

Roadmap Pattern Recognition

Pathway 3

Case 1: Permanent absence (Familiehulp Turnhout – Subregioteam Turnhout)

<p><u>Causal relationship</u> <i>Causal mechanism linking ecological change as discontinuity of organizational routines (cues) within a context of ‘no previous experience with similar cues’ (pathway 1), ‘peer experience with similar cues’ (pathway 2) or ‘experience with similar cues’ (pathway 3), with cognitive discrepancy (situation) that eventually produces cognitive dissonance (unpleasant feeling).</i></p> <p><u>Prior relatively low</u> ●There is no existing research about the cases.</p>		
C a u s e	<p><u>Theorized cause:</u> Ecological change (discontinuity of organizational routines), which is perceived as something unexpected at work, producing a variation change, or disturbance in the environment.</p>	
	<p><u>Observable manifestations:</u> We expect to find fingerprints concerning the disturbance in the routine organizational workflow (environment). Evidence can be found in interviews asking about what routine and non-routine is; the origin of the issue and why employees gave attention to this issue. — Htu¹</p> <p>●Theoretical certainty not formulated (no priors) ●High theoretical uniqueness, as observing this observable manifestation necessarily means that the presence of an ecological change or discontinuity of a workflow routine is taking place (Weick, 2009, 2006, 1995, 1977).</p>	
● <i>observation</i> C1(i)	<p>Account evidence. Interview I team members Familiehulp Subregioteam Turnhout</p> <p><i>Observation on the presence of a disturbance at work that altered the workflow routine. Reasons why team members gave attention to the issue</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu. Given that evidence relates to the presence of discontinuity of organizational routines, the accuracy can be evaluated as relatively high. We can observe the reasons why team members gave attention to this disturbance provoked by the permanent absence of a colleague: the colleague was the only one of the team who always took care of the phone service, and this needs to be functioning permanently. The service cannot be suspended. Therefore, we have a clear evidence of the occurrence of the alteration of the workflow. We can 	<p>24min: Interviewee: “X was the only one of the SRT (cf. team) who always took care of the service phone line. That is something (a task) that has to be replaced constantly, you cannot say we’re not going to do service phone for two days, this has to be taken care of.”</p>

¹ Note: Htu= high theoretical uniqueness; Hu = High uniqueness; Mu = Moderate uniqueness; Lu = Low uniqueness.

	<p>trust this source because it is a team member who speaks out of her/his own experience with the unexpected event. There are no reasons to mention this, if a disturbance of workflow is not happening. Therefore, we can trust this source.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong confirmation of condition 1 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>observation C1(ii)</i> 	<p>Account evidence. Interview I team leader Familiehulp Subregioteam Turnhout <i>Observation on the presence of a disturbance at work that altered the workflow routine. Reasons why the task is vital to the organization of work activities</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu. This piece of evidence tells us something about the importance of the altered work task and the preoccupation with failure. The team leader clearly mentions that the task (permanent phone service) needs to be incorporated in the work schedule, and that solutions need to be implemented to assure this service. We can observe that the team leader also assumes a sense of responsibility/preoccupation with failure from team members, when she/he mentions the need of making working agreements to assure the right functioning of the tasks. We have clear evidence of the occurrence of the alteration of the workflow within a context of preoccupation with failure. We can trust this source because it is the team leader who speaks out of her/his own experience with the unexpected event and because we have both visions about the presence of this condition, one provided by team members and another provided by the team leader. • Strong confirmation of condition 1 	<p>11min: Interviewee: “What they (cf. the team) certainly have to do is make sure that we have a permanent telephone accessibility from 7-17h, so they also make sure, by means of working agreements between them, that this permanence (cf. service phone task) is also agreed upon, that somebody does that. They have chosen in this SRT (cf. team) that this is 1 permanent person (cf. X).”</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition C1</i> 	<p>Because both pieces of evidence are found, we can confirm the presence of the condition ‘ecological change’ as discontinuity of organizational routines. If only C1(i) or C1(ii) is found, we cannot confirm, since we need both pieces to infer that C1 is present, because the observations come from both team leader and team members. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation:</u> strong warranted, given C1(i) and C1(ii) are strong and accurate evidence of the occurrence of an ‘altered workflow’ at the organizations.</p>	

1	<p><u>Building Block:</u> Perception and sense of 'knowing' without knowing 'why'. <u>Theorized part 1:</u> Individual team member perceives 'signs' of possible variation in the organizational routine that are puzzling [This comes from some stratum of awareness just below the conscious level].</p>	
<p><u>Fingerprints:</u> We expect to find fingerprints about the perceived signs of the disturbances at work. Evidence can be found in the interviews asking the employees if they saw it coming.</p>		
<p>●<i>observation</i> P1(i)</p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team leader Familiehulp Turnhout Subregioteam</p> <p><i>Observation on perceived signs of disturbance</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu. This piece of evidence is quite unique, because it clearly reflects the perceived issue and the context within which the perception happens: 'team members felt it [the problem] coming', because team members had already experienced similar problems with the colleague in the past. Therefore, because their experience, team members were able to perceive the issue faster. We can also trust this source, since the observation comes from the team leader who observed the situation and who speaks out of her/his own experience with the disturbance. ● Strong confirmation of proposition 1 	<p>23min: Interviewer asks: "When did it become clear that, for the service phone line, X was not coming back?" Interviewee: "I think that they (cf. the team), because of their informal contact, felt it coming. They knew the problems they knew what troubled her (cf. X) (...) I think they got it faster than I did."</p>
<p>●<i>observation</i> P1(ii)</p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team members Familiehulp Turnhout Subregioteam</p> <p><i>Observation on perceived signs of disturbance</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu. This piece of evidence tells us something about the perceived disturbance. Team members clearly reflect about the fact that the permanent absence of their colleague was not announced and therefore, this makes it 'unexpected' and then 'perceived' because they know that 'things had not been going well for a while'. We can trust this source, because the observation comes from the team members who experienced the issue and some symptoms thereof for a while before it became a disturbance. ● Strong confirmation of proposition 1 	<p>25min: Interviewee 1: "It wasn't announced like 'from that time I'm going to stay home' or anything (...) It wasn't like a planned operation or anything." Interviewee 2: "It had a difficult reason. Things hadn't been going well for a while already (for X)."</p>
<p>●<i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 1</i></p>	<p>Because both pieces of evidence are found, we can confirm the presence of the proposition 1. If only P1(i) or P1(ii) is found, we cannot confirm, however, since both pieces are found, we might infer that P1 is present. This is because or observations come from both of team members and team leader. Sources are relatively independent.</p>	

		<u>Overall confirmation</u> strong warranted, given P1(i) and P1 (ii) are strong and accurate evidence of ‘perceived disturbances at work’ from team leader and team members.
2	<p><u>Building Block:</u> Associative intuition.</p> <p><u>Theorized part 2:</u> Because of his/her experience and expertise, individual team member recognizes in the 'signs' some kind of deviation in the workflow that indicates its similarities to one previously encountered. But no conclusions can be drawn, it's better if someone listens.</p> <p><u>Fingerprints:</u> We expect to find fingerprints about the discrepancy between the normal workflow and the altered workflow when the disturbance is recognized. Evidence can be found in the interviews by asking employees how they reacted to the disturbance and what it would mean for their normal workflow. Also, we expect to find information on similarities to previous experiences.</p>	
	<p>●<i>observation P2(i)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team members Familiehulp Turnhout Subregioteam <i>Observation on discrepancy between normal workflow and consequence of disturbance</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mu. This piece of evidence tells us something about the acknowledgement of work deviations. Team members mention that taking on extra tasks would mean an altered workflow and bad consequences for them due to the lack of time to do the tasks of others. However, this piece tells us nothing related to similarities to previous experiences with the same issue. Even if we can make some kind of updating of our confidence here, we cannot trust the source because there must be some other alternative empirical explanations for the existence of this piece of evidence beyond the theorized part 2 of this mechanism. • Modest confirmation of proposition 2 but updating possible.
	<p>●<i>observation P2(ii)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview I team members Familiehulp Turnhout Subregioteam <i>Observation on discrepancy between normal workflow and consequence of disturbance</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mu. Even if this piece of evidence tells us something about the acknowledgement of work deviations, it is not enough to confirm that team members recognized signs of deviation in the workflow. We, therefore, cannot trust the source because it is the interpretation of the whole piece of evidence, but we do not have the exact record
		<p>1u06: Interviewee: “Everyone is short on time (...) we try to solve it ourselves.”</p> <p>This observation shows that the team members don't have spare time to take over other shifts, so it's a stretch for them to take over the shifts from their colleague. Taking up extra tasks means a disturbed workflow for them.</p>
		<p>Evidence as a whole. The absence of the colleague was unannounced in the sense that it was not planned, and the team was not prepared to manage the absence and to take over the work activities. Before the team members often had to (acutely) take over the phone service. This caused work pressure and some frustration for the other team members.</p>

		<p>of this. However, we can make some kind of update of our confidence here.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modest confirmation of proposition 2 but updating possible. 	
	<p>● <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 2a</i></p>	<p>Both pieces of evidence are found, but with modest confirmation. Therefore, we can confirm the presence of proposition 2 in a moderate way, although we can update our confidence in the presence of the P2 due to the absence of priors. Sources are relatively independent.</p> <p><u>Overall confirmation</u> moderately warranted, given P2(i) and P2(ii) are modest and not fully accurate evidence of ‘acknowledgements of work deviations.’</p>	
3		<p><u>Building block:</u> Past experiences matching.</p> <p><u>Theorized part 3:</u> Individual team member selects OR modifies actions that proved to be effective in that situation in the past such as skipping levels and seeking information directly from key sources.</p> <p><u>Fingerprints:</u> We expect to find fingerprints about how the team member decides the disturbance cannot be resolved through existing work routines and actions the team carries out. Evidence can be found by asking the employees why the current work routine could not suffice to handle the disturbance. Evidence can be found by asking the team members to give an example of work situations where the disturbance could become a problem that they cannot handle using existing work routines.</p>	
	<p>● <i>observation P3(i)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team members Familiehulp Subregioteam Turnhout</p> <p><i>Observation on information from key sources (cf. the team members themselves)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mu. This piece of evidence says something about how current work routines are failing. The current routine does not suffice to handle the disturbance, hence the negative consequences of information loss. The disturbance could thus become a problem they cannot handle using the existing routines. • Modest confirmation of proposition 2 but updating possible. 	<p>1u18: Interviewee: “If you have to put that in a notification, then you’ll have 50 notifications for your colleague, who won’t be able to remember all of this.”</p> <p>The interviewee is saying that when the shift of the service phone is split up in half days, information gets lost because of the many things that have to be rescheduled or clients that call with notifications and so on. The half days are the current work routine, but these clearly do not suffice to handle the disturbance, because of the negative consequences (information loss because of the overload of notifications).</p>
	<p>● <i>observation P3(ii)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team members Familiehulp Subregioteam Turnhout</p> <p><i>Observation on information from key sources (cf. the team members themselves)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu. This piece of evidence tells us something about the way team members make choices to resolve the existing disturbance, other than the typical routines actions. We can observe that team members are concerned with the possibility of causing problems for other team members - something that they want to avoid. They want to make 	<p>1u18: “Then you can say I’m going to deal with that in the afternoon, whereas otherwise (cf. when you only have a half day shift at the service phone) you are somewhat stressed like ‘I want to solve this already, because I don’t want to bother my colleague with this’.”</p> <p>Team member says that replacing half a shift is less efficient, because of the extra stress and the information loss. She has this information out of her own experience.</p>

		<p>the most efficient choice in order to avoid extra stress and loss of information. We can, therefore, trust in the source because it is clear how team members are modifying actions and searching information from key sources (the team members themselves) to confirm the existence of the problem as it is being perceived.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High confirmation of proposition 3. 	
	<p>● <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 3</i></p>	<p>Both pieces of evidence are found, we can confirm the presence of the proposition 3. If only P3(i) is found, we cannot confirm, whereas if P3(ii) is found, we might infer that P3 is present, because the piece of evidence confirms the presence of the proposition. Sources are relatively independent.</p> <p><u>Overall confirmation</u> moderately warranted, given P3(i): is modest evidence of ‘information from key sources’ and P3(ii) is accurate evidence of thereof .</p>	
4	<p><u>Building block:</u> Cognitive versatility.</p> <p><u>Theorized part 4:</u> Using this knowledge from key sources, individual team members identify the cue they face and brackets the cue that matched with the framework according to the organizational flow of experience referred by peers.</p> <p><u>Fingerprints:</u> We expect to find fingerprints about the link between the real work situation and the disturbance the team member thinks is going to happen where normal work routines are not sufficient. Evidence can be found by asking the team members how this link would fit into their team structure and activities.</p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team members Familiehulp Subregioteam Turnhout</p> <p><i>Observation on the link between the real- life work situations and the disturbance</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu. This piece of evidence is unique. Team members clearly identify the cue: “transferring your work to someone else, it’s more annoying”, emphasizing the difficulties they addressed when the work is divided in half parts. The cue bracketed here are the difficulties addressed by team members in dealing with the absent colleague tasks within their own routines that may be altered. We can trust this source, since there is no reason to mention this if the observation would not be true. In addition, there is no alternative empirical explanation for the existence of this observation other than the link between the real work situation and the disturbance that team member thinks is going to happen when normal work routines are not sufficient. 	<p>1u18: Interviewee 1: “It’s easier when you can work with that (cf. service phone task) for a whole day, because if you have to transfer your work to someone else, it’s more annoying (...) It feels different when you can sit there a whole day.”</p>

<p>● <i>observation P4(ii)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● High confirmation of proposition 4. <p>Account evidence. Interview I team leader Familiehulp Subregioteam Turnhout <i>Observation on the link between the real- life work situations and the disturbance</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu. This piece of evidence is quite unique. Team leader mentions how important it was for team members having a fixed person do the tasks of the absent one, because the information is better managed. There is a loss of information (as a whole and in details) when different colleagues do the absent colleague’s job every day, and this finally becomes the real cue: “transferring the work to someone else”. Here, the cues bracketed are the difficulties addressed by team members in dealing with the tasks of the absent colleague within their own routines that may be altered because of that. We can trust this source, since there is no reason for the team leader to mention these facts, if the observation would not be true. There are no alternative empirical explanations for the existence of this observation other than the link between the real work situation and the disturbance that the team member thinks is going to happen when normal work routines are not sufficient. Important to say is that observations from team members and team leader reinforced each other here. ● High confirmation of proposition 4. 	<p>29min: Interviewee: “The team had chosen a different person every day to do the service phone line, but they have grown to a fixed person (cf. X). They felt something is lost in the transfer from one day to the next. You can't write down all the details of what's going on and make sure your colleague has heard and seen it all.”</p> <p>This observation shows why it’s important to have a fixed person at the service phone, otherwise there’s information loss.</p>
<p>● <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 4</i></p>	<p>Both pieces of evidence are found, we can confirm the presence of the proposition 4. If only P4(i) or P4(ii) is found, we cannot confirm, since we need both pieces to infer that P4 is present, because they reinforce each other for the presence of the proposition. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation</u> strong warranted, given P4(i) and P4(ii) are strong evidence of the existence of a ‘link between the real- life work situations and the disturbance at work’.</p>	
<p>5</p>	<p><u>Building block:</u> Cognitive versatility. <u>Theorized part 5:</u> As consequence, cues are extracted by individual team member and incorporated in his/her mental models.</p> <p><u>Fingerprints:</u> We expect to find fingerprints about how the team member puts this link (between real life work situations and a possible disturbance and how the work routines don't suffice to solve it) into their head (experience). Evidence can be found by asking team members how they try to become better at noticing signs/possible disturbance.</p>	

	<p>●<i>observation P5(i)</i></p> <p>Account evidence. Interview II team members Familiehulp Subregioteam Turnhout</p> <p><i>Observation on the extracted cue</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu. This piece of information tells us something about how team members have put the link between the negative consequences of planning half days in their head, linked to the situation of the permanent absence of the person taking care of the service phone. They mention that planning full days is the preference, but this is not always feasible. Team members have clearly made a preferred work routine which is incorporated in their mental models. Therefore we can trust this source and what is meant. ● Strong confirmation proposition 5 	<p>41min: Interviewer: "...the other team members divided 3 days with the agreement or with the regulation that it could only be full days and not half days?" Interviewee 1: "That is not always feasible in practice." Interviewer: "It was the preference (to plan full days)?" Interviewee 2: "Yes." Interviewee 1: "It's not convenient, but it's not always feasible". Another interviewee confirms.</p> <p>This part of the interview shows that the team members have put the link between the negative consequences of planning half days in their head, linked to the situation of X.</p>
	<p>●<i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 5</i></p> <p>The piece of evidence is found, we can confirm the presence of the proposition 5. With only P5(i) found, we can confirm, since this is quite unique, and we can trust it. Sources are relatively independent.</p> <p><u>Overall confirmation</u> strong warranted, given P5 is accurate evidence of the existence of a 'extracted cue and its incorporation in the mental models'.</p>	
<p>O</p> <p>u</p> <p>t</p> <p>c</p> <p>o</p> <p>m</p> <p>e</p>	<p><u>Theorized outcome:</u> The cognitive discrepancy (situation) caused by the extracted cue that altered the work-flow routines, produces cognitive dissonance (unpleasant feeling) in the team member because of the 'violated expectations' between the 'planned work routine' and the actual situation'.</p>	
	<p><u>Observable manifestations:</u> We expect to find fingerprints concerning the disturbance that causes team members an unpleasant feeling. Something that causes a discrepancy between the planned work routine and the actual situation. Evidence can be found by asking team members what the event is that causes their unpleasant feeling and how they noticed this (what is the cue).</p>	
	<p>●<i>observation O1(i)</i></p> <p>Account evidence. Interview II team members Familiehulp Subregioteam Turnhout</p> <p><i>Observation on signs of disturbance</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu. This piece of evidence tells us something about the presence of discrepancy as a situation that produces an unpleasant feeling. Team member mentions that she and her peers feel that their colleague X is not coming back any time soon, what causes them to have to take over shifts for a long time, which cause them an unpleasant feeling, a dissonance. From the past they know shifts are best divided per day and not per half day (this would be an acute solution, for a short absence). So, this gives them an unpleasant feeling (more work). The source 	<p>47min: When interviewer asks when the team knew their colleague X was going to be absent permanently the interviewee says: "She didn't communicate it like that herself, but I think we knew that it was going to be something long term (...) I think in October we had the feeling 'hmm she's not going to be back soon' (...) You feel what's happening and if it all stays vague and unclear then you know she's not going to be back here the next weeks."</p>

	comes from team members and we can trust this source, since there is no reason for them to mention these facts, if the observation would not be true. Furthermore, there is no alternative empirical explanation for the existence of this observation other than the discrepancy itself caused by the extracted cue.
<p>● Strong confirmation of outcome.</p> <p>● <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition O2</i></p>	<p>In general, with this piece of evidence found, we can confirm the presence of the outcome.</p> <p>If O1(i) is found, we can confirm the presence of the outcome. Observation (i) is relevant in terms of uniqueness and trust, and information of what we can interpret.</p> <p>Sources are relatively independent.</p> <p><u>Overall confirmation</u> strong warranted, given O1(i) is strong evidence of the existence of a discrepancy produced by the extracted cue and it is accurate because we can trust the source.</p>

Roadmap Cognitive Dissonance

Case 1: Permanent absence (Familiehulp Turnhout – Subregioteam Turnhout)

	<p><u>Causal relationship</u> <i>Causal mechanism linking motivational force as sense of urgency within a context of high magnitude of dissonance, with the success of complex team problem-solving.</i></p> <p><u>Prior relatively low</u> ● There is no existing research about the cases.</p>
C	<u>Theorized cause:</u> Due to the dissonance caused by 'unexpected events' [violation of expectations] at work, individual team member feels pressure to reduce it because he/she is aware that unresolved dissonance could interfere with (1) his/her effective job performance' and group performance, and (2) because it is psychologically unpleasant.
a	
u	
s	<u>Observable manifestations:</u> Expect to find evidence in the empirical record of employees' (who work in Flemish companies; individual team members, team leader, team members) activities relating to 'feelings of frustration' or violated expectations about the work-flow routines planning, along with activities relating to the 'preoccupation with the failure' of the consequences of this dissonance in the own performance, group performance and the emotional state. Evidence for this can be found by asking employees about their feelings and thoughts when an unexpected event has modified the planned work routines. This could be measured using account evidence (from interviews with involved actors).
e	<p>— Htu²</p> <p>● Theoretical certainty not formulated (no priors)</p> <p>● High theoretical uniqueness, as observing this observable manifestation necessarily means the presence of a <i>cognitive dissonance arousal</i> (Festinger, 1957).</p>

² Note: Htu= high theoretical uniqueness; Hu = High uniqueness; Mu = Moderate uniqueness; Lu = Low uniqueness.

