees divide the time between flexibility and stability on their own. As the term support already indicates, supporting others in the organization is very important for the organizational context. Looking after other team members and assisting them if someone needs help in place of showing authority and power contributes positively to the factor stretch. Members of a system can help each other by giving access to resources or giving employees freedom in low-level functions. The last dimension is called trust and attributes to an organizational context by giving all employees the feeling that they can rely on each other and on the other’s commitment to the organization. Thereby, fairness and participation in decision-making and different other actions are very important. Furthermore, new employees should be hired, who perfectly fit into an organization and who fulfill all requirements for trust (Gibson and Birkinshaw, 2004: 213).

Summing up, the four attributes discipline, stretch, trust and support are necessary to build an organizational context. Combining these four attributes, the results are two dimensions of the organizational context of a firm. One dimension is performance management, which is a mixture of discipline and stretch. This dimension is responsible for inspiring employees to bring high quality and the best results and showing that they are responsible for the activities, they do within the firm. The second dimension is social support, including support and trust. The task of this dimension is to give all individuals of the organization security and autonomy, which they prefer to be able to perform. Both dimensions are important in the same way
and if all dimensions and factors are present within an organization, then a high performance context is built. An imbalance of all factors should be avoided, as this results in a very bad contextual environment, with no freedom for ambidextrous handling (Birkinshaw and Gibson, 2004: 51).

Besides the four dimensions discipline, stretch, trust and support, there are also other suggestions and factors mentioned in literature that influence the organizational context and the implementation of contextual ambidexterity. Adler et al. (1999: 43ff) identified three very important factors, on which organizational systems should focus. Therefore, training, trust and leadership are needed within a firm to create the optimal context. To deal with the trade-off problem, it is very important that employees are trained. If knowledge and skills do not exist, people cannot manage to handle ambidextrous. Therefore, organizations should invest into trainings and knowledge increases of their employees to make sure that they are able to deal with the contextual situation. The second factor, as already included in the concept of Gibson and Birkinshaw (2004), is trust. Reliability between team members and commitment, which is also shown by the management, are very essential factors that trust acts as a main component within a firm. Leadership is the third factor mentioned by Adler et al. (1999). Committed leaders and the continually communication of the importance of flexibility and efficiency are very crucial for an appropriate context. Otherwise, lower-level leaders apply a more autocratic leadership style, which negatively affects trust (Adler et al., 1999: 43ff).

According to Güttel and Konlechner (2009), a wide-ranging skill and capability base of all employees, a shared frame of references and a comparable level of background knowledge of individuals is necessary to create the context for implementing ambidexterity. To give employees stability and to be able to implement both learning strategies for a long period of time, changing project structures and a shared and strong culture, norms and values are important (Güttel and Konlechner, 2009: 165).

To be successful, there exists also a more recent approach combining structural and contextual ambidexterity in structurally separated organizations and not to see them as two different approaches, where an organization has to decide between these two. On the one hand, specialization is quite important within this approach, as it is a profit of structural ambidexterity. But on the other hand, organizations should also be able to profit from the quickness of knowledge transfer, which is a huge advantage
for implementing contextual ambidexterity. Therefore, it can be quite profitable to combine both concepts (Güttel and Konlechner, 2015: 279f.).

**Different paths for achieving ambidexterity**

Moreover, there exist different paths and possibilities to implement alignment as well as adaptability within a firm. There is not only one way to bring ambidexterity, which results in more success, into an organization. Gibson and Birkinshaw (2004: 223) investigated different ambidextrous organizations. One interviewed organization in the automotive industry created a new context in that way that they developed new skills for implementing adaptability besides their traditionally skills and activities of alignment. Dissimilar to the first case, a business unit of an oil and gas company, which was acting ambidextrous, concentrated their activities around adaptability and then created alignment around it. A third path within a software firm is also explained. This business unit created ambidexterity by mixing both dimensions in an equal way (Gibson and Birkinshaw, 2004: 223). This result also supports the statement that it is possible to achieve (contextual) ambidexterity and to reach the same final goal through multiple different paths and not only through one suggestion (Gresov and Drazin, 1997: 420). As a result, organizations can choose how their organizational context is formed, as they differ in administration or the behaviour and importance of their leaders. However, there are different ways to reach an ambidextrous context within a system, but they are all equally important and end in the same outcome (Gibson and Birkinshaw, 2004: 223).

**Role of the management**

As already stated, the management has an important function concerning offering and creating an appropriate context, where each employee is able to switch between explorative and exploitative tasks. As there are always kind of trade-off decisions due to conflicts in the task environment, it is the task of the management to create a context, where these conflicts and trade-offs can be bridged, because it is not possible to eliminate them at all. Is such a reconciliation possible, then long-term success and high performance is the result (Gibson and Birkinshaw, 2004: 209). In particular, the top management team, which are senior leaders with high impact on the strategical and practical orientation of a firm, are responsible for a behavioural integration. This integration can be made through information sharing, collaboration
and joint decision-making within the firm. To have influences on decisions within the organization increases the commitment and motivation of the employees and to work together as well as giving information to others is essential for a behavioural integration. Moreover, the behavioural integration has influence on the behavioural complexity of a firm. In detail, this complexity consists of the portfolio range of different leadership roles of the managers and the ability of the leaders to apply the different roles at different organizational situations. Summarizing, it can be said that if the top management team handles the behavioural integration, then this leads to behavioural complexity, which helps organizations to be able to balance exploration and exploitation within their firm and implement an ambidextrous design (Carmeli and Halevi, 2009: 207ff).

2.2 Self-organizing teams

As the external environment of organizations and the markets, in which firms are operating, are nowadays quite volatile and unstable, self-organization can help to face upcoming challenges in a quick way. Increasing the engagement of all employees within a firm can help managers to concentrate on a strategical perspective and to not be overloaded with handling all the work alone. Important therefore is to change from a hierarchical approach, where authority comes from high levels within the organization, to decentralized working, where decisions are made by employees and teams (Pircher, 2017: 16). Encouraging teams and therefore employees to implement and switch to self-managing teams within an organization is very beneficial and profitable for the whole organization and all individuals (Manz & Sims, 1980: 363ff). Therefore, it has to be assumed that all employees within an organization are skilled to lead themselves to a certain degree (Pearce and Manz, 2005: 133). So summing up, as organizational agility, flexibility as well as employees are gaining increasing importance regarding the success of organizations, organizations switch to more loose, flexible and flat structures and additionally are empowering employees and therefore, hand over power from the management to work teams, which results in the implementation of self-managed teams (Bernstein, Bunch, Canner and Lee, 2016: 40ff).

Jong, Ruyter and Lemmink (2004) define self-managing teams as following in their paper: “self-managing teams (SMTs), or groups of interdependent employees that
have the collective authority and responsibility to manage and perform relatively whole tasks.” (Jong, Ruyter and Lemmink, 2004: 18). Therefore, authority and responsibility (for example over products, tasks or customers) are main factors that characterize stable working teams within an organization. According to Pearce and Manz (2005), self-managing teams empower employees within an organization by giving them more freedom in leading themselves and therefore, offering them more responsibility on their tasks and working behaviour (Pearce and Manz, 2005: 130ff).

Applying self-managing teams and shared leadership within an organization can be extremely successful, if the following five factors are given. One factor is the level of urgency, if time is available for implementing this organizational type. Moreover, high employee commitment is essential. In very unstable and volatile times, commitment to the organization and team is quite important for shared leadership and the resulting success of the teams. If creativity within an organization to introduce new products or services or high interdependence between team members and tasks are important, then self-managing teams and shared leadership are an excellent way of being successful over a long period of time (Pearce and Manz, 2005: 135ff).

2.2.1 Leadership in self-organizing teams

Implementing a self-managing style within an organization brings lots of changes in roles and structures within a firm to be able to support a democratic principle. All employees and managers on all levels are affected from the hierarchical changes, as there exist only a competence based hierarchy level between employees in self-managing teams. But obviously, there is still the necessity to have a hierarchy within self-managing organizations, but as already mentioned, only on a competence level. The role of managers to only check and control the work of employees is completely removed, the only hierarchy is the one of responsibility, as every level and team has own responsibility and authority over the tasks. For managers, it is often quite hard to switch to a self-organizing organization, as they do not know how their different roles are changing. Of course, there is the need for a management level also in self-managing teams, but they are very low and quite participative designed. Managers often switch from controlling employees and coordination of tasks to regulate internal and external borders of the organization. Besides the autonomy and self-directing, each employee has clear roles, accountabilities and tries to fulfill the required tasks in the best quality to ensure organizational success and fulfilling of the strategical
and operational objectives. To be able to manage the tasks and contribute to the overall success, skills of employees are improved. Important is that each objective of the self-regulating teams should be supporting the overall strategic direction and goals. So one of the most important factors of introducing self-managing teams within an organization and therefore, for the competency-based approach is that there is a high employee involvement. If all is successfully implemented within the firm, then every person can participate in decisions instead of being controlled and not being integrated in any planning and decision process (Purser and Cabana, 1999: 41f).

Self-managing teams, which are leading themselves, are highly productive and successful, but they need some kind of external lead, as they need information about the direction of the whole organization and the teams also have to report through a person or a group the results of their work. In Figure 3, the most important tasks of external leaders are summarized to gain team effectiveness at the end. One important work of external leaders is to move between different levels regarding teams and the whole organization and to build relations. Therefore, being socially and politically aware, which means that they have to be aware of their actions and their broader agreement for the whole organization and therefore not giving one team advantages over others, is quite important. Moreover, building team trust and caring for team members is essential, as here, personal problems for example can also help to build relationships. The second task is scouting, which includes the seeking of information from all different employees and specialists within the broader organization. Leaders, who keep this in mind, help teams to build political awareness and social capital (Druskat and Wheeler, 2004: 67ff). The gained information is also often used to influence the decision-making of the teams by external leaders. As external leaders are kind of responsible for the performance of the teams, it is important that they analyze team members’ behaviour and to investigate problems by gathering lots of information from team members, to have a good insight and give adequate recommendations. The third task is persuading and includes obtaining external support, which means external leaders should fulfill this task effectively, when teams need the help and support of the broader organization. Moreover, influencing the team in decisions that are beneficial for the broader organization is essential, as they already built trust and gathered the necessary information. Fourth, empowering of teams occurs through the behaviour of delegating most of the
authority to teams, showing flexibility regarding decisions of the team and coaching. Coaching includes behaviours such as feedback and training with employees to ensure that they are able to manage themselves and get confidence. Are these tasks and behaviors taken into account, superior team effectiveness is the result (Druskat and Wheeler, 2004: 67ff).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relating</th>
<th>Scouting</th>
<th>Persuading</th>
<th>Empowering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization-focused behavior</strong></td>
<td>1. Being socially and politically aware</td>
<td>4. Seeking information from managers, peers and specialists</td>
<td>7. Obtaining external support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization/team boundary</strong></td>
<td><strong>Team-focused behavior</strong></td>
<td><strong>Team-focused behavior</strong></td>
<td><strong>Team-focused behavior</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. Influencing the team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9. Delegating authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10. Exercising flexibility regarding team decisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11. Coaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3:** Work of the external leaders of self-managing teams (adopted from Druskat and Wheeler, 2004: 69)

### 2.2.2 Important factors for implementing self-organizing teams

Besides the already mentioned importance of designated leaders within an organization with self-managing teams to develop self and shared leadership of other members in the chapter 2.2.1 *Leadership in self-managing teams*, Pearce and Manz (2005) mentioned a second factor, which is quite important for shared leadership and therefore, for teams, which is the organization itself. On the one hand, organizational rewarding is quite crucial, where individual as well as team rewarding plays an important role. On the other hand, training within the teams is necessary to develop the skills of employees within self-organizing teams, which can be trainings in communication or conflict management, for instance (Pearce and Manz, 2005: 132ff).

In self-managing organizations, where a competency-based hierarchy is lived, it is important that the teams have a strategic direction, into which the organization should go. However, teams should decide on their own how they manage to fulfill organizational directions. Therefore, it is essential for self-managing teams to have
meeting places and computers, different kind of trainings, certain tools to accomplish their teamwork and support from outside of the team. Moreover, a clearly defined decision procedure and borders are important, so that managers are not able to be involved into certain decisions. After some time, if the self-management is clearly and well established, then decision rights can be switched from management to the teams to a large extent. In addition to that, all teams should have set performance goals, which have to be fulfilled within a certain amount of time to ensure the success of the team and the whole organization. Summing up, there exist four essential factors for self-managing team structures. The first two important factors are that self-managing teams have common goals and that the teams are really independent from management. Third, effective teams like working with each other and are collaborating and work as a whole team. The last factor is that self-managing teams are responsible for their results as a whole team. In detail, this means that although there are differences in the salaries of team members, they should be rewarded and punished equally for the performances (Purser and Cabana, 1999: 42).

In addition to the already mentioned factors, Magpili and Pazos (2018) also found out that competencies are quite essential for successful self-managing teams. They include the skill of employees to work in teams, a broad set of technical skills to be able to doing job rotation and leadership. As already mentioned, external as well as internal leaders contribute to the organizational context through information sharing, trainings, coaching, resources and different rewarding. Looking to an organizational level, the most important factors that are affecting a self-managing team performance are the structure, guidelines, culture, reward systems and resources of the whole organization. The authors also confirm that the appropriate organizational context includes flattened structures and hierarchy, little formalization and an empowering culture, where autonomy can be lived (Magpili and Pazos, 2018: 49f).

### 2.2.3 Roles within self-organizing teams

According to Hoda, Noble and Marshall (2013), there exist different roles within self-managing teams, which are based on software development teams in their investigation. Altogether, they found six different roles, which are implicit, informal and also spontaneous and changing roles within teams. One role is the one of a mentor, who is responsible for supporting the team and giving a certain direction. The mentor is the person who brings self-confidence into a team, especially in the
phase of switching to self-organizing teams, as this process and change is often quite uncomfortable and a challenge for employees. So, it is the task of the mentor to help changing the work environment into a more agile style and providing support, for instance, in the use and applying of a scrum method within their projects. Through removing misconceptions, the mentor builds trust within a self-managing team and helps employees to develop self-organizing practices, such as self-evaluation or planning. The co-ordinator is another role and is a kind of a representative of the whole team and is an interface between customers and teams and has the task to manage all the customer requirements, as well as changes (Hoda, Noble and Marshall, 2013: 430ff).

The third role is called translator and has to manage language borders between the customer and the team. They have the responsibility to translate the business language of the external customer into a technical language with the use of certain tools, so that communication can be ensured between the external and internal participants of a project. Another role is the champion, who are people securing the support of the senior management team, as the champions understand the factors that are responsible for certain decisions within a company, for instance, process improvements or cost effectiveness. Champions can support the use of self-managing teams, as they know the applicability in the project context. A champion builds pilot projects and implements more and more agile teams into the organization, as they convince the senior management that these agile teams fit into the organizational context. Another role within self-managing teams is the promoter. Besides the senior level management, the customer involvement is also quite important. It is the task of the promoter to convince the customer that such an agile project team method is quite beneficial, as the result is a product, which fits all the requirements. The last role is the terminator, focusing on the identification of members, who are dangerous for the future success of the self-managing teams. It is important for them to get support from the management to remove such people from these self-organizing teams, as these teams are open and agreeable with changes. (Hoda, Noble and Marshall, 2013: 430ff). Altogether, the mentor, co-ordinator, translator, champion, promoter and terminator are the six different roles, which occur in self-managing teams. Employees of an agile team adopt either one role or several informal roles to simplify the work within self-organizing teams (Hoda, Noble and Marshall, 2010: 293).
Looking to the holacracy approach of Bernstein, Bunch, Canner and Lee (2016), which is also about this agile approach and a form of self-management, they define roles of employees within self-managing teams as “a set of responsibilities for a certain outcome or process. Roles can be created, revised, or destroyed; individuals usually have more than one, in multiple circles.” (Bernstein et al., 2016: 47). Moreover, leadership is contextual, which means that these responsibilities also change, as the work changes or the team creates or defines other roles. In self-managing teams, it is very essential that roles are designed, which fit the person and the skills and contributes to the overall strategic and organizational goals (Bernstein et al., 2016: 44).

Moreover, the role of the customer and the integration and collaboration within projects is very essential for the overall project context. If customers are not very well integrated into the process, then it has consequences for the self-managing teams, such as challenges in providing and gathering requirements, getting feedback or low productivity. One occurring problem is that team members do not know the right prioritization of user stories, for instance, as there is a lack of communication and integration of the customer into the project. Overall, for the project success, the collaboration with customers is very important, although Hoda, Noble and Marshall (2010) find out in their study that this is one of the biggest problems for self-managing teams, as customers are often not that much integrated as these agile methods would need (Hoda, Noble and Marshall, 2010: 521ff).

2.3 Teams in ambidextrous organizations

Teams are very essential in the implementation of exploitation and exploration within an organization and therefore for the successful implementation of an ambidextrous behaviour within teams. Implementing ambidexterity on a project team level contributes to the performance of the team in a positive way. The level of ambidexterity within project teams is also influenced by the appropriate project context within a team to make their choices between exploration and exploitation (Liu and Leitner, 2012: 106). As team ambidexterity is quite vital nowadays, important factors and possible practices as well as certain behaviours of the team members and leaders for the implementation of ambidexterity on a team level are discussed in the following.
2.3.1 Factors, environment and team context

Implementing contextual ambidexterity within a system means that whole departments or individuals pursue exploitation as well as exploration simultaneously. This is very challenging and so, there is a high conflict potential, as employees are required to meet all expectations within different and more than one project teams with dissimilar objectives and tasks. For working in development projects, creativity and risk taking is required, whereas at the same time, the employee is included in a replication project, where the focus is on being careful, efficient and precise. As employees are involved in exploitative and explorative tasks, they have to manage these contradictory learning modes and their time for each dimension. As there is a simultaneous involvement and not structurally separated, an organization can profit from this broad knowledge and information base of each employee, which can also be transferred to other tasks. For that, an organization has the duty to balance the tasks and to care if some employees of a department are not overspecialized and follow only one dimension. Then, contextual ambidexterity fails within a team and loses the optimal balance of exploitation and exploration (Konlechner and Güttel, 2009: 49f).

Therefore, implementing contextual ambidexterity within an organization is quite important and employees and organizations understand that there are different requirements for the implementation of explorative and exploitative tasks. Moreover, to manage the tensions between exploitation and exploration, each individual should have an appropriate competence and skill base, which allows the system to pursue both learning modes for reaching high success and performance outcomes. To integrate all employees and to make it possible for all individuals to balance these occurring tensions, it is the responsibility of the organization to provide and create a homogeneous organizational culture, which allows individuals and project teams to switch between their tasks. For organizations with project teams, it is an advantage that they integrate their members into different teams with contradictory tasks and therefore, to avoid a specialization into only one learning mode. As it is very essential that employees are equally motivated to handle their tasks, organizations have to foster this. They can do this by implementing management by objectives, the balance of different incentives, the communication of an ambidextrous business model and building of an appropriate organizational culture (Konlechner and Güttel, 2009: 49ff).
A hierarchy within an organization, which is based on competencies (explained in more detail in chapter 2.2.1 *Leadership in self-organizing teams*), where empowerment of team members and participation exists, contributes to a high degree of innovation within an organization (Purser and Cabana, 1999: 42). For implementing contextual ambidexterity within a team, a bottom-up approach is necessary (Wang and Rafiq, 2014: 71). Employees are creative and take the initiative for building something new, when failures or risks do not result in punishment. Using all the talents and several different insights and background of employees leads to a high value creation for the customers (Purser and Cabana, 1999: 42). Additionally, Pearce and Manz (2005) show that an important factor for implementing creativity within a team is shared leadership among team members. If the team members own the power and knowledge of their tasks and not leaders, who are telling them what they have to work, innovation and creativity increases. Important here is that employees share information, decision-making, problems and solutions as well as opportunities and ideas with other team members, which affects creativity of the team (Pearce and Manz, 2005: 136).

Besides the already mentioned factors and contextual and environmental requirements, team diversity is another one, which influences ambidexterity within an organization through the promotion of team reflexivity. Reflexivity can be defined as a process, where goals and strategies of a team are discussed and reflected and in another step also adapted to recent or future circumstances. Furthermore, the authors mention that if a shared meta-knowledge level is quite high within a team, then the diverse functional backgrounds of team members affect team ambidexterity more in a positive way. Teams with a shared meta-knowledge are teams, which own effective processes for sharing and searching data between all team members. Besides this guidance of information, the social relations are also included, meaning that members are keen on responding to the information gaps of others (Li, Li, Lin and Liu, 2018: 1034ff). Pelagio Rodriguez and Hechanova (2014) examined cultural factors, such as the influence of power distance. Supportive to several other studies, exploration within teams is quite low if superiors and leaders have the power and authority on tasks and decisions. Collectivist environments, where ideas are shared and implemented together within a team, have a positive effect on exploration as well as exploitation, whereas team members with masculine characters are positively related to exploratory tasks. Masculine behaviour includes characters like logical
problem solving, being aggressive and more task rather than relationship-oriented (Pelagio Rodriguez and Hechanova, 2014: 28f). Moreover, the values and norms of organizations, which integrate shared vision as well as organizational diversity at the same time, foster the integration of exploitation and exploration, which leads to a balance of new innovations and products in a radical and incremental way. Shared vision describes all the values and norms created, communicated and implemented by the organizational members to reach organizational goals whereas organizational diversity includes a set of values and norms, where differences in opinions, skills and other knowledge are accepted, tolerated and rewarded (Wang and Rafiq, 2014: 62ff).

**Analogical thinking**

According to Karhu, Ritala and Viola (2016), analogical thinking within teams is a good strategy for implementing ambidexterity, which results in new product creation. Thus, this approach can be seen as a tool for idea generation for new products. Through their study, they find out that there are near (equal broad product group), medium-far (not the same product group) and far (non-product group) analogies. The higher the distance between the source and the objective, the higher is the degree of innovation of the product. As a result, near analogies are used for incremental innovations and medium-far and far analogies help in the creation of radical new products. An ambidextrous team focuses on one of these analogies, dependent on which degree of innovation it has to be. An important factor is that knowledge is quite diverse in the design teams, which can be improved by hiring new employees with new knowledge or by including external service providers into this process. Analogical thinking and thus ambidexterity can be managed best, if team diversity, regular communication and flat structures and the ability to express new ideas are given conditions within the organization and the culture (Karhu, Ritala and Viola, 2016: 14f).

**2.3.2 Practices fostering team ambidexterity**

To balance and integrate exploitation and exploration permanently within an organization, the use of various employment practices as well as work practices can foster and positively contribute to the implementation of organizational ambidexterity. Social integration is encouraged by practices like recruitment of new potential employees, the onboarding process of these individuals as well as various
trainings and practices about development within an organization. Therefore, it is quite essential how these employment practices are used in the organization, as this has an impact on the social integration. Applying work practices, which includes the job design, supports formal integration. Combining social and formal integration permanently, leads to knowledge integration and as a result, this makes it easier to implement organizational ambidexterity within an organization (Garaus, Güttel, Konlechner, Koprax, Lackner, Link and Müller, 2016: 356).

Jorgensen and Becker (2017) investigated two firms within their study and their findings show that a relationship-centric human resource management and practices influences ambidexterity in teams. Included are internally organizational practices such as staffing, training and improvements, work design, performance management and also the compensation of employees. All these practices contribute to long-term relationships within the organization and teams, which is quite fundamental for the building of contextual ambidexterity. Therefore, it is the responsibility of the teams to manage exploitation and exploration at the same time. Concerning the recruiting of new team members, the focus is on employees with broad knowledge and similar backgrounds, which leads to the fundament of developing something new and improving existing products and services. This similar background and homogeneity between members of a team is quite important to develop ideas and switch between explorative and exploitative tasks. Moreover, the focus is on team development and training, paying average industry salaries and giving team rewards. Additionally, performance management concentrates on team goal setting and the work design is characterized by high autonomy, long-lasting team structure and team responsibility within their investigated organization (Jorgensen and Becker, 2017: 270ff).

Besides the already mentioned important practices and factors (diversity in knowledge and the appropriate leadership style), Parmentier and Picq (2016) find five additional creative team management practices, which are from high importance in ambidextrous teams. First of all, a culture of creativity is vital, where people can take risk an failure. Besides that, interactions in a dense network plays a role, which can be reached through regular meetings or the creation of mini-teams, including diverse jobs. Ambidextrous design also increases by flexibility of rules and adaptions. In detail, this means to steer through goals of the projects in different stages and not distributing all the tasks. This is beneficial for the employees, as they are empowered,
but also gives flexibility in planning and bringing in all ideas to achieve the project goal with the help of mini-milestones. Capitalization and knowledge sharing is also an essential point, which can be implemented through summaries after finishing a project, communication through the intranet, design documents or rounds, where the team can discuss all the positive and negative issues of the finished project. The last practice is the integration of the whole team into the design process, as every person can give his or her opinion. Altogether, these seven management practices contribute to a contextual ambidextrous outcome, which is particularly important for small and medium-sized organizations (Parmentier and Picq, 2016: 16ff).

2.3.3 Team behaviours

Leader behaviours

Contrary to the leadership solution based on structural ambidexterity, Rosing, Fresche and Bauch (2011) note a contextual approach, where ambidextrous leadership and innovation are related to each other and where managers simultaneously pursue exploitation and exploration. Important for innovations are exploitation and exploration as well as existing flexibility, to be able to switch between them. Rosing et al. (2011) suggest two leadership behaviours for an ambidextrous leadership, which are complementary and help employees or teams to pursue exploration and exploitation. These two behaviours are opening and closing leader behaviours and one of the most important characteristic is that leaders are able to switch between those, to fulfill the tasks of the innovation process. Opening leader behaviour allows individuals to break rules and think outside the box. Contrary to that, closing leader behaviour includes existing guidelines and the monitoring of achieving organizational objectives. Leadership behaviour has to be matched with the overall situation, but also has to be appropriate for a temporal and quick change for innovation tasks. These leadership behaviours are not only important for the top management team, but they should also be applied by leaders, innovative teams and by individuals. Opening leader behaviour fosters exploration, whereas closing leader behaviour influences exploitation. Temporal switching, if the situation requires a change, is very essential for such a successful ambidextrous leadership (Rosing, Frese and Bausch, 2011: 956ff).
Moreover, Turner, Maylor and Swart (2015) show in their paper that for managers of a project, applying knowledge assets at the same time to both explore and exploit is very important for an ambidextrous approach for the context within the project. Knowledge resources that are used from managers are human, social and organizational capital. Human capital includes specialist knowledge (project management, technical knowledge and customer knowledge) and generalist knowledge (previous experience, which means a broader understanding of the project and the overall strategy of the organization). In their study, social capital is very vital for the effectiveness of the managers, which is mostly about the relationships and contacts within the teams to share information and get access to required knowledge and skills. If social capital is absent, it has a negative effect on the effectiveness of the project teams. Moreover, organizational capital includes mechanistic structures to coordinate and control the projects, but also an organic structure, allowing problem solving and innovations. These three intellectual capitals are not only used interdependent, but also in lots of other possible combinations to implement an ambidextrous behaviour within a project team (Turner, Maylor and Swart, 2015: 177ff).

**Ambidextrous team behaviours**

Individuals, who are acting ambidextrous within an organization, can influence the positive implementation of organizational ambidexterity. Employees have the power to connect and build ties to overcome the boundaries of different job roles, divisions and different social groups. Therefore, different behaviours in several organizational situations are desired and required, to make sure that employees can be confronted with conflicting intentions, another knowledge base or with conflicting expectations. This is quite a challenge for employees, as they have to concentrate on handling different stakeholders in their actual and required role. Equivalent to that, they have to operate and switch between different roles and have to bridge boundaries and combine knowledge (Tempelaar and Rosenkranz, 2017: 16).

Adopted from Birkinshaw and Gibson (2004), Fiset and Dostaler (2017) mention four individual behaviours, which should occur in high ambidextrous organizations. Initiator, cooperator, broker and multitasker should every organization besides the four dimensions stretch, discipline, support and trust own, to have the optimal requirements for being ambidextrous as a whole system. Initiators are individuals
that are acting ambidextrous in the way that they are taking the initiative and look for opportunities that are outside their usual working tasks. Cooperators are individuals that are cooperative and therefore, work together and find opportunities to unite their engagement with other individuals within the firm. The third ambidextrous behaviour, the broker, are people, who try to always find new internal ties and relations. The last behaviour is the multitasker, who not only focus on one of the already mentioned behaviours, but who feel comfortable by having more than only one of these behaviours (Fiset and Dostaler, 2017: 5).

2.3.4 Research Gap

All the mentioned factors of the organization, such as the culture or the context, which are very central to implement contextual ambidexterity, have their focus on a team level. Included are teams in a broader view, but also project teams and small creative teams, which all implement exploitation and exploration within their teams simultaneously. The focus of the chapter 2.3 Team ambidexterity, lies on important factors and contextual requirements teams need to fulfill exploitative as well as explorative tasks. However, the studies and different papers do not define the teams in more detail and therefore, it is not clear how all these teams are structured and how conditions are given within these organizations. Thus, it is not clear if the teams in these papers are self-managed or not. Moreover, as mentioned by Tarody (2016), there is little research about the topic how small organizations can create a context, which is ambidextrous, about the drivers of the ambidextrous context and how leaders and managers handle the processes and how they improve human resources within teams (Tarody, 2016: 48). Besides that, there is still research necessary about how contextual ambidexterity is brought forward on a team and group level (Turner, Maylor and Swart, 2015: 177ff).
3 RESEARCH METHOD

In order to be able to answer the research question of this work, using an appropriate research strategy and method is quite essential, to get the best out of the underlying case. Besides this, choosing the best research setting to find an answer to the research question to get useful practical and theoretical implications and contributions is from high importance. Moreover, interviewing the right employees within the organization also contributes to increasing success of answering the open questions. Therefore, the research methods and strategy are summarized in the following.

3.1 Research setting

The organization, which is investigated within this thesis and which I gave the fictitious company name Larut, operates in the industry of multimedia and internet and it belongs to the group of small and medium-sized organizations in Austria, with a balanced female and male quota. The organization provides several services in the digital area, such as different e-business solutions or diverse apps, tools and other digital platforms. In these fields, they act as designers and software engineers as well as consultants. The organization is truly driven from the employees and there exists high commitment since the start of the firm. Solving the arising complex demands desires an interaction between technical exactness and high creativity. Recent technologies and tools are applied to fulfill the needs of the customers in a simple and elegant way. Besides this, projects are internally developed and reviewed from a customer and user’s perspective to get the most suitable results. Customer projects with specific ideas are managed by studying the customer and the environment as well as all requirements and then using the most appropriate technologies that are available to face the fast changing environment through an agility approach. Therefore, an agile approach is from high importance to be able to execute very specific customer projects successfully (Company webpage, 2018).

Larut and their internal structures are a quite interesting case regarding the research question within this thesis and that is why the research is made with this organization. Some time ago, this firm decided that there is the necessity to reorganize the company to also stay competitive in this industry on the external market in the future. Due to the high complexity of the external demands of
customers as well as the existing dynamics within the market and the organization, structures were changed that way that the employees and in the further the teams got more responsibility and authority within their tasks and projects. The change was quite important, as no person within the company can complete and manage a whole customer project alone, as they are very complex. Therefore, a diverse perspective and knowledge base within handling those projects and short-decision processes were required to succeed in managing and finishing customer projects. Fast decisions contribute to an excellent customer relationship and therefore, helps to avoid uncomfortable situations with the external environment (Company webpage, 2018).