<p>● <i>observation C1(i)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview I team members Familiehulp Subregioteam Turnhout <i>Observation on feelings of frustration</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Mu. Despite modest information given about the ‘feelings’ of team members with the new situation of ‘we have to do all that work’, we can trust this source because it’s the team member who speaks out of her own experience with the problem. She also literally says: “X is sick”, so we know for sure there is no alternative explanation. Also, the interviewee talks about the ‘initial reaction’ of the team to the problem, so we know this is the cause of the feelings of frustration. ● Modest confirmation of condition 1 but updating possible. 	<p>53min: The interviewee says: ““Oh no X is sick, oh no do we have to do all that extra work’ is the initial reaction. (...) In the beginning it’s ‘aah’ for a bit. Certainly, when you can’t prepare yourself, if it happens acutely.” The way the team member express herself denotes certain panic within the team in the beginning (‘oh no’ and ‘aah’).</p>
<p>● <i>observation C1(ii)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team members Familiehulp Subregioteam Turnhout <i>Observation on violated expectations about work-flow routines</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu. Given that evidence relates to violated expectations about work flow routines, and uncomfortable consequences for the performances, the accuracy can be evaluated as relatively high. Furthermore, we are told that these perceptions reflect a broader pattern between employees, mainly within the context of high magnitude of dissonance, because the team member talks in a “we-us” way. We can trust this source because it is a team member who speaks out of her own experience with unexpected absences. The interviewer asks for confirmation of the feeling of restlessness and both interviewees confirm firmly. They are both team members who are in the field every day. ● Strong confirmation of condition 1 	<p>1u20: The interviewee (team member) explains how an unexpected absence can throw the planning upside down and how that makes her and other team members feel: “You never have certainty that it works out how you think it will and for some (team members) it gives them a lot of restlessness.” Interviewer asks: “Yes?”. Interviewee confirms: “Yes”. Other interviewee (also team member) confirms as well: “Yes, I think so.” (...) Interviewee explains further: “When I leave for work in the morning, I have a planning in my head (...) if someone falls sick, you have to change the planning and sometimes this doesn’t fit, but you have no other choice and you will have to choose, you have to let go of some of your own tasks and that causes us restlessness sometimes”.</p>
<p>● <i>Aggregation of evidence for observable manifestations C1</i></p>	<p>Because both pieces of evidence are found, we can confirm the presence of the condition ‘motivational force as sense of urgency’. If only C(i) is found, we cannot confirm, whereas if C1(ii) is found, we might infer that C1 is present. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation</u> moderately warranted, given C1(i): is modest evidence of ‘frustration’ and C1(ii) is accurate evidence of the presence of violated expectation among employees. In addition, C1(ii) is clearer in terms of motivational force to reduce dissonance.</p>	
<p>1</p>	<p><u>Theorized part:</u> Individual team member seeks out information about the sources of this ‘cognitive discrepancy’ (the salient cues not prevented by the current mental models) by collecting material with the expectation to achieve consonant cognition with the existing cognitive elements.</p>	

<p><u>Fingerprints</u>: Expect to find evidence in the empirical record of employees where team members are engaging in activities related to searching information about the cue noticed in order to reduce the unpleasant feeling/frustration and go back to the work routine. Evidence for this can be found by asking employees what they do first when an unexpected event at work is already noticed, how they feel and what they expect to happen to be able to go back to their work routines. This could be measured using account evidence (from interviews with involved actors).</p> <p>— Hu</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Theoretical certainty not formulated (no priors) ● Relatively high theoretical uniqueness. Highly unlikely to find this fingerprint without the mechanism of ‘cognitive dissonance reduction’ being operative because dissonance is unpleasant when the magnitude thereof is high, therefore ‘trying to’ reduce such unpleasant feelings is a key part of the process of cognitive reduction theory. 		
<p>● <i>observation</i> <i>PI(i)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview I regional director (team leader) Familiehulp Turnhout <i>Observation on what team expects to happen</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu. The evidence is empirically unique, because we can trust the source (credible and competent team leader), and because the team leader, in general, knows the team members’ performances. In addition, to find that the team takes care of operational issues, is related to the way in which they may behave when facing unexpected events at work. ● Strong confirmation of proposition 1 	<p>29min: The interviewee says: “This kind of problem is not handled on a star role meeting, the team itself takes care of these more operational issues.” (<i>Note: this is a higher-level meeting with management</i>).</p>
<p>● <i>observation</i> <i>PI(ii)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview I regional director (team leader) Familiehulp Turnhout <i>Observation on violated expectations about work-flow routines (team has to handle these issues themselves)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu. The evidence is empirically unique. There are no reasons to say that one leaves the issues to be solved to the team, if one does not know the team’s potential capacity to deal with it. The team leader knows the team and its role, so we trust the source and its content. Finding this piece of evidence that the team has to handle issues themselves is difficult to account for with empirical alternative explanations, other than the team has a certain autonomy and organization is non-hierarchical. ● Strong confirmation of proposition 1 	<p>1u08: Interviewee says: “When the message came that X would be permanently absent, I waited and left it to the team.”</p>
<p>● <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 1</i></p>	<p>Both pieces of evidence are found, we can confirm the presence of the proposition 1. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation</u> strong warranted, given proposition 1 is strong evidence of ‘activities related to information-searching for reducing dissonance when the magnitude thereof is high.</p>	

2	<p><u>Theorized part:</u> Individual team member identifies some dissonant-increasing new information : 'actual signs of trouble that deserve closer attention'.</p> <p><u>Fingerprints:</u> We expect to find fingerprints concerning the increase of preoccupation with failure and activities that can reflect that the noticed issue is actual and important for the team member. These activities are related to the non-stop searching for sources that can reduce the increased dissonance when the magnitude thereof is high. Evidence can be found by asking the participants what they do when searching and finding information of cues that does not match with their work flow routine. We expect to see that the team member does not stop searching for consonance. However, if the magnitude of the dissonance is not increased even if the team members figure out information that the actual cue could deserve some attention, the process of cognitive dissonance reduction could end. Evidence can be found by asking to the participants whether they go back to work routines when an event is considered as abnormal in the work flow production process and why.</p> <p>— Htu</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Theoretical certainty not formulated (no priors) •Relatively high theoretical uniqueness for (1) non-stop search of information, because we consider it would be difficult to otherwise explain why team members engage in iterative voluntary search of information after noticing a cue – if it is not for reducing the dissonance. •Relatively high theoretical uniqueness for (2) stop of searching information, which is highly unlikely find this piece of the activity if team members are still experiencing cognitive dissonance. Process stops when dissonance is reduced because of the low magnitude and then the mechanism is not operative anymore. 	
• <i>observation</i> P2(i)	<p>Interview I team members Familiehulp Subregioteam Turnhout <i>Observation on what team expects to happen</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mu. Modest information is given about what team members expect to happen within the new situation where signs of trouble (cue) were taken seriously. Team members talk about the absence, because the interviewer specifically asks about it. So, there is no alternative explanation. Team members reply confidently that all team members know what to expect (because they have had to replace shifts in the past etc.). The interviewees were there to see and hear reactions of their colleagues, so they have first line information about this. • Modest confirmation of proposition 2 	<p>35min: Interviewer asks: “When the topic (absence of X) is talked about, it was recognizable for everyone?”. Interviewee (very firmly): “Yes yes yes yes, no one is surprised saying ‘oh do we have to replace the shifts?’” Interviewer: “Okay, so it was pretty clear.”. Interviewee: “Yes yes.”</p>
• <i>observation</i> P2(ii)	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team members Familiehulp Subregioteam Turnhout <i>Observation on preoccupation for the failure, search for information related to cues that does not match with work-flow routine. Team members don't go back to routine: cue is taken seriously.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu. The observation as a whole tells us something about the preoccupation with the altered routine and disturbances that the consequences of their colleague's sickness is 	<p>1u20: The interviewees say: “You count on it that it's been planned, and you plan your own work with that in mind. Then someone falls sick and there has to be someone at the service phone line, you can't say we're not going to send anyone (...) That's always considering and compromising. You don't have that structure.”</p>

	<p>causing. The cue is being taken seriously. They recognize that routine has changed. The interviewee is a team member who speaks out of her own experience with replacing shifts, so we can trust this source. They are talking about the specific problem of the absence of X (because it's about her job function: service phone line), so there is no alternative explanation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong confirmation of proposition 2 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 2</i> 	<p>Because both pieces of evidence are found, we can confirm the presence of the proposition 2. If only p2(i) is found, we cannot confirm, whereas if p2(ii) is found, we might infer that p2 is present. Sources are relatively independent.</p> <p><u>Overall confirmation</u> moderately warranted, given p2(i): is modest evidence of 'what teams expect to happen' and p2(ii) is accurate evidence of the presence of preoccupation for the failure, search for information related to cues and cues taken seriously. In addition, p2(ii) is more relevant in terms of having the content as a whole.</p>	
3	<p><u>Theorized part:</u> Due to this increase of dissonance, individual team members search for social support - by communicating the perceived signs of trouble to other peers - in order to know what to do.</p> <p><u>Fingerprints:</u> Expect to find - in the empirical record - teams members' activities relating to searching some kind of support via communication about what to do, along with activities relating to understanding the problem that the perceived cue is generating and what to do to solve it. Evidence for this part can be found by asking employees (account evidence) whether the team members meet each other (formal/informal) to communicate their concern and which other persons are involved.</p> <p>— Htu</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Theoretical certainty not formulated (no priors) • Relatively high theoretical uniqueness. Highly unlikely to find this fingerprint without the mechanism of 'cognitive dissonance reduction' being operative, because the search of support about 'what to do' with the cue noticed, implies a social acknowledgment of the alteration of the work flows and a search for solutions within a dissonant cognitive environment. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>observation P3(i)</i> 	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team members Familiehulp Subregioteam Turnhout</p> <p><i>Observation on team members communicating</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu. The observation clearly tells us something about the existence of communication among peers and information related to what to do with the problem. The team needs every team member to be involved in the solution, because it's about replacing someone, so it's not possible to solve this without communicating/discussing. We can trust the source because we do not see other reasons why team members could affirm being engaged in discussions and concerns about how to solve the problem, if it is not 	<p>49min: Interviewee says: "That is something we discussed in the team: how do you handle this as a team and how will this problem get solved?"</p>

	<p>because they feel dissonance and they search for building a common support to act as a team. It's clear they need each other's views on the problem to solve it, the individual team member cannot solve the problem alone. Also, we can trust this source, because the interviewer specifically asks if it was discussed in the team and the interviewee responds firmly, not hesitant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong confirmation of proposition 3 	
<p>● <i>observation P3(ii)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence . Interview II team members Familiehulp Subregioteam Turnhout <i>Observation on involvement team members</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu. The observation as a whole clearly tells us something about the existence of team members' engagement in the problem. The fact that the team member thinks it's important to choose a moment where everyone can be there to discuss the problem, shows they are involved. We can trust the source because we do not see other reasons why team members could get involved in a work arrangement caused by a cue, if it is not because they want to know what to do to solve it. The question from the interviewer gets a firm answer from the interviewee. Both interviewees state that it's necessary to know everyone's take on the problem to be able to solve it. So, we can assume they remember correctly. • Strong confirmation of proposition 3 	<p>7min: Interviewer: "Is the whole team involved to arrange it (intention to solve the cue)?" Interviewee: "Yes. Otherwise you choose a moment where everyone can be there, you need everyone to see where you can put someone and when." Another interviewee: "Yes" (confirms).</p>
<p>● <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 3</i></p>	<p>Both pieces of evidence are found out and both has strong confirmation. We can, therefore, confirm the presence of the proposition 3. If only p3(i) or p3(ii) is found, we cannot confirm the evidence because we need both observations to infer that p3 is present. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation</u> strong warranted, given p3(i) and p3(ii) are strong evidence of 'team communication' and 'team involvement'. Both are accurate evidence of the presence of searching social support via communication about 'what to do' and 'formal/informal talks' to communicate their concerns regarding the cues.</p>	
<p>4</p>	<p><u>Theorized part:</u> Team members listen to each other about their concern and agree that, even if a long-term solution is imperative for this cue, some urgent measures need to be implemented, because the cue has escalated.</p>	

<p><u>Fingerprints</u>: Expect to find fingerprints concerning the severity of the problem, stating this is something the team cannot ignore, but action needs to be taken immediately in order to solve the problem correctly. To make sure the tasks can be executed. Evidence can be found in work agreements that can be made to solve this problem at least temporarily, until a more permanent solution can be made.</p> <p>— Htu</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Theoretical certainty not formulated (no priors) ● Relatively high theoretical uniqueness. If the mechanism does not exist, the expected probability of finding work agreements that can be made to resolve an urgent problem causing dissonance is low. 		
<p>● <i>observation</i> P4(i)</p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview I team members Familiehulp Subregioteam Turnhout <i>Observation on work agreements</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Lu. There can be other reasons to ‘put on the agenda’ a subject, for instance, because it is part of a weekly work routine and not necessarily something ‘specially’ related with team’s concern and agreement about long-term solution for the escalated cue. The reason to put it on the agenda is that they got the message X was going to be absent for a longer period, so the problem becomes more severe. ● Weak confirmation of proposition 4 	<p>41min: “We knew it (cf. X was going to be absent for a longer period; shows the severity of the problem) on Thursday and then we put in on the agenda for Tuesday (cf. lunch meeting every Tuesday).”</p>
<p>● <i>observation</i> P4(ii)</p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview I team members Familiehulp Subregioteam Turnhout <i>Observation on work agreements</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu. The observation as a whole tells us something about the work agreements in terms of planning shifts. What the team does on their meeting, is they go over every shift that has to be taken over by someone else and they just ask out loud who can take over the shift. They do this to be able to take care of the acute problem of the absence (the first two weeks). The cue is not being ignored, and some actions are being taken by the team in order to keep the work flow going. ● Strong confirmation of proposition 4 	<p>41min: The interviewee says: “The first two weeks, then we look at it ‘ok Monday morning, who can take the shift?’ (...) And that’s then every half day there’s someone else.”</p>
<p>● <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 4</i></p>	<p>If only p4(i) is found, we cannot confirm proposition 4, whereas if p4(ii) is found, we might infer that p4 is present, because it is a supporting observation. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation</u> moderately warranted, given p4(i): is a weak evidence of ‘work agreements’ and p4(ii) is accurate evidence of the presence of work agreement, efforts to deal with the problem and cues that are not being ignored.</p>	

5	<p><u>Theorized part:</u> Due to this escalation, some kind of common awareness is established within team about the possible slippage of the cues if they are not managed on time and the bad consequences for the team performance. Thus, using this argument, team members craft some kind of solution they can provide individually from their autonomy [e.g. re-planning].</p>		
	<p><u>Fingerprints:</u> Expect to see evidence of activities carried out by the team members in getting some kind of alignment and managing the escalated problem-solving process at work from their autonomy. This can involve agenda management (planning), attempting to ensure that the issue can be controlled to ensuring avoid workload situations and slippage. Finding in interviews (account evidence) that team members established some kind of common awareness about the problem and a search for some kind of solution (for example by re-planning agenda, etc.) would be strong confirming evidence.</p> <p>— Htu</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Theoretical certainty not formulated (no priors) • Relatively high theoretical uniqueness, because we consider it would be difficult to otherwise explain why team members engage in iterative voluntary search of information after noticing a cue – if it is not for reducing the dissonance. 		
	<p>• <i>observation P5(i)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence, Interview I team members Familiehulp Subregioteam Turnhout</p> <p><i>Observation on common awareness</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu. The evidence is empirically unique. There are no reasons to say that one feels addressed and has a great sense of responsibility, if one is not concerned to deal with the issue. When talking about this issue, team member states that everyone contributes to the solution and no one ignores the need for such a solution, so there is a common awareness. Another team member also confirms this. Therefore, we can trust the source, because they confirm each other, and they are talking about the absence of X because the interviewer specifically asked about this issue. • Strong confirmation of proposition 5 	<p>53min: Team member says: “Everyone feels addressed, everyone has a great sense of responsibility. (...) There is no team member that says: ‘sure whatever, they should solve it themselves’.”</p>
<p>• <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 5</i></p>	<p><u>Overall confirmation</u> strong warranted, given p5 is strong evidence of ‘common awareness’ about the escalation of the problem (the permanent absence of a colleague) and the sense of responsibility with it at work. Sources are also relatively independent.</p>		
6	<p><u>Theorized part:</u> As they are searching for solutions, team members debate that such solutions are not sustainable in the long-term, producing a uniform within-team reaction that some actions need to be taken and approved by the team leader because of her/his expertise and experience.</p>		
	<p><u>Fingerprints:</u> Expect to see evidence of discussions and concerns in the team about the long-term character of the problem. Evidence can be found in the interviews (account evidence) by asking what a long-term solution for this problem would be, and to what point the team members can decide/solve this problem on their own.</p>		
	<p>• <i>observation P6(i)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview I team members Familiehulp Subregioteam Turnhout</p> <p><i>Observation on concerns about long-term character</i></p>	<p>38min: Interviewee says: “Y (colleague) has been knocking on the table a couple of times anyway saying: ‘no we'll stop arranging now, we're outnumbered.’ That's important too.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu. The observation clearly tells us something about the existence of the concern about the long-term character of the absence. The fact that one of the two interviewees talks about the frustrations of other team member (not present in the interview) shows that there were concerns in the team about the problem with the permanent absence of colleague. It is clearly about a long-term planning change, because they explain the team member who showed concerns did not want to plan further ahead than 1-2 weeks. The concerns were about the fact that the same people always had to replace the absent colleague. We can trust the source because it is a direct colleague of the team member who tells this story with clarity - as if she remembers exactly what happened. • Strong confirmation proposition 6 	<p>(...) We are in our team with 10 people, but sometimes we are only here with 5. Since we are all quite busy, sometimes someone dares to knock on the table saying 'no we're only looking at 1-2 weeks now' and then look at it with everyone (for the long-term planning), so it's not always the same ones who have to take over the shift."</p>
<p>● <i>observation P6(ii)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview I regional director (team leader) Familiehulp Turnhout <i>Observation on the need for a long-term solution</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu. The system of 'stand-by' means that there is a team member responsible for replacing shifts of an absent colleague. Every week this is someone else. For the situation with X, the team explains they need other solutions. They make this conclusion based on the fact that the absence of X is long-term and not just a week. The team members explain that the stand-by system only works for acute situations, but that this problem has become a structural one. Therefore, based on this, we can trust the source because they talk about the specific issue of the absence of X and they explain how their normal work-flow (out of their own experience) does not suffice for this kind of issue, making this observation quite unique. • Strong confirmation proposition 6 	<p>lu13: Interviewee says: "The system of 'stand-by' works very good for acute, short situations, but situations like the one with X need other solutions."</p>
<p>● <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 6</i></p>	<p>Both pieces of evidence are found out and both has strong confirmation. We can, therefore, confirm the presence of the proposition 6. If only p6(i) or p6(ii) is found, we cannot confirm the evidence because we need both observations to infer that p6 is present. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation</u> strong warranted, given p6(i) and p6(ii) are strong evidence of team discussions and concerns about the long-term character of the problem. Both pieces of observations are accurate evidence of the presence of concerns of long-term character and the need for a long-term solution.</p>	

7	<p><u>Theorized part:</u> Team members decide to communicate their concerns to team leader with arguments about their preoccupation with failure, in order to search a final solution to the escalated problem.</p>	
<p><u>Fingerprints:</u> Expect to find fingerprints in the empirical record of the employees' activities relating to trying to figure out what measures can be undertaken top-down. Inquiring about what is possible as a long-term solution. Evidence can be found in the interviews (account evidence) by asking team members what their next step was in communicating their concern to the team leader.</p>		
<p>● <i>observation</i> P7(i)</p>	<p>Account evidence: Interview I regional director (team leader) Familiehulp Turnhout <i>Observation on communicating concern to team leader</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Mu. Despite modest information about the communication concern to team leader, the observation appears quite clear and concise. Therefore, we can trust this source because it's the team leader who speaks out of her own experience with the problem. She also corroborates the fact that the replacement of the absent colleague is a concern for the team. ● Modest confirmation of proposition 7 but updating possible 	<p>1u13: Interviewee says: "The first question they ask me is then do we get a replacement for X?"</p>
<p>● <i>observation</i> P7(ii)</p>	<p>Account evidence: Interview II regional director (team leader) Familiehulp Turnhout <i>Observation on communicating concern to team leader</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu. The evidence is empirically unique, because we can trust the source (credible and competent leader) who knows the team members and who mention how the team members ask her for a replacement of their absent colleague as a way to figure out what measures can be undertaken top-down to get a solution to the problem. We can trust this source because it's the team leader who speaks out of her own experience with the problem and describes how the team members come to her to search solutions. ● Strong confirmation of proposition 7 	<p>2min: Interviewee says: "I remember that one person specifically came to me to ask if there's a chance that the team could get a replacement."</p>
<p>● <i>observation</i> P7(iii)</p>	<p>Account evidence: Interview I team members Familiehulp Subregioteam Turnhout <i>Observation on communicating concern</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu. The observation as a whole tells us something about communication concern with the colleague's sickness consequences. This time, the evidence comes from team 	<p>28min: Interviewees say: "We asked if we could get a replacement for X."</p>

	<p>members. They asked the team leader for a replacement for their absent colleague. The interviewee is a team member who speaks out of her own experience with the issue, so we can trust this source. He/she is talking about the specific problem related to the absence of the colleague, so there is no alternative empirical explanation for this observation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong confirmation of proposition 7 	
<p>● <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 7</i></p>	<p>Because the three pieces of evidence are found, we can confirm the presence of the proposition 7. If only p7(i) is found, we cannot confirm, whereas if p7(i) or p7 (ii) is found, in combination with p7(iii) we might infer that p7 is present. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation</u> moderately warranted, given p7(i): is modest evidence of ‘communication concern’. However, p7(ii) and p7 (iii) are accurate evidence of the presence of communication concern from team leader and team members.</p>	
<p>8</p>	<p><u>Theorized part:</u> Team leader listens and notices that the issue is important for the whole group and deserves attention. (team leader cannot pretend that nothing’s wrong and the rest of his/her team knows there is - it can be really problematic).</p> <p><u>Fingerprints:</u> Expect to see evidence concerning the reaction of the team leader to the inquiry of the team about top-down measures. This is the signal for the team to either solve the problem themselves, also in the long-term, or to start executing the measures taken by the team leader. Evidence for this part can be found in the interviews (account evidence) by asking the team leader what the reaction was to the inquiry of the team.</p>	
<p>● <i>observation P8(i)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview I regional director (team leader) Familiehulp Turnhout <i>Observation on reaction from team leader</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu. The observation clearly tells us something about the existence of a reaction from team leader. Here is the team leader who speaks out of the interactions with team members in relation to ‘agree with some solutions to the problem’ and how it brought the topic the team meeting. We can, therefore, trust this source because there is no reason to make these statements if the team leader did not actually experience it. • Strong confirmation of proposition 8 	<p>1u13: Interviewee says: “...Their (team members’) next question is can you agree with some solutions we’re thinking of?” Interviewee states that she talked to the team member who came to her (to discuss the solutions) so that they can bring this on their team meeting.</p>
<p>● <i>observation P8(ii)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview I team members Familiehulp Turnhout <i>Observation on reaction from team leader</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mu. Despite modest information given about the reaction from the team leader by team members, the observation tells us something about how the work dynamic is within team and how autonomous (semi) they are. The piece of 	<p>26min: Interviewee says: “Actually the intention (cf. the ‘rule’) is to solve absence in the team within the team itself.”</p>

	<p>evidence reflects the ‘rule of problem solving’ within the team. Therefore, if the team was able to communicate the issue to team leader, it’s because the problem exceeded group capacity. We can trust this source because there is no reason to mention team members communicate the issue to team leader if they are autonomous. In addition, there is no alternative empirical explanations for the existence of this observation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modest confirmation of proposition 8 but updating possible 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 8</i> 	<p>Because both pieces of evidence are found, we can confirm the presence of the proposition 8. If only p8(i) or p8(ii), are found we cannot confirm, since we need both pieces of evidence to infer that P8 is present (from team leader and team member). Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation</u> moderately warranted, given p8(ii): is modest evidence of ‘reaction from team leader’ and p8(i) is accurate evidence of the presence of interactions between team leader and team members but we cannot infer solely with this piece.</p>	
9	<p><u>Theorized part:</u> Team leader confirms the importance of the problem and manages the discussion by proposing some kind of problem-solving setting with the whole team as a way to increases the likelihood of recovery and continuing reliable performance.</p> <p><u>Fingerprints:</u> Expect to find fingerprints about the top-down measures that will be undertaken by the team leader. The severity of the problem is acknowledged, either the team members get the signal that they have to take care of the problem or they get help from the team leader with certain top-down measures. Evidence for this part can be found in the communication of the ‘communicator’ team member (who went to the team leader to ask about the measures) to the rest of the team about the reaction of the team leader. This could be on a team meeting or informal one (trace evidence).</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>observation P9(i)</i> 	<p>Account evidence. Interview I team members Familiehulp Subregioteam Turnhout <i>Observation on reaction team leader</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu. This observation is empirically unique. It tells us something about the involvement of the team leader in the problem-solving setting. We can also infer that the problem was important for the team leader, because as mentioned, she helped solve the problem at least in the short-term. • Strong confirmation of proposition 9 	<p>28min: Interviewees state they tried to solve the problem themselves. They say: “We did ask Z (cf. team leader) for a replacement, and then someone helped but we had to share this person with the other teams.”</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>observation P9(ii)</i> 	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team members Familiehulp Subregioteam Turnhout <i>Observation on reaction team leader</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu. This piece of observation tells us something about the way in which the issue was becoming important as well as 	<p>52min: Interviewee states that the ‘replacement’ they got would have joined the team anyway, it had nothing to do with the case of X. Interviewee: “This was not a replacement (for X). B would have returned anyway, independent of X. But</p>

		<p>its resolution. We can infer that the problem was important for the team members and team leader, as they proposed some kind of problem-solving setting to deal with the replacement of the absent colleague.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong confirmation of proposition 9 	<p>from the moment we knew ‘B is back’, we thought we can use this to solve the problem of replacing X.”</p>
	<p>● <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 9</i></p>	<p>Because both pieces of evidence are found, we can confirm the presence of the proposition 9. If only p9(i) or p9(ii), are found we can confirm, since we do not need both pieces of evidence to infer that P9 is present (team members observations). Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation</u> strong warranted, given p9(i) and p9 (ii) are accurate evidence of the importance of the problem and the problem-solving setting proposed with the whole team.</p>	
10	<p><u>Theorized part:</u> Team members agreed with the existing proposal because they feel listened to/taken seriously as the issue is put on the agenda by the team leader for its resolution. The cognitive discrepancy is reduced although not yet eliminated.</p> <p><u>Fingerprints:</u> Expect to see evidence of activities reflecting that after having checked the undertaken top-down measures, the team has to move further with a long-term solution. This can be observed in a team meeting where work agreements are made. Possibilities are given by all individual team members and there's a discussion. Evidence for this part can be found in the interview with participants (account evidence) by asking about the long-term solution for this problem and how this came about. A written report of this meeting can also be a piece of evidence (trace evidence).</p>		
	<p>● <i>observation P10(i)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team members Familiehulp Subregioteam Turnhout <i>Observation on search for a permanent solution</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu. The observation as a whole clearly tells us something about the search for a permanent solution to the problem. Clearly, in the beginning the team only planned ahead for 1-2 weeks, saying “who can take Monday morning?” and then another team member goes: “okay, I can”. So, they divided the shifts <i>ad hoc</i>, to solve the acute problem. However, as it becomes clear X is going to be absent permanently, they tried to bring some structure in this, by assigning full days of taking over shifts instead of an <i>ad hoc</i> regulation where team members end up having all colleagues taking over random shifts (e.g. half a day on Tuesday this week, half a day on Wednesday the next etc.). • Strong confirmation proposition 10 	<p>42min: Interviewee says: “When we knew it was going to be for a longer time, then you can say these are ‘my days’. (I’ll take over the shift during these days.)”</p>
	<p>● <i>observation P10(ii)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team members Familiehulp Subregioteam Turnhout <i>Observation on search for a permanent solution</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu. The evidence is empirically unique. Making a more structural planning (as described in the previous 	<p>41min: Interviewee says: “We looked for a more global solution, then I also had the information of Z that we could ‘use’ A.”</p>

	<p>observation), was more manageable when the team was able to appeal for a replacement team member: A. Although this was not an official replacement for X, A would have joined the team anyway, the team members decided they would give A some shifts that belonged to X to replace. We can therefore trust this source.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong confirmation proposition 10 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>observation P10(iii)</i> 	<p>Account evidence. Interview I team members Familiehulp Subregioteam Turnhout <i>Observation on team members going back to work routines</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu. The observation as a whole tells us something about the way in which team members deal with going back to work. As quoted, the meeting of the team members was focused more on finding a structural solution, this is exactly what the team member describes. This tone of meeting changed when they knew X was going to be absent permanently. Therefore, there are no reasons to mention this, if the team member is not really on the 'same page' with colleagues about back to work routines. • Strong confirmation proposition 10 	<p>35min: The interviewees say: "When it became clear that X was going to be absent permanently, then the meeting became different, it was focused more on 'how are we going to do this struc- more globally."</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>observation P10(iv)</i> 	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team members Familiehulp Subregioteam Turnhout <i>Observation on search for a permanent solution</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu. This observation is about communicating within the team about the more structural solution: who can take up which shifts? More specifically: which days can be taken over by which colleagues? This observation clearly shows how the team members make this consideration: when do they have spare time to spend or when do they have a less busy day to take on extra work? Based on this, we can trust the source. • Strong confirmation proposition 10 	<p>43min: Interviewee says: "For me it was logical to say I want to do a couple of days. I have a less busy Thursday than the others, because I don't have to make a planning (...) so that's the least strenuous for the colleagues."</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 10</i> 	<p>Four pieces of evidence are found, we can confirm the presence of the proposition 10. If only p10(iii) is found, we cannot confirm, since we need at least the presence of p10(i), (ii) or (iv). We might infer that p10 is present if at least p10(iii) is found (back to work routines) in combination with any of the other observations (search for permanent solution). Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation</u> strong warranted, given p10(i,ii,iii,iv) are strong evidence of what teams are doing to move further with long-term solutions and also they are accurate evidence of the presence of preoccupation with failure as a contextual condition.</p>	

O u t c o m e	<u>Theorized outcome:</u> Total dissonance is reduced (although not eliminated), which means that an internal balance/harmony is restored because the 'perceived issue' is in the agenda for further solution.	
	<u>Observable manifestations:</u> It includes a kind of intention of planning that is subject to change, but where the issue is being dealt with by the team, with or without help from the team leader. The solution from the team does not have to be set in stone, there are unexpected things that could force the solution to be adapted. Evidence for this part can be found by asking how the team dealt with the problem eventually and what work agreements are still standing and how they are possibly changing (account evidence).	
	● <i>observation O1(i)</i>	Account evidence. Interview II regional director (team leader) Turnhout Familiehulp <i>Observation on changing work agreements</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu. The observation as a whole tells us something about the intention of planning and its adaptability due to the possible unexpected circumstances, such as the replacement of a colleague in 'maternity leave'. The argument here is that everything 'shifts' regularly, in a fluid way as being part of a way to work. ● Strong confirmation presence of the outcome
	● <i>observation O1(ii)</i>	Account evidence. Interview II team members Turnhout Subregioteam <i>Observation on team members going back to work routines</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu. The observation as a whole tells us something about the presence of 'back to work routines' in the work agenda, because both team members agree with each other about this matter, they explicitly confirm each other's story. Therefore, we can trust this source. Similarly, there is no alternative empirical explanation, because the interviewer specifically asks for the agreements that have been made for the absence of X and it is perceived that these agreements have reduced the unpleasant feeling of cognitive dissonance since the topic is in the agenda for further resolution. ● Strong confirmation presence of the outcome
● <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition O1</i>	Both pieces of evidence are found out and both has strong confirmation. We can, therefore, confirm the presence of the outcome for this case. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation</u> strong warranted, O1(i) and O1(ii) are strong evidence of how the problem is put in agenda due to the intentions of back to work routines. Based on cognitive dissonance theory we assume that once the topic is put in the agenda the problem is considered as relevant with a potential solution, reducing the dissonance although not eliminating it, because further steps need to be disentangled for this purpose.	

Roadmap Perspective Taking

Case 1: Permanent absence (Familiehulp Turnhout – Subregio team Turnhout)

<p><u>Causal relationship</u> <i>The causal mechanism links the detection of a work- related problem with the design of a solution through the cognitive process of differentiating and integrating different viewpoints.</i></p> <p><u>Prior relatively low</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no existing research about the cases. 		
<p>C a u s e</p>	<p><u>Theorized part:</u> Team member detects a disturbance during the operation of her/his work activities.</p>	
	<p><u>Observable manifestations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sequential & Trace: the initial detection of the problem happens before the design of the solution to the problem. - Account: team members remember the occurrence of the problem by being able to explain what was detected and how (how it all started). — Htu³ • Theoretical certainty not formulated (no priors) • High theoretical uniqueness: there is no other plausible explanation for observing this fingerprint 	
<p>• <i>observation</i> CI(i)</p>	<p><u>Sequential evidence:</u> Interview 2 Team members</p> <p><u>Trace evidence:</u> Word file Overview meetings ‘Opvang Permanentie X’</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu – The collected evidence confirms that the problem preceded the work solutions. The interviewed team members confirm that the moment X’s long-term absence became apparent was in September 2019. The overview of meetings shows different planning schemes between October 2019 and February 2020. The Word file overview with meetings and planning schemes was made by one of the interviewees and shared at the request of the researchers. This means that the previous group interview can have influenced the making of the document. However, there seems to be no reason why interviewees would lie about the start of the team member’s absence and the fact different work solutions were implemented. • Strong confirmation condition 1 	<p>Interview 2 Team members (00:47:00) The team members report that X became absent permanently in September 2019 and was still absent when the interview took place. The shift from an acute absence to a long term absence was a problem for the team, because this has consequences for their planning.</p> <p>Word file Overview meetings ‘Opvang Permanentie X’ This overview of meetings and events related to the case show the dates of when different consequent work solutions became active:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Date missing: Mondays and Thursdays taken up by A, Wednesdays and Fridays by B, Tuesdays by other team members. • 14/10/2019: Colleague is reassigned to another team so that Mondays have to be taken up by team members depending on their agenda and Thursdays are taken up by C.