Using Larut as case in this thesis is very interesting and valuable for answering the open research question, as the company switched from a top-down to a bottom-up approach, meaning that two self-managing teams were built within the organization, to make the whole organization and the handling of different projects more agile. Each of the two teams handles and manages new customer projects on their own responsibility and divides new projects and customers between and within the two teams. Besides the two teams, which are managing the customer projects, there are also other functions within the organization that are not included into the teams, which are functions such as the human resource management and information technology as backbone, the sales directors, content and community or the two managing directors. Moreover, each team member has a special function and one or more team roles within the team, which consists of about 20 to 22 diverse employees concerning their functional background. All the customer projects are handled by these two operative teams including functions as strategy and consulting, design, software engineering and several experts, for instance, for 3D projects (Company webpage, 2018).

Thus, this thesis investigates the essential change process from a more hierarchical approach to these contextual self-managing teams. In the focus of the case are upcoming issues, the changing organizational context, important influencing factors and the role of the management of such agile and innovative teams as well as the management of flexibility and stability within the two teams.
3.2 Sampling

For answering the research question, it is quite important to search for the most appropriate interview partners within the examined organization. In detail, this means that employees and in general the sources of data and information are selected that are giving the most valuable and appropriate insights and have the most relevance for finding solutions and answers for the open questions (Yin, 2011: 311). Moreover, the first interview within this company was made with an employee outside the two teams that are managing the different and specific customer projects, as discussed by Kumar, Stern and Anderson (1993). This person can be seen as key informant concerning the issue of switching to self-managing teams, as this person drives forward the change and contributed to a large extent to the implementation and change process besides the two managing directors within the organization. To get a good overview of the change process and deep insides into the organization concerning strategies, structures, actions or about the change and reasons itself, the interview started with this person (Kumar, Stern and Anderson, 1993: 163ff).

In addition to that, other interview partners with a good insight into organizational processes were chosen. These are people either working in one of the two teams, which are managing the projects and bring in the view of the teams, but also employees, who are working outside of the teams to get a good overview of all different organizational perspectives. All these people can give very important information about the change process and the work within an organization that introduced self-organizing teams. Besides that, not only people, who already worked before the change process in the organization were interviewed, but also people, who came into the organization during the change process or after this process to get a broad view on the case and the whole organization.

Compared to a quantitative research, where the sample size is much larger, the sample size within a qualitative research is much smaller. The reason for that is that within a qualitative research, the focus is on getting information to understand the complexity of certain issues or to get deep insights into a case and the contextual factors and not to represent a whole population, as it is done with a quantitative research method (Gentles, Charles, Ploeg and McKibbon, 2015: 1782). As reaching a theoretical saturation after conducting eight interviews within the organization,
which means that no further valuable and important data and information can be gained through more qualitative interviews with other employees, this is the underlying sample size within this thesis (Glaser and Strauss, 1967: 61).

3.3 Data collection

The necessary data for this thesis and for answering the research question was collected with two different, but also complementary methods to get the best and quite objective results. The first technique was a qualitative method, as semi-structured interviews were conducted within one organization in the industry of internet and multimedia. The semi-structured interviews were the main and most important source of getting valuable results for the open research question. In addition to these interviews, different documentations of the organization were used to support the analysis of the interviews and to get a broader view on certain processes and factors and to have a pool of multiple information sources (Gioia, Corley and Hamilton, 2012: 19).

Semi-structured interview

Semi-structured interviews are a form of getting information as a form of qualitative research method. Therefore, one person, who is the interviewer, tries to get important information from another person by questioning. The interviewer prepares several questions and categories that are very essential to get answers. Although several questions are prepared, the interview is quite open and can also focus on other issues and topics, if they suddenly pop up within the interview. Altogether, prepared topics, but also not included questions that are also important for answering the research question are talked about within several interviews (Clifford, Gillespie and French, 2016: 143).

For this thesis, eight interviews were conducted within one organization. The focus of these semi-structured interviews was to get valuable information of the change process from a more hierarchical approach to self-organizing teams, where authority and responsibility lies within teams. To get different views, employees from one of the two self-managing teams with different functions and roles as well as people outside these two teams were interviewed and each person brought in important inputs and information. All eight interviews were conducted from the same person to
be consistent and the interview duration was between 42 and 60 minutes. The protocol of the interview questions and topics were quite standardized, with only little deviations. Differences occurred, for instance, for people who were involved into the change from a team perspective, people outside the teams or for employees, who entered the organization after the implementation or during the implementation and change process. Except for one interview, which was held in English, all the other seven interviews were held in German, as all these people are German native speakers. Besides introductory and questions for concluding the interview, the main categories and topics within the interview protocol were the following ones:

- Introduction of self-organizing teams
- Teamwork
- Roles and distribution of tasks
- Changes of the contextual environment
- Classification and time for projects
- Process of handling projects
- Organizational culture
- Performance comparison
- Leading of teams
- Communication

All interviews were recorded and afterwards transcribed according to the transcription rules of Froschauer and Lueger (2003: 223).

**Document analysis**

The document analysis was used as additional source of information, which can include a wide range of different electronic or printed forms of information that are important for answering the research question, such as newspaper articles, internal documentations, protocols or web pages (Mayring, 2014: 43). For the analysis within this work, the web page as well as internal documents are used for analyzing, for instance, all different role descriptions that are divided between team members and the definition of the feedback procedure within the organization.
3.4 Data analysis

After collecting all the important information and the transcription of all the conducted interviews, the data was analyzed, which was carried out by following the method of Gioia, Corley and Hamilton (2012). Therefore, the authors suggest that a number of informant terms and categories appear quite early in the underlying research. This is called 1st order analysis and includes building lots of different categories. As the analysis is progressing and the research is getting further, there can be identified differences and similarities and connections between the existing categories. This process can be seen as 2nd order themes and reduces the already identified categories. It is the task to think at multiple levels, on the one hand, there is the level of the informant terms and categories (1st order concepts) and on the other hand, a more intangible and abstract 2nd order level is necessary for dimensions and broader categories. Moreover, the focus within this analysis is to find relationships between certain dimensions, terms or categories. This is from high importance, as from a theoretical perspective, themes and categories have to emerge to be able to create concepts and further to get an answer to the research question. If these certain themes or concepts are found, the further investigation is on bringing the 2nd order themes into more overall and combining dimensions, which are called 2nd order aggregate dimensions within the strategy of Gioia, Corley and Hamilton (2012). This is the basis, which leads to a data structure, which can be related with the underlying theory of the research to combine upcoming results with theoretical foundation, to be able to identify differences, similarities or develop a new concept (Gioia, Corley and Hamilton, 2012: 20ff).

3.5 Trustworthiness

To ensure the objectivity and reliability of this research, there were used and applied several methods to guarantee the trustworthiness of the information and the results of this thesis. First of all, the management of all the information was quite important. Therefore, interviews were recorded as well as transcribed by following determined rules. Moreover, field notes and other documents were included into the analysis to guarantee an objective result. Peer debriefing is another method mentioned by Lincoln and Guba (1985). For creating credibility and not having a very subjective result, other people, who are not involved into the research, are asked about the
case. This is carried out by discussing different patterns and aspects that came out after analyzing the qualitative interviews and with additional data from several documentations. This is quite important, as the perspective of an unknown person regarding the case is illustrated and contributes to an objective overall picture of the analysis and the results of this research (Lincoln and Guba, 1985: 289ff).
4 RESULTS

In Figure 4, the results of this analysis are summarized and illustrated, to get a good overview of all important outcomes. In detail, the illustration shows the most important factors that influence the development and collaboration of contextual ambidextrous self-organizing teams. Important factors within this thesis are organizational factors including structural and cultural issues, team factors, individual factors, external factors, the role of the top management team as well as certain HR practices that foster the integration and therefore, also the ambidextrous behaviour of existing and new employees.

Figure 4: Important factors that influence the development of contextual ambidextrous self-organizing teams
Altogether, these four different factors, the role of the top management and several HR practices influence the development and collaboration of self-organizing teams, which are acting contextual ambidextrous. Are all the factors fulfilled, then such teams are showing high performance within an organization and are acting very successful within their external dynamic market.

4.1 Organizational factors

One of the most important factors for working together within self-organizing teams in an ambidextrous context are organizational aspects. The organization itself and the provided context are very essential for the development and successful collaboration to be efficient and innovative simultaneously within such teams. In the organization, in which the qualitative interviews were conducted, the organizational context can be divided into structural and cultural factors that are from high importance for successfully working teams. Therefore, the structural as well as the cultural aspects within the organization Larut are discussed in the following.

4.1.1 Structural factors

Flat structure and hierarchy

First of all, a flat and flexible structure and hierarchy is quite essential for the organizational context, in which contextual ambidextrous self-organizing teams are operating. For Larut, it is important that there are not lots of different levels of hierarchy and power within their company, to be flexible and face upcoming challenges rapidly:

“There are not so many levels or maybe the steps are just not that, the steps are kind of flat, so that it does not feel like a level, that's really awesome.” (I8, 545-548)

As customer requirements and special wishes are increasing and getting more complex, it is necessary to react to such dynamics and to divide power and authority between all members of the organization and therefore, to reduce existing hierarchies and structures. This is made by removing a top down hierarchy and by implementing flat structures, where individuals and teams are empowered and therefore, can better react to the external market and customers. Although some kind of structure is necessary to be able to collaborate in an efficient way, those structures have to be
very flat. Consequently, two self-managing teams with diverse functional responsibilities were implemented within the firm. Thus, existing departments were split up to very diverse teams concerning their knowledge and function, which have the responsibility to work on specific customer projects on their own without having teamleaders as before. Besides these two units, some functions are not integrated into these two teams, which are sales directors, content and community and the backbone, including, for instance, human resource management or information technology. The two customer teams consist of about 20 to 22 employees with different functional backgrounds. If a new customer order is coming in, then small project teams within these two large units are formed for such a new order. These people are working together for one special order and if it is successfully fulfilled, the people split up again and form new teams for other orders. Therefore, employees are integrated into one or more projects within their unit simultaneously. So summing up, there are interdisciplinary customer teams from the specialist teams strategy/consulting, UX/UI design, engineering, 3D/AR/VR. According to Larut, such a flexible and agile organizational form of self-managing teams is nowadays really necessary for an organizational success. Only flat structures enable flexible project settlement within dynamic markets, such as the industry of multimedia and internet, in which Larut is operating. It was quite essential to change structures, as one department alone is not able to solve a complete customer project on their own and thus, flat structures and interdisciplinary teams are required. Above the two units, only the two managing directors are given more authority within the organization, all other employees have equal responsibility over their tasks:

“Cause there’s no such title anymore and there’s also no such rules that give you all, I mean, there is no rule in general, that gives you a power to command other people.” (I4, 123-126)

As the structure is very flexible, small adaptations are happening and are sometimes necessary, but a whole reorganization is not needed anymore within the firm, as structures are already created very agile and elastic.

However, as Larut is a medium-sized organization, there is some kind of structure necessary to work efficiently. Moreover, besides the managing directors, there is also a steering team within each self-managing team that consists of representatives of the specialist teams and has lots of power within the self-managing teams:
“That was, for example, there, that goes from, a bit from top to bottom, and in truth it's only two steps anyway, because the managing directors and then the steering team and then.” (I5, 350-353)

**Providing tools**

The second structural factor is the provision of certain tools. First of all, the use of a resource management tool is very important to be able to plan required resources and projects and their approximated duration. This helps to get a clear overview of all the resources and if all projects can be handled within the planned time. Within this tool, employees can register their tasks and the needed time for the next weeks and so, efficiency is ensured. Besides this tool, a communication tool is more often used now, as the specialist teams (formerly the different departments with equal employees concerning their functional background) are not sitting together anymore and that is the reason why the slack communication has increased within Larut after the change to self-organizing teams. Moreover, such internal communication tools are necessary, if an organization is getting larger, as it is not possible to communicate with every person within Larut face-to-face all the time. Within the internal communication tool, there exist different group chats, such as one for HR leads, for instance, where they can chat and exchange information between all those people and which can be built and removed very flexible. For an agile and flexible project handling, the scrum tool is from high importance, which can be seen as a kind of project management tool and helps to realize special customer projects in the software development. This tool is very essential especially for completely innovative projects, as an interim result is presented after an arranged time interval to the customer. Furthermore, a planer board is used to plan projects and to divide tasks between project members to not loose efficiency within their project management. Besides that, also a business intelligence system is used within Larut:

“Ahm, there is, ahm, a tool. That's called BI, and, ahm, there are the whole figures open for everyone, ahm, of the employees, so the whole economic figures.” (I7, 679-681)

There was also used an online bord, but this is not used anymore, as it was not used that often and people did not like to allocate their tasks within this tool.
Open spaces and adequate equipment

The spaces and premises are another important factor of the organizational context. The two teams are now organized in such a way that they are sitting together and not being split up into the functional departments. This is a huge advantage, as communication is getting easier and quicker within project teams. But this was also a big challenge, as teams were already formed and worked together for a long time. In addition to that, all meeting rooms are glazed, which contributes to an open and familiar atmosphere. Besides the meeting rooms, the two big units are separated by sitting into two different floors within large and open offices without any people sitting alone into an office. This atmosphere and openness is also strengthened by the open offices of the two managing directors, which walls are also made of glass and therefore, symbolizes transparency within the organization. Bringing lots of advantages, these meeting rooms also have some kind of difficulties, because decapsulating from the others, for instance, when doing tasks for your special role, is quite a challenge, as colleagues can see you sitting within a room and are disturbing you if they need something. For this reason, some people often avoid these premises of Larut:

“This is a co-working space, which is so to say one floor below. And if you are, so they are in cooperation with us, so it, ah. ... Yes, but then you are really far away from the action, but people do that sometimes.” (I3, 416-418; 425-426)

Besides the premises, also the availability and functioning of the equipment or digital sources is an important prerequisite for working successfully within teams, which are a functioning heating and internet service or a kitchen for breaks. Such factors should not be underestimated, as they make a difference in the working quality and climate.

4.1.2 Cultural factors

Commitment

One of the major cultural context factor is the existing commitment of all employees within Larut. In general, people are quite committed to the organization and there exists an appreciative treatment of each other, where respect between all diverse employees is very important, as announced by the following employee:
“So, I think, respect is important. ... It is really nice, because it somehow connects everything like that. That one appreciates all the diversity and respects the others for that.” (I7, 567; 578-580)

Showing respect also includes to inform colleagues when a meeting has to be cancelled or shifted to another time or day due to several reasons. The change to self-managing teams was also implemented with the commitment of the employees, only few people left the organization. The main reason for this was that these people were not able to identify themselves with the new and agile organizational system, which is expressed in the following statement:

“And, and what has been communicated to me very well, is that people have left the organization, who were not able to identify themselves with, with the system, or who, ahm, wanted to have a power position or a specific title on their business card out of principle and could not handle it. They then left the company.” (I7, 141-146)

Therefore, identifying yourself with the organizational system is quite important for the commitment of the employees. In addition to that, the interviews and analysis show that there just exist some basic guidelines within Larut, which have to be obeyed, but lots of other strict rules do not really exist.

Within Larut, there exists no organizational chart, as such illustrations are not important for all of them. Moreover, people are working on an equal level and the teams understand each other very well. It is a participative environment, where employees can bring in their opinions and are able to discuss several topics, which was also the case with the implementation of the self-organizing teams. Although there was the decision that there is going to be a reorganization, the employees were included into decisions and how the new divisions into teams should be look like and all other recommendations or ideas were welcomed. Within workshops, ideas and other opinions were developed and discussed and considered for the implementation of the teams. After the introduction of the teams, the context is also quite participative, where each employee can bring in their issues and can be part of certain decisions.

The commitment is quite high within the two units, but employees argued that one team, which is the sales director’s team, has to increase their commitment. They have to see themselves as a whole team and not as individual persons within the
organization, as the whole system can only functioning, if all teams show high commitment and see themselves as a strong team. Through defining roles and tasks, this problem has a little bit decreased.

**Transparency and communication**

For the collaboration and development of contextual ambidextrous self-organizing teams, transparency is an important cultural factor. On the one hand, transparency is existing within Larut, as their meeting rooms are all made of glass and therefore, all meetings and conferences of all members can be seen from all people, which contributes to a transparent atmosphere. On the other hand, not only the architecture fosters transparency, but also the fact that the change process was implemented transparent with the integration of the employees. Moreover, all decisions are very transparent from the steering team, which is described in detail in 4.1.3 Team factors, as all protocols are available for all employees and are communicated to the whole teams:

“What has been discussed or, ahm, what has come out and that everything is as transparent as possible of course. Ah, every protocol in the steering team is public to everyone, so anyone can read what we have discussed or the to do's or something.” (I8, 205-209)

In addition to that, there exists an open book philosophy, which means that all figures and performances of the teams are obvious for all employees. Therefore, teams can compare their figures with other ones, which can lead somehow to a kind of competition. But altogether, the two units are supporting each other, if anyone needs help:

“And, ahm, we also have team open book philosophy, which means every employee knows the figures of the projects. This has changed with the new organization.” (I1, 118-121)

What is somehow a problem and leads to disturbance is that within one large unit, the role of the HR lead, which is described in 4.1.3 Team factors, is not taken from a member inside the team, but is operating outside. This is not conform to the structure, as within all other teams and roles, they are all taken by employees within the teams. Although this is a kind of inconsistency, as teams are not equally treated
concerning this role, there have not been huge difficulties due to the fact that one team has this role outsourced.

For transparency, communication is also quite important. Within Larut, the communication is quite open and often include open discussions, where each individual of the organization can bring in their opinion and therefore, valuable knowledge, which is also the case when roles are changed or new defined. People with the same functions have regular meetings across the two teams. This means that all people with the same functional background of Larut communicate regularly and are exchanging information, knowledge and other important data. Besides these regular meetings with the same functional backgrounds, also people who own the same roles across the two teams have regular meetings to discuss important issues face-to-face. Besides these meetings, also the steering teams have regular meetings and there are also meetings with the whole unit, meaning all 20-22 team members of one team are coming together and discussing current topics. These meetings ensure that information and knowledge is transferred and communicated through all teams. In addition to that, if other and additional meetings are necessary, then they are held and managed quite flexible and spontaneously. Such meetings are very time consuming as mentioned by employees, but they are vital to ensure efficiency and to avoid misunderstandings between individuals and teams:

“And at the beginning of the week, so my Monday morning is actually always full of meetings, where we plan resources, so who does what stuff in this week, how we distribute the tasks.” (I3, 27-29)

Besides all the personal and face-to-face meetings, there is also an internal communication tool, which ensures the frequent communication and information sharing between all employees and teams. As Larut is a medium-sized organization, it is necessary to have such a tool, as it is not possible to communicate with all colleagues personally and the use of this tool also increased after changing to these self-organizing teams.

The only challenge that came with the reorganization was that the personal communication within the specialist teams decreased a little bit as well as distributing the knowledge between the specialist teams is more challenging, as mentioned in these statements:
“And then you have a lot of small communication circles and that the two then always coordinate in a good way, ah, together, that has been more difficult. Because with the others sitting up now and the others downstairs, and not just like that, we have our weekly meetings where we vote. But they also tend to be relatively short or maybe it's stressful and then you do not spend that much time, and then, yeah, it always separates a bit.” (I8, 63-69)

“This may have been easier before, that you just spread the know-how a little better, just from the communication.” (I8, 71-72)

**Familiar atmosphere**

One of the most important reasons why those teams are functioning that well within Larut is the familiar and collective atmosphere, not only within the teams, but also within the whole organization, which following statements show:

“Mhh, yeah, ahm, what sets us apart most, probably is just the whole atmosphere. So on the one hand the familiar and, and the friendship atmosphere through all levels.” (I8, 540-542)

“And I think it works relatively well too, because everyone is so open and so, ahm, cordially people that you arrive just fine there. Because you can feel good.” (I8, 523-525)

“No, I mean company is really important for me, so the people that I work with are really important for me, but I wouldn’t just work with people who are not happy to work with.” (I4, 491-493)

Employees mentioned that it is like a little family, where people help and support you if you need their help or advice. Moreover, lots of employees became friends and are also doing several things together within their leisure time, which contributes really in a positive way to the overall atmosphere and culture within Larut. The atmosphere and interconnection is quite high, but the atmosphere was already very excellent before the reorganization, as the mood within Larut was always quite good and collective.
**Innovative**

Within Larut, innovation has always been part of the culture, also before switching to the organizational form of self-managing teams. Out of the organization, three different spin-offs already emerged, which were quite innovative. Besides these spin-offs, all other employees are also innovative and pioneering within their tasks and working time. To ensure the innovation and new idea creation of all employees, there has been implemented a format. Within this organizational arrangement, which was called innovation day, all employees should show their creativity by spending one day per month as whole department with the same functions and test and experiment on several issues and discuss them in detail. As all employees with the same functional background are working together within this day, it was quite hard to work the whole day on innovations and ideas as a whole team. The reason for that was that, for instance, customers are calling or other challenges are arising, to which certain employees have to react and therefore, had to exit the innovation group. Moreover, employees mentioned that it often only was this one special day used, without focusing these ideas further. As a result, the innovation day was split up into a general education time, which means that each individual gets eight hours for being innovative, experimenting, doing some research on their topic or develop them and the organization further, as described by the following employee:

“Ah, and then people have the chance to try things out. Especially with software engineers, that, ahm, things, test new languages, so new coding languages, or maybe, ahm, some new tools, an instrument, that just kinda buzzes around in silicon valley, and they say wow, I want to test that, maybe it will take us further. And then they have enough time. ... And this is also fully appreciated by the company, which really see it as an added value, what I am now bringing in from the outside or even appropriating myself, ah, ah, that I can actually take the organization forward and further develop myself.” (I7, 605-611; 615-618)

Within the innovation days, only the teams with the same functional background have been working together on new ideas and no interdisciplinary team was formed to get diverse knowledge, views and opinions on certain issues and ideas. Applying the new form of education time, it is possible to invest this time into individual learning and idea creation or to sit together with other employees and create new ideas, which can also be made with people who have another functional background. Moreover,
by implementing the education time, individual responsibility also increased, as they have to manage, plan and consume these hours with a good self-organization and management. According to Larut, there is enough space for innovation and they are convinced that they are a learning organization, which was developed further with the implementation of the two units:

“And time to be creative, I think you have even more, because the complexity has decreased, from the planning you might have faced lots of problems, which again cost a lot of time and nerves. And that has become easier now.” (I8, 436-451)

“Ah, the room is given, yes. That is also, is, is also something that we say, that, the learning in the organization, so the learning organization, I think so.” (I6, 542-544)

The challenge that employees now have with the change to the education time is that they keep in mind that there is this time for innovation and creativity, as before there was announced a specific day for this, where each individual prepared themselves:

“The challenge is that you still have it in your mind, the innovation. Because before you knew, you have one day a month and so you have been reminded again and again, when you see the appointment in the calendar, ah yeah, exactly, there.” (I3, 162-165)

So now, it is more on coincidence to create something new than it was before. But if an employee has an excellent and valuable idea, then they get the opportunity to develop the ideas further, within the working time and providing premises, but also in their leisure time. Are the managing directors convinced, then employees within Larut get a certain budget and time for experimenting and can consider this into the resource planning. If they are not convinced that the idea can lead to success, then employees have to invest their leisure time to focus on this project and to develop it further. Besides random innovations, there is also sometimes a certain challenge or issue, for which solutions have to be found and then, some employees are working on this challenge.

Although innovations are quite important for Larut, efficiency also has to be ensured and therefore, customer projects have the priority, as the organization can only be successful, if these projects are handled professionally. This is the reason why innovations within Larut are often kind of restricted by those customer projects. As
already mentioned, to ensure innovation, the education time was implemented to do not loose flexibility in new idea creation:

"but it's always very difficult to do anything besides the project business. Because just the project business, ah, has priority." (I2, 464-466)

**Learning and failures**

An agile and flexible form of managing projects develops employees further, as they learn to make research on their own and gain new knowledge through such a self-organizing working style. As the working style is quite flexible and people can take over other roles, it is always a learning process and people within Larut are appreciating that they are able to develop themselves, either on a social or a professional level.

The culture for making mistakes and taking risks is quite open. Nobody within the organization has to be afraid to make failures, as they are not being punished, which is quite important for bringing in new innovations, for instance. Failures are seen as a chance to learn from them and to get the best out of these failures. Moreover, these failures are communicated to others, not to judge these people, but to inform all others that such a failure can be avoided in future, as the following statement also shows:

“Saying, hey guys, look at what I have done wrong now, I want you to do that better the next time, or can we find a solution together for that?” (I7, 588-591)

So overall, reflecting failures is important. In addition to that, there can be made a kind of emergency plan that other teams can react much faster on a problem if such a failure happens again.

**4.2 Team factors**

Besides the organizational influencing factors, factors on the team level are also from high importance. For the successful implementation of self-organizing teams, it is decisive that the teams are working together very well and that interconnection is existing. Moreover, how much responsibility and autonomy teams have within handling their customer projects is also an essential issue for the performance outcome of these teams. In addition to that, distributing different roles within teams
as well as communicating frequently is also very crucial. Therefore, all the important factors of the teams are discussed in the following.

**Empowerment**

One essential factor and almost the most important prerequisite that employees and teams are able to work successfully within self-organizing teams is that they are given authority and autonomy over their daily tasks, as it is the case within the organization Larut:

“So it will not be structured in the morning, what you have to do. So, if you expect that, you probably will not be happy. Ahm, on the other hand, of course, that offers a lot of creative freedom, if you can handle it.” (I7, 83-85; 87-88)

When the teams were introduced in the summer 2016, all the responsibility concerning their projects was given into the teams, which is quite motivating, if people like to manage their tasks on their own and do not want to only fulfill the tasks that are commanded to them. Therefore, individuals are empowered with this new system and are able to control and manage their work on their own. Each individual can choose when they are working on which projects and how are they dividing their work, which also requires a good self-organization. As shown in the following statement, this was different before the reorganization:

“Ahm, and you may just feel more capable of being able to control, what, mhh, yeah, or simply optimize in particular. Because before you somehow were able to manage this well within your specialist team, but as soon as it has somehow gone to the interfaces in the other teams or so the big picture, then you were somehow lost there, because you are not really authorized or empowered, that you there too, mhh, make changes or bring somewhat in or something.” (I8, 132-139)

Of course, there are also some other stakeholders or the managing directors, who give somehow the direction or there are urgent tasks that have to be fulfilled and therefore, you have to do this work as soon as possible. But in general, this is very rarely happening within Larut, as the self-management and management of projects on your own and as a team are in the foreground. As long as you are reaching the goals and are working within the strategic orientation of Larut, you are very free in dividing your time and project tasks within the team.
Trust from the managing directors that all projects are fulfilled very well as well as skills from each individual to work as a team and fulfill the task in the necessary priority and to manage all customer projects on their own show the following extracts from the conducted interviews:

“Ah, no, I believe that the teams have been put together so that the skills are also allocated accordingly. That each team, so the goal is that each of the teams can make decisions independently and can also serve customers. And the, the main goal is that you have a big unit, where are the specialist teams and where voting is incredibly slow, so that, ah, we have smaller operationally agile teams, but who can completely serve a customer.” (I6, 613-619)

“The teams themselves decide, which people work on which projects, how do they approach the work there, how do they organize themselves, where do they focus, how did they divide the roles, ah, how do these roles develop further, what do they need for that, exactly, so everything that is within this team, so even existing customers are assigned to the teams, how do they look after these customers, what do they offer them, whatever, that all happens in the team.” (I1, 479-485)

Thus, teams divide their tasks and roles considering their individual skills and strengths of each employee to get the best results for projects out of them. People within Larut only take roles or take over tasks, if they are convinced and really keen on doing this. Another advantage of such self-organizing teams and the empowerment is that employees that have just entered the organization, are faster integrated and are welcomed to bring in their opinion and can also take an important role within the team, which would not be able within another, more hierarchical driven organization.

When it comes to decision-making within the two teams, there has to be made a difference between unit decisions and project team decisions. Looking on a unit level of the two large teams, it is obvious that most of the decisions are coming from the steering team, which every unit has. As people with different functional backgrounds are part of the steering team, they have a quite diverse perspective and therefore, most of the topics are discussed first in the steering team and decisions are made there:

“Ahm, yes, actually in the steering team, so now for the teams.” (I2, 271)
To communicate these decisions and guarantee transparency, these decisions are discussed and announced within the monthly meetings, to ensure that all employees are up to date. Important is that the steering team focuses on the teams and only make decisions in the sense of the teams. Moreover, it is important to integrate all team members by distributing some tasks that result out of decisions or discussions out of the steering team. As mentioned, there is still potential to extent this and to give more tasks out of the steering team to other members of the unit. This is kind of hard and often a challenge, as the steering team do not know how and until the work will be done and if they need to control the work, which is very time consuming. But as stated out, there is the opportunity to create this much opener, as the steering team now has lots of power within the self-managing teams and when it comes to unit decisions.

Issues that are discussed within the steering team are, for instance, if overtime is necessary or if new employees are needed within the teams. Moreover, within the goals process, there are some requirements given from the managing directors that are quite open formulated. Then, it is the task of the steering team to break down unit goals and in another step, the specialist teams get these unit goals and should discuss their underlying team goals. Although the steering team is discussing and breaking it down first, the teams are also integrated and are able to find their goals or add other important ones.

Between the interdisciplinary project teams, which are all working on specific customer wishes, the decisions are completely made from these teams without any interferences from outside. Apart from the steering team, these small teams are discussing and deciding all topics and upcoming challenges within them and do not need to ask whether their decision or work is released by others:

“And if it is on the project level, ah, then actually in the team, in the project team, because that's not the whole unit.” (I8, 172-174)

**Agile and flexible project management**

For contextual ambidextrous self-organizing teams, an agile and flexible project handling is important, as it is the best possibility to manage specific customer wishes. If a new customer request is coming in, then the unit, to which this customer is assigned, forms an appropriate new project team:
“That means, the teams of the, they are forming together just as they are needed and then they separate again. And go back together differently, if they just need to be used for another project. And that works relatively quickly and smoothly.” (I7, 301-304)

From beginning to the finish of the project, always the same project team members are integrated, which is quite important. It has to be ensured that all project members know all important project figures and what the exact requirements are. Information has to be shared within this team and if this is done and equal members are participating, then each employee knows everything about the project and it can be completed very successfully, as there are no misunderstandings or a lack of information, as members stay the same within the project.

For the organization Larut, it is very hard to say into how much projects the employees are integrated on average, as it can happen that you are, for instance, working for three customer projects simultaneously or that you are even integrated into six diverse projects of different customers within your unit. It always depends on how much of your resources the projects are occupying and if it are very large or small projects or if it is a completely new challenge or tasks that have already became a routine. Managing an innovative new project can be quite challenging and therefore, applying the agile project management method is quite successful:

“Or quite innovative. Of course, that’s where it is extremely important, because maybe you do not even know exactly what you want for the end result. You have thoughts in your head, but you do not really know, what then, then how the end, or most of the time, it is so that you can not ask so many questions in the beginning that you know all the answers, you would need. From that point of view, having that, with the agile logic we've had now, with this solution that really was, has worked really well.” (I5, 593-600)

Especially for new innovative and special customer projects that have never been executed before, it is always some kind of risky that the project team is not able to handle the challenge and new innovations and do not know how to fulfill the order or which offer and price they should make at the beginning of a project. To overcome these challenges, the project management tool scrum was applied at such projects within Larut. In detail, this means that the project and the procedure are quite agile
and in close collaboration with the customer. The huge advantage within this scrum logic is that the customer is really integrated, which means that the project team works on the project and continually after two weeks and after fulfilling the user stories, there is a meeting with the customer. Within this meeting, all important issues and upcoming ambiguities are discussed with the customer and there, the customer always gets a deliverable product, which can be progressed within the next two week sprints again. Moreover, such method ensures that the project team knows that they are on the right way. If the customer would not be satisfied with a current status, it is much easier and less effort to go one step back and work into another direction. Although such agile scrum method is quite time consuming, it guarantees that the customer and the project team are not going and working into two different directions. As such scrum methods are quite successful, the customer should be integrated more often into different projects, as this was only implemented several times.