³ Note: Htu= high theoretical uniqueness; Hu = High uniqueness; Mu = Moderate uniqueness; Lu = Low uniqueness.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 04/11/2020 & 19/11/2019: Planning of half days of the service phone duty on Mondays • 14/01/2020: New planning
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>observation C1(ii)</i> 	<u>Account evidence:</u> Interview 1 team members; Interview 2 team members <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu – The reports from interviewed team members tell a consistent and plausible story of process leading up to X’s long-term absence and the issues this presented for the service phone. Two interviewed team members were present at the office where and when it became apparent that X was going to absent for a longer period. • Strong confirmation condition 1 	Interview 1 and 2 Team members During both interviews, interviewees tell a coherent story about how X’s absence became permanent and how this affected the operation of the service phone. Interview 1 Team members (00:43:30) Team members were able to explain how X’s absence affected the service phone operation (cf. loss of information due to discontinuity of who operates the service phone)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition C1</i> 	In general, the presence of the cause seems supported by evidence, because both observations are found. We can, therefore, confirm the presence of the condition. If only C(i) or C1(ii) is found, we can confirm the evidence. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation:</u> strong warranted, given C1(i) and C1(ii) are accurate evidence of the presence of the condition being a problem situation related to the work organization.		
1	<u>Theorized part:</u> The team member tries to find an adequate explanation (cf. to make sense) for the observed disturbances in terms of the team work organization (drawing on her/his existing knowledge about the work organization) that enables her/him to design an adequate solution but is unable to do so. <u>Fingerprints:</u> - Account: Team member states that she/he had some kind of explanation of how the problem was caused in terms of the work organization but that this explanation was (self-)judged as incomplete. — Ltu <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Theoretical certainty not formulated (no priors) • Low theoretical uniqueness: contacting team members could have been done for several reasons other than a realization of interdependence 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>observation P1(i)</i> 	<u>Account evidence:</u> Interview I team members <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mu – The disturbances are there because the tasks of the absent colleague need to be taken over by the others, this is clear for everyone in the team. The collected evidence confirms that it was clear for team members (present at the office) that the issue of the service phone planning exceeded their individual capacity to deal with it properly and a collective solution was needed. From the information in the interviews it seems that it is difficult to attribute this part to only one individual team member as this part of the process was told in ‘we-form’. Two 	(00:37:00) Interviewees reported that when it became apparent that X was going to be absent permanently, it was clear for some colleagues that the way to cope with ad hoc absences was not adequate to deal with more permanent absences of colleagues. Precisely, trying to fill in and divide the gaps in the service phone planning among team members who happen to be around at the office when the message of absence is received was no longer perceived as a sustainable option. Therefore the issue was put on the team agenda as to organize a solution with all team members.	

	<p>interviewed team members were present at the office where and when it became apparent that X was going to be absent for a longer period.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modest confirmation proposition 1 	
<p>● <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 1</i></p>	<p>In general, the collected evidence confirms the need for a collective solution. Although, from the information in the interviews it seems that it is difficult to attribute this part to only one individual team member as this part of the process was told in ‘we-form’. We can, therefore, confirm the presence of proposition 1 moderately. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation:</u> moderately warranted, given P1(i) is moderately unique.</p>	
<p>2</p>	<p><u>Theorization:</u> The team member contacts other team members, before a formal meeting, to explain and discuss the problem situation on a formal meeting in order to find an explanation that enables an adequate solution.</p> <p><u>Fingerprints:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Trace & Account: A record of the attempt making contact with team members through some means of team communication such as email, post-its, a log in a work diary, a meeting agenda... - Account: The contact to other team members contained (among other possible things) a request to deal with the problem. <p>— Mtu</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Theoretical certainty not formulated (no priors) • Modest theoretical uniqueness: contacting team members could have been done for several reasons other than a realization of interdependence, however it is unlikely that a request is made to problem solve when the problem solving is not the goal. 	
<p>● <i>observation P2a(i)</i></p>	<p><u>Trace evidence:</u> Word file Overview meetings ‘Opvang Permanentie X’</p> <p><u>Account evidence:</u> Interview 1 team members; Interview 2 team members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mu – The evidence indirectly confirms the contact made to other team members. The record indicates the occurrence of the first team meeting in which the problem was discussed. The information obtained during the interview indicates that the meeting took place after the absence of X became apparent. Every Tuesday the team has team meeting with all team members. It seems logical that the contact to discuss the issue happened during this meeting and more precisely via the request made to put the issue on the agenda. The Word file overview with meetings and planning schemes was made by one of the interviewees and shared at the request of the researchers. This means that the previous group interview can have influenced the making of the document. However, there seems to be no reason why interviewees would lie about the start of the team member’s absence and the fact different work solutions were implemented. 	<p>Word file Overview meetings ‘Opvang Permanentie X’ The record does show consequent meetings which resulted in new planning schemes for the service phone duty.</p> <p>Interview 1 Team members - 00:41:00 & Interview 2 Team members - 00:47:00 The interviewees (who were present at the office when the message of X’s absence arrived) reported that the issue was put on the agenda for the next team meeting after it became clear that X was going to be absent for a longer period with the goal to find a collective solution.</p> <p>Interview 1 Team members – 00:30:00 Every Tuesday the team has team meeting in which different types of topics can be discussed. Agenda items are scheduled on request and managed by one of the interviewees.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modest confirmation proposition 2 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>observation P2a(ii)</i> 	<u>Account evidence:</u> Interview I team members <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lu – The evidence confirms the proposition as it shows that the intention of putting the issue on the agenda to find a solution for the issue related to the planning of the service phone duty. However, we do not have any more information about how the request was made and what information it contained. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weak confirmation proposition 2 	(00:50:00) One interviewee who is responsible for managing the team meeting states that she put forward the issue during the team meeting with an explicit reminder that the issue needs a solution.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 2</i> 	In general, although we cannot confirm that the request itself contained information about problem solving, we can confirm that contact was made via the regular weekly team meeting. If only P2(i) or P2(ii) is found, we cannot confirm the evidence. Even if both observations reinforce each other, we cannot confirm presence of P2. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation:</u> moderately warranted, given P2(i) and P2(ii) are not accurate evidence of the presence of proposition 2. From the information in the interviews it seems that it is difficult to attribute this part to only one individual team member as this part of the process was told in ‘we-form’.	
3	<u>Theorized part:</u> Team members share their experiences (cf. exemplars) with problems, their pending explanation of the problem situation in terms of the work organization and facilitate mutual understanding. <u>Fingerprints:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Trace & Account: Team members recollect the date and location of when they shared viewpoints. - Account (a): Team members mention how they shared experiences about the problem and ideas on how it relates to the work organization (not being focused on interpersonal issues). - Account (b): Team members mention that efforts were made to understand each other (e.g. asking questions, clarify statements, ...) — Mtu <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Theoretical certainty not formulated (no priors) • High theoretical uniqueness: meeting could have taken place for several reasons and with several outcomes, however the outcome is written down in the document which shows the problem was a topic on the meeting. This fingerprint is difficult to explain by other theories than those used in the mechanism. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>observation P3(i)</i> 	<u>Trace</u> evidence: Word file Overview meetings ‘Opvang Permanentie X’ <u>Account evidence:</u> Interview I team members <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lu – The collected evidence only shows limited support for the fingerprint. The record does not show the date of the first meeting in which a first work solution was found. The interviewees (of which one manages the weekly team 	Word file Overview meetings ‘Opvang Permanentie X’ The record shows multiple consequent team meetings and the resulting planning schemes for the service phone. Interview 1 Team members (00:41:00) The interviewees (who were present at the office when the message of X’s absence arrived) reported that the

	<p>meetings) reported that the issue was discussed in group during the next team meeting after it became clear that X was absent permanently. The Word file overview with meetings and planning schemes was made by one of the interviewees and shared at the request of the researchers. This means that the previous group interview can have influenced the making of the document. However, there seems to be no reason why interviewees would lie about the start of the team member's absence and the fact different work solutions were implemented</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weak confirmation of proposition 3 	<p>issue was put on the agenda for the next team meeting after the message of X's absence arrived.</p>
<p>● <i>observation P3(ii)</i></p>	<p><u>Account evidence (a):</u> Interview 1 Team members Interview 2 Team members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lu – The collected evidence cannot confirm how they shared perspectives for this particular case specifically. Interviewees did however report that the team practice in general is supportive towards different visions and ideas among team members. Additionally, based on the report of the interviewees we might conclude that given the experience of team members with the service phone and recurrent planning issues, team members have continually shared perspectives from earlier on. This would decrease the need to and intensity of sharing. • Weak confirmation proposition 3 	<p>Interview 2 Team members (01:40:00) The importance of the service phone is acknowledged by all team members. The service phone has to be operational otherwise nothing will function. The service phone often has priority over other individual work activities such as going to basic care team meetings because they (cf. basic care team) can make their own planning.</p> <p>Interview 2 Team members (01:39:00) One interviewee reports: “It is always a shared decision and that bears a comfortable feeling; you stand together on one line. You don’t have to say that only I decided this, it is a collective decision. It’s good to have different visions. That way you can attune your own idea. It’s not because I have a specific idea about something that it is correct.”</p> <p>Interview 1 & 2 Team members Interviews reported that the planning of the service phone is a recurrent problem that needs constant attention because of unplanned (e.g. X’s long term absence, colleagues resigning) and planned (e.g. maternity leave) absences of colleagues in the team. Because of the crucial function of the service phone for the work processes in the team, addressing these issues is deemed vital.</p>
<p>● <i>observation P3(iii)</i></p>	<p><u>Account evidence (b):</u> Interview I team members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lu - The collected evidence cannot confirm how they efforts were made to understand each other during the 	<p>In general, the team culture is characterized by open communication, mutual respect and members being attentive to each other’s work situation. Team members know we can talk openly easily and who doesn’t.</p>

		<p>problem-solving process for this case specifically. Given the description of the team culture by team members we carefully could assume during this specific case that efforts to understand each other well were made.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weak confirmation proposition 3 	
	<p>• <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 3</i></p>	<p>In general, the collected evidence only indirectly confirms that perspectives were shared during the meeting. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation:</u> weak warranted, given P3(i), P3(ii) and P3(iii) are not accurate evidence of proposition 3.</p>	
<p>4</p>	<p><u>Theorized part:</u></p>	<p>Team members discuss each other’s experiences and explanations by identifying similarities and differences (incl. contradictions) between explanations in terms of the problem and solution.</p> <p><u>Fingerprints:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Trace/Account: Team members recollect the date and location of when they discussed the problem situation in detail. - Account: Team members mention how understandings of the problem and ideas about the solution were discussed in terms of the team work organization. <p>— Mtu</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Theoretical certainty not formulated (no priors) • Modest theoretical uniqueness: The substantive focus of the meeting in fingerprint 1 could be different depending on the motivation of the team whether or not they want to actually solve the problem. Although, it’s hard to explain the occurrence of the second fingerprint through other theories. 	
	<p>• <i>observation P4(i)</i></p>	<p><u>Trace evidence:</u> Word file Overview meetings ‘Opvang Permanentie X’</p> <p><u>Account evidence:</u> Interview I team members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lu – The collected evidence confirms to reasonable extent that during the team meeting after X’s absence the issue was up for discussion by the team and resulted in a work solution to deal with the planning phone. We can only thus assume that this kind of discussion took place given that a meeting took place and resulted in a work solution. Given other available information about the team culture (see observations P3iii) it seems very unlikely that no discussion took place. The Word file overview with meetings and planning schemes was made by one of the interviewees and shared at the request of the researchers. This means that the previous group interview can have influenced the making of the document. However, there seems to be no reason why interviewees would lie about 	<p>Word file Overview meetings ‘Opvang Permanentie X’ The record shows multiple consequent team meetings and the resulting planning schemes for the service phone.</p> <p>Interview I team members (00:41:00) The interviewees (who were present at the office when the message of X’s absence arrived) reported that the issue was put on the agenda for the next team meeting after the message of X’s absence arrived.</p>

	<p>the start of the team member's absence and the fact different work solutions were implemented.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weak confirmation of proposition 4 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>observation P4(ii)</i> 	<p><u>Account evidence:</u> Interview I team members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lu – The report of interviewees states that the underlying structural issues are clear and known. However, we have no further information whether at the time this perspective was shared or differed between team members. We do not have any more detailed information about what the discussions between team members exactly looked like, whether there were different opinions, etc. Similar to proposition 3ii, based on the report of the interviewees we might carefully assume that given the experience of team members with the service phone and recurrent planning issues, team members already to some extent had shared perspectives from earlier discussions. This would decrease the need to and intensity of sharing. • Weak confirmation of proposition 4 	<p>(00:43:20) Interviewees reported that it was clear how the existing way of dealing with absences causes problems for the service phone and the team task in general and what the ideal solution would look like. More precisely, often the operational issues addressed via the phone service extend over multiple days (e.g. absence of base care worker that needs rescheduling) and requires some continuity. When every half day another care partner takes over phone service duty, information needs to get exchanged but inevitably information gets lost causing frustrations within the team. Ideally, continuity is achieved by having one permanent team member who operates the service phone.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 4</i> 	<p>In general, the collected evidence can only indirectly confirm that the type of meeting and conversation posits actually took place in this specific case. We know that meetings took place that resulted in solutions, but we have very limited information about what the discussions actually looked like.</p> <p>Given that sharing (part 3) and discussing (part 4) perspectives with all team members happens in the same meeting, sharing and discussing might have happened simultaneously during the conversation. This could have two implications for the mechanism: 1) presence feedback loops between sharing (part 3) and discussing (part 4) depicting conversation dynamics or 2) that part 3 & 4 need to be integrated into one part.</p> <p><u>Overall confirmation:</u> weak warranted, given P4(i) and P4(ii) are not accurate evidence of the presence of proposition 4.</p>	
5	<p><u>Theorized part:</u> Team members propose and discuss collective solutions (using pending the individual understandings of the problem situation and solution within the team) and reach agreement based on convergent individual perceptions of the solution at least being relevant and adequate in solving the problem situation.</p> <p><u>Fingerprints:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Trace & Account: Team members recollect the date and location of when they worked together to design a solution. - Account (a): The solutions proposed transcended job functions/work activities from individual team members but related to the collective process (cf. team task comprising different functions) - Account (b): Team members mention how they individually evaluate(d) the solution was as relevant and adequate as it made sense given the initial problem it tried to deal with. <p>— Mtu</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Theoretical certainty not formulated (no priors) 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Modest theoretical uniqueness: This interaction could have been organized for very different types of problem solving than the one proposed in the mechanism. (a) It is not very plausible that this proposition is not related to integration of information originating from ideas or viewpoints held by other people; (b) Adequacy and relevance do not necessarily mean that an individual team member is personally convinced that this is the best or most efficient, effective or optimal solution possible. However, individual team members need to be convinced (cf. makes logically sense) that it might work. 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>observation P5(i)</i> 	<p><u>Trace evidence:</u> Word file Overview meetings ‘Opvang Permanentie X’</p> <p><u>Account evidence:</u> Interview 1 Team members Interview 2 Team members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu – The collected evidence confirms that multiple meetings took place which resulted in new planning schemes for the service phone. These new planning schemes were designed during the weekly team meetings during which all team members are present. The Word file overview with meetings and planning schemes was made by one of the interviewees and shared at the request of the researchers. This means that the previous group interview can have influenced the making of the document. However, there seems to be no reason why interviewees would lie about the start of the team member’s absence and the fact different work solutions were implemented ● Strong confirmation of proposition 5 	<p>Interview 1 Team members (00:41:00) The interviewees (who were present at the office when the message of X’s absence arrived) reported that the issue was put on the agenda for the next team meeting after the message of X’s absence arrived.</p> <p>(00:28:00) Interviewees reported that solution then was that A (colleague from another team) did the service phone duty on Mondays and Thursdays. On Wednesdays and Fridays, B had phone service duty. Tuesdays were handled by colleagues who took up a half or full day. This was discussed during a lunch meeting, without A as she was based in another team. However, this solution was not permanent because A was assigned to another team that was also understaffed.</p> <p>Interview 1 & 2 Team members The interviewees reported that during the time period September and February 2020, multiple meetings took place in which the planning scheme for the service phone was altered due to new developments in the team.</p> <p>E.g. (01:13:00 - Interview 2 Team members) Interviewee says: “This week still this arrangement, but next week different again, because new colleague C resigned. She is gone next week and then we need a solution again.”</p> <p>E.g. (00:18:00 - Interview 1 Team members) Team member D will go on maternity leave beginning next year (2020). This means that some of D’s tasks will be assigned to team member B which in turn means that the two days of service phone duty, assigned to B, were revised in terms of feasibility (cf. work load).</p> <p>Word file Overview meetings ‘Opvang Permanentie X’</p>

		<p>The record shows multiple consequent team meetings and the resulting planning schemes for the service phone:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Date missing: Mondays and Thursdays taken up by A, Wednesdays and Fridays by B, Tuesdays by other team members. • 14/10/2019: Colleague is reassigned to another team so that Mondays have to be taken up by team members depending on their agenda and Thursdays are taken up by E. • 04/11/2020 & 19/11/2019: Planning of half days of the service phone duty on Mondays • 14/01/2020: New planning
<p>● <i>observation P5(ii)</i></p>	<p><u>Account evidence (a):</u> Interview 1 team members Interview 2 team members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mu – The collected evidence confirms to reasonable extent that solutions were made in function of the collective work process (cf. service phone) but took into account the different individual work situations of team members. However, only three team members were interviewed, therefore we cannot be completely certain whether other team members agree on this point. • Modest confirmation proposition 5 	<p>Interview 1 and 2 Team members The different planning schemes for the service phone duty were made collectively to manage the team work process of the service phone. These solutions took into account the work situations of the individual team members.</p> <p>Interview 1 Team members (00:44:00) Care partners have knowledge about each other’s work load and so propose to particular care partners not to take any more (service phone) tasks for that period when they have a large work load. This knowledge is interpersonal and comes from performance related data.</p>
<p>● <i>observation P5(iii)</i></p>	<p><u>Account evidence (b):</u> Interview 1 Team members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lu – The evidence does not confirm explicitly how team members evaluated work solutions in terms of relevance and adequacy. • Weak confirmation proposition 5 	<p>(00:43:20) Interviewees reported that it was clear how the existing way of dealing with absences causes problems for the service phone and the team task in general and what the ideal solution would look like (see evidence related to proposition 4ii). When looking for solutions for the service phone, providing continuity for the service phone was deemed important. Therefore work solutions tried to plan half or full days of service phone duty as best as possible.</p>
<p>● <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 5</i></p>	<p>In general, the evidence can confirm the part to a reasonable extent. Meetings took place resulting in actual solutions focused on the teamwork process (cf. service phone). Too lesser extent we can confirm that solutions actually represented the different viewpoints within the team. If only P5(i) is found, we can confirm the evidence, whereas if P5(ii) or P5(iii) are found, we cannot. We need the evidence of observation 1. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation:</u> moderately warranted, given P5(ii) and P5(iii) are not accurate evidence of the presence of proposition 5.</p>	

O u t c o m e	<u>Theorized part:</u> Team members hold a shared perspective on what needs to be done.	
	<u>Observable manifestations:</u> - Account: Team members state that during the implementation no issues were reported due to team members understanding things differently. - Sequential & Trace: the solution is designed after the initial detection of the problem. — Mtu • Theoretical certainty not formulated (no priors) • Modest theoretical uniqueness: The fact enact the work solution in a similar manner is the result of the previous parts of the mechanism in which they construct a shared understanding of what needs to be done. The fact that the solution comes after the problem detection does not explain that team members hold as shared perspective.	
• <i>observation</i> <i>O(i)</i>	Account evidence not found	No access to full empirical record: The available information does not mention any misunderstandings related to the work solutions related to the service phone. Given the clear and straightforward nature of a planning as a list of names and timeslots the likelihood of misunderstandings having occurred is rather small. Using this logic, we could assume that no misunderstandings occurred. However, this topic was not explicitly addressed during interviews. Therefore we cannot be certain whether the proposition is present in the case or not.
• <i>observation</i> <i>O(ii)</i>	<u>Sequential evidence:</u> Interview 2 Team members <u>Trace evidence:</u> Word file Overview meetings ‘Opvang Permanentie X’ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu – The collected evidence confirms that the series of solutions were designed after the absence of team member X. The interviewed team members report that the moment X’s long term absence became apparent was in September 2019. The overview of meetings show different planning schemes between October 2019 and February 2020. The Word file overview with meetings and planning schemes was made by one of the interviewees and shared at the request of the researchers. This means that the previous group interview can have influenced the making of the document. However, there seems to be no reason why interviewees would lie about the start of the team member’s absence and the fact different work solutions were implemented 	(00:47:00) The team members state that X became absent permanently in September 2019 and was still absent when the interview took place. Word file Overview meetings ‘Opvang Permanentie X’ The record shows multiple consequent team meetings and the resulting planning schemes for the service phone: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Date missing: Mondays and Thursdays taken up by A, Wednesdays and Fridays by B, Tuesdays by other team members. • 14/10/2019: Colleague is reassigned to another team so that Mondays have to be taken up by team members depending on their agenda and Thursdays are taken up by E. • 04/11/2020 & 19/11/2019: Planning of half days of the service phone duty on Mondays • 14/01/2020: New planning

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong confirmation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition PO</i> 	<p>In general, the evidence can confirm that there was a work solution concerning the organization of the service phone. However, we can only indirectly assume that team members understood the solution similarly because sources reported no instances of misunderstandings.</p> <p><u>Overall confirmation</u>: moderately warranted, given O1(i) was not found and O1(ii) is accurate evidence of the presence of the outcome.</p>

Roadmap Motivation

Case 1: Permanent absence (Familiehulp Turnhout – Subregioteam Turnhout)

<p><u>Causal relationship</u> The mechanism is triggered as team member(s) detect(s) a disturbance in the work flow and it becomes clear that the problem situation affects their work and the team task (cf. identified it as a problem that surpasses his or her individual job).</p> <p><u>Prior relatively low</u> • There is no existing research</p>			
<p>C a u s e</p>	<p><u>Theorized cause</u>: Team member(s) detect(s) a work related problem</p> <p><u>Observables manifestations</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sequential & Trace: The initial detection of the problem happens before the design of the solution to the problem. - Account: Team members tell a consistent story about the occurrence of the problem by being able to explain what was detected and how. (how it all started) <p>— Htu⁴</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Theoretical certainty not formulated (no priors) • High theoretical uniqueness: there is no other plausible explanation. 		
	<table border="0"> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: top;"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>observation</i> <i>CI(i)</i> </td> <td style="vertical-align: top;"> <p><u>Sequential</u> evidence: Interview 2 team members</p> <p><u>Trace</u> evidence: Word file Overview meetings ‘Opvang Permanentie X’</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu – The collected evidence confirms that the problem preceded the work solutions. The interviewed team members confirm that the moment X’s long term absence became apparent was in September 2019. The overview of meetings show different planning schemes between October 2019 and February 2020. The Word file overview with meetings and planning schemes was made by one of </td> <td style="vertical-align: top;"> <p>Interview 2 Team members (00:47:00) The team members state report that X became absent permanently in September 2019 and was still absent when the interview took place.</p> <p>Word file Overview meetings ‘Opvang Permanentie X’ This overview of meetings and events related to the case show the dates of when different consequent work solutions became active:</p> </td> </tr> </table>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>observation</i> <i>CI(i)</i> 	<p><u>Sequential</u> evidence: Interview 2 team members</p> <p><u>Trace</u> evidence: Word file Overview meetings ‘Opvang Permanentie X’</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu – The collected evidence confirms that the problem preceded the work solutions. The interviewed team members confirm that the moment X’s long term absence became apparent was in September 2019. The overview of meetings show different planning schemes between October 2019 and February 2020. The Word file overview with meetings and planning schemes was made by one of
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>observation</i> <i>CI(i)</i> 	<p><u>Sequential</u> evidence: Interview 2 team members</p> <p><u>Trace</u> evidence: Word file Overview meetings ‘Opvang Permanentie X’</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu – The collected evidence confirms that the problem preceded the work solutions. The interviewed team members confirm that the moment X’s long term absence became apparent was in September 2019. The overview of meetings show different planning schemes between October 2019 and February 2020. The Word file overview with meetings and planning schemes was made by one of 	<p>Interview 2 Team members (00:47:00) The team members state report that X became absent permanently in September 2019 and was still absent when the interview took place.</p> <p>Word file Overview meetings ‘Opvang Permanentie X’ This overview of meetings and events related to the case show the dates of when different consequent work solutions became active:</p>	

⁴ Note: Htu= high theoretical uniqueness; Hu = High uniqueness; Mu = Moderate uniqueness; Lu = Low uniqueness.

	<p>the interviewees and shared at the request of the researchers. This means that the previous group interview can have influenced the making of the document. However, there seems to be no reason why interviewees would lie about the start of the team member's absence and the fact different work solutions were implemented.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong confirmation of condition 1 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Date missing: Mondays and Thursdays taken up by A, Wednesdays and Fridays by B, Tuesdays by other team members. • 14/10/2019: Colleague is reassigned to another team so that Mondays have to be taken up by team members depending on their agenda and Thursdays are taken up by C. • 04/11/2020 & 19/11/2019: Planning of half days of the service phone duty on Mondays • 14/01/2020: New planning
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>observation C1(ii)</i> 	<p><u>Account evidence:</u> Interview 1 Team members Interview 2 Team members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu – The reports from interviewed team members tell a consistent and plausible story of process leading up to X's long- term absence and the issues this presented for the service phone. Two interviewed team members were present at the office where and when it became apparent that X was going to absent for a longer period. • Strong confirmation of condition 1 	<p>Interview 1 & 2 Team members During both interviews, interviewees tell a coherent story about how X's absence became permanent and how this affected the operation of the service phone.</p> <p>Interview 1 Team members (00:43:30) Team members were able to explain how X's absence affected the service phone operation (cf. loss of information due to discontinuity of who operates the service phone)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition C1</i> 	<p>Due to these two pieces of evidence are found, we can confirm the presence of the condition, even if it was present being a problem situation related to the work organization. If only C1(i) or C1(ii) are found we cannot confirm, since we need both observations to infer that C1 is present, because the evidence tells us different things related to (1) sequence and (2) process. <u>Overall confirmation:</u> strong warranted, there is a significant amount of evidence on the presence of a team leader detecting a work-related problem.</p>	
1	<p><u>Theorized part:</u> The team member feels addressed to take action by emphasizing the importance of effective performance of the team task.</p> <p><u>Fingerprints:</u> - Account (a): Team member states that the team task is of personal significance to her/him. - Account (b): Team member states that she found it important that the problem needed to be dealt with as it would become disruptive. — Mtu</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Theoretical certainty not formulated (no priors) • Moderate theoretical uniqueness: (a) It is not plausible to find this fingerprint when the team member is not engaged with her/his work. However, the report by the team member might be biased (forced or socially desired). (b) The team member might find it important to act because of external control or pressure in the group. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>observation P1(i)</i> 	<p><u>Account evidence (a):</u> Interview 2 Team members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu – The interviewed team members confirm that work engagement within the team is high meaning that they are 	<p>(01:40:00) Interviewees report that the importance of the service phone is generally acknowledged by all team members. The service phone has to be operational otherwise nothing will function. The service phone often has priority</p>

	<p>dedicated to the basic care teams they manage and committed to keep work processes going. From the information in the interviews it seems that it is difficult to attribute this part to only one individual team member as this part of the process was told In ‘we-form’. Two team members interviewed stated that they were present at the office when it became apparent that X was going to be absent long term. We can therefore assume that, given their statement concerning personal significance and that they were closely involved in this phase of the process, the evidence can conform the proposition.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong confirmation of proposition 1 	<p>over other individual work activities such as going to basic care team meetings because they (cf. basic care team) can make their own planning.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>observation P1(ii)</i> 	<p><u>Account evidence (b):</u> Interview 1 Team members Interview 2 Team members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu – The information confirms the proposition. Given the functional role of the service phone in the work process and team members’ experience with similar issues in its operation it is very likely team members generally knew the importance of dealing with the problem situation. From the information in the interviews it seems that it is difficult to attribute this part to only one individual team member as this part of the process was told In ‘we-form’ • Strong confirmation of proposition 1 	<p>Interview 2 Team members (01:26:20) interviewees report (in general) that there never is any resistance in falling for the service phone duty. Team members can state openly if they have time or not to take extra hours of service phone duty, there has always been solidarity. In the end everybody wants clients to receive their services and that service provision is managed well.</p> <p>Interview 1 & 2 Team members Interviewees reported that the planning of the service phone is a recurrent problem that needs constant attention because of unplanned (e.g. X’s long term absence, colleagues resigning) and planned (e.g. maternity leave) absences of colleagues in the team. Because of the crucial function of the service phone for the work processes in the team, addressing these issues is deemed vital.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 1</i> 	<p>Because these pieces of evidence are found, we can confirm the presence of the part 1 of the mechanism. If only P1(i) or P1 (ii) is found, we cannot confirm. We need both observations to infer that P1 is present. Sources are relatively independent. Overall confirmation: strong warranted, given our pieces are accurate evidence of the team member feeling addressed to take action by emphasizing the importance of effective performance of the team task.</p>	
<p>2</p>	<p><u>Theorized part:</u> The team member assesses her/his range of possible actions*, realizes that the problem can only be adequately solved at the team level and takes initiative to contact other team members to explain the problem situation in order to mobilize 'team resources' to deal with the problem situation. *(considers his control opportunities)</p> <p><u>Fingerprints:</u></p>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Trace & Account: A record of the attempt making contact with team members through some means of team communication such as email, post-its, a log in a work diary, a meeting agenda... - Account (a): The team member took the initiative to contact other team members without being instructed to do so. - Account (b): The team member (from part 1) states that she/he decided to contact other colleagues because she/he was work wise not able to deal with the problem her-/himself adequately and needed help from others. <p>— Mtu</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Theoretical certainty not formulated (no priors) ● Moderate theoretical uniqueness: Contacting team members could have been done for several reasons other than a realization of interdependence. Although there is no other plausible explanation than that the team member reasoned from her/his job function (and control opportunities) and the conclusion they were not enough to deal with the problem situation. 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>observation</i> P2(i) 	<p><u>Trace evidence;</u> Word file Overview meetings ‘Opvang Permanentie X’</p> <p><u>Account evidence:</u> Interview 1 Team members Interview 2 Team members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu – Given that the problem was addressed during team meetings outreach to the rest of the team was made via the team agenda. From the information in the interviews it seems that it is difficult to attribute this part to only one individual team member as this part of the process was told In ‘we-form’. The Word file overview with meetings and planning schemes was made by one of the interviewees and shared at the request of the researchers. This means that the previous group interview can have influenced the making of the document. However, there seems to be no reason why interviewees would lie about the start of the team member’s absence and the fact different work solutions were implemented. ● Strong confirmation of proposition 2 	<p>Word file Overview meetings ‘Opvang Permanentie X’ The record does not show clearly the exact date of the first team meeting during which the issue was discussed. However, the record does show consequent meetings which resulted in new planning schemes for the service phone duty.</p> <p>Interview 1 Team members - 00:41:00 Interview 2 Team members - 00:47:00 The interviewees (who were present at the office when the message of X’s absence arrived) reported that the issue was put on the agenda for the next team meeting after it became clear that X’s was going to be absent for a longer period.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>observation</i> P2(ii) 	<p><u>Account evidence (a):</u> Interview 1 Team members Interview 2 Team members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu – Team members acted based on their own initiative because there is no formal team leader in the team and action was self-initiated because of the realization that other team members needed to be involved other team members. From the information in the interviews it seems that it is difficult to attribute this part to only one individual team member as this part of the process was told In ‘we-form’. 	<p>Interview 1 &2 Team members There is no formal team leader in the team. In this case, the team members that were present at the office and that received the message of X’s absence followed the general routine of putting the issue on the agenda of the next team meeting.</p> <p>Interview 1 Team members (00:30:00) Every Tuesday the team has team meeting in which different types of topics can be discussed. Agenda-items are scheduled on request and managed by one of the interviewees.</p>

<p>● <i>observation P2(iii)</i></p> <p>● <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 2</i></p>	<p>● Strong confirmation of proposition 2</p> <p><u>Account evidence (b):</u> Interview 1 Team members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu – Team members’ action to contact other team members was self-initiated because of the realization that other team members needed to be involved other team members. From the information in the interviews it seems that it is difficult to attribute this part to only one individual team member as this part of the process was told In ‘we-form’. <p>● Strong confirmation of proposition 2</p> <p>Due to the evidence, we can confirm to reasonable extent that team members were convinced they needed to involve other team members to design a work solution. The initiative to contact others was taken via the weekly team meetings. If only P2(i), or P2(ii) or P2(iii) is found, we cannot confirm. We need the three observations to infer that P2 is present. Sources are relatively independent.</p> <p><u>Overall confirmation</u> strong warranted, there is a significant amount of evidence that proposition 2 is present in the case.</p>	<p>It was clear from the onset that a permanent absence should be not just managed by a limited number of team members that happen to be at the office but by the full team.</p> <p>(00:38:00) One of the team members (that were present at the office and that received the message of X’s absence) has said before that these issues need to be addressed by everybody and not just a few. Every team member has considerable workloads so it is unfair if only a few have to take over service phone duty hours when somebody is absent.</p>
<p>3</p>	<p><u>Theorized part:</u> Team members discuss the problem situation using an appropriate style of interaction so that they feel addressed to take action and express their willingness to personally contribute to solving the problems or assign team resources.</p> <p><u>Fingerprints:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Trace: A record of the occasion(s) where the situation was explained to team members such as minutes, reports, communiqué... The record shows a decision to deal with the problem - Account (a): Team members state that appeals were made on how the problem situation impacted the team task in a ways that made them want to solve the problem. - Account (b): Team members state that they wanted to contribute to solving the problem because otherwise the team task could be impacted. <p>— Mtu</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Theoretical certainty not formulated (no priors) ● Moderate theoretical uniqueness: (a) Decisions to engage in problem solving can be made based on very different motivations other than posited by the theory. It confirms that a problem was considered and used as a reason to make a decision and to dedicate resources to. (b) Another explanations would be that team members were forced to solve the problem. However, this would not trigger personal commitment or dedication but most likely punishment-aversion or hesitant attitude. (c) The only plausible explanation is that team members would say this because they are committed to (they care about) the team task. 	
<p>● <i>observation P3(i)</i></p>	<p><u>Trace evidence;</u> Word file Overview meetings ‘Opvang Permanentie X’</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu – Based on the information in the record we can assume that the planning schemes as the result of the consequent meeting were associated with some form of discussion with the team members mentioned in the specific schemes. We can assume that a decision was made to change the previous planning scheme. However, this evidence is indirect as no record was collected in which 	<p>Word file Overview meetings ‘Opvang Permanentie X’ The record shows multiple consequent team meetings and the resulting planning schemes for the service phone.</p>

		<p>the decision itself is shown. The Word file overview with meetings and planning schemes was made by one of the interviewees and shared at the request of the researchers. This means that the previous group interview can have influenced the making of the document. However, there seems to be no reason why interviewees would lie about the start of the team member's absence and the fact different work solutions were implemented.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong confirmation of proposition 3 	
	<p>• <i>observation P3(ii)</i></p>	<p><u>Account evidence (a):</u> Interview 1 Team members Interview 2 Team members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lu – The evidence does not conform that appeals were explicitly being made when the problem was discussed specifically for this case. The reports of interviewees show that team members are already convinced about the importance of the service phone and that the magnitude of the specific problem situation was known because of similar earlier issues. This statement confirms the presence of the concept of 'calibration' as interviewees describe interaction styles that illustrate how team members consider the personal situation and affect of other team members. However, stronger confirmation should be achieved when other team members describe similar styles of interacting with each other. • Weak confirmation of proposition 3 	<p>Interview 2 Team members (01:40:00) The importance of the service phone is acknowledged by all team members. The service phone has to be operational otherwise nothing will function. The service phone often has priority over other individual work activities such as going to basic care team meetings because they (cf. basic care team) can make their own planning.</p> <p>Interview 1 Team members In general, the team culture is characterized by open communication, mutual respect and members being attentive to each other's work situation. Team members know we can talk openly easily and who doesn't.</p> <p>(00:55:00) "[...] communicating well I guess. And when somebody has the feeling that "ooh I am drowning, it's getting too much" that these persons dare to say this. And we also know well who doesn't dare that well to indicate this. For a while we did this, that at the start of every team meeting in turn everybody said how she was feeling. This made it easier for some team members to open up and to indicate their limits. It's about being consciously. We talked about this during a whole SRT. That we were worried about specific persons Without confronting them personally like "hey what's your problem"."</p> <p>Interview 1 & 2 Team members Interviews reported that the planning of the service phone is a recurrent problem that needs constant attention because of unplanned (e.g. X's long term absence, colleagues resigning) and planned (e.g. maternity leave) absences of colleagues in</p>

		the team. Because of the crucial function of the service phone for the work processes in the team, addressing these issues is deemed vital.
● <i>observation P3(iii)</i>	<u>Account evidence (b):</u> Interview 1 Team members Interview 2 Team members <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Mu – The report of interviewees confirms team members’ consideration of the team task when dealing with problems situations as in the case of X’s long term absence. However, these are general statements about the whole team, it could be that an individual team member feels different. ● Modest confirmation of proposition 2 	Interview 1 Team members (00:52:30) Team member reports: “you don’t really experience this as a problem. You can sigh off course but in the end all of us think come on this has to be solved and everyone contributes as much as she can.” (00:53:30) Team member reports (in general): “Everybody feels addressed because everybody feels very responsible, nobody thinks I don’t care, let others solve it.” Interview 2 Team members (01:26:20) Interviewees report (in general) that there never is any resistance in falling for the service phone duty. Team members can state openly if they have time or not to take extra hours of service phone duty, there has always been solidarity. In the end everybody wants clients to receive their services and that service provision is managed well.
● <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 3</i>	In general, the evidence can confirm that meetings took place focused on problem solving. However due to limited information we cannot confirm what interactions and conversations looked like for the specific case. However, general information about the team culture make it likely that this part has occurred. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation: moderately warranted.</u>	
4	<u>Theorized part:</u> Team members engage in problem solving using an appropriate style of interaction so that they make a focused effort and invest team resources until a solution is found that is deemed adequate to deal with the problem situation. <u>Fingerprints:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Trace: (Multiple consecutive) moments in which the problem (solving) was discussed. - Account (a): Team members state that the problem solving was kept on the team agenda for as long as needed. - Account (b): Team members state they were motivated to solve the problem to safeguard and to contribute to the team task. - Account (c): Team members were attentive to everybody being engaged to solve the problem. — Mtu <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Theoretical certainty not formulated (no priors) ● Moderate theoretical uniqueness: The reason for consecutive moments of problem solving can be explained in several ways. E.g. when the item of problem solving gets postponed due to other topics regarded as more urgent. (a) The underlying reasons for keeping the problem situation on the team agenda as long as needed can be very different. (b) It is highly unlikely to find this evidence when team members would not act out of work engagement. When not engaged they could state other reasons such as they were being controlled in some way (positive or negative external incentive to engage in problem solving, e.g. punishment, reward, pressure, ...). (c) This proposition is very unlikely to occur when people are being forced into problem solving. 	