Moreover, for handling complete new products, which have never been made before within Larut, there is a proof of concept phase, where the project team or the organization has about two or three months to develop a prototype and to try if this idea can result in a product. Therefore, their lab is used from customers to try out their new ideas and develop them further. For products that are already introduced on the external market, but are not quite well known within Larut, then the time span is a little bit shorter and a certain specialist team gets the order to work on this special product. Is a plan available, then a price offer can be made.

Which members are working on a certain project depends on how much resources a person has available. If another project just comes to an end, then such person will probably participate in the new project. Besides the resources, the know-how of employees is quite important as it makes no sense if people are integrated into a project, where they are not able to contribute valuable input. For preparing projects and idea generation, it is often the task of the designers within Larut to generate new ideas or to decide how to convince the customer within the pitch presentation to get the assignment. But besides this, other members are now more integrated also at the beginning of the project and are allowed to bring in the opinion in an early stage and discuss with designers. But as mentioned, for winning the customers, it is most of the time the task only of the designers to generate ideas to get the project
contract. Overall, it happens that for certain issues, people are generating ideas and doing research alone, but it needs the whole project team to succeed:

“So it is, sometimes if it is really, let’s say it this way, really department specific, then it may be that someone separately prepares or researches that. But in the end you often need the cooperation of several.” (I3, 545-548)

If there is a lack of knowledge within a project team or they do not know how they should go on with a certain problem or project, they are bringing in some new people, even from the other unit. Important is that this person has the necessary know-how or experience and can help them to come to a solution to succeed. So, it is quite important to know, which person has which skills and experience, to bring them in, if it is necessary.

A huge advantage of an agile project management is that the people of Larut now recognize what other people are doing and there is a deeper information exchange between them, as they now work together with other disciplines, what was not the case before the reorganization. When implementing the self-organizing teams, not all structures and processes were existing in the beginning. It was a continually process a long time, where adaptations were made and which was created quite flexible. If some challenge popped up, then they knew that this issue was not clarified before and then, processes were prepared, which was the case, for instance, for distributing new customers to the two units.

Important is that information is getting to the managing directors on an informal basis, as there has often been the case that information exchange did not happen and at the end, the customer and the project teams were satisfied with the outcome, but the managing directors weren’t. Therefore, keeping the managers up do date is very essential.

Flexible role identity

The identification of roles within the two units and Larut after the reorganization was an important change and contributes that all employees know the task area and responsibilities of each other and that important roles are distributed within the teams and are not determined from outside, which is a result out of the empowerment of employees and the teams. For the teams, such allocation of
different roles is quite essential, as some functions that a team or project leader normally holds, are given into the teams. This is quite important, as it is the responsibility to manage flexible projects, but to also be efficient and fulfill the goals and perform well to stay competitive on the market.

Roles that are distributed within the specialist teams in each unit are the professional lead, the organizational lead and the HR lead. The professional lead is responsible to ensure the quality and standards. Furthermore, this role has to make sure that the employees within the specialist team own the competencies and that they are developing them further to make technological innovations and to be state of the art. Therefore, this role has the duty to foster technological developments and acts as a professional mentor. The organizational lead is the second role on the specialist team level and is doing the resource allocation. Moreover, the tasks include vacation management and also the handling when employees are ill. Besides this, the organizational lead has to manage that all projects are properly staffed and that people with the best competencies are working into the right customer project teams. If there is the need for new resources, it is the task of this role to recognize and report it. The HR lead has the typical role of human resources management within the specialist teams of each unit. This person is doing the appraisal interviews and is ensuring that there is given feedback. This employee is the first contact person and integrated into the decision process for hiring new employees. Moreover, the HR lead manages trainings of employees within the specialist team, for which the person is responsible.

Besides these roles on a specialist team level, there are also roles that are on the unit level and therefore, represented in each of the two units. In each unit, there is the role of a communicator or kind of quality manager, who is managing the internal knowledge management and that documentations are made correctly and that standards are available. Every person within the unit should know where documents can be found and where they have to save certain documents. Therefore, the main task of this role is to clearly communicate these structures. Moreover, the role of a dispo-manager within Larut is to manage the dispo-meetings besides the current projects. The person coordinates appointments and communicates them to all, is defining an agenda and develops the meeting process further. Within the dispo-meeting, this person has to ensure efficiency and has to manage the time. Another
important role is the one of a financial guru, who manages the economy of the unit. This role has an overview of all important key figures within the unit as well as how projects are financially running. Another role is the linkage to the managing directors and the connection concerning the communication between management and the steering team within the meeting of the steering teams. The socializer ensures that the team cohesion is quite high and that employees can get along with each other very well. Teambuilding is important and therefore, this unit role organizes several events and other activities within the unit or smaller project teams.

To divide the roles and tasks of a teamleader before between several employees within the organization has the following reason:

“What is the background behind that is that we have employees who are extremely technically skilled, but maybe not in the relationship with others, ah, have their heart there, that they like to do that, ah, or who want to be available as technically mentor, but that the plan vacations of someone or coordinate the project resources correctly, they are not interested into that.” (I1, 74-79)

The splitting of the roles was made participative in a workshop, where each team decided within a team process and a discussion, which people are interested in taking the roles and whom they are thinking would be appropriate for doing these roles. This process was quite clear, as not every person likes to take over one of the roles. Although the roles can be changed when and how often people like, they are not changed that often and therefore, it has to be ensured that they are not too stable without any flexibility and changes. If no other employee is pointing out that they are interested to take over one of the roles and no person puts away their role because they do not like to to these tasks anymore, then they are quite stable. Are two people interested into the same role, then there is an election within the team, where each employee can vote for one of the two and the person with the highest votes is getting the role. Moreover, it was often the case that the former teamleaders took over one or more of these roles and therefore, the change was not that huge, which speaks against the implemented flexible working style and therefore, the roles should also be changed more often.

Important is that no role is combined with a higher salary, as employees should take over a role because they like to organize things, for instance, or to support the team
in form of a HR lead and not to get more money for that. In addition to your functional background and activity within Larut, employees can take over up to three roles, as they are mainly designer or developer, for instance, and these roles only can take over 20 percent of the whole work effort of an employee. Important is that although the roles have different percentages concerning their effort, each role is equal important:

“And we do not have this coming up within the hierarchy, but this is a system where we have many equivalents. It's not the HR lead better than the organizational lead. The role is a smaller one of the socializer than the role of the steering team member, in percentage or time, but it's not less important, yes. Because, because, we need teambuilding as well.” (I1, 684-689)

Once or twice a year, there is a so-called peer review, which is a feedback procedure and where the role owners as well as employees, who are affected by this role are reflecting and giving feedback. It is not clear if these reviews are held once or twice a year, as there was a discrepancy between the qualitative interviews and the internal document. The reason for that can be that they are originally planned twice a year, but are only held once a year. Within this reviews, it is discussed, if this person likes to continue with this role or if they want to give the role to another person. It should not be seen as a judgement, but as chance to develop the role further, as the role is discussed and not the person itself. The following rules are important feedback rules for the peer reviews within Larut (internal document):

- Feedback is always formulated as one's own perception and as an I-message
- Feedback is always given directly
- Feedback is always described concrete (example)
- Feedback is formulated as a gift (appreciative)
- Feedback taker listens, questions in case of ambiguity, but does not justify itself

To manage the whole two units within Larut, there exists a steering team within each unit, where several different topics that are related to the whole unit are discussed and sometimes also decided. The steering team is interdisciplinary staffed with representatives from the different specialist teams, which helps to get a broad perspective and to ensure that decisions are made considering all the different specialist teams. Such a team is quite important to be able to manage a whole unit
that consists of 20 to 22 diverse people and to keep in mind the broader picture of a unit to ensure efficiency:

"Committee is now somehow the, the unit manager." (I4, 90)

The decision, who will be a member of the steering team, was also made within the team. Meanwhile, the two steering teams do not include all representatives of all specialist teams anymore, which sometimes can be quite challenging, as there is a lack of information or no direct communication between this specialist team and the steering team.

**Cohesiveness**

Another team factor, which is especially important within such empowered teams, is the team cohesion. Teamevents contributed positively to the cohesion of the whole team as well as to the smaller project teams, but the cohesion was also quite high before changing to this form of managing projects. People are working together perfectly and feel themselves as a team. Derived from the net promoter score, which was increasing constantly, it can be said that the team spirit and cohesion is much higher than before the reorganization.

The only disadvantage is that the cohesion within the specialist departments before was higher than nowadays, as they are not sitting together as a whole team anymore and are splitted and therefore, communication and cohesion has a little bit decreased, but is also quite good. In addition to that, the cohesion of the project teams, which are looking after an important and large customer with lots of projects is also a little bit higher than in teams that are switching more often between several small projects.

But as mentioned within the interviews, the cohesion is quite high and it is very important for the employees within Larut:

"And we are doing constantly, so, things together. Which, in turn, strengthens the sense of community, which is important, I believe. ... With the whole company, but also on team level." (I7, 535-238; 542)

One reason for the team cohesion within Larut is that these people are quite homogeneous when it comes to values and norms and to expectations that they
have. Although they have shared values, concerning their education, they are very diverse and different.

Cohesion also increases as the teams are supporting each other. Although there is some kind of competition between those two units, especially at the beginning of the change or if new customers are distributed, they are helping each other and see themselves working together as a whole organization and not against each other. If some people are having free resources or another project team or unit needs someone’s help, of course the other people are helping:

“Because as said we help each other out with the resources and then again, they work again on the project and that actually belongs to the other team, but you just have to balance from the resources, from the capacity utilization.” (I8, 681-684)

It is quite interconnected and although each unit has performance goals, no person let anyone or any unit or project team down and let them make lot of extra hours and do not help. Therefore, sharing their time and resources contributes positively to the cohesion of the teams.

### 4.3 Individual factors

Besides the organizational and the team level, individual factors of each employee are also important to work within empowered teams. Essential is that each individual within Larut has the required skills and personality to work within such organizational context and environment, where they have to manage tasks in a team and therefore, skills and also the motivation, for instance, are from high importance to successfully finish all the incoming customer projects.

**Intrinsic motivation**

As teams are empowered for working on certain customer projects on their own, this contributes to the intrinsic motivation of employees as well as the whole atmosphere within Larut. Within the organization, only people should work there who are really intrinsic motivated in what they are doing and have fun in working on diverse customer projects with their team. Quite motivating is that you can really decide in your team how you are managing projects and so you and the team are setting the targets and deadlines and are fully responsible for your projects without any
intervention and authority from outside the project team. Moreover, employees work there because they really love their job and the responsibility they have when it came to the self-managing teams and not because they just earn their money there and do not care what is going on into the organization:

“And yes, I think that's what motivates people, not money, but simply, ahm, the activity itself and the environment, that's what we do.” (I7, 169-171)

**Skills and experience**

Another important individual factor is the skill base of each individual. This means that you should have the skill and personality that you can work within such flexible and agile environment. First of all, employees, who are working within Larut have an excellent self-management, as they need to manage and handle their tasks without any instructions from outside or from the managing directors. Having professional knowledge is also quite important, but in each team, there are juniors as well as seniors and therefore, personal skills for handling such situations and gaining experience within such a working environment are quite more essential. Therefore, more the social skills as well as the mindset of people should fit to the organizational form. Altogether, the average age of the employees is quite low:

“I believe that our staff, I have to say, we have very well-trained young employees, we have an average age of 30, ahm, so that they can handle this form well.” (I1, 292-294)

As mentioned before, employees should have a certain skill base, but the organization supports employees to develop them and their knowledge further and to gain important and valuable experience within such self-organizing teams. Moreover, within such organizations, people gain more knowledge and a better understanding of what is happening before and after their task and what other people are doing, as they are integrated from the beginning until the end into a project.

**4.4  External factors**

Not only the internal factors of an organization are important for the implementation and collaboration of such ambidextrous self-managing teams, but external factors also have a huge influence on these teams and therefore, on the performance of
them. For Larut, the cooperation with their spin-offs as well as the integration of their customers into their project management is of high importance for them to be successful and perform very high.

**Cooperation with spin-offs**

Before the reorganization, innovation was always part of Larut. As a result, new products were developed and as they were quite successful, these ideas, which were developed within Larut, were outsourced. Three diverse spin-offs were created, but some of them are still sitting within Larut and are doing their tasks there. Therefore, Larut is quite interconnected with their spin-offs and they are supporting each other when help is needed. If a unit or a project team has no idea how they should solve a certain issue or how to implement a specific customer wish, they pick a person from the spin-offs for a certain amount of time, who is bringing in valuable input into the project so that the project team can build on these inputs. This especially happens if completely new products have to be created, which were not implemented before within Larut. Thus, this cooperation with all the spin-offs brings high value into project teams and their performance:

“But they also talk to the front end developers and the mobile team and, and get information there.” (I6, 467-469)

Although the spin-offs are integrated when Larut needs help and knowledge, some employees mentioned that they do not have that much contact with the spin-offs, which could also be different by which function and tasks individuals have.

**Customer integration**

For a flexible and agile project management and for performing well, collaboration with the customer is quite important. The better integrated the customer, the better it is for the performance of the team, especially when creating completely new products:

“Ahm, as much as possible, I would almost say in the case now. It was the case with us now, so really every two weeks, the customer was there in the house, or we there, but mostly the customer was there.” (I5, 608-610)
Within such meetings with the customer, they are able to test, for instance, the required application and can discuss what is already perfectly implemented or where changes within the application should happen. As team members are the same from beginning to the end, employees are now able to identify themselves more with the customer or the project, as you are always integrated. Moreover, since the change to the self-organizing teams, customer satisfaction is also higher, as customers know that there is a special project team responsible for them and they get quick feedback and answers.

### 4.5 Role of the top management

The top management, which are the two managing directors in the case of Larut, have a quite important role within such forms of organizational context, where people and teams are empowered and have the authority to make their own decisions and take responsibility. It is the task of the managing directors to somehow manage these teams without influencing them too much. Therefore, important issues and factors are discussed in the following.

**Performance management**

To ensure the performance and therefore the efficiency of the two units within Larut, there is the necessity of having certain financial goals or to monitor the performance of the two units:

“Concerning the figures yes, so there are target sales that each team has. ... Ah, every month should fulfill. Ah, that’s pretty much the only thing where the two teams are compared. So on a controlling basis.” (I6, 610-611)

Within the business intelligence system, the figures of the two units can be seen as well as their sales targets of a month. Thus, the managing directors create the performance management and controlling of the units quite transparent, as every employee can see how the figures of their unit as well as the ones from the other unit develop. It is important that each unit and project team have in mind that they have to perform very well so that the whole organization can benefit from it and stays competitive. Within the marginal return, it can be seen that the contextual ambidextrous self-managing teams are performing better, as this figure is better
because teams are acting more anticipatory and the teams are organizing them much better within the empowered teams.

**Support and trust**

One the one hand, support is necessary if project teams or the unit has open and unclear questions. On the other hand, high trust has to come from the managing directors, as they give the power over tasks and decisions into the teams and therefore, trust into their employees that they are managing operative tasks quite well, is a prerequisite, but also an ongoing process. This can be extended more and more if the directors see that all is working well, also without making their decisions. Within Larut, this is a process, which can be expanded further, that the managing directors trust their employees a little bit more, show more commitment and give them more freedom concerning certain issues and decisions:

"And, yes, ahm, I think that's a bit of room for improvement, but we think we're on the way. And it just needs a lot of trust also from the management, that they leave decisions. And, ahm, the team is working on that, so." (I7, 715-719)

Support is really given, if any employee or team needs their help, as mentioned from several employees:

"I believe, when someone wants support, he can go to the management and either he gets the decision, decide it yourself. ... Or it comes the support." (I6, 699-701; 703)

"Then you can definitely go to them." (I2, 625)

If it is really necessary to integrate the management into project decisions because there is a huge problem or something else that the team or the unit is not able to solve or decide alone, then the management is integrated, and they find a solution together with the team.

**Boundaries for decision-making**

Although teams are quite empowered within Larut, it is necessary within such a medium-sized organization to give certain boundaries including decisions that are made or have to be set free from the managing directors. Besides these decisions,
freedom is quite high, especially when it comes to certain project management decisions for customers, where the management is not integrated:

“Actually, relatively many freedoms. There we are, that is still a continuous process. So now we are still on, ahm, partly on finding out what else would be decided from us.” (I5, 782-784)

“That's more in the team, so. The closer it is to the implementation, the less the management is involved.” (I2, 622-623)

Decisions about the topics that are announced in the following statement are still made from the management and therefore, project teams and units are not allowed to decide something without their vote:

“It is the case that the final decisions in terms of personnel recruitment are re-approved by the management and budgets are released by the management. That means, for example, the topic of training, ah, we need a budget from the management, and if we do not get that, then we get none.” (I1, 472-477)

There is the wish from employees that giving the budgeting process more into the responsibility of the teams by giving them a certain budget, within the team can decide what are they doing with it and how they are investing it, which is connected to high trust to the employees.

It is often the case that teams or units are quite unsure if they are allowed to decide it, when something new is popping up. Thus, as more and more things are coming up, boundaries of decision-making are getting clearer and the teams have already lots of autonomy, which is also getting more. However, employees sometimes think that if a situation is getting very complex, difficult and a situation becomes critical, then the managing directors are making decisions, which is often not that welcomed from employees, as they are convinced that they could also have come to the same decisions within their teams.

Overall, it is quite important that clear boundaries for the decision-making are set, so that the managing directors as well as the units know where their boundaries are and to define clear responsibilities within decision-making, as it is often unclear now, if the unit has the authority to decide certain issues or not.
Giving strategic direction

The role of the top management within Larut is that they have to give an overall strategic direction, into which the organization should go and how they are going to develop further, as this is necessary to give employees a kind of framework, within they can work and which goals and orientations their work should follow:

“But to a degree, there are still just strategic issues that I think the management has to decide. ... So the overalls things. Ahm, in which direction do we want to go? So I’m not sure if that would then work hundred percent bottom-up.” (I7, 351-353; 355-357)

In specific, they are giving a strategic framework within employees and teams are able to operate very independently. Moreover, they decide, into which direction employees and the whole organization is going by, for instance, giving the direction concerning the organizational goals for each year. However, these goals are formulated quite open and give lots of room for creativity and can be discussed and developed within the units.

4.6 HR practices

HR practices are another issue that is quite important, as these practices have a positive effect on the performance and collaboration of these teams. Rewarding employees or important factors for hiring new employees are essential, as they can influence the team in a positive or negative way. Therefore, important practices of Larut are summarized.

Recruiting

In general, when new employees are hired, besides the professional knowledge of them, it is quite important that the person really fits into the organization and that this individual shares the same values and norms, which are lived within Larut:

“But in principle you always look that the personality is matching. So, I think there is always a very strong cultural fit, if it is ok in there, long-term.” (I7, 111-113)

Thus, the personality of the people is interesting and Larut is also looking if their curriculum vitae is designed creative. Already when it comes to the first phone call,
Larut wants to know what this person motivates in doing this profession and what he or she loves doing. Then they quickly get a small picture if the person would fit into the organization or not. Is the mindset the right one for Larut and certain professional skills are there, then they hire the person. If these are people coming, for instance, from university, then Larut is really a place where they are well introduced into the practice and help them to find a good step into the profession and help them to develop themselves further.

**Contracting and administration**

Making contracts and the whole administration within such an agile and flexible organization is quite challenging. You have to consider lots of rules and requirements that have to be followed, but they are originally all developed for very conservative organizations. Therefore, implementing such things are quite hard within Larut and therefore, lots of creativity is often needed:

“And that's of course, speaks against our creative and innovative concept that you can work free. ... So sometimes that spits itself extremely. And then the more creativity, ahm, is asked, that somehow you will find a suitable solution.” (I7, 253-255; 257-258)

Moreover, it is quite challenging to convince the working inspector, for instance, that roles are defined within the contracts and that they are designed very flexible and can also be changed between people very quickly. Although a kind of structure is needed, the design is very flexible and agile and therefore, following collective external agreements and following a certain working time model is not easy, as you are also not able to compare your flexible designed organization with other ones:

“And of course you have no experiences, can barely benchmark, so because, mhh, what earns an HR lead in company XY. Or, ah, what qualifications does he have, what does he have to take with him?” (I7, 265-268)

**Onboarding**

To socially and formally integrate new employees, the onboarding process is from high importance. Beginning with the personal contact at the interview and coming in for signing the contract, Larut calls them one to two weeks before the start and give these hired people an overview of what they will expect at the first week, which is
made with the responsible HR lead. To integrate new people best, they get a buddy for all questions they have. Moreover, new people get to know the whole organization and there is a kind of welcome round to get to know all people and to get insight into how the organization is functioning. After the welcome round, the new employee gets into his team and gets enrolled. Besides this, there are also trainings after several new employees were hired, where these new employees get an insight into the tasks and functions of the other employees and what they are doing.

During the first time, the buddy is always supporting the new employee and to get to know each other quite well and socially integrate new people faster, they do something together:

“And the buddy accompanies him, of course, in the first few weeks we look, that the employee has a breakfast with the buddy and yeah, there are mostly vouchers and then they have a breakfast in the morning and get to know each other personally and then a bit of an introduction, away from the organization.” (I7, 519-523)

**Incentives**

Rewarding and incentives also influence the performance of such self-managing teams in an ambidextrous context. Besides the individual rewarding, there is no monetary team rewarding, which means that there is no bonus or that employees get a certain percentage of the turnover. If a team performs very well, then there is a rewarding in the form that they can have a dinner or they can do something special. Moreover, the success of these teams is often mentioned in meetings, where they earn applause from the others, which is very valuable for them:

“Exactly. But we notice that the immediate feedback, appreciation, praise, that is, really an enthusiasm for what they have done, ahm, is often more important than any monetary one.” (I1, 580-582)

The reason why there are no monetary team rewardings is that the teams are really supporting each other and take over tasks if it is stressful. And then, it is not fair to reward the project team for their success, but other employees also contributed to the success and therefore, this would lead to unequal treatment.
5 DISCUSSION

As markets are very dynamic and organizations have to be very flexible besides their stability within existing products, the research topic ambidexterity is from high importance. In specific, team ambidexterity is very essential, as they are very vital for the implementation of exploitation as well as exploration and therefore, for the successful implementation of a contextual ambidextrous team behaviour. Combined with the introduction of self-organizing teams within a medium-sized organization within the industry of multimedia and internet, it is a quite interesting research field, as there do not exist lots of papers about these two topics in specific. The purpose of this thesis is to find out influencing factors for the development and successful collaboration of contextual ambidextrous self-managing teams. Therefore, important influencing factors and the organizational context as well as the role of the top management within such agile organizations have been found by conducting eight qualitative interviews from different people within the organization Larut.

5.1 Theoretical implications

Organizational factors and context

As mentioned by Gibson and Birkinshaw (2004), the organizational context is also quite important within Larut and a very important factor for the successful implementation of contextual ambidextrous self-organizing teams. In specific, the structure as well as the culture are very vital to create an appropriate context where contextual ambidextrous self-managing teams can develop. Therefore, such organizations are responsible for creating a system and context, in which teams and individuals are able to decide on their own how they are dividing their work and how each team handles their projects and tasks. Within the investigated organization, my findings show that the organizational context and structures were provided for a contextual ambidextrous design for teams by implementing self-organizing teams within the organization. This reorganization was a big change, as hierarchies were removed and very flat structures were implemented, where the power was given to teams and not to leaders anymore. This ensured that responsibility was given to teams and as a result, that each team handles flexibility and stability on their own and ensured a contextual ambidextrous behaviour of all employees within the teams. Supporting already existing research, for instance, from Wang and Rafiq (2014), a
bottom-up approach is quite important for developing teams in ambidextrous organizations.

A factor that is just a little bit discussed in the literature of self-managing teams (Purser and Cabana, 1999), but which is not included in team ambidexterity is the provision of certain tools as well as the open spaces and equipment of the organization. Although it is not mentioned in detail in literature, within Larut, it is an important organizational context factor. In detail, this means that certain tools, for instance, a resource management tool or a communication tool are very important for teams. A resource management tool is very important, as it ensures efficiency within teams, as resources and tasks can be planned within this tool. Moreover, the open offices as well as meeting room walls made of glass contribute to a positive atmosphere and high transparency and trust.

Moreover, to ensure that employees and teams share information, which supports already existing theory (for instance Pearce and Manz, 2005), there is the internal communication tool to share information among all. Furthermore, besides this tool, face-to-face communication is also very essential and therefore, regular meetings regarding different functions, roles or the steering teams are made to ensure communication and knowledge transfer between people. As also mentioned by Konlechner and Güttel (2009), the transfer of knowledge also occurs automatically during operational team activities and projects. This communication and meetings also contribute to transparency within Larut, which is quite important and surprisingly, it is not really discussed as an important factor in recent theory of team ambidexterity. Transparency within Larut is ensured on the one hand through the open spaces and meeting rooms made of glass, but on the other hand also by regular communication and transparent decision-making as well as an existing open book philosophy, so everyone can have a look on protocols, performance targets and other figures of the teams.

As pointed out by Druskat and Wheeler (2004), for the successful collaboration of different teams, equal treatment of all teams is quite important and not giving any team an advantage on certain issues. This political and social awareness also came out to be quite important for the organizational culture and transparency as well as the familiar atmosphere between all. Although the overall treatment is equal, there were several issues where teams were treated unequally within Larut, which can lead
to trouble and disagreements, as other teams see themselves disadvantaged and the mood is decreasing, which can have a negative effect on the atmosphere and commitment. Therefore, equal treatment as part of transparency is very essential for the successful development of contextual ambidextrous self-organizing teams.

Another cultural aspect is that the culture and atmosphere is quite innovative, which means that it allows to experiment on certain issues and to develop new ideas besides the projects. The research shows that on the one hand, such ideas are investigated if either it is necessary and there is a need for it to find new solutions. On the other hand, new ideas also pop up suddenly or if employees, for instance, have time and invest it into new ideas. Important for such an innovative culture and for Larut is that the organization gives space for innovative tasks and experimenting by giving them an education time. This means that each individual has eight hours within a month where they can do whatever they want. This instrument really fosters innovations, as employees deal with new ideas or experiment on several issues, which has led to already three spin-offs within the organization. This can be done on an individual basis, but also with other members of the organization. If such education time is used interdisciplinary, then really new ideas can pop up and can be developed. However, if employees have a new idea, they have to convince the managing directors to get time and resources for this project. For the approach of Karhu, Ritala and Viola (2016) and the analogies thinking, it did not really came out within this thesis and therefore, it cannot be supported or disproved, as there was no division between different product groups and therefore analogies and has not been mentioned within the qualitative interviews.

In addition to the already mentioned cultural factors, a familiar atmosphere between all teams and commitment is existing, which means that each individual is able to identify oneself with the organizational system and can deal with it and otherwise, they left the organization. This is not a disadvantage, as only those people stay within the organization, who are really committed to this system and like to work within self-organizing teams. As also mentioned within the self-organizing team’s literature from Purser and Cabana (1999), it is often quite hard, especially for leaders, as they do not know how their roles are changing and that they do not own the full power anymore after the reorganization. Moreover, there should be the room for failure making for each individual without punishing them, as also mentioned by Purser and
Cabana (1999). If employees are not punished for failures, then they try out more and also take certain risks, which leads to a higher degree of innovation within the organization.

**Team factors**

Confirming the existing theory, empowerment of teams is a very important factor for the developing of contextual ambidextrous teams. In addition, for self-organizing teams, this is a kind of prerequisite, as otherwise, teams would not be able to manage and handle their customer projects on their own without any influence from outside of the teams. Giving authority and responsibility to teams leads to successful implementation of projects, as they can divide their work within teams. Besides certain issues and tasks that suddenly arise and have to be done, teams really decide on their own, when and how they are doing their tasks.

When it comes to decisions, the specific project decisions are completely made within these small project teams without pressure from outside or the larger team. Contrary to that, unit decisions are almost always made from the two steering teams. Although smaller teams can make decisions on their own, larger decisions and decisions, which are affecting the whole unit or the organization, are made from the steering team and therefore, other employees do not have that much influence on these decisions. Therefore, the steering team can somehow be seen as an internal leader. Supporting the research of Magpili and Pazos (2018), the steering team and therefore, the internal leaders are responsible for information sharing. Different to this research, within Larut, the steering team is not responsible for resource planning, as there exists the organizational lead within every specialist team, who manages the resources. Moreover, they are also not responsible for rewarding, as they are a part of the whole unit and are also integrated into the self-managing teams and small customer project teams. Therefore, it would not make sense, if they are managing the rewarding. Surprisingly, the approach of a shared leadership can only be confirmed a bit, as within project teams there exists a shared leadership. But when it comes to the whole two units, the steering team is kind of an internal leader for the unit.

Job enrichment is also discussed in terms of successfully implementing contextual ambidextrous teams in literature (for instance Adler et al., 1999; Gibson and
Birkinshaw, 2004) and the introduction of self-managing teams can also be seen as kind of job enrichment, as teams and individuals are getting more authority and responsibility over their task. As a result, this can lead to more innovation within teams and organizations. Moreover, within Larut, team members also get different roles and can choose between flexible roles, where job enrichment is also increasing by this.

In the literature of self-managing teams (for instance Hoda, Noble and Marshall, 2013), there is already discussed the importance of an agile and flexible project management, to be able to fulfill projects at the company’s best and therefore, the scrum method is quite essential. This method is also quite vital for the successful collaboration of contextual ambidextrous self-organizing teams, as according to Gibson and Birkinshaw (2004), teams are able to handle projects more innovative, which is quite important to be able to react on changes on the market and environment and to fulfill special customer wishes. Supporting the research of these authors, each individual is quite important for the value increase of the whole organization as well as value creation of customers. As also discussed by Purser and Cabana (1999), this thesis supports that through integrating diverse people within a customer project team, value increases for the customer.

Supporting the paper of Konlechner and Güttel (2009), the results of this thesis also show that changing project structures and tasks are essential to avoid overspecialization into only one task. Through interdisciplinary teams that are always changing between different projects including different tasks as well as the taking of diverse roles, overspecialization does not occur.

Different to the roles of Hoda, Noble and Marshall (2013), Larut introduces several other roles. Therefore, they ensured that all the functions that were in the responsibility of a teamleader before, were distributed among different people. Therefore, each specialist team has an organizational lead, an HR as well as a professional lead. However, to ensure flexibility, roles have to be distributed among different people and not between the former teamleaders again. Moreover, roles have to change more often. In addition to that, there are also other roles that are responsible, for instance, for the social interactions and events of employees or quality managers within each unit, who look for having all documents saved correctly. All the existing roles within Larut are discussed in detail in the chapter 4.2 Team
factors. Special within this system is that each role can be given away and taken whenever employees like this. To ensure equal treatment, there are always voting rounds for the division of certain roles and continuous and open feedback rounds. The flexibility and taking of several roles supports the research of Bernstein et al. (2016). They also state out that persons and roles should really match and have to contribute to the overall strategic and organizational goals, which is also quite important within the investigated organization. The issue that came out within this research is that although roles can be changed, they are not switched that often, which could probably lead to focusing too much on a role and seeing it as a routine, which could influence innovation perhaps in a negative way. Moreover, the roles of Fiset and Dostaler (2017) can be confirmed, as the qualitative interviews show that there are initiators within the firm, who are looking for new opportunities and ideas and product creation. These are people who invest their time into developing ideas, which always existed, as there were already several spin-offs made out of the ideas of initiators, for instance. The cooperator is a person who works together with others and find engagement. The broker is a person who always finds new internal ties and relations. The cooperator and broker can arise out of the support from others or integrating oneself into other projects and teams if they need advice or help. Moreover, this arises out of the cultural context, as employees are quite committed and show high team cohesion. The last person is a multitasker, who likes to focus on more behaviours. These are, for instance, people within the steering team or employees with several roles, as they like to be multifaceted.

As one organizational factor of Gibson and Birkinshaw (2004) also confirms, support is quite essential between small project teams as well as between the two units. Moreover, support can be integrated within cohesion between and within teams. In detail, this means that team members are committed to each other and are supporting all the others, if they need help. Moreover, they are very homogeneous concerning their values and beliefs. If a project team or a whole unit has no resources available anymore or needs help, then other members who are having free resources are helping them, which really contributes to team cohesion and to increase it even more.
**Individual factors**

The individual factors are other ones that are quite essential for the development of such contextual ambidextrous teams, as the organization and teams consist of several individual members. By supporting the existing theory, intrinsic motivation has to be high to be able to work on your own and fulfill all the tasks and projects at your best. As the culture and the whole system is open and participative, this also contributes to the motivation of employees. As discussed in depth in the existing literature and what can also be confirmed within this paper is the need for a certain skill base of each employee. Employees need certain skills to be able to work within such environment and to handle those tasks. Moreover, lots of self-organization is necessary to handle projects efficiently besides quite innovative and new products and the creation of something new. In addition to certain skills and their gained experience within such an agile system, which also helps to increase the skills, employees also should have the willingness and motivation to always learn new things and to develop themselves further, either within certain trainings or by using the education time, for instance.

**External factors**

Surprisingly, the factor of cooperating with spin-offs has not really been mentioned within literature yet. This a very important factor for Larut, as they work together with their spin-offs, if they are not able to solve a problem alone or are facing a certain challenge within a completely new customer project, where they need support and knowledge from outside. This contributes to an increase of knowledge, as the knowledge of the spin-offs is flowing into the organization, which also fosters innovations and new ideas within the organization.

In addition to that, the integration of the customer is also very essential for the collaboration of contextual ambidextrous self-managing teams, as they are bringing in valuable input and contribute to successful project implementations, as already studied by Hoda, Noble and Marshall (2010). They also point out the importance of integrating customers within projects to ensure agility and flexibility. Integrating customers fosters on the one hand efficiency, as failures within a project can be identified earlier and with less costs and time. On the other hand, integrating a
customer brings in high value and also some kind of knowledge, which can be applied within other projects or for the development of new products and ideas.

**Role of the top management**

The role of the top management and leaders is also discussed a lot within theory and within this thesis, as the top management also contributes to the collaboration of such self-managing teams and the positive performance outcome of them. First of all, the top management and therefore, the managing directors are responsible for creating an appropriate context and culture for employees to be able to switch between exploration and exploitation, which they made by successfully introducing self-organizing teams within their organization, which all focus on flexibility as well as on stability.

To make sure that the two large units are working efficiently and that the organization stays competitive, there is the need for a performance management. As also mentioned by Gibson and Birkinshaw (2004), performance management, including discipline and stretch, are very essential that employees give their best, are working towards the organizational goals and showing responsibility for their tasks. Therefore, for the term stretch, the already mentioned corporate identity of which every person is convinced, is quite important. Within Larut, performance management is controlled through a controlling basis and consists of clear principles, which includes, for instance, certain sales targets that each unit has to reach every month. Important is that all figures are available for all employees to ensure transparency, as this is an important cultural factor.

Besides the factors stretch and discipline, the importance of trust and support (Gibson and Birkinshaw, 2004) can be confirmed. As discussed before, it is important between employees and teams, but giving support from the managing directors and contributing to trust that your self-managing teams can make decisions on their own is also very essential.

Regarding the leader behaviours of Rosing et al. (2011), they are not that applicable for the managing directors within Larut, as they are only acting as a support if someone needs help. Therefore, these behaviours can be relevant and considered by all individual employees, as they have to be innovative on the one hand and break the rules, but on the other hand, there is the need for a closing behaviour, meaning
that organizational goals have to be monitored and achieved by each individual and the teams. In addition to every employee, such leader behaviours could also be important especially for the steering teams to control and switch between closing and open behaviours.

Although some kind of external lead, as Druskat and Wheeler (2004) point out, is necessary to ensure the success of the organization and the communication between the managing directors and the teams, the communication between the steering team and other team members and the management is just on a supportive level and on the exchange of information. Only if a customer project team needs help or has to escalate a project, then the managing directors are integrated. General reporting between the employees and the managing directors is done by the steering teams of each unit.

Agreeing to Pelagio Rodriguez and Hechanova (2014), the power distance is quite low, which contributes to a collectivist environment, where teams share ideas and implemented ideas and such projects together. Moreover, the role of the top management is to ensure a perfect collaboration of those contextual ambidextrous self-organizing teams by giving clear boundaries for decision-making. This means that all employees as well as the managing directors should have a clear picture of where their borders for making decisions are and which decisions are their responsibility and for which they are not authorized to make them. This is also already mentioned in literature as important factor from Purser and Cabana (1999), as managers should not be involved into certain decisions. Moreover, as already stated out by these two authors, after some time, even more and more decisions can be switched from the management to teams, which is an ongoing process. For Larut, there have to be made clearer boundaries, as it is often unclear for teams if they are allowed to decide on certain issues. Besides this, the budgeting as well as personnel decisions are still made from the two managing directors. In addition to that, the strategic direction of the whole organization that all employees are following is giving by the management. But as mentioned by several employees, there is also happening this process of giving more and more decisions into the responsibility of the teams.
HR practices

In addition to the already mentioned factors, HR practices can affect ambidextrous self-organizing teams and their performance. First of all, for the social integration of new employees, the recruiting is quite essential, according to Garaus et al. (2016). When Larut hires new employees, the social and cultural fit of new employees is quite important besides the existing professional knowledge. Combining this with the formal integration, which means the flexible and self-managing working design within Larut, leads to easier implementing ambidexterity, as knowledge is integrated. As mentioned by Jorgensen and Becker (2017), people with broad knowledge, but similar background and homogeneity contributes to idea development and switching between explorative and exploitative tasks. The social integration is also important at the onboarding process, as Larut tries to integrate those people best by welcoming them and integrating them fast into their social structure and culture. To ensure this, the buddy, who always supports new employees, has a breakfast with the new employee outside the organization to get to know each other better and to introduce them aside the organization. This is ensured by the human resource management by giving them vouchers for having their breakfast.

As not really mentioned in literature, contracting and administration is also quite important, as you sometimes have to make your own rules and somehow avoid certain regulations, to be able to give employees enough freedom and to apply such an agile and flexible organizational style, as the existing standards and regulations are made for very conservative and stable organizations.

Although there is the contribution of existing literature to give team rewards, Larut does not do that, which is quite surprisingly. They just reward teams with appreciation, but without giving them team bonuses. One important reason for that is that those teams are working together and are helping each other, if there is the need for help or for additional resources. Therefore, the human resource management is convinced that it would not be fair to monetary reward this team and the other people, who also supported the team or took over tasks, do not get anything. In addition, they are convinced that they do not need monetary team rewards, as teams really appreciate thankful and praising words and applause.
Relations between factors

All these organizational, team, individual and external factors as well as the human resource practices and the role of the two managing directors are interrelated and somehow influencing each other in different ways. Overall, through the reorganization and implementation of self-managing teams, the management contributed and created the organizational context as it is now, where employees can feel comfortable and work together in a perfect way, which contributes to high performance of these ambidextrous self-managing teams. Moreover, by only giving an overall strategic direction and giving all the other responsibilities into the teams, leads to empowerment. Having influence on decisions, as already mentioned by Carmeli and Halevi (2009), increases on the one hand the overall commitment and on the other hand, also the individual intrinsic motivation, as individuals are responsible for their tasks. Moreover, empowerment also leads to a higher degree of innovation, as they own the power and authority over their tasks and routines and creation of new products, as also discussed by Pearce and Manz (2005). Besides that, if support and trust is given from the management, but teams are responsible for their own decisions, teams get confident, which also contributes to the building of new ideas.

Besides the management, human resources practices also influence the overall culture and the cohesion of the teams by their recruiting strategy and onboarding process, for instance. If they are hiring the right people who perfectly fit into the organization and integrate them socially and formally, then they get committed to the organization and are integrated into teams, which results in trust and team cohesion.

In addition, the external factors, especially the cooperation with spin-offs, contribute to the project management as well as bringing in knowledge, which can also lead to new innovations. Furthermore, individuals really try something new and are innovative, if they are not punished for occurring failures, as also stated out by Purser and Cabana (1999) or Parmentier and Picq (2016). Furthermore, such failures and learning can also be related to the team level, as they are then able to avoid such mistakes, which results into a better overall performance and project management. An important point, discussed by Adler et al. (1999), is that job enrichment also has a positive effect on the degree of innovations. This is also supported by this thesis,
as getting responsibility over your tasks and taking several different roles brings in flexibility and innovation. However, if roles are, for instance, taken too long and not switched that often between employees, than this could also be negative related to the innovative culture, as it is going to be stable and a routine.

Additionally, the cultural and structural factors and therefore, the organizational factors also contribute and influence other factors. In detail, as there are open and transparent spaces within Larut, this leads to transparency, which furthermore develops trust to others leading to team cohesion, but also to higher trust to the top management team, as they also are very transparent regarding their offices. Moreover, transparency and equal treatment also contributes to a high team cohesion and the ongoing learning and improving of skills of each employee is resulting in a good project performance and has influence on innovations, as their skills and experiences are increasing.

So summing up, all factors are related to each other and are influencing other factors more or less. Therefore, all of the factors are interconnected and they cannot be considered separately. If each of the factors are equally fulfilled, as they are all quite important, this influences the collaboration and development of ambidextrous self-organizing teams and their high performance outcome.

5.2 Practical implications

Findings of this research also can be related to the practical environment and therefore, has consequences for the practice. The constructed illustration within this thesis for showing important influencing factors for the successful collaboration and development of contextual ambidextrous self-organizing teams gives managers of organizations a good overview of relevant factors, which have to be considered when developing such teams within their organization. This framework can help managers to do not forget any important influencing factor before, during or after the change to such agile and flexible teams of a firm, especially for managers of small to medium-sized organizations or of firms that are acting within the same or similar industry of multimedia and internet. This illustration can assist managers by implementing such contextual ambidextrous self-organizing teams or if there are arising several challenges or obstacles, for instance. Important for managers is to know that not only some of these factors should be fulfilled, but to successfully implemented such
teams, all factors have to be existing, as they are interrelated and are influencing each other.

In addition to that, this framework helps managers to get a clear picture of their function and tasks within such agile and flexible organizations. Therefore, managers are able to adapt their behaviours and their tasks and have a good overview of their role. Thus, this illustration makes obvious if they have to change certain issues or if they are on the right way to best support those self-managing teams.

Moreover, as interrelations between factors are discussed, it gives a clear picture of how the absence of a certain factor can negatively be related to other factors and which effects they have on each other. Is solely one part or factor missing of all these, it can happen that the whole reorganization and balancing of flexibility and stability within these self-managing teams is not functioning. Therefore, if problems occur or certain issues do not functioning well, it can help to keep in mind interrelations and eliminate them by making changes and adaptations within certain factors.

Besides that, distributing former teamleader responsibilities to several people in form of roles is quite motivating and relieving for people and therefore, can lead to higher performance outcome, as people can choose where their strengths are and which tasks they would like to manage and work on.

Moreover, this illustration gives employees within the human resource management a clear picture of how their practices influence the overall atmosphere of such teams, as they are responsible for hiring new employees and integrating them into the organization. Therefore, it is quite important that not only professional skills are considered, but also if the person really fits to the organizational culture and can handle such working style because otherwise, bringing in not suitable people can lead to lots of challenges and troubles.
6  CONCLUSION

Markets and the external environment of organizations are getting more complex, flexible and rapid changes are occurring. Therefore, organizations need to be flexible and adapt to changes and requirements that are coming from the external environment. To be flexible and stable simultaneously within diverse teams of a company and therefore, to be successful, team ambidexterity has gained increased importance within the literature. Moreover, self-organizing teams are also discussed in literature in depth, as they contribute to an organization’s success significantly. As these two research topics are quite important, but not really discussed in literature together, this was the aim of this thesis. In detail, this thesis deals with identifying influencing factors for the successful collaboration and development of contextual ambidextrous self-organizing teams. Moreover, the needed context of self-managing teams as well as the role of the top management within such agile organizations are discussed and recognized. This was made by conducting qualitative interviews within a medium-sized organization that is operating in the industry of multimedia and internet, which is a quite dynamic market.

First of all, this thesis contributes in that way to the already existing literature that a framework was created, which includes all important factors and essential context conditions for the development and successful collaboration of contextual ambidextrous self-managing teams, which lead to high performance of these teams. In detail, the illustration gives important input concerning organizational, team, individual and external factors as well as human resource practices and the role of the top management within such flexible organizational forms. Concerning the contextual factors that such ambidextrous self-managing teams need, they can be divided into the structure and the culture of the organization. For the structure, a bottom-up approach as well as the availability of equipment and tools is very essential for the successful working of these teams. Moreover, the context factor culture is very important, as there should be high commitment to the organization and so, each individual should be able to identify itself with the organizational system because otherwise, this would lead to negative performance. Other identified cultural factors are the transparency, which was not really discussed as an important factor of the culture before. Moreover, organizational communication, a quite familiar atmosphere as well as being innovative is vital. Innovation is additionally ensured by
giving all employees eight hours time within a month where they are able to develop ideas, experiment and create new products or to do some research or other trainings that contributes positively to the knowledge and performance of the organization.

Besides the organizational context, team factors are very important. In detail, empowering employees and teams by giving them responsibility and authority over their tasks and managing their projects on their own in an agile and flexible project management style is very essential. Moreover, flexible roles and cohesion within and between teams is very vital for the high performance of ambidextrous self-managing teams. In addition, there is the significance of individual factors, as the organization consists of several individuals, who are working together. Important for individuals is that they are intrinsic motivated and that they have a certain skill base, as this is necessary to be able to work within such environment and to handle all the tasks within the team. Moreover, individuals should be open for learning and training. In addition to that, it is important that their individual mistakes are not punished, but that these situations are used to get the most out of it and learn as a whole organization and avoid such mistakes in future.

One of the most important factors are the external ones, as organizations can cooperate for example with their different spin-offs, if there is the need for support or external knowledge, which is not really discussed in literature yet. Getting support and knowledge from spin-offs is very essential and can bring in valuable knowledge. Moreover, it contributes to the successful and efficient implementation of completely new products and services, where there is no experience within the organization and therefore, for really new ideas and innovations. Besides this, through an agile project management on a scrum basis, customers are quite integrated into projects, which ensures the quality and success of really new ideas, which have never been implemented within the organization before.

So summing up, this thesis contributes to the existing literature that important factors, including the organizational context, are identified, which are quite important for contextual ambidextrous teams. Therefore, the illustration focuses on diverse factors on different levels and does not only include the organizational context, which is important to balance exploitation and exploration. Moreover, the gap of how smaller organizations can create an organizational context to foster ambidexterity is filled by discussing that introducing self-organizing teams can positively contribute
to balance flexibility and stability simultaneously on an individual and team level. Besides that, this thesis gives information and input to the already existing literature on how these factors and the organizational context are influencing each other in a positive or even in a negative way, as this is very essential for the successful balancing of flexibility and stability at the same time.

Moreover, the role of the top management within such flexible organizations is quite essential, as they give and create the framework, in which contextual ambidextrous self-organizing teams are operating. By supporting the existing literature, managing the performance and setting clear principles and standards is necessary to ensure the efficiency of the project management of each team besides the flexibility and high degree of innovation within the organization. Although there is some controlling on certain figures, it is handled very transparent, as each person can have a look on the figures and therefore, on the performance of their and of other teams. In addition, it is just the role of the managing directors to support the teams if they need their help. Only if team members are asking them for help or if a project is really escalating, then they are intervening, but also in discussion with the team. Besides giving support whenever it is needed, it is the role of the top management team to set clear boundaries for decision-making throughout the whole organization. This is quite essential, as each team and also the managing directors have to know which decisions are in the responsibility of the employees and which ones they are making. Are such boundaries not set, this often leads to misunderstandings and is really time consuming, as if a topic suddenly pops up, the team has to clarify if they are allowed to decide it or not. Moreover, the managing directors are also responsible for giving the strategic direction, into which the whole organization and teams should develop and work for. Overall, the thesis adds and discusses important tasks of managers and leaders for handling these processes within an organization, as this was not discussed in depth within the existing literature of contextual ambidexterity before. Important is that managers just act as supporters and do not interfere into the customer project management of the different teams.

In addition, also HR practices such as the recruiting, the contracting and administration as well as the onboarding process and the incentive management are crucial for the success of these teams. Supporting existing theory by showing that recruiting and onboarding are quite essential and that is important to focus on a
relationship-centred human resource management, there is only support for the individual rewarding and not for introducing team rewarding to increase the performance of contextual ambidextrous teams. In addition to that, managing contracts and administration is another important factor for the human resource management. The reason for this is that the legal framework is created for very conservative and classic organizations and so, a good working and creative human resource management team is necessary to go around certain requirements, to be able to implement flexible contextual ambidextrous teams within an organization.

If all these factors are considered within an organization and are fulfilled, then contextual ambidexterity can arise and can be implemented successfully by developing such self-organizing teams that are working on their own on all the diverse customer projects within small teams of each unit. All factors are quite important, as they are all interrelated and are influencing each other. The change within the investigated medium-sized organization was very important and contributed to a high performance within those teams. However, this organization was already quite innovative before and the commitment was also quite high before the reorganization. Therefore, switching to self-organizing teams would even more contribute to the degree of innovation and to the performance and success of the overall organization, if this is not existing within an organization. However, then the change process is also quite more challenging.

Second, the research shows that besides giving one person the whole power and responsibility over teams, it is quite successful to distribute these tasks of a teamleader to different people. This is made by taking roles, where, for instance, the professional, the organizational and the human resources issues are divided. This is quite important, as there is no single person authorized and can delegate alone over all the others. In addition to that, each employee can take the roles and tasks wherever their interests are. This is quite essential, as teamleaders are not always interested in doing all the different tasks. They are, for instance, really interested in being a professional mentor or in doing organizational stuff such as planning and managing resources of teams. But if they have to do all of these tasks and are not able to choose, this can lead to a decrease of motivation and quality, as several tasks are just fulfilled because they have to do it. Moreover, by creating the roles flexible, it is ensured that only people who are convinced of their tasks are doing them, as
they can take and leave them very flexible. To ensure transparency, the roles are distributed quite open and are allocated by votings. Therefore, such flexible role identity fosters innovation and flexibility of employees and contributes to the simultaneous balance of flexibility and stability, as employees switch between different roles.

Third, this thesis shows that external leaders besides the managing directors are not really necessary in small to medium-sized contextual ambidextrous organizations for self-managing teams. There is the possibility to implement a steering team within each contextual ambidextrous self-manging team, which consists of people of diverse functional and professional backgrounds. Important therefore is that each function of the unit is represented within the steering team, to ensure that they make unit decisions that are in the sense and acceptable for all different functions. In addition to that, the representation of all functions within the steering team is essential because otherwise, certain information and knowledge are not communicated to the whole organization, which has a negative effect on the performance of such empowered teams. Therefore, there is no external lead, but as there has to be some kind of leader to be able to communicate with the managing directors and to ensure the information sharing and reporting of the teams as well as the managing directors, there are the steering teams. They are integrated into the teams and act as a representative of each function and try to make only overall decisions that are in the sense of all different employees. As the members of the steering team can also be changed very flexible and displaced by other employees, it is designed quite flexible and fair. Are roles changed in certain time spans, this also contributes to the successful implementation of contextual ambidexterity, as flexibility is ensured besides the efficient project management. Consequently, the thesis contributes to the literature of leadership in ambidextrous organizations, as there is the possibility to implement internal leaders as steering team, where all representatives of the departments are participating and representing their department.

**Limitations and future research**

As this study was made within one medium-sized organization within the industry of multimedia and internet, it is quite difficult to transfer these findings to the general. Therefore, for very large organizations and group of companies that are operating within several different countries, it is not sure if they same factors or additional
factors are relevant. Thus, further research will be necessary for supporting these factors, finding additional ones, proof these factors wrong throughout all sizes of organizations or identify diverse factors for different sizes of organizations and different industries.

As already mentioned, the research can also be influenced through conducting the qualitative interviews within one organization and so, it was a single case study. Therefore, there is the limitation that for other industries, other and additional factors are more important. Therefore, conducting qualitative interviews within several organizations within one industry would help in future to support or proof certain factors wrong, as they just occur, for instance, within this special organization. Moreover, only two self-managing teams within the organization was examined, as this organization is medium-sized and just introduced these two teams. Therefore, these teams can show certain habits or particularities that are not appropriate to generalize.

Altogether, more research is necessary within these two combined fields. Including more organizations and doing research within different industries and sizes of organizations is essential. As this is a very interesting research topic, future papers should focus on the relations of team ambidexterity and self-managing teams. Moreover, a longitudinal study would confirm results and factors better. In addition to that, research about how conflicts are arising and solved within such a flexible style of self-managing teams would be worth to investigate.
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# APPENDIX

## I. Analysis of eight qualitative interviews and other valuable documents and digital sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Representative quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>organizational factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>structural</td>
<td>Es gibt do ned so wahnsinnig vü Ebenen oder vielleicht san die Stufen einfoch ned so, san die Stufen irgendwie flach gestaltet, so dass sie des ned anfühlt wie a Ebene, des ist eigentlich voi super. (I8, 545-548)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Und wir wochsen natürlich a, und je größer dass ma werden, desto mehr Struktur brauchts a wiederum, dass ma guad zaumorbeiten kaun. (I7, 273-275)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mein Eindruck oder einer von die Sochen, warums ma do so guad gfoin hod, woa eigentlich von Anfang an der, dass eigentlich gaunz, gaunz, gaunz, gaunz flache Hierachie gibt. Oiso in Wohrheit sogen wir immer, wir haben genau zwei Chef's, des san unsere zwei Geschäftsführer, und olle anderen san mehr oder weniger auf einer Ebene. Ahm, stimmt natürlich ned ganz, weil es gibt natürlich Leid, die san in manchen Besprechungen jetzt mehr drinnen oder deafen, erfoahn a Spur mehr und deafen daun a Spur mehr Entscheidungen treffen. (I5, 153-160)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flat structure and hierarchy</td>
<td>Des woa zum Beispiel, do, dann geht des von, a bisserl von oben noch unten, wobeis in Wohrheit eh nur zwei Stufen san, weil Geschäftsführung und daun Steuerungsteam und daun ist. (I5, 350-353)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cause there’s no such title anymore and there’s also no such rules that give you all, I mean, there is no rule in general, that gives you a power to command other people. (I4, 123-126)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oiso des hob i überhaupt ned des Gefühl. Do hob i ma a am Anfang gedocht, so wie ma die Rollen eingefügt, eingeführt hoben, ob do jetzt wieder a Hierarchie ist. Oiso steht da HR Lead überm organisatorischen Lead und am technischen Lead. Oder steht da technische Lead irgendwie drüber. Oba es, eigentlich is relativ floch und es gspiato se a so au. (I3, 313-317)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Najo, i moan, sogen ma so, erstens amoi die flochen Hierarchien, oba die hoben ma vorher a schau ghobt. Oiso, es hod nie so wirklich a, ... oiso es woan schau immer floch die Hierarchien. (I2, 192-194)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Des heißt, ah, unsere Hierarchien waren insofern ein Problem, weil jeder Teamleiter seine Fach, äh sein Fachteam ghobt hat, und ein Fachteam bei uns kann aber nie a Kundenprojekt lösen. Also des kann immer nur a interdisziplinäres Team. (I, 40-43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Es wird nu laufend immer nu Adaptionen vorgnumma. (I7, 30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ohne dass ma zu sehr einengt oder zu sehr strukturiert ist, weil wir haben zwoa a Struktur, oba die ist sehr agil, und ahm, die ist hoid sehr, laufend ändern kina, oba des ist hoid ned imma einfach, waun ma daun sogt, ok, man hod an Kollektivvertrag, des san die Mindestgehälter. (I7, 260-263)

Oba unser Organisation entwickelt se jetzt laufend weiter. Und i glaub a, dass wir jetzt ka Reorganisation mehr brauchen. Weil, dieses System, des ist wie a Organismus jo, wie, des entwickelt se laufend weiter. So, waun jetzt I, ahm, die, die Steuerungsteam zum Beispiel sogen, wir wissen gor ned, ob ma uns überhaupt nu braucht, oder ob ma vier brauchen, oder ob ned zwei reichen, do braucht's jetzt ned a große Reorganisation, dass ma jetzt wieder Steuerungsteams obschoft oder, oder umgestaltet, sondern wann des so ist, dann ist des hoid so. Es wird niedergeschrieben in unsere Statuten, quasi in unserm, ah, intern, oiso Confluence, in unserem System. Und dann mocht mas hoid so. (I1, 658-667)

Organisation: Basierend auf einer neuen, selbstorganisierten Arbeitsform in interdisziplinären Kundenteams aus den Fachbereichen Strategie/Beratung, UX/UI Design, Engineering, 3D/AR/VR. (Company webpage)

Providing tools

Weil du natürlich kommunizieren muast, und waunst du, ahm, mit vä Leid, ahm, kommunizierst, daun brauchst gewisse Tools und gewisse Strukturen, damitst des vereinfochst. Weil waunst jetzt jeden, mit, sogen ma, waunst fünf Leid in am Unternehmen host, daun duast da wahrscheinlich sehr leicht, dasst die täglich austauscht und auf Stand bringst, oba waunst jetzt 15 host und 50, und daun vielleicht nu größter wiast und 70 Leid host, daun kaunst natürlich ned jeden Tog a Stand Up hoben mit olle. (I7, 275-282)

Ahm, i glaub, dass die in die Teams, ahm, oiso in die fochlichen Teams, innerhalb von da Unit, sehr guad aufgestellt san, weil, ahm, hoid direkt an Projekt oft a ins Scrum, ahm, Prozessen arbeiten. (I7, 297-301)

Im Zusammenhang mit Agilität ist jo des eigentlich ah, ahm, wos soid i sogen, ah, ... ah Framework, ah, agiles Framework, wie ma Projekte, oiso wie ma innerhalb, wie ma Softwareentwicklung strukturieren und aufbauen kaun. (I2, 20-23)

Und a, oiso ma kann ned sogen, es ist a Projektmanagementtool, oba innerhalb von Projekten, wie ma, setzen mas ein zur Umsetzung. (I2, 25-26)

Ahm, es gibt, ahm, a Tool. Des hoast, BI, und, ahm, do liegen die gauzen Zahlen offen ahm, der Mitarbeiter, oiso die gauzen wirtschaftlichen Kennzahlen. (I7, 679-681)

Jo, und so funktioniert da Austausch, und es gibt daun a natürlich, ah, technische Hilfsmittel, wie zum Beispiel, ah, unser internes Kommunikationstool, Slack, oiso, woa ned ob da des schau wer anderer erwähnt hod, oba normal gibt's in jedem Unternehmen, ahm, neben E-Mails a nu irgendwie so Ort Facebook im Int, oiso im, im Unternehmen, und do haben wir Slack. Und do kaun ma se daun a immer nu guad austauschen, dass ma Gruppen definiert, zum
Beispiel Gruppe der HR Leads, und waun irgendwos ist, daun kaun ma do einiposten. (I7, 772-780)

Für Front End, Back End und Design, ah, haben ma a Ressourcenplanung, wo a drinnen steht, wiavü Zeit ma maximal investieren soid. Des gibt’s, ah, kurzfristig, auf, auf a Woche, ändert sie a in der Woche trotzdem, ah, mittelfristig, auf, auf zwei bis vier Wochen, dass ma einfach a Ressourcenauslastung a schau, schau obschätzen kaun. (I6, 320-324)

Des hod wahrscheinlich a des, die, die, die, die Slack Kommunikation hod a wengal zuagnumma. Oiso wir haben do unser internes, ahm, Kommunikationstool. (I5, 84-86)

Wo i ma Zeit nehmen muas, damit i des mochen kaun, weil sonst kum i zu nichts. Des ist daun eigentlich, wir haben daun eigentlich, nochcher in der, in der Ressourcenverfügbarkeit haben ma uns a Tabelle gmocht und hoben uns des angeschaust. Und habend daun amoi festgestellt, jo wiavü Stunden san denn des und habend daun amoi zuchwitzschaust in die Stundenwochen und so, und do daun eigentlich draus daun eigentlich so an Schlüssel ob, kreiert, und i glaub, seit ma den haben, funktionierts gaunz guad. (I5, 486-492)

Und wir kleben se daun, wir haben a so a, i hob so a Bord, und do kleben ma se daun de, unsere Kundenkürzel kleben ma se do hin und an die wird gearbeitet. Ahm, wir haben moi ghobt, a Online Bord, wo ma sie gegenseitig Tasks zuweisen hod kina hod und so weiter. Des hod ned so guad funktioniert, des hoben ma a Zeitlang ghobt, des woa daun, irgendwaun hod ma daun, hods daun koan mehr gfreit, dass a do einigeht und sich die Dings zuaweist. U n d des guade ist, wir haben eigentlich relativ wenig klane Sochen, von dem her geht des gaunz guad. Und hoid a boa Tools, oiso wir haben so an Hard Planer, hast des oane, wo ma hoid daun quasi eintrggt, wer orbet an wos, und daun kumts hoid immer drauf an, wos san die Deadlines, und daun schaut ma hoid, dass ma rechtzeitig, rechtzeitig fertig ist. (I5, 524-535)

Calendar. (I4, 331)
But also to be able to split your time across your roles and your projects. (I4, 334-335)
By doing for yourself some blocks of and doing this and this time only this and this time. (I4, 337-338)

Und daun moch i moi an groben Plan für die nächsten boa Wochen. Oiso olle To Do's, die ma so einfallen. (I3, 463-464)
Schreib i olle auf und daun schau i hoid je noch Auslastung a von die Projekte, wos i in aner Wochen priorisieren muas. (I3, 466-467)

Open spaces and adequate equipment

Weil meistens ist jo a linearer Prozess, wo daun die Dinge, aneinander passieren, ah, hosd da Vorteil ist, in der Art und Weise, wie's aufgeteilt ist. Einerseits architektonisch und in die beiden Units, dass ma hoid möglichst nahe beinander sitzt. Somit se a die Wege und Obstimmungen daun verkürzen, des funktionierts schau sehr guad. (I6, 21-25)

Und daun, hin und wieder, brauchst einfoch Räumlichkeiten. Wir haben, find i, relativ wenig klane Räume, wo ma wirklich an Tisch vielleicht drinnen hod, wo ma sie zurückziehen kann. (3, 376-377)
Daun sogt a he, host du grod Zeit. Des ist dieses obkapseln, braucht ma teilweise schau in die Rollen, wos ned so guad funktionierts do a in, in da Firma. (I3, 394-396)

Jo, oba, do bist daun wirklich weit weg vom Geschehen, oba des machen Leid daun maunchmoi. (I3, 425-426)
I glaub des braucht's a, diese hohe soziale Kompetenz, ahm, von, von den Rahmenbedingungen glaub i, dass dieses Großraumbüro recht entscheidend ist, oiso, diese neuen Formen der Arbeit können ned in Einzelbüros stattfinden. Wobei man musa a dort schauen, inwiefern gibt's Zonen der Begegnung, Zonen des stillen Arbeitens, do san wir a ständig nu am Ausprobieren und am Experimentieren, was denn da a guad ist. (I1, 410-415)