<p>● <i>observation</i> P4(i)</p>	<p><u>Trace evidence:</u> Word file Overview meetings ‘Opvang Permanentie X’</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu – The overview of meetings and the resulting planning schemes confirm how the problem situation was handled multiple times which is an indication of a focused effort at the team level of dealing with the problem situation. The Word file overview with meetings and planning schemes was made by one of the interviewees and shared at the request of the researchers. This means that the previous group interview can have influenced the making of the document. However, there seems to be no reason why interviewees would lie about the start of the team member’s absence and the fact different work solutions were implemented. ● Strong confirmation of proposition 4 	<p>Word file Overview meetings ‘Opvang Permanentie X’ The record shows consecutive planning schemes to operate the service phone. Each scheme was the result of a collective effort in making an adequate planning.</p>
<p>● <i>observation</i> P4(ii)</p>	<p><u>Account evidence (a):</u> Interview 1 Team members Interview 2 Team members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu – The information confirms the presence of sustained team effort in finding solutions for the service phone planning. The team as a group keeps making the effort as these kind of problems situations are regarded as normal inherent part of the team functioning. Moreover, the interviews report that they believe is present that the team can overcome these challenges because they usually do. ● Strong confirmation of proposition 4 	<p>Interview 1 & 2 Team members Interviewees reported that the planning of the service phone is a recurrent problem that needs constant attention because of unplanned (e.g. X’s long term absence, colleagues resigning) and planned (e.g. maternity leave) absences of colleagues in the team. Because of the crucial function of the service phone for the work processes in the team, addressing these issues is deemed vital.</p> <p>Interview 2 Team members (01:28:20) “Normally we never handle it like this, we never dig into this in that much detail. We just do it like that, it’s an automatism. If I hear us talking about this than I think this just keeps on going and going. We spend a lot of time and energy but at that moment you don’t realize how much time this demands and keeps demanding. It’s an never ending story. You just keep on going. [...] We think it’s normal that it gets solved so we do that.”</p>
<p>● <i>observation</i> P4(iii)</p>	<p><u>Account evidence (b):</u> Interview 2 Team members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Lu – Interviewees confirmed that team members are motivated to solve planning issues in general. No specific information was given about the specific case of X’s long term absence and the consequent problem solving process. ● Weak confirmation of proposition 4 	<p>(01:26:20) interviewees report (in general) that there never is any resistance having to fall in for the service phone duty. Team members can state openly if they have time or not to take extra hours of service phone duty, there has always been solidarity. In the end everybody wants clients to receive their services and that service provision is managed well.</p>

<p>● <i>observation</i> <i>P4(iv)</i></p>	<p><u>Account evidence (c):</u> Interview 1 Team members Interview 2 Team members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Mu – Interviewees confirmed that team members are motivated to solve planning issues in general. No specific information was given about the specific case of X’s long term absence and the consequent problem solving process. ● Modest confirmation of proposition 4 	<p>Interview 2 Team members (01:38:00) One interviewee reports: “You can make decisions concerning your own sector [cf. teams each care partner manages] but other things you need to discuss collectively. It is always a shared decision and that bears a comfortable feeling; you stand together on one line. You don’t have to say that (only) I decided this, it is a collective decision.”</p> <p>Interview 1 Team members (00:44:05) Care partners were asked whether they were okay with the structural solution (cf. full days) knowing that not every care partner enjoys doing service phone duty.</p> <p>In general, the team culture is characterized by open communication, mutual respect and members being attentive to each other’s work situation. Team members know we can talk openly easily and who doesn’t.</p> <p>(00:55:00) “[...] communicating well I guess. And when somebody has the feeling that “ooh I am drowning, it’s getting too much“ that these persons dare to say this. And we also know well who doesn’t dare that well to indicate this. For a while we did this, that at the start of every team meeting in turn everybody said how she was feeling. This made it easier for some team members to open up and to indicate their limits. It’s about being consciously. We talked about this during a whole SRT. That we were worried about specific persons without confronting them personally like “hey what’s your problema”.</p>
<p>● <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 4</i></p>	<p>In general, the evidence can confirm that a series meetings took place focused on problem solving resulting in different work solutions. However due to limited number of team members interviewed we cannot confirm what interactions, conversations and affects looked like during the process of the specific case. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation:</u> Moderately warranted because there are some non-accurate pieces of evidence of team members engagement in problem solving using an appropriate style of interaction.</p>	
<p>O u t c o</p>	<p><u>Theorized part:</u> Team members come up with a work solution to the problem situation and commit to it. <u>Observable manifestations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Trace & account: Team members (that relate to the problem situation and/or were involved in the problem solving) report there is a working solution for the work problem that they are personally convinced the solution is adequate and relevant (= identification). - Account: Team members report that the solution is being implemented consistently by every team member (= realized commitment). 	

<p>m e</p>	<p>- Sequential & Account & Trace: The solution is implemented after the initial detection of the problem. — Mtu</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Theoretical certainty not formulated (no priors) ● Moderate theoretical uniqueness: The fact there is a solution and that this comes after the problem does not mean people are necessarily committed to the solution. The fact that the solution is implanted consistently is the result of the previous parts of the mechanism in which team members behavior is driven by their engagement towards the team task and motivation to find a solution. 	
	<p>● <i>observation</i> <i>O1(i)</i></p> <p><u>Trace evidence:</u> Word file Overview meetings ‘Opvang Permanentie X’</p> <p><u>Account evidence:</u> Interview 1 Team members Interview 2 Team members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Mu – The collected evidence does not explicitly conform the attitude of team members towards the work solutions. However, given their dedication towards the service phone (see fingerprint P3ii) we can carefully assume that taking action was in itself deemed relevant and necessary to keep the service phone operating well. ● Modest confirmation of outcome 	<p>Interview 1 & 2 Team members In both interviews interviewees state that the found solutions are not perfect but deemed good enough at the time to deal with the situation. Other more ideally perceived solutions were considered (e.g. hiring an extra team member) but were not possible (due to hiring restrictions).</p> <p>Interview 2 Team members One interviewee mentions that the decisions made concerning the service planning were always shared meaning that everyone is on the same page.</p> <p>Word file Overview meetings ‘Opvang Permanentie X’ This record shows an overview of the different planning schemes for the service phone between October 2019 and January 2020.</p>
	<p>● <i>observation</i> <i>O1(ii)</i></p> <p><u>Account evidence:</u> Interview 2 Team members Interview 2 Team members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Lu – The interviewees did not mention the work solutions not being properly implemented by team members. This topic was also not discussed explicitly during interviews. However, interviewees reported that in general team members comply well with work solutions concerning the planning of the service phone. ● Weak confirmation of outcome 	<p>(01:26:20) interviewees report (in general) that there never is any resistance having to fall in for the service phone duty. Team members can state openly if they have time or not to take extra hours of service phone duty, there has always been solidarity. In the end everybody wants clients to receive their services and that service provision is managed well.</p>
	<p>● <i>observation</i> <i>O1(iii)</i></p> <p><u>Sequential & Trace & Account:</u> Word file Overview meetings ‘Opvang Permanentie X’ Interview 2 Team members Interview 2 Team members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu – The collected evidence confirms the proposition based on the dates mentioned in the record and the chronology reported by interviewees. The Word file overview with meetings and planning schemes was made 	<p>Interview 2 Team members (00:47:00) The team members state report that E became absent permanently in September 2019 and was still absent when the interview took place.</p> <p>Interview 1 & 2 Team members</p>

	<p>by one of the interviewees and shared at the request of the researchers. This means that the previous group interview can have influenced the making of the document. However, there seems to be no reason why interviewees would lie about the start of the team member's absence and the fact different work solutions were implemented</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong confirmation of outcome. 	<p>The interviewees reported that since X's permanent absent the team has used different ways of planning and operating the service phone duty.</p> <p>Word file Overview meetings 'Opvang Permanentie X' This overview of meetings and events related to the case show the dates of when different consequent work solutions became active:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Date missing: Mondays and Thursdays taken up by A, Wednesdays and Fridays by B, Tuesdays by other team members. • 14/10/2019: Colleague is reassigned to another team so that Mondays have to be taken up by team members depending on their agenda and Thursdays are taken up by E. • 04/11/2020 & 19/11/2019: Planning of half days of the service phone duty on Mondays • 14/01/2020: New planning
<p>● <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition O1</i></p>	<p>In general, the collected evidence can only partly confirm the presence the presence of the outcome due to limited empirical material (meaning that available evidence does not disconfirm it). Due to the limited number of team members interviewed we have little information about the attitudes toward work solutions in the group. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation:</u> Moderately warranted presence of the outcome.</p>	

Roadmap Pattern Recognition

Pathway 1

Case 2: Planning (Familiehulp Leuven – Team Kessel-Lo II)

<p><u>Causal relationship</u> <i>Causal mechanism linking ecological change as discontinuity of organizational routines (cues), with cognitive discrepancy (situation) that eventually produces cognitive dissonance (unpleasant feeling). Within the context of a new cue situation (pathway 1).</i></p> <p><u>Prior relatively low</u> ●There is no existing research about the cases.</p>		
<p>C a u s e</p>	<p><u>Theorized cause:</u> Ecological change (discontinuity of organizational routines), which is perceived as something unexpected at work, producing a variation change, or disturbance in the environment.</p>	
	<p><u>Observable manifestations:</u> We expect to find fingerprints concerning the disturbance in the routine organizational workflow (environment). Evidence can be found in interviews asking about what routine and non-routine is; the origin of the issue and why employees gave attention to this issue. — Htu¹</p> <p>●Theoretical certainty not formulated (no priors) ●High theoretical uniqueness, as observing this observable manifestation necessarily means that the presence of an ecological change or discontinuity of a workflow routine is taking place (Weick, 2009, 2006, 1995, 1977).</p>	
<p>●<i>observation</i> <i>CI(i)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview I team leader Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II <i>Observation on the presence of a disturbance at work that altered the workflow routine. Reasons why team members gave attention to the issue</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu. Given that evidence relates to the presence of discontinuity of organizational routines, the accuracy can be evaluated as relatively high. We can observe the reasons why team members gave attention to this disturbance provoked by the shortcomings of the planning: changes in the planning cause the team members and their clients a lot of insecurity. Therefore, we have a clear evidence of the occurrence of the alteration of the workflow. We can trust this source because it is the team leader who speaks out of his/her own experience with the unexpected event. There are no 	<p>3min: Interviewee: “There were a lot of reactions from team members saying the first week a lot changes, but the second week so much changes. They get 3 times changes via e-mail, but also clients get three times a notification: “Next week they’re coming on Tuesday morning, oh no it will be in the afternoon, oh no it’s...” (...) It gives (the team members) a lot of insecurity.”</p>

¹ Note: Htu= high theoretical uniqueness; Hu = High uniqueness; Mu = Moderate uniqueness; Lu = Low uniqueness.

		<p>reasons to mention this, if a disturbance of workflow is not happening.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong confirmation of condition 1 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>observation C1(ii)</i> 	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team members Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II</p> <p><i>Observation on the presence of a disturbance at work that altered the workflow routine. Reasons why team members gave attention to the issue</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu. Given that evidence relates to the presence of discontinuity of organizational routines, the accuracy can be evaluated as relatively high. We can observe the reasons why team members gave attention to this disturbance provoked by the shortcomings of the planning: changes in the planning cause the team members and their clients frustration. Clients are not happy with the service the team members provide. The planning system is not flexible enough to provide good service to clients. Therefore, we have a clear evidence of the occurrence of the alteration of the workflow. We can trust this source because the interviewees are team members who speak out of their own experience with the planning issues. A clear and detailed example is given. There are no reasons to mention this, if a disturbance of workflow is not happening. • Strong confirmation of condition 1 	<p>15min: Interviewee: “Clients have become harder to deal with, if you’re not allowed to enter (their home) then it’s clear right, they were just not satisfied.”</p> <p>> Team members state that clients have higher expectations and that their planning system is not flexible enough to handle this.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition C1</i> 	<p>Because both pieces of evidence are found, we can confirm the presence of the condition ‘ecological change’ as discontinuity of organizational routines.</p> <p>If only C1(i) or C1(ii) is found, we cannot confirm, since we need both pieces to infer that C1 is present, because the observations come from both team leader and team members.</p> <p>Sources are relatively independent.</p> <p><u>Overall confirmation</u> strong warranted, given C1(i) and C1(ii) are strong and accurate evidence of the occurrence of an ‘altered workflow’ at the organizations.</p>		
1	<p><u>Building Block:</u> Perception and sense of 'knowing' without knowing 'why' (occurring in parallel).</p> <p><u>Theorized part 1a:</u> Individual team member perceives ‘signs’ of possible variation in the organizational routine that are puzzling [This comes from some stratum of awareness just below the conscious level].</p> <p><u>Theorized part 1b:</u> Because these ‘signs’ are sorted out and integrated into retained impressions that often cannot be verbalized, but that guide action, individual team member reacts with certain degree of shock and surprise.</p>		

<p><u>Fingerprints:</u> We expect to find fingerprints about the perceived signs of the disturbances at work. Evidence can be found in the interviews asking the employees if they saw it coming and how they reacted to the disturbance.</p>		
<p>● <i>observation</i> <i>PI(i)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team members Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II <i>Observation on perceived signs of disturbance</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu. This piece of evidence is quite unique, because it clearly reflects an example of the perceived issue and the context within which the perception happens: team members experience problems with their planning when they go to their clients. Clients are not aware of the planning or they haven't been notified about changes. Team members talk about this happening multiple times, so it's not a one time thing, which makes it easier for them to perceive this as a sign of a structural problem. We can trust this source because the interviewees are team members who speak out of their own experience with the planning issues. A clear and detailed example is given. ● Strong confirmation of proposition 1a and 1b 	<p>15min: Interviewee: "If you go somewhere and they (cf. clients) say: 'I didn't know you were coming' then it's like they (c.f. service phone) didn't put it (cf. the information) through." > The interviewees state that when they perceived these signs that something went wrong with the planning, they are not sure what the cause of this is, but they feel it could have something to do with the service phone.</p>
<p>● <i>observation</i> <i>PI(ii)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team members Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II <i>Observation on perceived signs of disturbance</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu. Uniqueness of this observation is high, because the interviewer asks about the specific problem team members mention (planning problem). We can observe team members saw the signs of a possible disturbance for their work routines: changes in the planning are not communicated effectively throughout the organization. We can trust this source because the interviewees are team members who speak out of their own experience with the planning issues. A clear and detailed example is given. There are no reasons to mention this, if a disturbance of workflow is not happening. ● Strong confirmation of proposition 1a and 1b 	<p>14min: Interviewer: "Were clients forgotten sometimes or?" Interviewee 1: "Yes forgotten, or the hours – that I for example had on my thing (c.f. planning) from 8.30-10.30 and someone else from 10.30-12.30 and then it's wrong on the planning, or the client got it wrong on their calendar." Interviewee 2: "Or the client is not at home" (c.f. client was not warned a care worker was coming).</p>
<p>● <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 1</i></p>	<p>Because both pieces of evidence are found, we can confirm the presence of the proposition 1. This is because both observations show a clear example of the signs that there's a disturbance in the workflow. Sources are relatively independent.</p>	