Internet is working. (I4, 427)
Heating is not, ah, overkinning or not, ah, or defect. Yeah, coffee, kitchen, yeah for real, I mean those stuff are really making the huge difference in the qual, ah, life cycle itself. So that an office itself is ready. (I4, 429-431)

cultural

Und des ist hoid a, .... jo, recht, i, i woas jetzt ned, wie i sogen soid, es ist schwierig, do, ahm, gewisse Verbindlichkeit aufzubauen. Ahm, oder Commitment zum griagen für die Units. (I8, 323-325)
Jo, vor allem a Verbindlichkeit. Oiso eh dieses Commitment einfoch, dass i waun jetzt wer wos braucht, dass i dem des daun a in der Form zur Verfügung stöh oder do daun wos konkreter oder wos a immer gfrogt ist hoid. (I8, 665-668) (Sales Directors Team)

Ah, wo, wo, wo's schau Konfliktpotential a geben hod oder gibt, ah, wo'drum geht, jo was ist denn jetzt die Aufgabe und bis zu welchem Punkt is Aufgabe vom Verkauf, vom Sales, und waun kunnts in die Unit. Und wie schooff ma do a Obstimmung und durch des, dass dort ka Rollendefinition geben hod, wie in die Units, ah, hod a kaner gwusst, ok, wer ist eigentlich für was verantwortlich und zu wem kaun i daun eigentlich bei dem an oder anderen Problem daun a wirklich. (I6, 180-186)
Sie haben jetzt ihre Rollen und ihre Aufgabenbereiche definiert. (I6, 190) (Sales Directors Team)

Commitment

Mhh, Regeln, (Lacht) ist a schwieriges Thema bei uns. Ahm, an was hoit ma se. I glaub, (Lacht) Regeln san zum brechen do. Oiso wir haben prinzipiell so Grundrichtlinien, oba i glaub, dass do a Single Rule gibt, an die sie olle hoitn, i glaub, dass eher so Respekt gegenüber die andern. (I7, 562-565)

I glaub des ist wertschätzender Umgang miteinander. Des heißt, ahm, wie kommunizieren wir miteinander, wie nehmen, Wertschätzung heißt a, i loss nermt für a Meeting a hoibe Stunde warten, oder gis Besprechungen, sogs ned ab oder verscheibs ned sondern komm einfach ned, ahm, des gibt's ned. Dieses kommunizieren, wenn, ahm, gewisse Deadlines ned eingehalten werden kinan, dieses Rechtzeitige. (I1, 433-438)
Und sonst gibt's ned so vu Regeln, also wir haum wenig Regeln jetzt explizit gmocht irgendwo aufgeschrieben. (I1, 440-441)

I glaub, die meisten san oba relativ guad damit umgaunga. Weil vorher a schau die Kultur, schau so woa, dass ma sehr auf Augenhöhe agiert. (I7, 158-160)

Oiso, i glaub, Respekt ist groß geschrieben. (I7, 567)
Sche eigentlich a, weils des ois irgendwie so verbindet. Dass ma eben die gauzne Vielfalt schätzt und respektiert den unser für des. (I7, 578-580)

Und wie ma kleiner woan, diese Kultur, des woa so richtig, gauzne wo Wichtiges und hoch Gehaltenes und, ahm, Eigenständiges, des ist einfach waun ma größer wird und waun ma se mehr verteilt und so geht des a a bisserl, wird des vielleicht a bisserl dünner. Oba es wird trotzdem immer wieder versucht, dass ma des beibehoit, und es ist
a immer schau so gwen, dass sie die Teams einfich in, untereinander voi guad verstengan. (I8, 560-565)

Oiso, mhh, i glaub es ist a ganz a intuitive Organisationsform, die ma da haben. Oiso es, ah, wir haben a ka Organigramm, weil's uns glaub i a ned wichtig ist, dass mas jetzt so genau erklär oder genau in a Kasterl abbildet. (I1, 289-291)

**Participative environment**

Oba, wir haben jo a ned, ah, gsogt, ob heid muas genau so sein und man deaf nichts mehr umdranh, sonnder (Hustet) wir haben jo daun eh nu vü diskutiert und wors ist besser und so und wie dama daun mit die Meetings, des ma vielleicht a vos, wors ma hoid einfich vü, ah, im Fochteam aufgehängt haben. Wor ma daun schau soistad, dass ma hoid in die Units bringt, oba andererseits eben den Kontakt im Fochteam ned verliert. Des woa so des, des Wichtigste eigentlich. (I8, 93-99)

Die hod des eigentlich eh total guad koordiniert und moderiert eigentlich. Und uns eigentlich immer miteingebunden, oiso Anfangs hoid vielleicht eher, .... wie soid i sogen, punktuell, oder hoid teilweise, und wies daun in die Aufteilung gaunga ist, in die Units, und wie die Steuerungssteams gewählt worden san und so, do ist des total guad, mhh, eh moderiert worden, jo. (I8, 102-107) Und san immer eingebunden worden. (I8, 109)

Des hoast, des woa eh a .... demokratische Wahl. (I8, 238)


I glaub, dass ma an sehr hohen Grad an Miteingebundenheit, wors Untern, wors, wors Entscheidungen betrifft, haben, do. (I6, 720-721)

Ahm, danoch ist natürlich vü Gestaltungsfreiraum kuma. Oiso am Anfang ist amoi gsogt worden, jetzt wird umgestellt, glaub i, dass des so woa, und danoch woa oba daun natürlich mit der organis, mit der Selbstorganisation in die Teams woa daun hoid, schau vü. (I5, 233-236)

Und do extrem vü Input geben hod und wir natürlich a froh woan über den Input, weil ma hoid eh, bisserl woa i ned, verloren ned, oba zumindest nu ned gaunz gwusst haben, wos auf uns zuakumt, und so woa jeder Input gaunz guad. (I5, 240-243)

Des woa sehr transparent. Oiso es woa, am Anfang haums versucht, dass a boa Leid zaumfinden, die die grobe Ausarbeitung machen. Und noch da groben Ausarbeitung hod ma daun wirklich die gaunze Unit nu moi gnumma, und hods mit dieser ganzen Unit daun numoi a aufgearbeitet. (I3, 617-620)

Und hod gsogt, ok, fehlt euch irgendwos in dieser Rollenbeschreibung, oder würds irgendwos wegdoo, würds irgendwos einer anderen Rolle daun zuweisen. Do haben ma an gaunzen Workshop Tag gehabt. (I3, 622-624)

Dieses eigenverantwortliche sich einbringen, und auf Augenhöhe, ahm, arbeiten. (I1, 445-446)

**Identification with system**
Und, und wos mir do sehr wohl kommuniziert worden ist, ist, dass Leid des Unternehmens verlossen hoben, die wos sie mit, mit dem System nimma identifizieren haben kina oder die wos, ahm, aus Prinzip a Mochtposition hoben woin oder an bestimmten Titel auf ernara Visitenkorten und damit ned umgeh haum kina. Die haben des Unternehmen daun verlossen. Einfoch weil's, weil's, ah, für erna Position oder für, für, für sich söbst entschlösen haben, ok, se brauchen des in ernam Job. Se brauchen die Bestätigung, se brauchen, des, ahm, auf da Visitenkorte steht, oder se brauchen den Job Title oder sie brauchen, ahm, des, dass Leid anleiten kina und des ned im Sinn von, ahm, i empower meine Mitarbeiter, sondern im Sinn von, i kaun da wos anweisen und i bin vielvielich do jetzt des Team Lead, unter Anführungszeichen. (I7, 141-152)

Also i glaub dass die Mitarbeiter gut damit umgengan, die jetzt do san, ah, oder die neu ins System kuman. Wir haben schon a Teamleiter, also die woan Lead oder Head of Front End ja, und des war natürlich schon a a Karrierethema, ah, do hauma Mitarbeiter verloren. Die dann gesagt haben, naja jetzt bin i, kann i nimmer aufeschreiben auf mei Visitenkarte Head of, ahm, jetzt bin i HR Lead, des versteht keiner draußen, was des ist. (I1, 302-307)

**Transparency**

Ahm, und daun hauma se einföch im Team amoi zaumgsitzt und wir mochen des eigentlich immer, oder versuchens möglichst transparent zum hoiten ois. Ahm, und habben dann quasi einföch amoi gsgot, jèder soid die amoi des so, die zwei Teams so zaumschreiben, wie er glaubt, dass funktionieren kintat. Jetzt ned nur auf des, wer wen am liabsted meg oder, ahm, wo daun wöche Kunden zugeteilt werden, weil des woa a schau moi so a Gfühl, wies mit die Kunden funktionieren kintat. (I8, 115-121)

Und des woa eigentlich a relativ einheitliches Bild von am jeden, des woa eigentlich Guad. (I8, 126-127)

Wos besprochen worden ist oder, ahm, wos ausakuma ist und des quasi möglichst transparent ghoiden wird natürlich ois. Ah, es ist a a jedes Protokoll im Steuerungsteam öffentlich für an jeden, oiso es kaun ses jeder lesen, wos ma besprochen haben oder die To Do's oder so. (I8, 205-209)

Ahm, und einfach die Transparenz a, des ist einerseits, eh merkt mas schau räumlich quasi, dass olle Besprechungsräume verglast san, offen san, einsichtig san, genau so wies Büro vom Geschäftsführer und daneben ist a Besprechungsraum, wo ma komplett durch siagt. (I8, 579-583)

Oiso, i glaub, dass es jetzt eher a Minderheit tangiert hod und eher die Mehrheit positiv aufgeosst hod, dass do jetzt nu mehr, nu mehr auf Augenhöhe agiert werden kaun und nu mehr Transparenz im Unternehmen ist. (I7, 160-163)

Oiso wenn ma siagt, wir seng jo a zum Teil, wie Zahlen von die anderen, vom anderen Team ausschaunen und daun schaut ma natürlich a, dass ma se do gegenseeitig aushilf. Deswegen ist des a Aushelfen, natürlich trotzdem a im Vordergrund, weil letzten Endes san ma a Firma. (I5, 728-732)

Des woa sehr transparent. Oiso es woa, am Anfang haums versucht, dass a boa Leid zaumfinden, die die grobe Ausarbeitung mochen. Und noch da groben Ausarbeitung hod ma daun wirklich die gaunze Unit nu moi gnumma, und hod mit dieser ganzen Unit daun numoi a aufgearbeitet. (I3, 617-620)

Und, ahm, wir haben a in Teams Open Book Philosophie, des heißt jeder Mitarbeiter kennt von seinen Projekten die Zahlen. Des hod se a mit da neuen Organisation verändert. (I1, 118-121)
Des ist glaub i in dem Fall a bisserl schwierig. Oba es haben se jetzt do nu kane gravierenden Probleme ergeben oder so, neta des ist hoid einfoch was, was ned gauzn klor ist und wo sie daun aundare Teams a wieder vielleicht hin und do draun aufhängen und sogen, najo warum ist bei eich da HR Lead ausahoib und des bringt an Wirbel eini und so. Oba es hod, oiso Schwierigkeiten haben se dadurch nu ned wirklich ergeben. Vielleicht is manchmal a bisserl komplizierter oder wos hoid ned, wos ganz genau in die Struktur einpasst. (I8, 368-375)

Und do haben ma a Prozess definiert, damit do kane, ah, .... Dinge auftreten, die, die wo ma sogt, wieso hod der des jetzt griagt, und wieso redt der mit dem, sondern dass ma do a gaunzn klor Definition hod, wie Kunden aufgeteilt werden und wer des entscheiden kaun und ob, wauns, und wo ma se einfoch obstimmen musa. (I6, 574-578)

**Communication**

Und dass die so zaumsitzen. Und do host die hoid einfoch im Fochteam wahrscheinlich a bisserl besser obstimmen kina oder einfach do a wengal mehr Kommunikation innerhalb vom Fochteam ghobt. (I8, 57-60)

Und daun host hoid do vü an kleineren Kommunikationskreis und dass die zwei daun wieder immer guad, ahm, sie zaumfunken, des ist daun schwieriger gwen. Weil dadurch, dass jetzt die anderen oben gsessen san und die anderen herunten, und ma ned einfoch so, wir haben zwoa unsere wöchentlichen Meetings, wo ma se obstimmen. Oba die foin hoid a oft relativ kurz aus oder vielleicht is a a bisserl stressig und daun nimmt ma se ned so vü Zeit, und daun, jo, separiert se des immer a bisserl. (I8, 63-69)

Weil du natürlich kommunizieren muast, und waunst du, ahm, mit vü Leid, ahm, kommunizierst, daun brauchst gewisse Tools und gewisse Strukturen, damitst des vereinfochst. Weil waunst jetzt jeden, mit, sogen ma, waunst fünf Leid in am Unternehmen host, daun duast da wahrscheinlich sehr leicht, dasst die täglich austauscht und auf Stand bringst, oba waunst jetzt 15 host und 50, und daun vielleicht nun grüber wiast und 70 Leid host, daun kaunst natürlich ned jeden Tog a Stand Up hoben mit olle. (I7, 275-282)

Des hod wahrscheinlich a des, die, die, die, die Slack Kommunikation hod a wengal zuagnumma. Oiso wir haben do unser internes, ahm, Kommunikationstool. (I5, 84-86)

Des hod wahrscheinlich a wenig mehr zuagnumma. Wir haben daun irgendwaun angfaungt, dass ma mehr schreiben muas. (I5, 88-89)

Oiso jetzt is relativ offen, weil ma jo sogt haben wir mecht'n gern a offene Kommunikation. (I3, 292-293) (Vergabe von Rollen)

Und somit haben ma jetzt eigentlich durch diese ReOrg quasi den Komplexitätsgrad hobiert. Weil wir haben einfoch wieder kleinere Teams gmocht, die sie nur intern obstimmen miasen. (I8, 42-45)

Jo, do gibts schau auf jeden Fall die Schnittstelle, die wir eh schau seit langem versuchen, besser zum aufbauen oder generell aufzubauen, ist die Schnittstelle zu dem Team, des ma irgendwie a a wengal schwa benennen kaun, des New Business, oder Sales, weil des sich söbst ned so sehr ois Team versteht. Und ma daun se natürlich schwa duat, dass ma a Schnittstelle zu am Team aufbaut, des sie söba ned ois Team siagt. (I8, 314-319)

Oiso a in dem Statusmeeting, haben ma daun, teilweise kleinere Diskussionsrunden ghobt, waun hoid a Thema irgendwie besonders wichtig woa oder sie länger zogen hod. Es ist ned so, dass ma, wir haben jetzt quasi jede Wochen an Jour Fix im Steuerungsteam, und es ist ned so, dass ma jede Wochen irgendwos definiert und zu Ende
diskutiert und finalisiert. Und daun ist des so, sondern des ziaht sie eh a wieder über mehrere Wochen und es gibt Meetings dazua und daun sogt ma hoid a, wir reden jetzt grod über des Thema, und daun kaun eigentlich do wieder wer wos einbringen, waun a wos hod. Oba man hod eigentlich von Anfang an ned so wahnsinnig vü, ahm, gspiat von da Unit, dass do so vü einakema wa an Themen oder Kommentaren oder Anregungen oder so. Des woa immer eher so, dass wir versucht haben, dass mas aniniert, dass uns a Input geben oder Feedback geben und so. (I8, 220-232)

Ahm, jo es gibt Steuerungsmeeting, i woas jetzt grod ned wie oft des stottfindet, glaub ein, zwei Mal im Monat. Ahm, do kuman hoid, ahm, olle Leid, die wos hoid a gewisse Rolle hoben, zaum, und, ahm, do werden hoid so gewisse strategische Entscheidungen troffen oder a Sochen definier. Und daun gibts a nu a HR Meeting, wo olle HR Leads zaumkuman. Und des gleiche mit fochlichen Leads, so wos sie daun austausch, wo stehen ma grod. Und, ah, wos san die Themen, die wos uns bewegen. Genau, und Steuerungsmeeting ist a immer die Geschäftsführung dabei. (I7, 765-772)

Ah, a Design, Spezialfall ist a Design Team und a Mobile Team, die sie a immer gemeinsam obstimmen jede Wochen. (I6, 734-735) Und sonst lauft des eigentlich über die Rollen, aufgeteilt, ah, wie a die Schnittstellen san. (I6, 747-748)

Ahm, es gibt in jedem Fochteam, fochteamübergreifende Formate, des hoast, die Fochteams san schau moi olle, waun ma jetzt des quasi zur Units, ahm, nebeinander siagt, daun gibt’s do immer die horizontale Ebene auf die Fochteams, des san natürlich Schnittstellen. (I8, 678-681) Ahm, und daun eben auf da Steuerungsteamebene. (I8, 685)

Schnittstellen, jo und im Account Team, wir haben jede Woche, olle zwei Wochen an gemeinsamen, a gemeinsames Meeting, oiso wir dan gemeinsam, frühstücken beim, beim Honeder, wo ma Dinge besprechen, die beide Units betreffen. (I6, 744-747)

Oiso do ist eigentlich wurscht, wiavü dass sunst zu moa wäre oder sunst irgendwos, die san eigentlich fix. Anfoch weil mas, weil mas braucht. Oiso ohne Organisation arbeiten ist schwierig beziehungsweise die Stund, die ma schaut, dass ma wos gscheid plant, hoid ma locker wieder eine mit, bis zum Ende von da Woche. (I5, 455-459) (Steuerungsteam)

Oiso wir haben wie gsogt des, dass ma se einmal in da Früh zaumstellen, und daun kaun ma numoi olle draun erinnern, vergessts ned, do ist nu a Kleinigkeit, do ist nu a Kleinigkeit. Und wir kleben se daun, wir haben a so a, i hob so a Bord, und do kleben ma se daun de, unsere Kundenkürzel kleben ma se do hin und an die wird gearbeitet. (I5, 522-526)

Oba so richtig, oiso richtig, vorgegebene Schnittmengen, san eigentlich des, des übergreifende Status, des übergreifende Steuerungsteammeeting und daun eh die, die Team AVs, oiso Arbeitsvorbereitung hoast des, wo ma se am Anfang von da Woche zaumsitzt und numoi schaut, wos gibt’s so zum doa oder Allfälliges und soiche Sochen. (I5, 849-853)

So, yeah, of course we went ah, consuming much time in meetings before, but I guess meetings are also now more productive. (I4, 70-71)

Und am Anfang von da Woche, oiso mein Montag Vormittag ist eigentlich oiwei komplett voi mit Meetings, wo ma Ressourcen planen, oiso wer wöche Sochen in dieser Woche nu mocht, wie ma die Aufgaben verteilen. (I3, 27-29)
Oiso grundsätzlich hod jede Rolle jo seine, seine andere, oiso genau die gleiche Rolle im, in der andere Unit. (I3, 890-891) Und diese Rollen stimmen sie regelmäßig ab. (I3, 893)

Oiso des ist daun a der Rolle selber überlassen, wie oft ma se trifft und über wos ma redt und wie des daun eigentlich obläuft. (I3, 898-899)

Ah, yeah, those, ah, technology teams are now split over the units and there's still also the same team and it's really hard to get the full picture of the whole technology team any more. Because now half of it is sitting upstairs and the other half downstairs. (I4, 257-261)

That those people in the same Fachteam itself are not able to communicate together as much as before. (I4, 271-272)


Des hod wahrscheinlich a wenig mehr zuagnumma. Wir haben daun irgendwaun angfaungt, dass ma mehr schreiben muas. (I5, 88-89)

Transfer of knowledge

Des woa vielleicht vorher einfocher, dassse einfoch des Know How a bisserl besser verteilst, und einfoch a von da Kommunikation her. (I8, 71-72)

Und daun host am Anfang hoid dies mit dieser Übergangsphase, dass ma des Know How wirklich in die zwei Teams griaigt, des woa a bisserl schwieriger. (I3, 694-696)

Oiso mittlerweile haben ma des Know How a guad aufgeteilt. (I3, 711-712)

Familiar atmosphere

Mhh, jo, ahm, des wos uns am meisten obhebt wahrscheinlich ist einfoch die gauzne Atmosphäre. Oiso einerseits des familiäre und, und freundschaftliche durch olle Ebenen. (I8, 540-542)

Und dass ma se jeden Tog immer gegenseitig challenged. Und oba a Leid hod, die wos, die immer auffaungan, wauns da amoi ned guad geht. Des ist eher so a bisserl wie a klane Familie do herinnen. Und jo, des ist hoid a, glaub i, des wos a ausmocht, unter anderem. (I7, 181-185)

Oiso, i glaub, des passt immer gauz guad. Und dass do irgendwie Mochtämpfe gibt, eben ned, weil wir jo olle so ned denken. (I7, 406-407)

Und i glaub es funktioniert a relativ guad, weil olle so offen san und so, ahm, herzliche Menschen, dass do guad an Kumst einfoch. Weilst die wohlfühlen kaunst. (I7, 523-525)

Und es gibt a kane, irgendwie Zickenkriege oder, ah, dass der ane moi sogt, he, ma mit dem kaun i goaned zaaun, des gibt’s bei uns ned. (I7, 527-528)

Sondern i glaub, es gibt do herinnen kann, mit dem i ned noch da Orbeit ned moi a Bier tringa gehen würd, wauns passt, jo. (I7, 535-536)

No, I mean company is really important for me, so the people that I work with are really important for me but I wouldn’t just work with people who are not happy to work with. (I4, 491-493)

Des ist sicher ned so, dass des immer so ist. Oba, i hob so vü Freind do gfunden, gfunden mit die i mi a privat trifft. (I3, 653-654)

Freundlicher Umgang miteinander. (I2, 534)

Und, hob jetzt a super Kollegen, mit denen i zusammenorbeiten kaun, oiso. (I2, 552-553)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Innovative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oiso bei uns ist sicher dieses, wie gengan (Lacht) wie gengan ma miteinander um, wie kommunizieren wir miteinander, haben wir Spaß miteinander, ist sicher ganz a wichtige Rahmenbedingung. Des heißt, dass ma gern eingehakt, ahm, hängt a damit zusammen, wie ma miteinander kommunizieren. Also es gibt bei uns eigentlich nernt, der schreit, oder der irgendwie wen andern zur Schnecke macht. Also da würd sofort des Team, ahm, eingreifen. (11, 402-408)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find schau, dass ma des eigentlich ned verloren haben. Ahm, wobeis do daun jo a wieder nu, .... mh, wieder andere Formate gibt, die des daun wieder sicherstöhn. Oiso wir haben jo immer an Innovations Day ghobt in jedem Fochteam, wo des Fochteam sie söba Themen suachen kaun, an des arbeiten mecht oder die einfach, ahm, bei uns woans eher so Optimierungen oder Prozessoptimierungen oder bei (Dates) Verbesserungen bringen. In die anderen Teams vielleicht a wirklich gaunz innovative Themen, des einfach, die se se anschauen, ob des guad ist oda ob des wos is. Und des hod jetzt wahrscheinlich weniger mit dem zum doa, dass ma se im, in diese Units aufteilt haben, weil die hods eigentlich in die anderen Teams eh schau immer geben, bei uns im Design Team hod ses daun erst a bisserl später geben, oba i glaub, dass des trotzdem gaunz guad funktioniert. Und Zeit zum kreativ sein find i hod ma sogor jetzt mehr, weil sie die Komplexität geringer worden ist, von da Planung hod ma se früher viel leicht einfach do vù Probleme stöhn hod miasen, die daun wieder vù Zeit und Nerven kosten. Und des jetzt leichter worden ist. (18, 436-451)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Die „Spin-off“ woan jo eigentlich immer schau a eigenständiges Team. Oiso des Lab, eigentlich sowos wies Design Team oder Front End Team oder Mobile Entwicklung, hods daun eben a des Lab geben u n d die Innovations Days san jo innerhoib von die Fochteams obghoidn woan. Des hoast, wir haben hoid unsere Innovations Days ghobt und die woan wahrscheinlich a anziger Innovations Day. (Lacht) Ahm, so a interdisziplinäres Innovationsformat haben ma eigentlich nie ghobt. (18, 458-464)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na, oiso eigentlich, ahm, wir haben früher immer die Innovations Days ghobt. Ahm, die wos mittlerweile jetzt, ah, Weiterbildungszeit hoast. Ah, und do haum die Leid daun die Möglichkeit, dass Sochen austesten. Grod a bei Software Engineers, dass, ahm, Sochen, neiche Sprochen austesten, oiso neiche Coding Languages, oder vielleicht, ahm, irgend a neiches Tool, a Instrument, des wos do grod draußn irgendwie im Silicon Valley rumschwirrt, und sogen, he wow, des mecht i testen, vielleicht bringt uns des weiter. Und daun haben’s sehr wohl Zeit. (17, 604-611)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Und des wird a voi geschätzt vom Unternehmen, weil die des a wirklich ois Mehrwert seng, wos i do jetzt von außen einatrog oder mir söst a aneigne, ahm, ah dass i damit eigentlich des Unternehmen weiterbringt und söst weiterentwickeln kaun. (17, 615-618)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ahm, prinzipiell hod ma Zeit, oiso wir haben dediziert an Tog im Monat Zeit, dass ma neue Idee ausprobieren darf und soid. Ahm, Vergangenheit hod ober zoagt, dass der ane Tog, waun der, wir haben des immer gemeinsam jetzt ghobt, oiso wirklich se des Team hingsitzt hod und gsogt hod, ok, wir probieren wos aus. Ahm, des hod sie daun oba zoagt, dass des so ned so guad funktioniert, waun a gaunzes Team an am Tog sogt, wir haben heid ka Zeit für irgendwos aundas. ... Weil doch anfoch daun a Kunde anruft oder sonst irgendwos ist, und a Tog, acht Stund san relativ schnell vorbei, waun i jetzt numoi a Stund dazwischen wieder telefonier, sans nur mehr sieben Stund, geht relativ wenig weiter. (Hustet) Nau. Und, jo, oiso, waun wer a Idee hod und sogt, er mechat des ausprobieren, hod a auf jeden Fall die Zeit dafia. Ahm, es gibt jetzt an neuen Rahmen, dass ma quasi sogt, man, man mechat des machen, und daun wird am dediziert Zeit dafür geben. Den anen Tog hod ma fix, den deaf ma se nehmen, und wauns wirklich a guade Idee ist, von der die Geschäftsführung überzeugt ist, daun griagt ma a a Budget dafür. (I5, 668-683)

Muas ma natürlich die zwei überzeugen, deswegen, jo und na, wauns natürlich, waun ma die zwei ned überzeugt hod oba selber ist ma davon überzeugt. (I5, 685-687)
Daun muas ma se wahrscheinlich in da Freizeit dazua sitzen. (I5, 689)

Oiso des ist vor allem jetzt a a neues Thema, des bei uns dann a aufkema ist. Oiso a neues Konzept, wie ma mit innovative Ideen umgengan. Des woa vorher, oiso wenn i jetzt numoi davor jetzt quasi geh, haben ma an Innovation Day ghobt einmal im Monat, pro Fachteam. (I3, 110-113)
Wo ma uns wirklich an Tog laung mit innovative Ideen beschäftigen deafen. Und des ist aber oft, ahm, daun schwierig gewesen mit Projekte, dass ma sogen, ok, wir haben wirklich a gaunzes Fachteam, des an ganzen Tag ned zur Verfügung steht. (I3, 115-118) Für ka Projekt, für nichts eigentlich. Des haben’s jetzt a bisserl umgestellt. Und haben jetzt gsogt, wenn ma wirklich a innovative Idee hod, daun kaun ma des einreichen bei da Geschäftsführung und sogen, ok, i hätt die und die Idee, i brauchat so vü Stunden, und die kinan des dann genehmigen und freigeben. (I3, 120-124)
Und daun kaunst das a einteilen bei da Ressourcenplanung. (I3, 126)

Die Herausforderung ist, dass mas jetzt a wirklich nu im Gedächtnis hod, dieses innovieren. Weil vorher host hoid gwusst, du host an Tog im Monat und somit is da immer wieder ins Gedächtnis gerufen worden, waun du den Termin im Kalender siagst, ajo genau, do. (I3, 162-165)
Und des ist hoid daun mehr jetzt auf Zufall daun ausgelegt eigentlich. (I3, 174)
oba es ist generell immer sehr schwierig, dass ma do wos mocht, neben an Projektgeschäft. Weil eben des Projektgeschäft, ah, Vorrang hod. (I2, 464-466)

Oba der hod des glaub i hauptsächlich in da Freizeit programmiert, oiso. (I2, 472)
Den Anfang, oiso, den Anfang bis dass a moii wos ghobt hod, was a daun herzoang hod kina. (I2, 474-475)

Des CMS System ist glaub i, aus der Notwendigkeit entstanden, dass ma einfoch koa CMS System ghobt hod, mit dem die Mitarbeiter gern arbeiten. (I2, 486-487)
I glaub, a anderes Projekt, wos jetzt rennt, oba des ist a eher von da Geschäftsführung getrieben, des ist mit die Chatbots, do gibt’s a Team, des se damit beschäftigt. (I2, 475-477)
Ah, des heißt, jeder Mitarbeiter darf 8 Stunden im Monat frei zur Verfügung haben, um sich weiterzubilden. Des heißt, entweder Tutorial anzuschauen oder a Buch zu lesen oder zu recherchieren oder sich gegenseitig irgendwos zu zeigen, irgendwelche neuen Entwicklungsmethoden, ah, des ist so des ane. Und des andere ist, ahm, des Thema Innovationsprojekte, des heißt, wenn ein Mitarbeiter oder eine Gruppe von Mitarbeitern eine Idee hat, dann können’s des pitchen, des heißt se können die Idee da Geschäftsführung zeigen, und wann die sagen, mhm, glauben wir dran dass da a Potenzial dahinter ist, dann wird Zeit und Geld zur Verfügung gestellt, damit die Mitarbeiter a mit ihrem eigenen Mitteleinsatz dann diese Idee weiterentwickeln, bis zu einem gewissen Punkt, wo ma dann wieder entscheidet, was tut man damit. Hat des weiterhin Potenzial, oder war’s halt a nette Idee, aber es hod ka, mhh, größere Auswirkung oder man hat’s vielleicht in einzelne Projekte integrieren können oder wie auch immer. (I1, 357-371)

Also da ist die Erwartungshaltung, dass einerseits Arbeitszeit zur Verfügung gestellt wird oder a Räume zur Verfügung gestellt werden, dass die a drinnen entwickeln können, aber dass schon a da Mitarbeiter sein, ah, seine Freizeit investiert. (I1, 380-383)

Also a wieder stärker in die Eigenverantwortung des Einzelnen gegeben. (I1, 398) (Education Time)

Oiso Projekte haben immer Vorrang. Kundenprojekte haben immer Vorrang. Des woa eigentlich schau immer so und des ist a klor, weil mit dem verdienen wir unser Geld. (Lacht) Und die internen Sochen werden dem einfach nachgereiht oder wir haben hoid gschat, dass ma möglichst regelmäßige, ahm, Formate haben, wo ma die Sochen bespricht oder erorbeitet. Und soboid irgendwos regelmäßig geplant ist, glaub i is eh leicht, dass ma des beibehoit und das ma dem a die nötige Priorität einräumt. (I8, 411-418)

Learning

Oiso wir san generell eher da Meinung, dass ma se vü söba beibringa kaun, waun ma des wü. (I7, 117-119)

Ahm, von denen ma lerna kaun, oiso, persönliche Weiterentwicklung, i würds ned Weiterbildung sondern Weiterentwicklung nenna, bewusst. Ah, ned nur fochlich, sondern a menschlich. (I7, 179-181)

Wos brauch’ts nu, jo, und des Gefühl haben, dass ma ned aun, ned ansteht, sondern dass ma immer wieder an Schritt weitergehn kaun, und ah, sie in Richtung entwickeln kaun, dass ma ned am Stand tritt. Genau. (I7, 185-188)

Oiso, es ist, sicher oft a a Challenge jo. (I7, 293)

Jo, oiso i siag do schau, oiso, des, glaub, des ist a so a Eigenschof von den Persönlichkeiten, die wos do herinnen arbeiten, dass, ah, sie se weiterbilden woin, oiso dass da Drang a do ist. (I7, 637-639)


So the guys who are really good at, ah, ah, colourful images and there are guys who are really good also at security and, ah, there are guys who are really good in terms of speed and when you are watching that guy who is really fast you are really triggered to also work as fast and that he’s quality is not that shiny within the team. (Laughing) So, you get to improve from yourself and that’s competitive. (I4, 641-647)

Failure and risk taking
Ahm, wir schauen, dass ma Fehler ois, ahm, ois Chance sehen. (I7, 583)
Dass ma sogt, he Leidl, schaut's eich au, wos i do jetzt foisch gmocht hobts, i mechat des, dass ihr des nächste moi besser mochts, oder kina ma a gemeinsame Lösung für des finden? (I7, 588-591)

So wie ma ses eigentlich vorstellt, dass ma, dass ma des a reflektiert und schaut, wo, dass ma einfach ned, oiso, wir dann ned Finger zeigen, des dann ma ned. (I6, 551-553)
Oiso es hod, sondern eher zu analysieren, wo ist des passiert und wie kina ma des nächste Mal besser mochen. Oder wos kina ma draus lernen. Oiso dass ma, dass ma do versucht, die, die eigenen Fehler zu akzeptieren, ahm, und daun schauen, wie, wie kina mas ois Team des nächste Mal besser mochen oder wos kina ma draus, ahm, ableiten. Dass ma, dass ma jetzt ned zum Beispiel, irgendwo in am Projekt irgendwos komplett ausfoid und des ist ova live, ah, wos haben ma daun für an Notfallplan. Hods des vorher geben, na, des ist jetzt passiert, und jetzt ok, mochen ma jetzt an Notfallplan. (I6, 555-563)

Und den stöhn ma dort hin, dass a für olle verfügbar ist so dass ma, dass ma a sicherstellen kaun, dass ma in anderen Projekten daun zumindestens schnell reagieren kaun. (I6, 565-567)

Oiso, glaub Fehler mochen gehört dazua. U n d man lernt wahrscheinlich aus am Fehler einiges, hoffentlich. (I5, 693-694)
oiso, nochdem wir a Software, nochdem wir vü Software mochen, do san, oiso Fehler des ist, des gehört einfach zum, zum, des gehört einfach dazua. Wichtig ist glaub i nur, dass die Kommunikation mitn Kunden stimmt. (I5, 705-708)

Jeder der, i glaub dass keiner do herinnen Angst hod davor, dass a jetzt kan Fehler mochen deaf. (I5, 720-721)

Daun schaut ma, ok, wos woa des, wos woa des Problem, wo ist da Fehler gelegen, daun schaut ma se den au, daun teilt ma des numoi ollen mit, so Achtung, des lieber ned doa und daun passt des a wieder. Oiso es ist a kaner böse auf wen aunan oder sowos. (I3, 682-685)

Ah, i sog amoi, do kaun ma nur daraus lernen. (I2, 555)

Ahm, oiso, Fehlertoleranz ist bei uns a Thema, des, ahm, des gegeben ist. Weil, .... waun jemand arbeitet, mocht a Fehler, ja, des ist so. Ahm, wichtig ist, dass des Team, waun jemand an Fehler mocht, des a anspricht, des bespricht, jetzt ned im Sinne von jemanden zur Schnecke mochen, sondern zu sagen, wos war da Grund, warum ist des passiert. (I1, 449-453)

Oba waun Fehler entstehen, geht's darum, dass ma sagt, lessons learned, wie gehen ma damit um und, oba wann des Thema Fehler so groß ist, dann übernehmen die Leid ka Eigenverantwortung. Oiso, es, a unsere Geschäftsführer passieren Fehler, jo, und, ahm, damit ist des wos, wos dazugehört. (I1, 459-463)

**team factors**

**Empowerment**

Ahm, u n d man fühlit sie vielleicht einfach a mehr in da Loge, dass ma wos, mhh, jo einfach steuern kaun oder hoid, optimieren kaun a vor allem. Weil vorher host irgendwie zwoa in deim Fochteam des quad managen kina, oba soboist daun irgendwie zu die Schnittstellen in die anderen Teams gaunga ist oder so des große Gaunze, do ist ma daun irgendwie angestanden, weil ma jo eigentlich ned so wirklich befugt ist oder bemächtigt ist, dass ma daun do a, mhh, wos ändert oder einbringt oder so. (I8, 132-139)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Ahm, vielleicht sowieso wie, jeder hat eine gewisse Verantwortung, sich darin zu verunsichern und versucht, die Verantwortung wahrzunehmen, und, oder sowieso, so wahrzunehmen und, ach, auf irgendwen anden obzuwählen. (18, 693-696) Ahm, oiso des ist glaub i wos, wos an jeden do herinnen klor ist und wos a guad ist für die Kultur, dass eh jeder wos, dass a Verantwortung hod und dass a für des, an dem er erbit, sowas Verantwortung trogt. (18, 700-702)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ah, Autonomie, in dem, dass ma einfach, ah, sich, ah, einbringen kaun und Sochen gestalten kaun. Des ist glaub i guanz wichtig. Siag i a bei mir persönlich immer wieder oda bei aundare und, dass des natürlich sehr motivierend ist. (17, 175-178)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oba do herinnen is hoid so, najo do entscheidst dass hoid du und daun hofst hoid, dass die richtige Entscheidung ist. (Lacht) Und ahm, do hods mi am Anfang ziemlich gestrauchelt muas i sogen, oiso des woa für mi ned einfach. (17, 480-483)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Du muast a sowas entscheiden, ob, oiso, du muast imma schauen, bis waun muast wos machen, und wiavü Zeit brauchst dafür und du muast hoid schauen, wiest daun, daun dir die Zeit einsteilst. (16, 332-334)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ah, sonst na, i glaub, dass die, die Teams a so zusammengestellt worden san, dass die Fähigkeiten a dementsprechend aufgeteilt san. Dass jedes Team, oiso des Ziel ist jo, dass jedes der Teams eigenständig Entscheidungen treffen kaun und a Kunden betreuen kaun. Und des, des Hauptziel, dass ma jo a große Einheit hod, wo die Fachteams san und wo Obstimmungen irrsinnig langsam, so dass ma, ah, kleinere operativ beweglichere Teams hod, die oda komplett an Kunden betreuen kinan. (16, 613-619)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
But those strategic decisions are I would say are most of the time getting to be more on the meta level. (I4, 542-543) So, you still need that, ah, out of shape of everything. But the inner decisions are really going more to the teams. And in terms of teams I am speaking about the unit, and then the team and then the project team and those two guys who are sitting together solving this only one task to get to decide whatever you want. So, yeah, I guess that the decision-making is getting more and more, ah, to the network and to really split it over everyone. (I4, 554-559)

Ahm, … die Leid nehman sicher, übernehmen sicher mehr Selbstverantwortung. Oiso wauns jetzt, ahm, mehr Freiheit haben und arbeiten oder jetzt ned des Gefühl haben, nur gesteuert zu werden oder nur Befehle von oben griagen. (I2, 208-211)

Mhm, oiso, und, … und, ..... oba i glaub, besonders was ma gemerkt hod durch die Umstrukturierung grod die Leid, die a nu ned so lang bei da Firma woan, die san schnö zur, dazu überganga, dass einfach mitreden kinan. Oiso, de hättn, hättst do jetzt vielleicht a länger braucht, bis dass die irgendwie amoi in a Position kema waradn, dass aktiv bei am Unternehmen mitwirken kaun. Und so hod eigentlich jeder jetzt die Chance ghobt, dass a aktiv mitwirken kaun im Unternehmen, oder dass a, i sog amoi, im Prinzip kaun des immer jeder mochen, ober i glaub jetzt sama so aufgestellt, dass jeder des Gefühl hod, er, es ist a gewünscht, dass as mocht. (I2, 226-234)

Ahm, für mi is interessant, weil i einfach an Handlungsspielraum hob, und mi mit die Interessen, was i hob, oiso, oiso, i hob mi jo in die 10 Jahr immer wieder weiterentwickeln kina und a von die Rollen her, immer wieder andere Rollen ghobt. (I2, 545-548)

Des heißt, je nochdem welche Stärken der hod oder wo seine Leidenschaften liegen, kann der se seine Rolle oder sein, sein Arbeiten do herinnen stärker gestalten als er des in einer klassischen Hierarchie kann. (I1, 196-198)

Dieses eigenverantwortliche sich einbringen, und auf Augenhöhe, ahm, arbeiten. (I1, 445-446)

De Teams selbst bestimmen, wöche Personen arbeiten an wöchen Projekten, wie gehen sie die Arbeit dort an, wie organisieren sie sich des, wo legens Schwerpunkte, wie haben's die Rollen vergeben, ah, wie entwickeln sich diese Rollen weiter, was brauchens dazu, genau, oiso ois was sozusagen innerhalb von diesem Team ist, a oiso Bestandskunden san ja den Teams zugeordnet, wie betreuens diese Kunden, was bietens denen a, was auch immer, des passiert ois im Team. (I1, 479-485)

Die Komplexität der Anforderungen unserer Kunden und die damit entstehende Dynamik braucht die Verteilung der Verantwortung auf Teams. Eine einzelne Person, egal in welcher hierarchischen Ebene sie angesiedelt wäre, würde Projekte in unserem Komplexitätsgrad nicht mehr managen und umsetzen können. Es braucht einerseits die unterschiedlichen Perspektiven aus den verschiedenen Disziplinen und andererseits kurze Entscheidungswege von Personen, die täglich mit unseren Kunden in Kontakt sind. Sonst entstehen immer wieder Engpässe und unsere Innovationskraft erleidet zu viele Reibungsverluste. (Company webpage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participative decision-making</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unit desicions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mhh, ..., najo eigentlich is schau vü im Steuerungsteam entschi
dworden. Oba i moan, wir haben jo a immer diese monatlichen Statusmeetings. Wo ma daun quasi immer die gesamte Unit obhoit. (I8, 203-205)

Ahm, wir versuchen a, dass ma die, die Aufgaben, die Tasks, die daun ausaföin, a wieder bisserl im Team verteilen, so dass ma einfso die Leid bisserl einbindet a. Ah, des is sicher a Punkt, wo ma nu, wo ma nu Potenzial haben, dass ma mehr quasi in die Units gibt. Weil ma immer die Angst hod, waun ma jetzt wos obgibt, daun hod mas nimma so sehr unter Kontrolle, wies geschieht oder bis wauns geschieht und muas daun wieder kontrollieren und muas ses daun wieder, griaugs daun wieder zuck und muas vielleicht daun numoi überprüfen. Und es ist insgesamt daun vielleicht mehr Aufwand aus wir waun mas jetzt einfso söba mocht. Oba des is natürlich a Möglichkeit, dass mas nu offener gestaltet ois. (I8, 209-218)

Weil je größer die Runde ist, desto komplizierter wird’s wahrscheinlich. Und des ned unbedingt immer guad, dass ma möglichst vü verschiedene, ahm, Meinungen hod. Sondern dass ma hoid schaut, dass ma die anderen guad vertritt. Oder die wichtigen Aspekte hoid mit erna immer. Oiso i find's schau guad, dass von da Größe her, dass die Runde ist. Oba i moan, man kunt natürlich a bei ana jeden Entscheidung, des amoi daun diskutieren, daun in die Unit geben, daun duat obstimmen, oba daun wird hoid des a immer komplizierter und aufwendiger. Und ziagt sie wieder länger und jo wie sogt, des is hoid trotzdem so, dass do jetzt ned unbedingt immer so wahnsinnig vü Input kumt. (I8, 252-263)

Und wenn's ums gesamte Unit geht, daun ist es a immer so, dass es des Steuerungsteam gibt, des ah, mit Vorschlägen kommt, die dann abgestimmt werden. (I6, 105-107)

Bis zu einem gewissen Grad oder einfach sogen, jo des moch ma jetzt so, weil des hod des Fachteam oder ois Steuerungsteam a so beschlossen und wir san jo die Vertreter der einzelnen Fachteams, in dem Gremium. (I6, 109-111)

Oiso, des von da Hierarchie a voi ok. Oiso es ist jetzt nichts, wo, wo Probleme aufwerfen könnte. (I6, 113-114)

und des hod eigentlich relativ vü Entscheidungsgewalt bzw. relativ vü, dass wir Sochen einwerfen, und daun a, Frogen, ob des eh so passt. Oiso wir woin eigentlich ned, dass ma, wir woin ned irgendwie do diktatorisch bestimmen, oba wir geben hoid vü Input und ob des daun so passt. Wir haben einmal im Monat a Statusmeeting, hoast des, do gibt dann des Steuerungsteam a Update an olle anderen Teammitglieder, wes ist in dem Monat so passiert. (I5, 295-301)

Und von dem her, würd i sogen, die meisten Entscheidungen, oder vü Entscheidungen, san im, im Steuerungsteam. Do san a Sochen wie, ob Überstunden gmocht werden soin jetzt grod, ahm, ob ma Personalzuwachs brauchen ist a meistens, wird daun do numoi a bisserl diskutiert. Do ist dann da HR Lead a wieder a wenig dabei, mit dem redt ma daun und so. Oba des siagt, im Prinzip aloa im Steuerungsteam, weil ma die Zahlen im Kopf hod, mit da Auslastung, und welche Projekte dass kuman und so weiter. Und .... jo, i moan, a bisserl des wer an wos orbeit, hättat eigentlich der, warad eigentlich
da organisatorische Lead, bei uns wie gsogt ist des, oiso im Mobile Team ist des weniger, weil ma do eh weniger die Einteilung brauchen. Ahm, und daun haben ma nu an, an fachlichen Lead in ollen Teams, der sie vü mit, mit, mit, mit vielen fachteamspezifischen Themen auseinandersetzt. Des hoast wirklich mit, wie entwickeln ma des, was brauch ma do für Tools, damit ma am besten arbeiten kinan. Do hod eigentlich der die Entscheidungsfreiheit. Ahm, und do trifft eigentlich der die meisten Entscheidungen. Und im Normfall is a so, dass, wenn der jetzt a Entscheidung trifft, dass der hoid daun numoi Rückssprache holt, und numoi sogt zum Team, he passt des eh. (I5, 308-325)

Oiso grod, zum Beispiel a bei die, .... wir haben jetzt grod die Zieleprozess ghobt, oiso wir haben Firmenziele, und daun gibt's ausgehend von da Geschäftsführung, die gibt quasi so große Themen vor, was san die, die san wirklich sehr frei. (I5, 336-339)

Und do waas daun a so, dass daun im, im, in die Steuerungsteams san daun numoi Unit Ziele heruntergebrochen worden, und daun ist ma zu die, ist vom Steuerungsteam zu den Fachteams gaunga. Man hod gsogt so, Jetzt haben ma die Unit Ziele gmocht, und schaut's dass Teamziele zu den Unit Zielen find's. Natürlich kaun daun a Team nu, nu andere Ziele a finden, die für sie guad passen und wo se se denken, ok, des brauchen ma fürs nächste Jahr. Oba es ist natürlich wieder die Vorgabe do, a bisserl so die Entscheidung, ok des ist des Ziel und schaut's, dass in des einiorbeits. (I5, 343-350)

Ahm, jo, eigentlich im Steuerungsteam, oiso, jetzt für die Teams. (I2, 271)

**project decisions**

Unit, es arbeit jo ned die gesamte Unit an am Projekt, sondern es gibt jo innerhoib von da Unit daun a wieder Leid, die an am bestimmten Projekt arbeiten. A wieder interdisziplinär, oiso ned olle vom AM und olle vom Design und olle vom Front End an am Projekt. Sondern es wird a Account Manager, zwei Designer und zwei vom Front End oder so, und des ist daun quasi des Projektteam. Und soboids um Entscheidungen im Projekt geht, daun wird natürlich des in dem Team besprochen oder a definiert, es kumt drauf an, in was für Richtung dass geht. (I8, 176-183)

Oiso i glaub schau, dass die Rollen, die ma do jetzt gefunden haben, eh in den Prozess in die letzten zwei Johr, dass die do schau relativ vü Entscheidungen haben und die a durchaus machen. (I5, 330-332)

Und wauns jetzt auf Projektbene, ah, gmoant ist, daun eigentlich in den Team, im Projektteam, weil des ist jo daun a ned die gaunze Unit. (I8, 172-174)

und dadurch, dass, ah natürlich die Entscheidungswege im Team gefunden werden, braucht's daun, oiso geht da Floschenhals verloren, den wos ma vorher vielleicht für die gaunzen Approvals braucht hätte. Oiso für die gaunzen, ah, Entscheidungen, dass des da Geschäftsführer oder sunst irgendwo trifft, sondern es wird direkt im Team gelöst und glaub des bringt einiges an Speed eina. Weilst ned worten muast und weilst eh sóba du da Experte bist in dem wost grod am Projekt oderbist. (I7, 304-311)

Ah, wenn's ums Fachteam geht, daun stimmen wir uns im Fachteam eigentlich immer so ob und entscheidens im Team. Moch ma eh fürn Kunden a, i mog a ned wos entscheiden, (Lacht) des interessiert mi goaned. Des entspricht a ned dem, wie, wie i des gern hoben mechat. (I6, 102-105)
Und wenn’s irgend a Entscheidung zum Fällen gibt, daun wirft ma des einfoch ein in die, in die Runde, daun redt ma drüber und daun kumt hoid des Ergebnis irgendwie ausa, des entweder andn Kunden kommuniziert oder wo ma intern drüberschaun muas oder des überorbeite muas, bevors daun ausikumt. (I3, 236-240)

If you are technology lead, you go to the tech lead and the tech round and decide on things that are only about the teams, the also the teams, the (…) teams. And if you are Steuerungsteam member, then you decide about projects, ah, forecasting and allocation. (I4, 285-288)

Des haben ma, ahm, Ende letzten Johres eigentlich genau so a Projekt ghobt. Und des woa recht spannend, weil do hod se wirklich die gaunze Unit zaumsgitzt, oiso des ist daun vom Account Manager eigentlich recht guad initiiert worden. Ahm, der hod eigentlich einfoch die gaunze Unit zaumtrommelt oder zumindest jeden, den’s intressiert hod. Ahm, und hod einfoch des amoi vorgstöht, um wer dass do geht und dass des eigentlich komplett wos Neiches ist, wos ma nu nie gmocht haben. Und wo ma a uns einfoch zerst amoi beweisen miasen haben, ob ma des kinan. Oda söba se amoi klor wern miasen haben, ob ma des überhaupt kinan, weil es woa hoid wirklich wos Schwieriges. Und des hoda einfoch moi erklärt und uns quasi moi mitgeben, daun hod se des jeder moi überlegen kina. Erstens, ob a se darin siagt, dass a do irgendwos beitrogen kaun. Ahm, und hoid a, ob, ob a do daun dabei sein wü bei dem Team. Und daun hods numoi a Meeting geben, wo ma des daun numoi besprochen haben, a jeder wie a ses vorstöhn kunt, ob a do wos, wos er beitrogen kaun und ob ma des schoffen. (I8, 491-505)

Des hoast, die Teams vom, die formen se grod so zaum, wies grod braucht werden und daun trennen se se wieder. Und gengan wieder aundas zaum, wauns grod für a Projekt, aun, aunders eingesetzt werden miasen. Und des geht relativ schnö und reibungslos (I7, 301-304)


Die, die Wichtigste ist immer, dass ma mitn Kunden gemeinsam obstimmt, ob ma, wenn's wos gaunz wos Neuartiges ist, ob ma daun sogt, he, wir wissen, oiso wenn a, wos Neues, Neuartiges, hod a immer damit zum duan, dass es a gewisse, a gewisses Risiko gibt, im, im, dass des Projekt scheitert. Um dem entgegenzuwirken, warad a Möglichkeit, dass ma sogt, ok, moch ma moi an Prototypen. Ahm, oder a Proof of Concept oder wie auch immer ma des nennen wü. (I6, 359-365)

Des hoast, du host schau a boa Mehrkosten drinnen, oba die Sicherheit ist do, dass des Projekt umgesetzt werden kaun. Oiso des ist a, wos wir echt gern mochen. (I6, 378-380)

Ahm, dass ma Proof of Concept mocht und sogt, schau ma moi, ob des hoit, oba ma des wirklich kinan und die technischen Rahmenbedingungen und des wos daun dahinter ausakuma soid, dass ma do wirklich so funktioniert. (I6, 382-384)
Dass ma die gaunze Unit zaumtrommelt und sogt, wir sitzen se jetzt zuam a hoibe Stund oder a Stund, wir klären des Projekt. Und, und jeder gibt amoi an Input, wos a, wo er an Beitrog leisten kaun. Ahm, damit mas a ois Projekt aufsetzen kaun, dass ma an, an, dass ma moï a so an, ah, Projekt Orientierungsplan mocht. Oiso wo ma sogt, ok, wos brauch ma denn ois und wer hod nu Fähigkeiten oder wem kint ma frogen. Ah, damit ma Struktur reinbringt. (I6, 406-412)

Oiso zu wissen, wer hod welche Fähigkeiten und wen kaun ma für so eine Task Force zaumfassen, damit ma dort in a, in a Projektstruktur einikumt, wo ma daun a im Gewissen sogen kaun, ah, mit dem trauen ma uns jetzt zum, zum Kunden gehen. Und wir haben an Ansatz, wie mas lösen können, wenn's wirklich so a unbekanntes Problem ist. (I6, 451-456)

Oiso do geht's einfach um Lösungen finden für unbekannte Neulandprojekte. (I6, 458)

Mhh, es kumt immer weng drauf an, wie groß dass die, die, die Aufgaben san. Ahm, i probier's dass i mas a weng, dass is a wenig geblockt moch und a für unser Team immer a weng geblockt anlege. (I5, 504-506)

Ahm, wir haben jetzt a daun an am großen Projekt georbeitet, wo ma, des ma agil angegangen san, in Scrum Logik. Do woas zwoa a so, dass wir am Anfang a Fixpreisangebot ghobt haben. Ahm, es woa oba zum Glück an Kunden bewusst und a von unserer Seite, des, von, von Vornherein gegeben, dass des in Scrum Logik abgehandelt wird. Des hoast, wir haben olle zwei Wochen a Ergebnis ghobt, von dem Produkt. Und daun ist immer gschaut worden, passt des und gehen ma so weiter in die Richtung. (I5, 552-559)

Und durch des, durch die Vorgehensweise, eben mit den, mit der agilen Logik, dass ma noch zwei Wochen a sogen kaun, he, Moment amoi, des woa in die letzten zwei Wochen gmocht haben, des woa eigentlich a voller Schaß, des bringt uns so überhaupt nichts, moch mas doch anders. (I5, 576-580)

Und des hod eigentlich wrichtlich guad funktioniert, bei, bei dem Projekt. Und i hoff, dass ma des a bei weitere Projekte so mochen kinan. Ahm, kumt natürlich immer aufn Kunden drauf an. Und grod natürlich bei am, bei uns nennt ma des a Leuchtturm Projekte, wauns, wauns Sochen san, die gaunz neich. (I5, 587-591)

Ah, des ist im, im in da Scrum Logik, von dem agilen arbeiten. Do is aso, dass ma, an zweiwöchiger Sprint hoast, in die zwei Wochen werden Sochen geplant am Anfang von die zwei Wochen, daun wird zwei Wochen draun, oiso bei uns woan zwei Wochen, wo ma sogt, normalerweise bis zu drei Wochen, oba recht vü länger soloids ned sein. Und in die zwei Wochen wird daun an die gaunzen Sochen georbeitet, an die User. (I5, 615-620)

User Stories und an die Tasks. Und waun die erledigt, die soind erledigt sein bis noch die zwei Wochen, und noch zwei Wochen, am Sprint Ende, soid immer ein Produkt, ein lieferbares Produkt do sein. (I5, 622-624)

Oiso do hod ma daun natürlich, des woa immer sehr zeitaufwendig natürlich, oba dafür is, hod des eigentlich ned geben, dass ma jetzt in zwei unterschiedliche Richtungen denkt. (I5, 650-653)

I glaub, dass die Strukturen klarer san. Und deswegen a scho a wengal a Zeitgewinn a do ist. Bei da Umsetzung selber vom Projekt. (I5, 774-775)
That varies really from task to another. So sometimes your desk is really more than enough. (I4, 344-345) Sometimes you just have to go outside (I4, 348) Or close the room when you are yourself and not communicate to anybody for the next two hours. (I4, 351-352) And, yeah, also the things that you would much easier do in a group so that we sit together, focus on a problem, give some, ah, assumptions and some suggestions and then decide how to do it. (I4, 354-356)

There's an, there's no rule if it's a single person, two or a whole team. Ah, yeah, we execute that experiment, if it works out, ok good, then we can solve this problem. Solve the problem and that's done. (I4, 402-404)

Oiso zerst mocht des Design des Design oder Konzeption hoid nu vorher, daun des Design, daun arbeiten wir draun, daun kumt's zum Kunden. Und des ist vü, vü besser obgestimmt jetzt, find i. (I3, 196-198)

Oiso grundsätzlich haben ma a Unterscheidung zwischen neiche Kunden und daun die Bestandskunden. Und bei Bestandskunden, do sama eh mittlerweile eh a super eingespieltes Team, in diese Kundenteams. Und wenn dann a Projekt einakumt, daun geht ma hoid gach zaum. Ok, wer, was san die Anforderungen, was mias ma am Ende ausagriang. Und daun schaut ma bei die Leid, wer kaun was, wer hod wie Zeit, und so teilen ma daun des Team amoi ein, für dieses neue Projekt. Oiso des ist daun a bei am Neukundenprojekt, oda wo, do muast des Kundenteam vorher a schau zaumsuchen. (I3, 475-483) Es kumt oft drauf an, wiavü Auslastung a Person dann schau hod. Oiso wennst sogst, ok irgendwer hod jetzt grod a Projektende und somit hod a wieder mehr Zeit, daun wird der schau eher in dieses neiche Kundenteam mit einignumma. Und daun hängts hoid davon ob, vom Know How. (I3, 488-491)

Oiso do gibt’s, bei wirklich komplett neiche Projekte, die ma im Haus nu nie gmocht haben, gibt’s oft a vorher a Proof of Concept Phase, wo ma mitn Kunden sogst, ok, wir kriegen jetzt zwei Monat oder drei Monat, und in die arbeiten ma moan an Prototypen aus, ob die Idee überhaupt zum Umsetzen ist. Oiso wenn’s wirklich wo komplett neichs ist. (I3, 507-511) Und wenn’s irgendwos is, wo zum Beispiel am Markt schon gang und gebe ist, oda es Ist bei uns im Unternehmen nu ned so neich, ähm, nu ned so eingesessen, oiso dass ma wirklich damit arbeiten kinan. Daun ist die Zeitspanne a bisserl kleiner. Daun kina ma sogen, ok, es befossen sie jetzt a Leid aus dem Fochteam, dem Fochteam, dem Fochteam mit dem Thema, kriegen a bestimmtes Kunden, ah, Zeitkontingent für den Kunden und kina des daun ausarbeiten. Und wenn ma daun an Plan hoben, daun kna ma eigentlich erst des Angebot machen. Oiso wir kina ka Angebot an Kunden gleich geben, für wos, wos ma nu nie gmocht haben. (I3, 513-521)

Oiso es ist, teilweise wenn’s wirklich, sogen ma so es ist, a Fachbereich wirklich spezifisch, daun kann schon sein, dass se wer separat daun vorbereitet oder des moi recherchiert. Oba im Enderfekt braucht oft die Zusammenarbeit von mehrere. (I3, 545-548)

Im Angebot 1.0 ist, ah, amoi da ganze grobe Budgetrahmen drinnen. Und im Angebot 2.0 woas ma daun schau ziemlich genau, wos da Kunde wü, und do ist da Funktionsrahmen daun a schau abgesteckt, eben in da Form von die User Stories, die im Backlog drinnen san, und mit dem Backlog, geht ma daun a in die Umsetzungsphase. Des hoast, man hod daun eben des Scrum Team, des a wieder interdisziplinär zaumgestellt ist. (I2, 391-397)

Oba jetzt moi Ideen generieren, oder es erfolgt a schau vorher, beim, waun ma jetzt zum Beispiel des, den Auftrog erst gewinnen miasen, für die Pitch Präsentation, san hauptsächlich immer die Designer. (I2, 449-451)

Und wie zum Beispiel die Aufteilung funktioniert, waun do jetzt a neicher Auftrag kumt, ob der jetzt in des eine oder in des andere Team kumt. Des woan hoid Sochen, die hod ma se vielleicht gaunz am Anfang nu ned gaunz überlegt ghobt, des hod sie dann in da Zeit herauskristallisiert, dass ma do a Prozesse braucht. Und des woa eigentlich, des gauenze hod jetzt glaub i eh, najo, a Johr, eineinhalt Johr dauert, bis do eigentlich die meisten Sochen in da Gänge kuma, dass die vielen Sochen daun geregelt oblaufen. (I5, 211-218)

Oder gaunz innovativ san. Grod do i s natürlich extrem wichtig, weil ma vielleicht a goaned amoi genau waos, wos wü ma denn eigentlich für Endergebnis hoben. Man hod zwor Gedanken im Kopf, obo man woas eigentlich goa ned genau, wos daun des, wie daun des End, oder meistens, ist jo so, dass ma am Anfang goa ned so vü Frogen stellen kaun, dass ma olle Antworten kennt, die ma brauchat. Von dem her, hod des do mit da, mit der agilen Logik, die ma jetzt ghobt habent, habent die meisten Sochen in da Zeit herauskristallisiert, dass ma do a Prozesse braucht. (I5, 593-600)

Sondern er schaut sie nur des Projekt an, hod se davor goaned informiert, und du griagst daun a Feedback, und sogst, eigentlich Kunde zufrieden, i bin zufrieden, die zwei san jetzt ned zufrieden, daun ist des a a Diskrepanz. Oiso du, immer proaktiv schaun, dass ma, ah, die Informationen, wenn's wen von die beiden betriift, immer immer auf informeller Ebene a weitergibt. (I6, 668-673)

Na, des woa, des woa, im, des woa in da Gruppen. Oiso des woa einf och a offene Diskussion und aner hods, oiso, Account Manager in dem Fall, hods moderiert. Und a auf an Flipchart quasi mitgeschrieben, wos so kumt, an Inputs oder jo. Es unterschiedlich, es kumt a aufs Projekt drauf an. Sicher, oft sitzt ma a für a kleineres Projekt, wo des ned so, ahm, a Neulandprojekt ist, sondern hoid wos ist, wos ma eh schau öfter gmocht hod, wos ma einf och nu moi wieder a bisserl aundas kumt. Oder einf och neich kumt. Daun bei am klan Projekt sitzt ma wahrscheinlich scho a amoi am Schreibtisch und schaut, wos ma daraus verwenden kaun. (I8, 524-533)

Mhhh, ...... voi schwierig. I woas ned. .... I glaub wir haben goa ned so vü Regeln, oder san vü, eh so kloa, i woas goa ned. (I5, 661-663)

Für mi persönlich hod se geändert, dass i, dass ma mehr schaut drauf, wos mochen die anderen, die in deinem Team san. A wauns für die unterschiedlichen Fachteams arbeiten. (I5, 249-251) Einf och aus dem ausa, dass wir selber für unsere, für unsere Zahlen und die Finanzen quasi verantwortlich san, oiso in die Teams. (I5, 253-254)