		<u>Overall confirmation:</u> strong warranted, given P1(i) and P1 (ii) are strong and accurate evidence of ‘perceived disturbances at work’ from team members.
2	<p><u>Building Block:</u> Holistic patterns and affectively-charged judgement</p> <p><u>Theorized part 2a:</u> Guided by these impressions, individual team member recognizes some kind of deviation in the workflow that indicates its difference from what is expected [associative intuition]</p> <p><u>Theorized part 2b:</u> Because team member can see the 'big picture', she/he notices that something is going wrong but without knowing exactly what's going on wrong, having a 'gut feeling' that current routine related-actions are possible failing.</p> <p><u>Fingerprints:</u> We expect to find fingerprints about the discrepancy between the normal workflow and the altered workflow when the disturbance is recognized. Evidence can be found in the interviews by asking employees how they reacted to the disturbance and what it would mean for their normal workflow. Also, we expect to find information on similarities to previous experiences.</p>	
	<p>●<i>observation P2(i)</i></p> <p>Account evidence. Interview II team members Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II</p> <p><i>Observation on discrepancy between normal workflow and consequence of disturbance</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu. This piece of evidence tells us something about the acknowledgement of work deviations. The team member mentions that because of problems with the planning, the reality is different from what was expected of the situation. This piece of evidence is quite unique, because the interviewer asks about a specific situation where a planning mistake caused the disturbance. We trust the source, because it’s a team member who speaks out of his/her own experience and it’s a specific example of a discrepancy between the normal workflow and the consequence of the disturbance. • Strong confirmation of proposition 2a 	<p>14min: Interviewer: “Were clients forgotten sometimes or?”</p> <p>Interviewee 1: “Yes forgotten, or the hours – that I for example had on my thing (c.f. planning) from 8.30-10.30 and someone else from 10.30-12.30 and then it’s wrong on the planning, or the client got it wrong on their calendar.”</p>
	<p>●<i>observation P2(ii)</i></p> <p>Account evidence. Interview II team members Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II</p> <p><i>Observation on discrepancy between normal workflow and consequence of disturbance and reaction</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu. This piece of evidence tells us something about the feeling the team members had when experiencing a discrepancy between the normal workflow and the consequence of the disturbance (the planning mistake). Team members have a feeling some routine-related actions (the service phone) are failing. The uniqueness of this evidence is quite high, because the team member explains a specific situation where a planning mistake 	<p>15min: Interviewee: “If you go somewhere and they (cf. clients) say: ‘I didn’t know you were coming’ then it’s like they (c.f. service phone) didn’t put it (cf. the information) through.”</p> <p>> The interviewees state that when they perceived these signs that something went wrong with the planning, they are not sure what the cause of this is, but they feel it could have something to do with the service phone. They have a feeling the service phone is probably failing.</p>

		<p>caused the disturbance and what his/her reaction to that was. We trust the source, because it's a team member who speaks out of his/her own experience and the team member specifies the gut feeling about the service phone possible failing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong confirmation of proposition 2b 	
	<p>● <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 2</i></p>	<p>Because both pieces of evidence are found, we can confirm the presence of the proposition 2. This is because both observations show a clear example of the discrepancy between normal workflow and the consequence of the disturbance. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation</u> strong warranted, given P2(i) and P2(ii) are strong and accurate evidence of deviations in the workflow.</p>	
3	<p><u>Building block:</u> Intuition and judgement <u>Theorized part 3:</u> Individual team member based on this 'gut feeling' and 'familiar routines' judge that those 'signs' cannot be addressed through normal routines. <u>Fingerprints:</u> We expect to find fingerprints about how the team member decides the disturbance cannot be resolved through existing work-routines and actions the team carry out. Evidence can be found by asking the employees why the current work routine could not suffice to handle the disturbance.</p>		
	<p>● <i>observation P3(i)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team members Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II <i>Observation on existing work routines failing</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu. This piece of evidence says something about how current work routines are failing. The current routine does not suffice to handle the disturbance, hence the negative consequences of planning mistakes. The disturbance could thus become a problem they cannot handle using the existing routines. We trust the source, because the team member talks about experiences with this work routine and how it's failing, related to the planning problem. The evidence is quite unique, since the interviewee talks about the planning changes specifically. • Strong confirmation of proposition 3. 	<p>17min: Interviewee: "Before, when you had to report everything (c.f. changes in the planning) by phone, then I also forgot a lot of things." > Team member states that he/she forgot to report changes in the planning, which could also be a cause of the disturbance (shortcomings of the planning). Team members were not allowed to make changes themselves, this had to happen via the service phone for the current week and via the team leader for the upcoming week. These were the existing work routines, before the disturbance was handled by the team.</p>
	<p>● <i>observation P3(ii)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team members Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II <i>Observation on existing work routines failing</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu. This piece of evidence says something about how current work routines are failing. The current routine does not suffice to handle the disturbance, hence the 	<p>16min: Interviewee: "Planning of the next week we have to report to X (cf. team leader) and then we are responsible ourselves for reporting this (c.f. changes in the planning), but if it's in the current week then you have to report it to the service phone and then they make it right."</p>

	<p>negative consequences of planning mistakes. The disturbance could thus become a problem they cannot handle using the existing routines. We trust the source, because the team member talks about experiences with this work routine and how it's failing, related to the planning problem. The evidence is quite unique, since the interviewee talks about the planning changes specifically and the work agreements/routines seem clear for the whole team.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong confirmation of proposition 3. 	<p>> In the current week team members have to report changes in the planning to the service phone and those colleagues have to warn the clients about this. Team members specify sometimes this goes wrong and clients are not properly warned or changes are not effectively communicated within the team (e.g. when a team member has to take over a shift from a colleague).</p>
<p>● <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 3</i></p>	<p>Both pieces of evidence are found, we can confirm the presence of the proposition 3. If only P3(i) is found, we cannot confirm, whereas if P3(ii) is found, we might infer that P3 is present, because the piece of evidence confirms the presence of the proposition by detailing current work routines. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation</u> strong warranted, given P3(i) and P3(ii) are strong and accurate evidence of deviations in the workflow.</p>	
<p>Intermediate outcome <u>This leads to a perceived uncertain environment [equivocal information]</u></p>		
<p>4</p>	<p><u>Building block:</u> Entrepreneurial intuition for reducing uncertainty <u>Theorized part 4:</u> Because of this judgement, individual team member draws on his/her experience to identify those 'signs' that mismatch with organizational experience (routine), generating new information.</p>	
<p><u>Observable manifestations:</u> We expect to find fingerprints about the team member linking real work situations to the mismatch between what team members normally do and how the disturbance would impact this. Evidence can be found by asking the team members an example of work situations where the disturbance could become a problem that they cannot handle using existing work routines.</p>		
<p>● <i>observation P4(i)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team members Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II <i>Observation on experiences with the signs work routines are possibly failing</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mu. This piece of evidence is an example of where the disturbance could become a problem the team members cannot handle using existing work routines. Uniqueness is high, because the interviewees are discussing the planning issue, there is no other explanation. However, we cannot fully trust the source since the discussion is about opinions and the team members feel like the service phone is causing the problems, but we don't know if this is really the case. • Moderate confirmation of proposition 4. 	<p>15min: Interviewee 1: "In the beginning the service phone colleagues were often accused in my opinion." Interviewee 2: "Yes, I did that too: 'They didn't pass it on'. But from the current week it is the service phone colleagues right." > The team members have a discussion on the cause of the planning problems. They state that problems in the current week are the responsibility of the service phone colleagues.</p>

	<p>●<i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 4</i></p> <p>If P4(i) is found, we can confirm the presence of proposition 4 moderately. Observation P4(i) is relevant in terms of uniqueness, but not in terms of trust. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation</u> moderately warranted, given P4(i) is moderate evidence of the mismatch between experiences of the team members and organizational routine.</p>	
<p>5</p>	<p><u>Building block:</u> Cognitive versatility. <u>Theorized part 5:</u> Individual team member compares the selected 'signs' [the new information] with their expectations (what they expect as result of routinely workflow) and bracket them with the organizational framework according to the organizational flow of experience. <u>Fingerprints:</u> We expect to find fingerprints about the link between the real work situation and the disturbance the team member thinks is going to happen where normal work routines are not sufficient. Evidence can be found by asking the team members how this link would fit into their team structure and activities.</p>	
<p>●<i>observation P5(i)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team members Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II <i>Observation on comparing signs with expectations and bracket this with the organizational framework</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu. This piece of evidence is a very clear statement on the failing work routines: changes in the planning cause the team members and their clients frustration. Clients are not happy with the service the team members provide. The planning system is not flexible enough to provide good service to clients. Therefore, we have a clear evidence of what the team thinks is going to happen when normal work routines are not sufficient. We can trust this source because the interviewees are team members who speak out of their own experience with the planning issues. A clear example is given, the cause is also clear for team members: clients are not happy because of the planning issues. There's no alternative explanation. ● Strong confirmation of proposition 5. 	<p>15min: Interviewee: "Clients have become harder to deal with, if you're not allowed to enter (their home) then it's clear right, they were just not satisfied." > Team members are talking about clients who don't allow care workers to come inside, because it was not planned like that or because they weren't warned about this. Team members state that clients have higher expectations and that their planning system is not flexible enough to handle this.</p>
	<p>●<i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 5</i></p> <p>If P5(i) is found, we can confirm the presence of proposition 5. Observation P5(i) is relevant in terms of uniqueness and trust, and information of what we can interpret. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation</u> strong warranted, given P5(i) is strong evidence of team members bracketing signs of a disturbance in the organizational framework.</p>	
<p>6</p>	<p><u>Building block:</u> Cognitive versatility. <u>Theorized part 6:</u> Cues are extracted by individual team member from the context in which the disturbance is occurring, providing points of reference for developing a larger sense of what may be occurring.</p>	

	<p><u>Fingerprints:</u> We expect to find fingerprints about how the team member puts this link (between real life work situations and a possible disturbance and how the work routines don't suffice to solve it) into their head (experience). Evidence can be found by asking team members how they try to become better at noticing signs/possible disturbance.</p>	
	<p>●<i>observation P6(i)</i> Account evidence. Interview I team members Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II <i>Observation on comparing signs with expectations and bracket this with the organizational framework</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu. This piece of information tells us something about how team members have put the link between the negative consequences of mistakes in the planning and the service phone in their head. They mention that service phone colleagues lack information about clients to properly make changes and adapt the planning. Also, they mention too many steps in the organizational flow to be able to change the planning effectively. Team members clearly made a preferred work routine which is incorporated in their mental models: less steps in between and more direct planning. Therefore, we can trust this source and what is meant. ● Strong confirmation proposition 6 	<p>36min: Interviewer: “Was the organization aware of your experiences with the service phone to change the planning? Is that something that was discussed before?” Interviewee 1: “There always have been issues, because (...) we are 10 people who have to be flexible constantly and change things, the service phone is not always the same (cf. not always the same person who does this task). And they don’t have a view on where he/she lives (cf. client) and I notice that it goes wrong sometimes. (...) There are too many steps to change and regulate 1 thing.” Interviewee 2: “(...) we know where our clients live and we see that, but they (cf. the service phone colleagues) don’t see that.” Interviewee 1: “But it (cf. changes in the planning) always has to go via them.” Interviewee 2: “Yes.” Interviewee 1: “And that’s where it goes wrong sometimes.”</p>
	<p>●<i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 5</i> The piece of evidence is found, we can confirm the presence of the proposition 6. With only P6(i) found, we can confirm, since this is quite unique, and we can trust it. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation</u> strong warranted, given P6 is accurate evidence of the existence of a ‘extracted cue and its incorporation in the mental models’.</p>	
<p>O u t c o m e</p>	<p><u>Theorized outcome:</u> Cognitive discrepancy (cue situation) caused by the extracted cue that modify the work-flow routines.</p> <p><u>Observable manifestations:</u> We expect to find fingerprints concerning the disturbance that causes team members an unpleasant feeling. Something that causes a discrepancy between the planned work routine and the actual situation. Evidence can be found by asking team members what the event is that causes their unpleasant feeling and how they noticed this (what is the cue).</p> <p>●<i>observation O1(i)</i> Account evidence. Interview I team leader Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II <i>Observation on the cognitive discrepancy caused by the extracted cue</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu. This piece of evidence is quite unique, it specifies the feeling team members have (insecurity) because of the extracted cue. We can trust this source because it is the team leader who speaks out of his/her own experience with the feeling of the team members <p>3min: Interviewee: “There were a lot of reactions from team members saying the first week a lot changes, but the second week so much changes. They get 3 times changes via e-mail, but also clients get three times a notification: “Next week they’re coming on Tuesday morning, oh no it will be in the afternoon, oh no it’s...” (...) It gives (the team members) a lot of insecurity.” > Team leader specifies the feeling team members have because of changes in the planning.</p>	

		concerning this situation. There are no reasons to mention this, if team members would not feel this way.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong confirmation of the outcome 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition O1</i> 	<p>In general, with this piece of evidence found, we can confirm the presence of the outcome.</p> <p>If O1(i) is found, we can confirm the presence of cognitive discrepancy. Observation (i) is relevant in terms of uniqueness and trust, and information of what we can interpret.</p> <p>Sources are relatively independent.</p> <p><u>Overall confirmation</u> strong warranted, given O1(i) is strong evidence of the existence of a discrepancy produced by the extracted cue and it is accurate because we can trust the source.</p>	

Roadmap Cognitive Dissonance

Case 2: Planning (Familiehulp Leuven – Team Kessel-Lo II)

	<p><u>Causal relationship</u> <i>Causal mechanism linking motivational force as sense of urgency within a context of high magnitude of dissonance, with the success of complex team problem-solving.</i></p> <p><u>Prior relatively low</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no existing research about the cases.
C	<u>Theorized cause:</u> Due to the dissonance caused by 'unexpected events' [violation of expectations] at work, individual team member feels pressure to
a	reduce it because he/she is aware that unresolved dissonance could interfere with (1) his/her effective job performance' and group performance, and (2)
u	because it is psychologically unpleasant.
s	<u>Observable manifestations:</u> Expect to find evidence in the empirical record of employees' (who work in Flemish companies; individual team members,
e	team leader, team members) activities relating to 'feelings of frustration' or violated expectations about the workflow routines planning, along with activities relating to the 'preoccupation with the failure' of the consequences of this dissonance in the own performance, group performance and the emotional state. Evidence for this can be found by asking employees about their feelings and thoughts when an unexpected event has modified the planned work routines. This could be measured using account evidence (from interviews with involved actors). — Htu ²
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Theoretical certainty not formulated (no priors) • High theoretical uniqueness, as observing this observable manifestation necessarily means the presence of a <i>cognitive dissonance arousal</i> (Festinger, 1957).

² Note: Htu= high theoretical uniqueness; Hu = High uniqueness; Mu = Moderate uniqueness; Lu = Low uniqueness.

<p>●<i>observation</i> C1(i)</p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team leader Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II <i>Observation on feelings of frustration and violated expectations</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu. These problems mentioned show team members are frustrated and stressed about current work routines. There are various reasons for that, one of them being the changes in the planning that occur and cause mistakes (see mechanism Pattern Recognition). We can trust this source, because it is the team leader who speaks out of his/her own experience with the reaction of the team members. These are things team members said to the team leader. There is no reason to assume the team leader would lie about this. This evidence is highly unique, since the feelings of the team members are clearly about the planning issues and the changes thereof. ● Strong confirmation of condition 1 	<p>5min: Interviewee: “There was another problem they mentioned: on the one hand the planning is complicated, on the other hand we don’t have enough time (cf. for the meeting) and a third problem they mentioned was that clients are notified for two weeks, but especially the schedule of the second week, they get 3-4 times a message that it changes. (...) The client cannot count on it, because it continuously changes especially the second week.” > Team leader explains how team members feel about the planning issues. They mention not having enough time to plan, which makes them feel stressed.</p>
<p>●<i>observation</i> C1(ii)</p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team members Familiehulp Subregioteam Turnhout <i>Observation on feelings of frustration</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Mu. This piece of evidence is unique, because there is no other explanation for this conversation: team members are expressing their feelings about current work routines regarding the planning process. We do not trust the source fully, since team members mainly focus on being frustrated or when they are new in the team, so the first few times they do the planning. However, one of the interviewees does state more mistakes happened in the past, which is one of the reasons team members have this unpleasant feeling. The other team members seemed to confirm this statement. ● Moderate confirmation of condition 1 	<p>26min: Interviewee 1: “I have experienced there were more mistakes before in comparison to now. (...) A lot more mistakes than now.” Interviewee 2: “I thought it was horrible (...) It’s the planning for two weeks. You are thrown in and you don’t know these people. Ugh, and then it was everyone, per colleague they talked about the clients and then it was put into it (cf. the planning) for two weeks. I thought it was horrible the first few times. (...) Interviewee 3: “I still have that.” (laughter) Interviewee 1: “Yes, but that’s also because you’re new in the team right.” > Team members talk about the way of planning before they changed it. About the fact there were more mistakes and the planning process itself was not pleasant, especially the first few times for a new colleague.</p>
<p>●<i>Aggregation of evidence for observable manifestations</i> C1</p>	<p>Because both pieces of evidence are found, we can confirm the presence of the condition ‘motivational force as sense of urgency’. If only C1(ii) is found, we cannot confirm, whereas if C1(i) is found, we might infer that C1 is present. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation</u> moderately warranted, given C1(i): is accurate evidence of ‘frustration’ and the presence of violated expectations among employees, whereas C1(ii) is modest evidence of the feelings of ‘frustration’ from the team members’ side. In addition, C1(ii) is clearer in terms of motivational force to reduce dissonance.</p>	

1	<p><u>Theorized part</u>: Individual team member seeks out information about the sources of this 'cognitive discrepancy' (the salient cues not prevented by the current mental models) by collecting material with the expectation to achieve consonant cognition with the existing cognitive elements.</p>	
<p><u>Observable manifestations</u>: Expect to find evidence in the empirical record of employees where team members are engaging in activities related to searching information about the cue noticed in order to reduce the unpleasant feeling/frustration and go back to the work routine. Evidence for this can be found by asking employees what they do first when an unexpected event at work is already noticed, how they feel and what they expect to happen to be able to go back to their work routines. This could be measured using account evidence (from interviews with involved actors).</p>		
<p>— Htu</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Theoretical certainty not formulated (no priors) • Relatively high theoretical uniqueness. Highly unlikely to find this fingerprint without the mechanism of 'cognitive dissonance reduction' being operative because dissonance is unpleasant when the magnitude thereof is high, therefore 'trying to' reduce such unpleasant feelings is a key part of the process of cognitive reduction theory. 		
<p>• <i>observation</i> PI(i)</p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview I team leader Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II</p> <p><i>Observation on what team does first when a disturbance happens</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu. The evidence is empirically unique, because it shows how team members try to reduce the unpleasant feeling by trying to figure out how to go back to their work routines and take care of the issue. We can trust the source (credible and competent team leader), because the team leader, in general, knows the team members' performances. There is no reason to suspect the team leader would make a reaction like this up. • Strong confirmation of proposition 1 	<p>4min: Interviewer: "I was wondering, how does the idea of trying it another way come about? (...) Is that also something that's being discussed with the group?"</p> <p>Interviewee: "It depends, now for the planning (...), that came partly from the team. It begins with they report: 'this doesn't work anymore', and then we don't have an answer to that immediately. So, by talking about it together regularly, like okay this doesn't work, but what could work? And then it's looking for: what could work."</p>
<p>• <i>observation</i> PI(ii)</p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team members Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II</p> <p><i>Observation on violated expectations about workflow routines</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu. The evidence is empirically unique. The interviewer specifically asks about an example that was given by an interviewee concerning a planning issue. Team members respond that the reaction of team members is mostly shared with each other (and with the team leader) on their weekly meetings (cf. wijkteams). We trust the source, because the interviewee has a clear answer to the question as to how they share their violated expectations about workflow routines and the other interviewees seemed to agree. • Strong confirmation of proposition 1 	<p>23min: Interviewer: "The example you gave, concretely, that one time it wasn't clear who had to do what and who had to inform who. Are those things you discuss in the team? (...) More generally, do you share those things in the team?"</p> <p>Interviewee: "Those are the moments on the meetings (cf. wijkteams) that you come together and you can say like that was annoying or this has happened, most of the times we try to look for a solution with everyone and then X (cf. team leader) writes that down."</p>