I find die Orbeit übergreifend über die Fachteams find i super. Oiso des ist ma vorher jetzt a nu ned eingfoin, oiso dass ma wirklich mit die aundan Fachteams ema Orbeit besser kenennlernen und mit ema wirklich verzauert eigentlich zusammenarbeit. (I3, 179-182)
Oiso des woa am Anfang a ned so, dass ma mit die Designer gleich am Anfang vom Design Prozess deaf ma a gleich mitreden. (I3, 184-185)

Vom Umfeld her, ahm, ist ma jetzt näher mit den anderen Disziplinen zuam, oiso. (I2, 114-115)

Die Kunst des Prototyping
Immer mehr unserer Auftraggeber nutzen das Lab als „Ort der Wahrheit“ für ihre Ideen. Was sich esoterisch anhört, ist nichts anderes als die Erkenntnis, dass digitale Strategien als Prototypen reüssieren sollten, bevor sie auf die Straße gebracht werden. Das Nachjustieren und -scharfen von Konzepten ist ein Prozess, der im Idealfall sofort beginnt. Denn Papier ist geduldig, die Realität nicht. Und so glänzt das Lab seit über fünf Jahren als Spielwiese, Inspiration und Modellbau für Natural Interfaces, Artificial Intelligence, Bots, Internet of things und andere Zukunftstechnologien. (Company webpage)


I moan, es gibt a die Fälle, dass jetzt irgendwer herkumt, und sogt, er brauchat irgend a Lösung in dem Bereich, woits eich damit beschäftigen. (I3, 144-145)

So he, i hob bei dem Kunden des und die, die Thematik ghobt. Und somit hod's do an Pool gegeben, do haum olle Leid Frogen einistöhn kina oder irgendwie söba Ideen einwerfen kina und sogen ok, des kuntn die Web Entwickler irgendwie ausarbeiten und amoi näher anschauen. (I3, 154-157)

Flexible role identity
Jo so wahnsinnig vü Rollen haben ma eigentlich ned. Oba es gibt schau Rollen, die, mhh, aktiver san und wöche, die ned so aktiv san. (I8, 168-169)

Es woa eigentlich immer relativ eindeutig. (I8, 277)

Weil es woa jo ursprünglich so kommuniziert, dass quasi jedes Johr Neuwahlen gibt. U n d des mochat ma daun jetzt wieder. Und wie ma do am geschicktesten dan, eben dass a die Leid, die sie vielleicht jetzt ned einfach so heraus, dass die so herausschreien und sogen, jo i wü des machen. Ahm, dass ma die a guad obhoit. Oba des ist eigentlich daun eh jetzt a wieder a relativ geschützter Rahmen, weil ma jo ned so vü Leid a daun wieder san. Oiso 20 oder sowos. (I8, 290-296)

Und vielleicht formuliert ma die Frogate hoid daun einfach so, ned wer wü jetzt die Rolle hoben, sondern wer intressiert se dafia. Und waun do daun zwei oder drei Leid duat stengan, daun losst ma hoid wieder die Leid wählen. Oder ma gibt erna kurz die Möglichkeit, dass ma sogt, warum mas gern machen mechat, damit die anderen a a bisserl leichter foid. Dass ma versteht, der wü des unbedingt mochen oder der ist do voi, ahm, leidenschoftlich dahinter, jo. (I8, 303-309)
Und zum Beispiel des Web Dev Team, des über 25 Leid woan oder 20 Leid woan, dass des für an Teamleiter eh schau schwierig woa, ahm, insofern is eigentlich für den weniger komplex worden, oba er hod ned weniger Aufgaben oder Verantwortung deswegen. Ahm, oder du host gmoant weniger Mocht oder so, weil's eh so woa, dass diese Teamleiter daun eigentlich entweder an organisatorischen Lead oder den fochlichen Lead übernumma haben. Do wo's eh schau recht guad woan in dem Bereich und daun hod ma se vielleicht sogar ois Teamleiter entscheiden kina, wü i, interessiert mi wirklich beides, oder wü i eigentlich mehr in a organisatorische Richtung geh oder wü i eigentlich nur in a fochliche Richtung geh, weil mi des Organisieren eigentlich eh immer nur gstoert hod an der Teamleiterposition, die ois machen misen hod. (I8, 383-395)

Ahm, oiso es sóid jo a, die Kompetenzen erwerben möchttest, oder weil du, ah, gern für deine Mitarbeiter do sein mecha. Oba ned, weilst jetzt daun mehr verdienst oder weilst jetzt, ah, daun mehr Mocht oder so host. Und, waunst des wüst, findst wahrscheinlich bei uns weniger. (I7, 212-216)

Na, oiso des woin wir prinziell ned, weil wir woin jo, dass ma die Rolle jederzeit obgeben kaun. (I7, 219-220) (Entlohnung)

In dem, dass du vielleicht, jo, keine Ahnung, es ist irgendwos, du mechaht nu mehr nu Teilzeit arbeiten oder du wirst Mutter, oder du wirst Vater oder du mechaht nebenbei wieder studieren oder so, und host natürlich daun a die Kapazitäten nimma oder vielleicht a die, jo, den Willen, dass du des jetzt grod mochst. Daun kaunst das wieder obgeben, und daun sóid des, natürlich, ahm, oiso, wir habens momentan, zumindest nu so, nichts mit, ah, finanziellen, ah, Situation ändern, jo. (I7, 223-229)

Oiso es sóid prinziell jetzt ned so sein, dass ma sogt, ok, man hod jetzt die Funktion, weil i besser verdienen wü, weil i mehr Mocht hoben wü, weil i a Führungskroft sein wü oder so. Ahm, sondern mehr aus dem, he, wie kaun i mi einbringen im Unternehmen bestmöglich, was, wo mechaht i mi hin entwickeln. (I7, 236-240)

Ahm, najo, es kumt eigentlich von der Person sóba. Oiso, dass, ahm, zum Beispiel des Obgeben. Konkret vor a boa Wochen an Fall ghobt, wo a Mitarbeiterin gsogt hod, na, sie siagt se in dera Rolle jetzt nimma, sie wü die jetzt einfoch nimma. Und daun is ok. Daun hod ses einfich obgegeben. (I7, 373-376)

Oba es kumt meistens aktiv von den Mitarbeitern, von Mitarbeiter beziehungsweise, ahm, i glaub, grod am Anfang woas so, dass se do eh a ausakristallisierd hod, wer könntes des machen. Oiso des woa, glaub i, daun a so, dass ma die Leid gfrogt hod, ob se ses vorstellen kinan, weil's einfich, ma gseng hod, ok, der würd des guad machen. (I7, 390-394)

Organisations, organisat, organisatorisches Lead, fochliches Lead haben ma ned, weil, ahm, i kaun schlecht sogen, ok, da Ralf von da IT is jetzt mei fochliches Lead, weil ma der ned weiterhelfen kunt mit Arbeitsrecht vermutlich. Oiso san ma olle unsere eigenen Fochexperten. (I7, 424-427)

Im Backbone, jo. Oba, jo, HR Lead hauma natürlich. Des is die Irene bei uns. Und, ahm, organisatorischen Lead haben ma a. (I7, 429-430)

Jo, i glaub, dass se a jeder die Rollen aussucht, die, wo a denkt, die kaun a guad ausfüllen. (I6, 277-278)

**Kommunikator/Qualitätsmanager**

Der schaut, dass ma vor allem unser internes, ahm, unser internes Wissensmanagement a guad abgelegt haben, dass ma Standards haben, dass ma die Dokumentation ordentlich haben. (I1, 89-92)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dispo-Manager</th>
<th>Dispo Manager, der schaut einfach, dass die Dispo-Meetings, die für uns ganz zentral san, weil ma so vü Projekte haben, ah guad ablaufen. (I1, 108-110)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dispo-Manager</td>
<td>Termine ausschreiben bzw. Ersatztermine festlegen, Agenda definieren und sicherstellen, Dispomeetingsprozess weiterentwickeln, Während dem Termin auf Effizienz achten, Zeitmanagement, Wenn nötig Vertretungspersonen zum Termin dazuholen, Charakteristika: Entscheidungsfreudig, Durchsetzungsfähig, Genauigkeit, Koordinationstalent (Company document)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR-Lead</td>
<td>Und ah, da HR Lead is der klassische Personal, die, hod die klassische Personalführung, des heißt der führt die Mitarbeitergespräche, die bei uns a bisserl anders heißen, der schaut a, dass Feedback, ahm, zustande kommt. Genau, also der schaut einfach, dass er so die erste persönliche Ansprechperson ist für den Mitarbeiter.(I1, 70-74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR-Lead</td>
<td>Beteilig am Entscheidungsprozess für neue Mitarbeiter, Einschulungsplan, Begleitung der neuen Mitarbeiter innerhalb des Fachteams, Aus- und Weiterbildung innerhalb des Fachteams, HR Themen in Abstimmung mit HR Abteilung, Eskalationsstelle auf persönlicher Ebene für Fachteam-Mitglieder, Führt 3-Monats- und Mitarbeitergespräche (Company document)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisatorischer Lead</td>
<td>Da organisatorische Lead mocht die Ressourceneinteilung, schaut mit Urlaube, ähm, Krankenstände, wie ma denn die Projekte guad richtig besetzt, welche Kompetenzen im Team san. (I1, 67-69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisatorischer Lead</td>
<td>nimmt als Repräsentant des Fachteams an der Ressourcenplanung des Kundenteams teil, Verantwortlich für AV = Team Koordination (auf Basis von Ressourcenplanung), Arbeitsverteilung im Fachteam, Service-Tickets im Kundeteam koordinieren, trifft Entscheidungen im Rahmen der Teamkoordination, Urlaubsplanung des Fachteams, Urlaube im Fachteam abstimmen, Ressourcen im Überblick haben um dem Dispo-Manager zur Hilfe zu stehen, Ressourcenbedarf erkennen und melden (Company document)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fachlicher Lead</td>
<td>Die, ah, diese Rollen, ah, san, also da fachliche Lead schaut, dass die Qualität und die Standards passen. Der schaut a welche Kompetenzen, ah, die Mitarbeiter in seiner Profession brauchen, was ist so State of the Art, was brauchen ma, um die nächsten, ah, Technologiesprüunge und so weiter mitmochen z'kinan. (I1, 63-67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fachlicher Lead</td>
<td>Eskalationsstelle (auf Projektebene, technischer Ebene), fachliche Anlaufstelle für alle Unit-Mitglieder, Mentoring (auf fachlicherEbene), Technische Entwicklungen die das ganze Fachteam betreffen abstimmen, Lösungen für aktuelle Problemstellungen abstimmen. Beispielsweise Betriebssystem Update oder neue Design Guidelines., gemeinsame technische Abläufe/Prozesse sicherstellen (Company document)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Kommunikator**
Sorge dafür, dass jeder weiß, wo was zu finden ist: am Work, wiki, Drive, Social Media oder anderen Plattformen?, Sorge dafür, dass jedem klar ist, wo er was abspeichern und ablegen muss, Sorge wenn nötig für Strukturen die Klarheit schaffen, Hat das Team einen Erfolg zu feiern oder spannende Erkenntnisse, dann stimme dich mit Lydia und Ernst ab, wie diese kommuniziert werden könnten., Du musst nicht immer alle Texte etc. selbst verfassen, aber eine gewisse Grundfreude am Schreiben und Formulieren wäre wohl nicht schlecht, Frage herum und informiere dich aktiv, ob es Themen gibt, die deine anderen Team-Mitglieder gerne kommunizieren würden.  
(company document)

Und daun gibt’s die Rollen in da Unit, so wie, ahm, ahm, an Kommunikator oder an, die, die werden eigentlich einmal im Jahr gibt’s diese Peer Reviews. Do bin i Moderator bei uns, genau. (I6, 129-131)

**Finanzguru**
Rollen, die ma a nu haben, ist da Finanzguru, der ist dafür zuständig, dass die Wirtschaftlichkeit des Teams sichtbar gmocht wird, oder a sichergestellt ist. (I1, 116-118)

**Finanzguru**
Informationen über den monatlichen Forecast (Verrechnungsvorschau) sammeln und Erstellung einfördern, Wissen über das Verrechnungsziel pro Monat, Formalen Überblick über die Jobs, Auftragsinventur einfördern, Auskunft geben können, wie wir bei einem Kunden stehen, Auskunft geben können, wie wir bei einem Projekt stehen (auf Basis der Zahlen, nicht inhaltlich), Ausblick über die kommenden Projekte für die 3-6 Monate, Auslastung des Teams, Zahlungskontrolle (Company document)

**Link zur Geschäftsführung**
Kommunikationskanal zwischen Geschäftsführung und Steuerungsteam im Rahmen des Jour Fix des Steuerungsteams aufrecht erhalten (Company document)

**Socializer**
Oiso wir haben 1 Rolle, de ist da Socializer. Und die haben ma am Anfang a definiert ghobt, dass ma sogen, wir brauchen irgendwen, der hoid für das Teamgefüge und Teamzusammenhalt daun a do sein muas. Und des ist eigentlich recht a coole Rolle. (I3, 752-755)

**Socializer**
Wir haben den Socializer, der is so bisserl für dieses Teambuilding und ah, für des, dass außerhalb von den Arbeitsthemen a nu irgendwas gibts für dieses Team, weil ma einfach a wissen, dass des Erfolgsgeheimnis von am funktionierendem Team, oder von, Erfolg von unserem, ahm, von unserer Leistung ist, oder so, wie muas i des formulieren. (I1, 95-100)

**Socializer**
Wir haben eben gaunz am Anfang, noch da Dings, haben ma so an Workshop ghobt, ahm, in ganzen Tog eigentlich. Oiso wirklich die Firma sich den gaunze Tog Zeit genommen, dass ma des mocht. Ahm, und do haben ma daun, do hod's daun eben geheißen, es gibt a Steuerungsteam, und wer möchte se do aufstellen losen. Und wir brauchen an organisatorischen Lead. U n d wir haben daun eigentlich im Mobile Team selber uns zaugredet, do woa ma zu dritt, und haben hoid daun geredet, wer mechat, wer mechat des mochen, wen glauben wir, dass des am besten warad. Und haben eigentlich daun so, oiso es woa eigentlich, a, a Teamprozess. (I5, 359-367)
You so instead of doing organizational and technical and HR all together, there is an organizational lead and a technical lead and then they can go and sit together and discuss something and also to be able to focus more on things that you do better. (I4, 63-66)

Des hoast, wenn irgendwer sogat, jo eigentlich, mir, mir daugats a, daun kunt di, oiso gibt's numoi a Wahl. Dass ma daun sagt, ok, jo mi gfreit's eigentlich a immer nu und daun host hoid a Wahl zwischen die zwei Leid. (I3, 262-264)

Jetzt san jo olle Rollen eigentlich gut vergeben. Oba des ist daun a die, die Gefahr ist vielleicht schau zu gut eingessessen. (I3, 277-278)

Was ist der Hintergrund dahinter, ist, dass wir Mitarbeiter haben, die fachlich extrem guad san, oba einfoch in der Beziehung zu anderen vielleicht jetzt ned, ah, dort des Herz haben, dass des gern duan, ah, beziehungsweise die zwar se fachlich gern ois Mentor zur Verfüigung stön, aber dass die Urlaube von jemandem koordinieren oder die Projekttressourcen richtig einteilren, des interessiertes gor ned. (I1, 74-79)


Und bei uns gibt's ned dieses nach oben, sondern des ist a System, wo ma vü Gleichwertigkeiten haben. Es ist ned da HR Lead besser als da organisatorische Lead. Es ist hoid die Rolle vom Socializer kleiner ois die vom am Steuerungsteammitglied, prozentmäßig oder zeitmäßig, aber sie ist deshalb ned weniger wichtig, ja. Weil, weil ma des, dieses Teambuilding genauso brauchen. (I1, 684-689)

Oiso, am Anfang woas wichtig, des Verständnis von olle, dass ma wirklich von die 100 Prozent, die ma in aner Wochen arbeiten kann, dass do wos obzwickt wírd. Oiso dass ma, einfoch Zeit für a Rolle braucht, des woa am Anfang die Umstellung, oba do san jetzt olle schau guad einikema, des hoast, des ist ka Problem mehr. (I3, 371-375)

Ahm, bei die, bei die Rollenfindungen, die ma am Anfang ghobt haben, des ist eigentlich relativ problemlos ob, obgelaufen. Oiso do hoben ma, am Anfang hoben ma a boa so, so Workshops quasi ghobt, und daun hod se des eigentlich gauz guad entwickelt. (I5, 195-199)

Oiso do bin i wirklich wieder eigentlich da Web Entwickler, der hoid daun des mocht. Oiso des ist relativ kloa gekapselt, von, von da Rolle. (I3, 449-450)

Oiso des hob i schau so empfunden, dass a quasi des eigentlich mehr, wie soid i sogen, oiso er hod jetzt wirklich, er woa ned die anzige Person, zu der ma quasi hingeht, sondern man hod mehrere Personen, zu die ma gehen kann. (I3, 342-345) Mit denen ma reden kaum. Oiso i woas ned, oiso mir ist vorgekommen, die Teamleiter hod's irgendwie am härtesten getroffen. (I3, 347-348)

Wie oft die wechseln, genau. Ahm, des woa eigentlich a so a Prozess, weil im Prinzip am Anfang, haben ma goa ned, oiso, am Anfang hods eigentlich koane Regeln geben, wie des osschaun, ausschauen soid. Ahm, i hob daun eh, i hob daun vor am halben Johr ungefähr moi eingeworforn oder vor am dreiviertei Johr amoi eingeworforn, wie des jetzt eigentlich ist, waun wir jetzt, ob wir uns quasi wieder neu zur Wahl stellen wollen. Ahm, und es ist so, dass wir den, intern von die Statusmeetings, die ma do jedes Monat haben, gibt's, a, a, a Review Runde. (I5, 382-389)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steering team</th>
<th>Committee is now somehow the, the unit manager. (I4, 90)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Und wie ma diese ReOrg daun, ahm, vollzogen haben quasi, wie ma des ois gestartet haben, haben ma a Steuerungsteam gewählt, und do haben ma gschaft, dass möglichst interdisziplinär ist, des Steuerungsteam, obwohl jetzt ned jede Disziplin vertreten ist. Weil nur vier, oder drei bis fünf Leid drinnen san, und do bin i quasi a jetzt im Steuerungsteam vom Argo. (I8, 21-25)</td>
<td>Oiso im Steuerungsteam, im Steuerungsteam san, da ursprüngliche Gedanke woa, dass aus jedem Fachteam a Mitglied im Steuerungsteam sitzt. Damit ma mitgliedert, wos aus die Teams, wos so, wos die Teams bewegt, wos san Sochen, die am obgengan, oder wos san Sochen, die ma brauchat. Ahm, mittlere weie ist des, sitz nimmer aus jedem Fachteam einer drinnen, mir san do quasi vier Leid, oiso im heroberen und im unteren Team quasi vier Leid, die in diesem Steuerungsteam sitzen, und des hod eigentlich relativ vü Entscheidungsgewalt bzw. relativ vü, dass wir Sochen einwerfen, und daun a, Frogen, ob des eh so passt. Oiso wir woin eigentlich ned, dass ma, wir woin ned irgendwie do diktatorisch bestimmen, oba wir geben hoid vü Input und ob des daun so passt. (I5, 289-299)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dass ma quasi a, a, die, die Entscheidungen san doch irgendwo Basis demokratisch, in dem Rahmen, wo ma se bewegen kann. Ah, oba do, ah, guad funktioniert, wer, oiso do gibts a Steuerungsteam, a, die daun a, mehr Verantwortung daun a dementsprechend haben. (I6, 34-37)</td>
<td>Und, und do probiert ma daun, dass ma a wenig informiert und a frogt, passt des. (I5, 304-305)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wos des, des Steuern des Teams, wohin des geht und, und den, den Rahmen a im Team daun a moi vorgeben, zu dem wos eh von da Geschäftsführung a kumt. (I6, 39-41)</td>
<td>Und, ahm, wos ma des Johr anfangen, oder jetzt, wos i versuch, dass i, dass ma mit unserem Team nu mehr forcieren, san eh so, ...... dass ma a wirklich schaut, dass mas ganze Team miteinbezieht. Weil i sog amoi, jetzt voriges Jahr ist vü im Steuerungsteam glaufen. (I2, 123-127)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oiso im Steuerungsteam, im Steuerungsteam san, da ursprüngliche Gedanke woa, dass aus jedem Fachteam a Mitglied im Steuerungsteam sitzt. Damit ma mitgliedert, wos aus die Teams, wos so, wos die Teams bewegt, wos san Sochen, die am obgengan, oder wos san Sochen, die ma brauchat. Ahm, mittlere weie ist des, sitz nimmer aus jedem Fachteam einer drinnen, mir san do quasi vier Leid, oiso im heroberen und im unteren Team quasi vier Leid, die in diesem Steuerungsteam sitzen, und des hod eigentlich relativ vü Entscheidungsgewalt bzw. relativ vü, dass wir Sochen einwerfen, und daun a, Frogen, ob des eh so passt. Oiso wir woin eigentlich ned, dass ma, wir woin ned irgendwie do diktatorisch bestimmen, oba wir geben hoid vü Input und ob des daun so passt. (I5, 289-299)</td>
<td>Ahm, oba es hod a jeder die Möglichkeit, dass a Punkte einbringt ins Steuerungsteam. (I8, 218-220)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oba man hod eigentlich von Anfang an ned so wahnsinnig vü, ahm, gspiat von da Unit, dass do so vü einakema wa an Themen oder Kommentaren oder Anregungen oder so. Des woa immer eher so, dass wir versucht haben, dass mas animiert, dass uns a Input geben oder Feedback geben und so. (I8, 228-232)</td>
<td>Oba i sog amoi, in die Units ist do sicher nu Potenzial drinnen. Do san die, die im Steuerungsteam arbeiten, .... ahm, de san owei die Leid, die die aundan mitziang, oba i glaub es kimt einfach zu wenig von die Teammitglieder söba. (I2, 141-144)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback procedure</td>
<td>Wir san dem Thema a wengal auskema, oba es ist sicha, ah, koa einfaches Thema, weil ma daun a zum Beispiel wieder sogen kaun, wir vom Back End Team haben nur zwei Leid im, im, in da Unit, wohingegen s'Front End Team mit sechs Leid vertreten ist. Und de Froge ist, waun se wer vom Front End und vom Back End aufstellt, ob ned olle Front End Leid für eher den vom Front End wählen, ob des daun. (I2, 314-319)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Und daun gibt's die Rollen in da Unit, so wie, ahm, ahm, an Kommunikator oder an, die, die werden eigentlich einmal im Jahr gibt's diese Peer Reviews. (I6, 129-130)

Ah, wo ma die Rolle für sich selber aus reflektiert, die ma einnimmt, von den anderen dann bewertet wird oder ned bewertet sondern die Rolle wird bewertet und ned die Person. Ah, und daun, ah, oba a der, der die Rolle hod, kaun a sogen, i mechts eigentlich nimma mochen. (I6, 132-136)

Und daun schaut ma hoid im Team, ob, ob ma dem übereinstimmt oder sogt, he, warum wüst das ned mochen oder gibt's irgend an Grund gibt, der aus dem Weg zu schaffen ist oder ned. Oba sonst wird die Rolle daun neu vergeben. (I6, 138-141)

Und genau so is a bei den Feedbacks. Ah, je noch dem, wer Feedback geben kann in der unmittelbaren Rollennähe, der gibt Feedback, und des is entweder die ganze Unit oder eben nur ein klarer Teil. (I1, 149-151)

Ahm, do deaf ois erstes, soid aus ersta jeder aus seiner eigener Rolle ausa sogen, des san daun, auf was bin ich stolz, wos, wie kün ich mich verbessern. Und danoch gibt's eigentlich a Review von, von allen, die in dem Team san, jeweils, die deafn daun dir Feedback geben. Und ane von die Sochen, die do a gsoigt wird ist, möchtste du des noch weiter machen, die Rolle. Do kaun ma daun jo oder na sogen. Und wir haben daun eigentlich jetzt do so aus, aus, aus Prozess überlegt, dass ma genau daun do a numoi frogt, ob wer anderer auch Steuerungsteam zum Beispiel sein mechat. Und i glaub oba, dass wir do nu ned gaunz fix beschlossen haben, wie ma do jetz vorgengan. Ob ma jetzt daun quasi numoi sogen, dass olle einheitlich zurücktreten und daun muas wieder jeder sogen, wer's mochen mechat. Ahm, des ist do nu a bisserl so im Gange, wie ma do jetz mit dem umgengan. Dawei is hoid wirklich so, dass ma quasi selber sogt, jo i mechts nu sein. Und daun deafn oba olle anderen a sogen, ob’s, ob’s se se vorstellen kunten, dass im Steuerungsteam san. (I5, 391-405)

Und daun gibt's die Rollen in da Unit, so wie, ahm, ahm, an Kommunikator oder an, die, die werden eigentlich einmal im Jahr gibt's diese Peer Reviews. (I6, 129-130)

Oiso es gibt grundsätzlich zweimal im Johr so genannte Peer Reviews. Des hoast, wir kriagen, der der die Rolle eingenommen hod, griagt a Feedback, von den Mitgliedern im Team, die des am meisten betrifft. (I3, 243-245)

Wie oft finden die Peer Reviews statt? 2x jährlich (Company document)

Feedbackregeln: (Company document)
- Feedback wird immer als eigene Wahrnehmung und als Ich-Botschaft formuliert (Ich erlebe dich als ..., Für mich bist du ...)
- Feedback wird immer direkt gegeben (In deiner Rolle als ... sehe ich dich ...)
- Feedback immer mit konkret beschrieben (Am Beispiel von ... möchte ich dir sagen)
- Feedback wird als Geschenk formuliert (Wertschätzend gegenüber der Person)
- Feedback-Nehmer hört zu, hinterfragt bei Unklarheiten, aber rechtfertigt sich nicht

Nicht-Ziel: Beurteilungssystem (Company document)
### Cohesiveness

Oiso in die Units auf jeden Fall. Mir haben jo daun a so Teamevents gmocht, oiso für die Units, a so a bisserl, weil ma hoid wirklich eigentlich ned olle in da Firma gleich guad kennt hod. Dass ma des einfach, dass ma do irgendwoche, gegebenenfalls, dass Barrieren do san, dass ma die hoid, aufhebt, oda, genau. Und dass ma se einfach besser kennen lernt, des hoid eigentlich guad funktioniert. Des merk i schau, dass innerhalb von die Units, dass se des vü verbessert hod. Bei die Fochteams is hoid daun wieder bissel ins Gegenteil gwaundert. (I8, 152-159)

Ah, wos brauchts nu, jo natürlich tolle Leid, mit denen ma zaumorbeitet. (I7, 178-179)

Sehr motivierend glaub i. Und jo, dadurch, dass sie olle relativ guad vastengan untereinander, do kloppt die, ah, Zusammenarbeit schau ziemlich guad. (I7, 317-319)

Ah, hod ma a den, den Teamzusammenhalt in den Teams, ah, a stork erhöht. Oiso i kauns jetzt nur obeiten, von, von dem wos ma, wir haben jo jetzt, im Monats, im Unit Status Meeting, ah, wo, ah, NPS obgfrogt wird, oiso da, da Net Promoter Score. (I6, 504-508)

Und der woa, wie i im Februar kuma bin, wo die Teams grod gebildet worden san oder grod eigentlich, wos nad, recht vü Zeit woa ned dazwischen, vielleicht zwei Monat, woa der ziemlich, und a vorher ziemlich im Keller. Und der ist eigentlich stetig auf a Level aufgliestien langsam. (I6, 513-517)

Dass do Teamplayer drinnen san, die wissen, wos wichtig ist in am, in aner Teamarbeit oder wie ma se in a Team einfügt guad. (I8, 574-576)

Oba des Wichtige ist, dass ma hoid einfach daun diese Werte aufrecht erhöiten kaun mit am jeden, der a wieder dazua kumt. (I8, 577-579)

Per se, so kaun ma ned sogen, es funktioniert besser, es hängt a immer von die Menschen ob, die daun a wirklich draun arbeiten. Und wie geht, ob die a gewillt san, dass im Team arbeiten oder ned. (I6, 77-79)

Oba es funktioniert heroben guad. Oiso da, .... kunt i jetzt ned sogen, dass des ned so funktioniert, wie ma se des vorgestellt hod. (I6, 81-82)

Oiso, oiso i kaun jetzt nur von, von, von mir und vom Team, was i beobacht sogen, die , die Instanzen, die ma hoben, dass ma ois Team, gesamtes Unit, oiso ois Unit Team, do guad zaumorbeiten, dass a Steuerungsteam gibt, des a den Link zur Geschäftsführung hod, wenn ma wirklich etwas dorthin trogen wü. (I6, 703-707)

Fix für den Kunden quasi zur Verfügung gestellt. Des haben ma bei uns, im unteren Team eher weniger, do haben ma ned an so an großen Kunden. Von dem her fehlt uns des vielleicht a bisserl, dass ma do nu a bisserl mehr Zusammenhalt hätteten. Oba sunst passts gaunz guad. (I5, 280-283)

Und jo, oba die Teamarbeit hod vorher schau super funktioniert find i. (I3, 206)

Oiso dasst wirklich an Kunden host, und dieses Kundenteam kennt se einfach daun a schau untereinander und woa wie ma zaumorbeit, und des funktioniert a super. (I3, 221-223)

Und wir mochen a laufend, oiso Sochen miteinander. Wos daun a wiederum des gem, den Gemeinschaftssinn stärkt, wos wichtig ist, glaub i. (I7, 535-538)

Mitn gaunzen Unternehmen oba a auf Teamebene. Zum Beispiel, ah, letzte Wochen woa i leider kraung, oba des hob i organisiert. Do haben ma All the Girls, ahm, Dinner gmocht. Ahm, sans ins Glorious Bastards in Linz gaunga. Jo, i hobs organisiert. (I7, 542-545)
Und wir mochens oba öfters a im Team einfach so, dass ma sogen, ok, vom Backbone, wir gengan jetzt Obend essen. Jo, ist generell ziemlich vü anders, von da, daun gehst hoid amoi wuzzeln. Zum Beispiel, bin i mitn Front End wuzzeln, oiso vom Wuzzeltisch, oder einfach so vü informelle Sochen a, wost so nebenbei die Leid einfach besser kennen lernst, was a wichtig ist. (I7, 552-557)

Support

Und so is a, so sois a goa ned sei, weil waun i jetzt oben an großen Kunden hob und unten vielleicht nur a boa kleine grod oder Projekte laufen hob und des Team ist überlastet und des aundare ned, daun sois jo ned so sein, dass die ham gengan und die oben mochen Überstunden. Sondern, dass ma des gleich verteilt wieden. Und daun arbeiten natürlich oba die bei den anderen Projekten oben mit (I8, 603-609)

Weil ma do a se eben wie gsogt mit die Ressourcen hüft und daun doch wieder, die wieder an dem Projekt arbeiten und des eigentlich ins andere Team gehört oba man se hoid einfach ausgleichen mus von die Ressourcen her, von da Auslastung her. (I8, 681-684)

Bei uns is oba trotzdem nu sehr verwoben. Ahm, weil wir haben zum Beispiel, oiso i bin jo eigentlich da anzug Android Entwickler, oiso wir haben zwoa nu a boa Kompetenzen im Haus, des hoast, immer waun ma wo mehr brauchen, do ziang ma uns wen anderen dazua. (I5, 97-101)

Oiso a kämpferisches Denken um seine Ressourcen und um seine Umsotzzahlen ist irgendwie trotzdem immer dabei. Oba man muas hoid schauan, dass des ned in Vordergrund kumt. (I8, 611-613)

Auf der anderen Seiten sicher a die Hilfe von seine Kollegen, dass ma se do generrell stärkt in seiner Entscheidung. (I7, 61-62)

Und waun ned, daun wird a se die Hillfe hoin, dass a die Entscheidung a treffen kaun. (I7, 445-446)

Jo und dass ma füreinander do ist, man se gegenseitig unterstützt und hüft, waun wes ist. (I7, 567-568)

Oiso, die schauen a immer, dass se se a gegenseitig unterstützen. (I7, 668-669)

Oder dass ma sogt, he, i hob jetzt eigentlich nu Ressourcen frei, i kaun da a Orbeit obnehmen. Oiso, dass ma auf wen anderen zuaht, in beide Richtungen. (I6, 291-293)

Wos meistens daun im, eben intern im Fachteam ist, wo ma sogt, he, wir san jetzt zu dritt. Und du merkt einfach, dass aner von die drei daun, daun ah, kämpft und rudert. Daun, und man hod söba nu Ressourcen, dass ma daun ned, so, najo, i geh heid um vier ham und, sondern dass ma frogt, he aktiv, kaun i da irgendwie helfen oda gibt’s irgendwos, wos i da obnehmen kaun. (I6, 295-300)

Oiso es kaun a sein, waun wir jetzt im oberen Team ahm, über, über, a Intranet nochdenken, ah, dass ma wen ausm Front End vom unteren Team dazua hoin, weil die dort vielleicht mehr Erfahrung haum. (I6, 449-451)

A bisserl a Konkurrenz ist ned schlecht und a bisserl a, a rittern, darum, do geht’s ober jetzt eher darum, wos passiert mit, eben mit Neukunden, dass ma do a bisserl se rittern kaun, wer in welchem Team, dass des besser aufgehoben ist. (I5, 724-727)

Deswegen ist des a Aushelfen, natürlich trotzdem a im Vordergrund, weil letzten Endes san ma a Firma. (I5, 730-732)
| **Homogeneity** |  
| --- | --- |
| Na, des eigentlich ned. (I8, 572) (Homogene Ausbildung)  
Oba, mhh, oiso dass einfoch menschlich guad passen. (I8, 574)  
Und wie gsgqt, i glaub des hod a numoi den Hintergrund, dass die Kultur do herinnen sehr homogen ist. Oiso, von, von die Persönlichkeiten sans zwoa sehr heterogen, oba so die, die Werte, Kultur an sich, oiso des ist glaub i bei olle ziemlich ähnlich. Oiso haben do olle herinnen ähnliche Werte. (I7, 321-324)  
Ahm, jo, ah, dass ma einfoch ehrlich ist, ah, loyal, ahm, jo, a positiv aufgeschlossener Mensch, offen für Neues, ahm, .... jo, ah, kritikfähig. (I7, 328-329)  
Und, ah, intrinsisch motiviert, jo. (I7, 331) |  

| **individual factors** |  
| --- | --- |
| **Intrinsic motivation** |  
und Motivation, weil, du setzt da deine Targets und Deadlines eben söba oft. (I7, 74-75)  
Ahm, oiso wir suchen noch, jo besonderen Leid, die wes, ah, jo, irgend a Leidenschaft a nochgengan und des wes do herinnen umsetzen kinan. (I7, 102-104)  
Und jo, glaub des ist a des, wes do herinnen die Leid motiviert, ned des Geld, sondern anfoch, ahm, die Tätigkeit an sich und des Umfeld, oiso, des wes hoid wir schoffen. (I7, 169-171)  
I glaub, des daugt die Teams a relativer, dass do da anfoch, eben, a vü Motivation von dem kumt, dass se söbst entscheiden deafn und söbst gestoiten deafn. (I7, 313-315) |  

| **Skills and experience** |  
Mhh, i glaub, dass sie des eh einfach obzeichnet. Des daun einfach a oft immer wieder so typische Persönlichkeiten, die daun se gern für sowos mödn und die gern do nu zusätzliche a Aufgabe annehman. Und aundare, die se hoid eher, mhh, die hoid eher do zurückhaltender san oder ned immer ernan Senf dazugeben. (I8, 242-246)  
Und natürlich a fochlich guad san, oba wir haben in jedem Team Seniors und Juniors drinnen. (I8, 576-577)  
Des kaun glaub i ned jeder. Und hoid einfach, jo, es, sehr vü Selbstdisziplin a und Motivation, weil, du setzt da deine Targets und Deadlines eben söba oft. (I7, 73-75)  
Oiso i glaub, es hod Vor- und Nochteile, oba prinziell is a Persönlichkeitssfrage a, ob ma, ob ma in so ana Umgebung arbeiten kaun, wü, oder ned. (I7, 79-81) |

Ober i glaub eher, dass es a persönlicher ah, persönliche Präferenzen san. (I3, 578)
Und obst des eigentlich, ob da des daugt, dass du des mocht. (I3, 580)

Wir merken, dass die, ah, Kompetenzen ausgeprägter werden und auch andere werden. (I1, 229-230)

Mhh, i glaub, do braucht's amoi Erfohrung, ah, eben generell in dem, in dera Position, ah, was ma mochte. (I7, 60-61)
Und, ahm, daun a gewisse, jo Erfohrung im Unternehmen, wie's Unternehmen an sich tickt. Weil ma wird do irgendwie so einagworfen in so a großes Biotop und ist so a klanes Fischerl und muas jetzt schauen, wie mas schwimmen lernt. Oiso, ah, sicher griagt ma do a Hilfe von unsere Kollegen, oba es ist hoid ned so, dass du, ahm, do a Anleitung griagst und Mikromanagement, ah, ahm, jo, .... mehr oder weniger du gemikromanaged wirst. Sondern es ist hoid sehr frei und i glaub, do muas ma a a gewisser Typ dazua sein. (I7, 62-69)

Und seit dem die Personen wissen, was es denn heißt, a zusätzliche Person einzustellen, wie viel mehr Projektvolumen müs ma denn do akquirieren, und waun rechnet se denn des pro Umsatz pro Kopf, ahm, san die Anfragen vü realistischer beziehungsweise is a so, dass ma sogen wir probieren zuerst einmal, dass ma uns organisatorisch vielleicht a bisserl umschiffen, dass ma versuchen, die Projektstrukturen noch mal verändern, dass wir uns Ressourcen ausborgen von wem anderen, die ma dann a wieder zurückgeben kinan. Und erst dann, ahm, schreien wir nach neuen Ressourcen oder organisieren wir uns neue Ressourcen. (I1, 239-247)

Mhh, i hob nur des Gefühl, dass i mehr Zeit zum Entwickeln ghobt hob. (I3, 77)
Und jetzt ist natürlich, dass i die Rollen übernommen hob, merk i, dass i hoid vü in Abstimmungen a mit dabei bin und mi, oiso mehr mitreden kann a, was a cool ist. (I3, 86-88)
Oiso grundsätzlich muast vü Selbstorganisation hoben. Dasst wirklich sogst, ok, du mochst, ähm, so und so vü Stunden nimmst du für die Rolle und wenn's hoid amoi mehr Zeit in Anspruch nimmt, daun kaunst a mehr Zeit daun aufwenden, oba es muas sie daun immer mit der Orbeit dest am Montag griagst, des muas se daun ausgeh die
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>external factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Son wahnscnig vü Kooperationen hods eigentl. jetzt seit da Ausgründung, wos i woas, ned geben oder zumindest ned, wo daun a die operativen Teams wieder eingebunden woan. (I8, 478-480)
| Oba es woa a vorher wenig. (I8, 482) |
| Cooperation with spin-offs |
| Des hoast, wenn mas in da Unit ned obbilden kaun, weil's a Thema ist, mit dem ma überhaupt kan, oder wo ma überhaupt kan Tau haben, wie ma des mochen. Ah, es gibt sicher wen bei, bei „Spin-off 1“ oder bei „Spin-off 2“ oder bei „Spin-off 3“, wo ma sogen, den hoin ma für die hoibe Stund dazua, der liefert uns an wertvollen Input, ah, damit wir für uns des Projekt strukturieren. Damit ma wissen, wie mas angehen kinan. (I6, 425-430)
| Oba die tauschen sie schau mit die Front End Entwickler und mitn Mobile Team a, a aus und, und hoin se do Infos. (I6, 467-469) |
| Customer integration |
| Des hoast, des Team ist eigentl. vorm, vom Anfang, vom fast vom Anfang an komplett, ah, bis zum Projektende, wos a an Projektobsschluss gibt, ah, mitn Kunden daun, daun idealerweise immer des gleiche und woas a, woas passiert. (I6, 351-354)
<p>| Die, die Wichtigste ist immer, dass ma mitn Kunden gemeinsam obstimmt, ob ma, wenn's wos gauzn wos Neuartiges ist, ob ma daun sogt, he, wir wissen, oiso wenn a, wos Neues, Neuartiges, hod a immer damit zum duan, dass es a gewisse, a gewisses Risiko gib, im, im, dass des Projekt scheitert. (I6, 359-363) |
| Ahm, so vü wie möglich, würd i jetzt in dem Fall fost sogen. Bei uns woa des jetzt so, oiso wirklich olle zwei Wochen, da Kunde daun do woa im Haus, oder wir dort, oba meistens woa da Kunde do. (I5, 608-610) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>role of the top management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weil höld diese Units daun a glei von Beginn an a Umsatzziel griagt haum. (I8, 600-601)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahm, es gibt, ahm, a Tool. Des hoast, BI, und, ahm, do liegen die gauzen Zahlen offen ahm, der Mitarbeiter, oiso die gauzen wirtschaftlichen Kennzahlen. Ah, wo ma natiirlich se verglichen kaun. Und, natiirlich werden die Mitarbeiter, oiso die Mitarbeiter, oiso die Teams, natiirlich verglichen. Weil, ahm, wir miasen jo schauan, dass uns olle finanziell guad geht, und insofern, ahm, jedes Team hod, maus an Beitrog leisten, weil waun a Team die gauze Zeit nur rote Zahlen schreibt, miasen natiirlich die aundan Teams des Team mittrogen. Und, dadurch, dass des oba ois transparent is, ahm, wü jo eh jeder schauan, dass a aktiv am wirtschaftlichen Erfolg vom Unternehmen teilnimmt. (I7, 679-688)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zahlentechnisch schon, oiso es gibt Zielumsätze, des jedes Team. (I6, 608)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ah, jedes Monat schaffen soll. Ah, des ist oba so ziemlich des anziege, wo ma die beiden Teams vergleicht. Oiso auf Controlling Basis. (I6, 610-611)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Des hoast, wir haben daun wirklich daun des herzoagt, do gibt ma, nochdem a App woa, do gibt ma den Kunden die Geräte in die Hand, lest numoi vor. (I5, 638-640)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Und da Kunde sitzt daun do, schaut sie des an, und sogt daun passt oder passt ned. (I5, 645-646)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oiso do hod ma daun natürlich, des woa immer sehr zeitaufwendig natürlich, oba dafür is, hod des eigentlich ned geben, dass ma jetzt in zwei unterschiedliche Richtungen denkt. (I5, 650-653)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oba es ist a, oft wirklich a enge Zusammenarbeit. (I3, 538)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a Sprint Präsentation, do ist idealerweise da Kunde a dabei, oiso bei unserem Projekt ist do a owei da Kunde dabei gewesen. Der kaun daun sogen, jo passt, ist a, ist so umgesetzt worden, wie i mas vorstellt. Es kinan wieder neue Ideen generiert werden, es kaun wieder geschaut werden, wo o ois nächster wichtig im Backlog. (I2, 420-425)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oiso Kundenzufriedenheit ist gestiegen, weil die einfoch merken, es ist a fixes Team für mich zuständig, und i triag unmittelbar a Feedback, triag unmittelbar Antworten. Weil der Mitarbeiter eben vom, im gesamten Prozess a integriert ist und deshalb a vü besser a Antwort geben kann. (I1, 173-177)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahm, u n d i glaub, es ist a für die Leid in die Units, vü gröbere, ahm, Identifikation mitn Kunden und mit die Projekte, weil ma einfoch vü mehr mitgriagt von die Projekte, die bei dir san. Und vorher host einfoch so an Haufen ghobt, dasst zwoa überoi a bisserl was guwusst hod, oba von vü Sochen a vü zu wenig bis goa nichts. Und daun, waunst do daun plötzlich an dem zum Beispiel arbeiten miasen hättest, daun woa des irgendwie gaunz wos Neiches, obwois eh schau immer do woa. Und des is jetzt nimmer so. (I8, 140-147)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahm, ziemliche fixe Projektzuteilung gibt und einfoch die Leid vü tiefer drinnan san und doch sie a bisserl mehr mit dem Kunden identifizieren kinan, weil einfoch immer do die selben Leid, ahm, dafür verantwortlich san. (I5, 743-746)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Und noch dem ma hoid recht vü Kunden a haben und vü verschiedene Technologien a verwenden, woa des vor allem für die Entwickler glaub i a einfoch ned so einfoch, dass do wieder einikumst, in diesen neichen Kunden, den amoi kennen lernst. Und daun die Wochen drauf arbeitst für wen gaunz wen aunderen. (I3, 50-54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support &amp; trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So, the competition is only on the results. (I4, 523)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des jo, oba i würde ned sogen, dass es oag verglichen ist. Dass sogen, die nehmen vü mehr Geld ein wie ihr, wos ist los. Oder so nur, oiso ned auf a böse Ort und Weise. (I3, 728-730)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weil natürlich hod jedes Team die, a Umsatzzziel, und jo Neukunden san sicher super. (I2, 567-568)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am Ende des Toges glaub i, zählen die Zahlen von die zwei Teams. (I2, 708)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oiso rein messen kina mas, dass wir in unseren Projekten, ah, bessere, ahm, Deckungsbeiträge erzielen, weil wir vü vorausschauender agieren und die Mitarbeiter sich selbst vü besser organisieren, des is amoi rein des monetäre. (I1, 168-171)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Es ist transparent. Oiso, wir haben, ah, unser, ah, System heißt BI, oiso Business Intelligence System. Do san ole Daten drinnen von unsere, ahm, Projekte und so weiter, a Umsatzziele pro Monat pro Unit san drinnen. (I1, 270-272)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des hod daun eigentlich gaunz guad geklappt. Ahm, a mit Unterstützung von da Geschäftsführung. (I8, 507-508)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Und daun setzt ma se hoid zaum und schaut, ok, wie kina ma jetzt do, die, die Luft außer nehma, und wie, wie kina ma des gemeinsam machen und wer redt mit wem. Oba so, so, oiso do gibt's kane, ah, autokratischen Entscheidungen, die, die do zum Ziang kuman, sondern eher Gemeinschoft, gemeinsam drauf schauen, wie kaun ma des jetzt lösen, so dass ma unterm Strich jetzt ned des Projekt komplett gegen die Waund foaht. (I6, 641-646)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I glaub, dort wo wer Unterstützung hoben wü, do kaun a zur Geschäftsführung geh und entweder er griagt die Entscheidung, entscheidet es söba. (I6, 699-701) Oder es kumt die Unterstützung. (I6, 703)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des funkiontiert gaunz guad. Oiso i glaub, sunst mehr Input, waun daun hoin ma se den. (I5, 822-823)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I guess always having the management around you to be able to advice you whenever you need the help in a certain decision is something that's really qualitative and also competitive for the employees themselves because they feel that they have the power to decide and they still are able to get the support they need. (I4, 565-569)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So I guess it gives, ah, more enabling for the employee and with then they are more, ah, self-centred and more, ah, confident about their own decisions, which helps in building the next idea or the next, ah, project manager. (I4, 575-578)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daun kaun ma auf olle Fälle zu erna geh. (I2, 625)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trust</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na, ned mehr Freiheiten glaub i. Oba wengal mehr, ahm, Commitment von außen, waun ma wos braucht oder waun ma daun gewisse, ahm, Entscheidungen vielleicht ned söba treffen kaun. Oba a Entscheidung braucht, des vielleicht a Punkt. (I8, 629-632) Waun wos, ahm, ned noch Plan funktioniert oder wauns hoid daun doch irgendwo a Problem gibt oder ma ansteht, dass an daun besser weitergeholfen wird. (I8, 634-636)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo, vor allem a Verbindlichkeit. Oiso eh dieses Commitment einfach, dass i waun jetzt wer wos braucht, dass i dem des daun a in der Form zur Verfügung stöh oder do daun wos konkretisier oder wos a immer gfrogt ist hoid. (I8, 665-668)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundaries for decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dass die Geschäftsführung hoid nu mehr Vertrauen a in uns gewinn. Do immer mehr daun a obgibt, a Entscheidungen. (I7, 350-351)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahm, i glaub ned, dass ma mehr Freiheiten brauchen, weil ma, wir krun, se glaub i sogor nu mehr Freiheiten nehma, ohne dass wer sagt, des geht jetzt oba ned. Oba wir dans eigentlich eh zu dem Ausmoß, wos notwendig ist, und ned darüber hinaus. (I8, 638-641)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo, hin und do hod ma des Gfühl, wauns in ana Ort und Weise brenzlig wird. Oder irgendwo a, a kritischer Punkt erreicht wird, dass daun trotzdem wieder von da Geschäftsführung a Entscheidung troffen wird, wo ma vielleicht jetzt ned so, des moi jetzt ned auf Anhieb versteht, warum des jetzt so gmocht worden ist. Weil ma eigentlich eh wir des a mochen hätten kina und des daun hoid wieder vielleicht a bisserl a Unruhe einbringt. Dass daun hoast, warum ist des jetzt so entschieden worden oder von dem oder. (I8, 649-656)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I glaub, dass weniger a Zeitdruck ist ois wie, wirtschaftliche Aspekte daun kommt, daun kumat mehr die Geschäftsführung ins Spiel natürlich. (I8, 661-662)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oba do ist daun bei mir grod a in meiner Position oft so, ahm, dass des, ah, schau die Geschäftsführung entscheidet und, ahm, do wünschat i ma a nu mehr Autonomie für mein Team. Dass, ah, wir daun a bisserl mehr ob, obgekoppelter san und a bisserl mehr Freiheiten haum, oba i glaub, es entwickelt se grod in die Richtung. (I7, 344-348)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo, zum Beispiel in gewisse Recruiting Entscheidungen oder i hob des gauzne Vertragswesen umgestellt in da „Larut“ seit i do bin. Und des hod relativ laung gedauert und bis ma daun drauf kuma ist, najo eigentlich hätt s i genau so entschieden, wie die Geschäftsführung. Und, oder, im Team hätten ma des genau so entschieden, warum haben mas nud glei söba gmocht. (I7, 360-364) Dass ma do jetzt nochher a nu mehr, ah, Selbstbestimmung und, do wären und Entscheidungen treffen kina. (I7, 368-369)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Najo es gibt, trotzdem immer, (Hustet) immer Dinge, wo ma, (Hustet) wie soi i sogen, oiso i hob ka konkretes Beispiel, oba es gibt, .... die Entscheidung, wenn da Albert oder Stefan sogen, des noch ma oba so, weil, oiso mit Begründung, daun, daun, daun ist des hoid so. (I6, 630-633)

Eigentlich relativ vü Freiheiten. Do san ma, des ist immer nu a andauernder Prozess. Oiso wir san jetzt a nu immer am, am, am, teilweise am Herausfinden, wos eigentlich nu, ahm, von uns zum Entscheiden wäre. (I5, 782-784)

Ahn, die Autonomie ist relativ groß und wir haben do jetzt eigentlich nu a booa Punkte, wo wir glaubt haben, dass des in unserer Entscheidung liegt. Wo daun die Geschäftsführung trotzdem Entscheidungen nu trifft, wo wir daun jetzt a immer nu der Meinung san, dass ma do a wengal schaun muas, dass ma a mit erna, ohwohl se quasi, trotzdem die Chefitätan san, dass ma a se numoi dazua anhoit, das se a noch dem Grundkonzept, des jo ursprünglich erna Gedanke woa, ahm, hoitn. Des hoast, dass Sochen wie Personalentscheidungen aus die Teams kuman und ned von, von die Zwei. (I5, 789-799)

Es muas hoid a, i glaub es muas eben a Soche kuma, die wos trigget und daun sogt ma, deaffen wir des entscheiden und daun wird des wieder in Gang, in Gang gesetzt. (I5, 807-809)

Bei die meisten Sochen, wo's jetzt so woa, woas daun wirklich so, dass ma relativ große Autonomie in die Teams eigentlich do ist. (I5, 811-812)

Wobeis daun eigentlich a oft nu so ist, dass wir quasi glauben, dass wir Entscheidungen treffen kinan, oba einfoch ned genau wissen, ob ma des wieder deaffen. (I5, 815-817)

But those strategic decisions are I would say are most of the time getting to be more on the meta level. (I4, 542-543)

So, you still need that, ah, out of shape of everything. But the inner decisions are really going more to the teams. (I4, 554-555)

Eigentlich passts. Vielleicht am Anfang haben ma a a bisserl so a Guidelines braucht, dass ma wirklich sogen, passt des eigentlich, wos wir grob machen. Weil des hoben ma eigentlich a oft a bisserl ertastet, dass ma sogen, kina ma des so machen, schauen ma mo, es schreit keiner, ok passt. (Lacht) (I3, 826-829)

Und daun miasen se daun numoi a Hakerl drunter setzen. Des ist daun teilweise a bisserl schwierig gewesn, von, von unserer Seite a zum Verstehen. Weil ma gsogt haben, eigentlich haben wir uns gedacht, wir kinan relativ selber entscheiden. (I3, 850-853)

Oder das zumindest einfocher lauft. (I3, 875)

Und wieder irgendwo hin miasen, oiso, da zeitliche Faktor ist glaub i eigentlich des, des Schwierigste. (I3, 883-884)

Do ist mir bis jetzt nu ned ganz klor, wo de Entscheidungsmacht endülig liegt, eher bei die Geschäftsführer. Oiso, man kaun schau vü innerhalb von am Projekt entscheiden, oba, ahm, .... für große Entscheidungen braucht ma dann eh wieder die Geschäftsführung. (I2, 146-150)

Des liegt eher im Team, oiso. Je näher das zur Umsetzung geht, desto weniger ist daun nu die Geschäftsführung involviert. (I2, 622-623)

Personalentscheidungen, finale, werden von da Geschäftsführung daun trotzdem freigeben. Ahm, find i a guad so. (I8, 644-645)

Jo, zum Beispiel in gewisse Recruiting Entscheidungen (I7, 360)

Oba wir kinan ned selbstständig einfoch wen einstellen. Sondern miasen zerst nu von da Geschäftsführung daun a des Go kriegen, ok,
Es ist so, dass Letztentscheidungen bei Personaleinstellungen von der Geschäftsführung abgesegnet werden, und Budgets freigegeben werden von der Geschäftsführung. (I1, 472-475)

Mhh, jo zum Beispiel wünsch ma uns vielleicht a Budget, des wos ma bestimmen knin. Dass ma soge kaun, innerhalb von dem Budgetrahmen, kina ma mochen, wos ma woin. (I7, 735-737)

Oba des ist natürlich a großes Vertrauen, wos uns die Geschäftsführung do entgegenbringa muas. (I7, 746-747)

Und, i griag oba des Jahresbudget und kann aber jetzt ned damit agieren wie i wū, sondern i muas für jedes, wos i ausgib in dem Budget, muas i zum Geschäftsführer geh. (I2, 156-158)

Es ist so, dass Letztentscheidungen bei Personaleinstellungen von der Geschäftsführung abgesegnet werden, und Budgets freigegeben werden von der Geschäftsführung. Des heißt, zum Beispiel des Thema Weiterbildung, ah, do brauchen ma a Budget von der Geschäftsführung, und wann ma des ned kriegen, dann kriegen ma kans. (I1, 472-477)

Ahm, mhh, zum Beispiel diese Ziele, die gesetzt werden, am Anfang des Jahres unternehmensweit, die keman von der Geschäftsführung. Oba a aus ana Diskussion mit ana Runde heraus, wo repräsentativ daun wieder die gauze, des gauze Unternehmen vertreten is, oiso passt des eigentlich a. (I8, 645-649)

Oba zu an gewissen Grad, gibt's hoid anfoch immer nu strategische Themen, die wos hoid die Geschäftsführung glaub i entscheiden muas. (I7, 351-353)

So die Overall Sochen. Ahm, in wöche Richtung woin ma uns weiterentwickeln. Oiso i bin ma ned sicher, ob a des daun 100-prozentig Bottom-Up funktionieren würd. (I7, 355-357)

Oiso die Geschäftsführung gibt uns an strategischen Rahmen vor. Des heißt, die sagt, in welche Richtung entwickelt se die Firma insgesamt, ahm, wos san .... so generelle Stoßrichtungen, die ma, die ma leben. (I1, 470-472)

**Giving strategic direction**

Oiso die Geschäftsführung gibt uns an strategischen Rahmen vor. Des heißt, die sagt, in welche Richtung entwickelt se die Firma insgesamt, ahm, wos san .... so generelle Stoßrichtungen, die ma, die ma leben. (I1, 470-472)

**HR practices**

**Recruiting**

Dass ma schaut, dass die Leid, die dazuaakuman, einföch guad einipassen, ned nur rein fochlich voi guad san, sondern a menschlich guad dazuaapassen. (I8, 565-567)
Oiso, ahm, oiso i moch jo des Recruiting a mit und, ah, do schaut ma natürlich schau moi, ah, von da Persönlichkeit her, Lebenslauf, vos hod der schau gmocht, hod der vielleicht Auslandserfahrung. Wos für Ausbildungen hod a, vos , vos wor sei Werdegang, ah, wie schreibt a. (I7, 93-96)

Ahm, oiso wir suchen noch, jo besonderen Leid, die vos, ah, jo, irgend a Leidenschaft a nochgengan und des vos do herinnen umsetzen kinan. Und jo, do schauen ma schau, daun a beim ersten Kennenlernen oder beim Telefoninterview, ah, klopf ta a bisserl ob, vos motiviert den Menschen, vos, vos mocht der gern, ah, wie glaubt er sòba, dass a ist und, ahm, jo, des merkt ma daun schau eh relativ schnö. (I7, 102-108)

Oba prinzipiell schaut ma immer, dass die Persönlichkeit do sehr matched. Oiso, glaub es gibt immer sehr storken kulturellen Fit, wauns do herinnen passt, laungfristig. (I7, 111-113)


Contracting & administration

Ah, a, a administrativ, oiso es ist, grod in mein Bereich a voi schwierig, weil, ah, es gibt gesetzliche Grundlagen und a an Kollektivvertrag und ah, des ist hoid natürlich guanz vi Regelwerk und des ist ois für sehr konservatives klassisches Unternehmen entworfen. Und wir san ois aundare, oiso, i stoß do regelrecht oft auf irgendwöche, ahm, jo, wirklich Herausforderungen und Hindernisse, weil i des ned woas, wie is umsetzen soid, jo. Ahm, erkläri moi an, an Orbeitsinspektor oder an GPLA Prüfer, vos a HR Lead ist oder vos des mocht und, ahm, jo, vos do deswegen im Orbeitsvertrag aundas drin steht, oder dass der des wieder obgeben kaun und so weiter. Und es wird irgendwie jo die guanz juristische Landschaft wird a jetzt ned leichter im Gegenteil, du griagst nu mehr Auflogen, immer nu mehr. Und des ist natürlich, spricht gegen unser kreatives und innovatives Konzept, dasst hoid frei arbeiten kaunst. (I7, 242-255)

Oiso des spielt sie manchmoi extrem. Und daun ist umso mehr Kreativität, ahm, gfrogt, dass ma do irgendwie a passende Lösung find. (I7, 257-258)

Ohne dass ma zu sehr einengt oder zu sehr strukturiert ist, weil wir haben zwoa a Struktur, oba die ist sehr agil, und ahm, die ist hoid sehr, laufend ändern kina, oba des ist hoid ned imma einfoch, waun ma daun sogt, ok, man hod an Kollektivvertrag, des an die Mindestgehälter. Oder, ahm, man muas do und duat einstufen und des und des Orbeitszeitmodell deafs ned, ned sein. Und, jo des ist wirklich a Herausforderung. Und du host natürlich kane Erfahrungswerte, kaunst schwer Benchmark betreiben, oiso weil, mhh, vos verdient a HR Lead in Firma XY. Oder, ah, hos hod der für Qualifikationen, vos muas der mitnehme. (I7, 260-268)

Onboarding

Ahm, wir haben jetzt a On Boarding, an On Boarding Prozess, ah, definiert, ah, prinzipiell is so, waun wir jetz an neichen Mitarbeiter giragen, dass ma den daun a bisserl obhoin. Oiso des hoast, ah, der kumt, der kumt natürlich schau eine fürs Interview meistens und daun a zum Unterschreiben vom Dienstvertrag und daun mödt ma uns meistens ein, zwei Wochen bevor a aunfaungt, a nu moi bei erm. Gibt erm amoii so an Ausblick, vos erm die erste Woche erwartet, ah, gemeinsam mit HR Lead. Ah, hos a do, ahm, am ersten Tog erleben wird, daun griagt a an Buddy. Ahm, jo, mh, bisserl so Welcome Runde
wird daun gaunga im Unternehmen, es wird erm jeder vorgestellt und erklärt a bisserl, wo wos ist und wie wos funktioniert. Und daun kumt a eh in sein Team und, ah, wird dort im Team daun a bisserl eingeschult. Zusätzlich gibt’s daun a nu, ahm, so nochdem wiavü Leid wir grod einstellen, oiso, wauns jetzt, waun ein oder zwei Personen eingestellt hob eher weniger, oba wenn ma wieder an größeren Schub an Leid einstellen, daun schau ma immer, dass ma des zaumfossen, in so, mhh, Trainings, wie wir des nennen. Oiso dass jeder daun a von den neichen Mitarbeitern Einblicke griagt in andere Fochbereiche. Do gibt’s meistens immer so Academies, wost die einsitzen kunst, wo daun, ahm, des, ah, HR Lead oder eigentlich des fochliche Lead eher, ahm, sein Unit vor, oiso sein, sein Fochbereich vorstellt, und erklärt, wos die so mochen. (I7, 493-512)
Und da Buddy begleiteteten natürlich a, in da ersten Wochen schauen ma moi glei, dass da Mitarbeiter mitn Buddy frühstücken geht und oiso, do gibt’s meistens Gutscheine und do gengans daun am Vormittag irgendwaun frühstücken und lernen se hoid a persönlich kenna, und daun a bisserl so a Einführung, aside von da Organisation. (I7, 519-523)

Incentives

Ahm, naja es gibt immer wieder, oiso, monetär is ned, dass wir jetzt sogen, für a Projekt gibt’s a Prämie von so und so vü Prozent vom Umsatz oder so. Ahm, wos hoid gibt is, dass ma am Team dann amoi, keine Ahnung, a Projektessen oder amoi Fortgehen zoiht oder dass amoi irgend a Besonderheit vielleicht mochen kinan. (I1, 573-578)

Genau. Wobei wos ma da a merken, is so dieses unmittelbare Feedback, Anerkennung, Lob, nämlich wirklich a Begeisterung für des was gmocht haben, ahm, oft mehr zählt, als jetzt irgend a monetäre. (I1, 580-582)

Des heißt, wennst das jetzt am Projektteam gibst, ahm, dann is a so, dass die anderen im Team, damit des Projektteam guad arbeiten kann, zum Beispiel a a Aufgabe mitmachen miasen. Ja, die miasen die ned jetzt a, in dem Moment wo die gerade in einer heißen Projektphase san, den Rücken freischaufeln. Die miasen vielleicht a irgendwelche anderen Tasks übernahme. (I1, 589-594)