<p>●<i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 1</i></p>	<p>Both pieces of evidence are found, we can confirm the presence of the proposition 1. If only P1(i) is found, we cannot confirm, whereas if P1(i) and P1(ii) are found, we might infer that P1 is present. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation</u> strong warranted, given proposition 1 is strong evidence of ‘activities related to information-searching for reducing dissonance when the magnitude thereof is high.</p>	
<p>2</p>	<p><u>Theorized part:</u> Individual team member identifies some dissonant-increasing new information: 'actual signs of trouble that deserve closer attention'.</p> <p><u>Observable manifestations:</u> We expect to find fingerprints concerning the increase of preoccupation with failure and activities that can reflect that the noticed issue is actual and important for the team member. These activities are related to the non-stop searching for sources that can reduce the increased dissonance when the magnitude thereof is high. Evidence can be found by asking the participants what they do when searching and finding information of cues that does not match with their workflow routine. We expect to see that the team member does not stop searching for consonance. However, if the magnitude of the dissonance is not increased even if the team members figure out information that the actual cue could deserve some attention, the process of cognitive dissonance reduction could end. Evidence can be found by asking the participants whether they go back to work routines when an event is considered as abnormal in the workflow production process and why.</p> <p>— Htu</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ●Theoretical certainty not formulated (no priors) ●Relatively high theoretical uniqueness for (1) non-stop search of information, because we consider it would be difficult to otherwise explain why team members engage in iterative voluntary search of information after noticing a cue – if it is not for reducing the dissonance. ●Relatively high theoretical uniqueness for (2) stop of searching information, but it’s highly unlikely to find this activity if team members are still experiencing cognitive dissonance. Process stops when dissonance is reduced because of the low magnitude and then the mechanism is not operative anymore. 	
<p>●<i>observation P2(i)</i></p>	<p>Interview II team members Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II</p> <p><i>Observation on what team expects to happen</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Mu. Modest information is given about what team members expect to happen within the new situation where signs of trouble (cue) were taken seriously. Team members talk about how there used to be more errors in the planning. This could have been the reason to take the cue seriously and not go back to work routines before a solution is presented. We trust the source, because the team members speak out of their own experience. Uniqueness is moderate, because team members talk about the situation before work routines were changed, so we don’t know if this information was the trigger to not go back to their work routines. We can assume more errors would have happened when routines would still be the same as when the cue was first taken seriously. The errors could have been a trigger for the team members to look for more information. 	<p>9min: The interviewee states that the problem was that a lot of time was lost during the two-weekly team meetings, having to make the work planning. They say less errors in the planning with client visits occur now, which means team members experienced errors with the planning before these work routines were changed.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderate confirmation of proposition 2 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>observation P2(ii)</i> 	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team leader Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II</p> <p><i>Observation on preoccupation for the failure, search for information related to cues that does not match with work-flow routine. Team members don't go back to routine: cue is taking seriously.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu. This observation shows team members don't go back to their routines. They mention to the team leader that their way of planning is not working. Errors occur and team members feel stressed. We can trust this source, because it is the team leader who speaks out of his/her own experience with the reaction of the team members. These are things team members said to the team leader. There is no reason to assume the team leader would lie about this. This evidence is highly unique, since the feelings of the team members are clearly about the planning issues and their feelings about this. • Strong confirmation of proposition 1 	<p>4min: Interviewee: "Even before (IAO) the care workers mentioned to me: this doesn't work. We all leave the meeting after one and a half hour feeling over stressed, we have no time to discuss client situations. We are always discussing planning planning planning."</p> <p>> Team members mention having no time to discuss client situations, which could cause errors. Team members have a preoccupation with failure, as they identify activities they do not want to go wrong.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 2</i> 	<p>Because both pieces of evidence are found, we can confirm the presence of the proposition 2.</p> <p>If only P2(i) is found, we cannot confirm, whereas if P2(ii) is found, we might infer that P2 is present.</p> <p>Sources are relatively independent.</p> <p><u>Overall confirmation</u> moderately warranted, given P2(i): is modest evidence of 'what teams expect to happen' and P2(ii) is accurate evidence of the presence of preoccupation for the failure, team members not going back to work routines. In addition, P2(ii) is more relevant in terms of having the content as a whole.</p>	
3		<p><u>Theorized part:</u> Due to this increase of dissonance, individual team members search for social support - by communicating the perceived signs of trouble to other peers - in order to know what to do.</p> <p><u>Observable manifestations:</u> Expect to find - in the empirical record - teams members' activities relating to searching some kind of support via communication about what to do, along with activities relating to understanding the problem that the perceived cue is generating and what to do to solve it. Evidence for this part can be found by asking employees (account evidence) whether the team members meet each other (formal/informal) to communicate their concern and which other persons are involved.</p> <p>— Htu</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Theoretical certainty not formulated (no priors) • Relatively high theoretical uniqueness. Highly unlikely to find this fingerprint without the mechanism of 'cognitive dissonance reduction' being operative, because the search of support about 'what to do' with the cue noticed, implies a social acknowledge of the alteration of the work flows and a search for solutions within a dissonant cognitive environment. 	

<p>●<i>observation P3(i)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team members Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II <i>Observation on communication between peers</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Mu. The observation tells us something about the existence of communication among peers and information related to what to do with the problem. However, it is not clear how the discussion went in detail, so we cannot trust the source completely. The evidence is empirically unique. The interviewer specifically asks about an example that was given by an interviewee concerning a planning issue. Team members respond that the reaction of team members is mostly shared with each other (and with the team leader) on their weekly meetings (cf. wijkteams). ● Modest confirmation of proposition 3 	<p>23min: Interviewer: “The example you gave, concretely, that one time it wasn’t clear who had to do what and who had to inform who. Are those things you discuss in the team? (...) More generally, do you share those things in the team?” Interviewee: “Those are the moments on the meetings (cf. wijkteams) that you come together and you can say like that was annoying or this has happened, most of the times we try to look for a solution with everyone and then X (cf. team leader) writes that down.”</p>
<p>●<i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 3</i></p>	<p>Because a single piece of evidence is found, we can confirm the presence of the proposition 3. If P3(i) is found, we can confirm the presence of proposition 3 moderately. Observation (i) is relevant in terms of uniqueness, but not in terms of trust. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation</u> moderately warranted, given P3(i) is moderate evidence of the communication between peers about the perceived cue.</p>	
<p>4</p>	<p><u>Theorized part:</u> Team members listen to each other about their concern and agree that, even if a long-term solution is imperative for this cue, some urgent measures need to be implemented, because the cue has escalated.</p> <p><u>Observable manifestations:</u> Expect to find fingerprints concerning the severity of the problem, stating this is something the team cannot ignore, but action needs to be taken immediately in order to solve the problem correctly. To make sure the tasks can be executed. Evidence can be found in work agreements that can be made to solve this problem at least temporarily, until a more permanent solution can be made. — Htu</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Theoretical certainty not formulated (no priors) ● Relatively high theoretical uniqueness. If the mechanism does not exist, the expected probability of finding work agreements that can be made to resolve an urgent problem causing dissonance is low. <p>●<i>observation P4(i)</i></p> <p>Account evidence. Interview II team leader Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II <i>Observation on severity of the problem</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Mu. This observation is highly unique, because the subject is clearly the planning issue, there is no alternative explanation. However, we cannot confirm this was the exact point where it escalated for the team members. It could be that it escalated earlier. We assume it escalated at this point, because they took it to the team leader, which is <p>4min: Interviewee: “Even before (IAO) the care workers mentioned to me: this doesn’t work. We all leave the meeting after one and a half hour feeling over stressed, we have no time to discuss client situations. We are always discussing planning planning planning. Is there a solution for this?” > This is the moment where the cue escalates for the team members. They mention to the team leader the way of planning doesn’t work for them for various reasons, see also</p>	

	<p>a sign they could not deal with it themselves because of the severity of the problem.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderate confirmation of proposition 4 	<p>C1(i). From this point on, the team starts looking for a solution.</p>
<p>●<i>observation P4(ii)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview I team leader Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II</p> <p><i>Observation on work agreements</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu. The observation as a whole tells us something about the work agreements in terms of planning. The team comes together every week (1 week full team, next week partially) instead of only every two weeks for the planning, which gives them more time to discuss clients and other things the first week with the full team. The cue is not being ignored, and some actions are being taken by the team in order to keep the workflow going. This was an idea from the team members. We trust the source, because the team leader speaks out of his/her own experience with the planning issues and the suggestion from the team is detailed, like it was well remembered. • Strong confirmation of proposition 4 	<p>3min: Interviewee: “This (cf. changes in the planning) causes so much uncertainty and frustration among both the care workers and the clients, and then they suggested: can't we just do this on a weekly basis, then much less will change. Officially this was not possible within the existing time (we are entitled to one and a half meeting hours every two weeks), but due to the fact that we now say ok we come 1 week with all together 1 hour for the planning, there's still time to discuss clients and other points. And the next week there are only a few team members who come for the planning, that makes that we do not go over our hours, because we always have to take that into account.”</p>
<p>●<i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 4</i></p>	<p>Two pieces of evidence are found, we can confirm the presence of the proposition 4. If only P4(i) is found, we cannot confirm proposition 4, whereas if P4(ii) is found, we might infer that P4 is present, because it is a supporting observation of making agreements when the cue escalated. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation</u> moderately warranted, given P4(i) is moderate evidence of 'severity of the problem' and P4(ii) is accurate evidence of the presence of work agreements, efforts to deal with the problem and cues that are not being ignored.</p>	
<p>5</p>	<p><u>Theorized part:</u> Due to this escalation, some kind of common awareness is established within team about the possible slippage of the cues if they are not managed on time and the bad consequences for the team performance. Thus, using this argument, team members craft some kind of solution they can provide individually from their autonomy [e.g. re-planning].</p> <p><u>Observable manifestations:</u> Expect to see evidence of activities carried out by the team members in getting some kind of alignment and managing the escalated problem-solving process at work from their autonomy. This can involve agenda management (planning), attempting to ensure that the issue can be controlled to ensuring avoid workload situations and slippage. Finding in interviews (account evidence) that team members established some kind of common awareness about the problem and a search for some kind of solution (for example by re-planning agenda, etc.) would be strong confirming evidence.</p> <p>— Htu</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Theoretical certainty not formulated (no priors) • Relatively high theoretical uniqueness, because we consider it would be difficult to otherwise explain why team members engage in iterative voluntary search of information after noticing a cue – if it is not for reducing the dissonance. 	

<p>●<i>observation P5(i)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence, Interview II team leader Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II <i>Observation on search for a solution</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu. The evidence is empirically unique. There are no reasons to say that one feels addressed and has a great sense of responsibility, if one is not concerned to deal with the issue. When talking about this issue, team member states that everyone contributes to the solution and no one ignores the need for such a solution, so there is a common awareness. Another team member also confirms this. Therefore, we can trust the source, because they confirm each other, and they are talking about the absence of X because the interviewer specifically asked about this issue. ● Strong confirmation of proposition 5 	<p>5min30: “And then the suggestion came from them: let us make the planning for two weeks, but we notify the client for one week. And then there are two team members who come here when there’s no meeting (cf. wijkteam), and they look what messages come in and they change the second week. So that (cf. the second week’s planning) wasn’t made from zero, it was a modification of what we made in group.”</p>
<p>●<i>observation P5(ii)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence, Interview II team members Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II <i>Observation on common awareness</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu. This evidence is empirically unique, because interviewees explain the process of how the cue was taken seriously by the team and team leader and how a common awareness was created. It becomes clear this is a ‘shared issue’ and the other team members feel the same way. All three team members in the interviewed confirmed this. Therefore, we can trust the source, because they confirm each other. ● Strong confirmation of proposition 5 	<p>9min: Interviewer: “What was the idea behind it to do it differently?(...)” Interviewee: “We lose a lot of time during meetings (cf. wijkteams) with the planning and now we have more time to talk about clients.” Other interviewees confirm this. > Team members specify problems they have with the planning: there’s no time to discuss clients and a lot of errors occur (see also pattern recognition mechanism) and state this was the idea behind changing the work routines.</p>
<p>●<i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 5</i></p>	<p>Two pieces of evidence are found, we can confirm the presence of the proposition 5. If only P4(i) is found, we cannot confirm proposition 4, whereas if P4(i) and P4 (ii) are found, we might infer that P4 is present, because both pieces of evidence reinforced each other. P4(i) reveals evidence on a search for solution, whereas P4(ii) reveals evidence related to common awareness. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation</u> strong warranted, given p5(i) shows the search for a solution and p5(ii) is strong evidence of ‘common awareness’ within the team about the escalation of the problem and the consequences thereof.</p>	
<p>6</p>	<p><u>Theorized part:</u> As they are searching for solutions, team members debate that such solutions are not sustainable in the long term, producing a uniform within-team reaction that some actions need to be taken and approved by the team leader because of her/his expertise and experience. <u>Observable manifestations:</u> Expect to see evidence of discussions and concerns in the team about the long-term character of the problem. Evidence can be found in the interviews (account evidence) by asking what a long-term solution for this problem would be, and to what point the team members can decide/solve this problem on their own.</p>	

<p>●<i>observation</i> P6(i)</p>	<p>Account evidence, Interview II team leader Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II <i>Observation on concerns about long-term character</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu. The observation clearly tells us something about the existence of the concern about the sustainability of the solution presented. Team members mentioned to the team leader they thought the new work agreement “didn’t make sense”. So, they decided to change it, this work agreement was not feasible in the long term. Team members did use the knowledge and “power” of the team leader to make this an official work agreement, because that is not in their power. We trust the source, because the team leader speaks about the events and the interviewee didn’t hesitate in telling this story. The evidence is unique, because there is no alternative explanation. ● Strong confirmation proposition 6 	<p>6min: Interviewee: “But after a while we started to notice that actually the second week a lot changes and they have to start from ok this we all made together, those messages come in and so we change that. So they didn’t think it made any sense. And then it changed to what we do every 14 days on the meeting (cf. wijkteam), we make the planning for 1 week, notify clients for 1 week and the next week two team members come here and they make the planning (cf. for the second week) from now on. Starting from scratch. And then we notify the clients.”</p>
<p>●<i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 6</i></p>	<p>Because this single piece of evidence p6(i) has strong confirmation, we can, therefore, confirm the presence of the proposition 6. <u>Overall confirmation</u> strong warranted, given p6(i) is strong evidence of concerns about the long-term character of the problem. This piece of observation is accurate evidence of the presence of concerns of long-term character and the need for a long-term solution.</p>	
<p>7</p>	<p><u>Theorized part:</u> Team members decide to communicate their concerns to team leader with arguments about their preoccupation with failure, in order to search a final solution to the escalated problem.</p>	
<p><u>Observable manifestations:</u> Expect to find fingerprints in the empirical record of the employees’ activities relating to trying to figure out what measures can be undertaken top-down. Inquiring about what is possible as a long-term solution. Evidence can be found in the interviews (account evidence) by asking team members what their next step was in communicating their concern to the team leader.</p>		
<p>●<i>observation</i> P7(i)</p>	<p>Account evidence: Interview II team leader Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II <i>Observation on communicating concern to team leader</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu. The evidence is empirically unique, because there is no alternative explanation for this evidence. We are sure the team members are talking about the planning method. We can trust the source (credible and competent leader) who knows the team members because it’s the team leader who speaks out of her own experience with the problem and describes how the team members come to him/her to search solutions because the current way of working is stressing them out. ● Strong confirmation of proposition 7 	<p>4min: Interviewee: “Even before (IAO) the care workers mentioned to me: this doesn’t work. We all leave the meeting after one and a half hour feeling over stressed, we have no time to discuss client situations. We are always discussing planning planning planning. Is there a solution for this?” > Team members come to a point where they feel stressed and feel the need to express this to their team leader, in order to be able to search for a solution.</p>

<p>●<i>observation P7(ii)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence: Interview II team leader Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II <i>Observation on communicating concern to team leader</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu. The team leader details three different problems the team members mentioned concerning the planning. This evidence is empirically unique, and we can trust the source, because it's the team leader who speaks out of her own experience with the problem. The team leader speaks as if he/she understands where the team is coming from and why it's a problem for them. ● Strong confirmation of proposition 7 	<p>5min: Interviewee: "There was another problem they mentioned: on the one hand the planning is complicated, on the other hand we don't have enough time (cf. for the meeting) and a third problem they mentioned was that clients are notified for two weeks, but especially the schedule of the second week, they get 3-4 times a message that it changes. (...) The client cannot count on it, because it continuously changes especially the second week." > Team leader explains how team members feel about the planning issues. They mention not having enough time to plan, which makes them feel stressed.</p>
<p>●<i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 7</i></p>	<p>Because the two pieces of evidence are found, we can confirm the presence of the proposition 7. If only P7(i) or P7(ii) is found, we can confirm proposition 7, because both observations provides evidence about the presence of communication concern to team leader. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation</u> strongly warranted, given p7(i) and p7(ii) are accurate evidence of the presence of communication concern from team leader and team members.</p>	
<p>8</p>	<p><u>Theorized part:</u> Team leader listens and notices that the issue is important for the whole group and deserves attention. (team leader cannot pretend that nothing's wrong and the rest of his/her team knows there is - it can be really problematic).</p>	
<p><u>Observable manifestations:</u> Expect to see evidence concerning the reaction of the team leader to the inquiry of the team about top-down measures. This is the signal for the team to either solve the problem themselves, also in the long-term, or to start executing the measures taken by the team leader. Evidence for this part can be found in the interviews (account evidence) by asking the team leader what the reaction was to the inquiry of the team.</p>		
<p>●<i>observation P8(i)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview I team leader Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II <i>Observation on reaction from team leader</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Mu. The observation tells us something about the existence of a reaction from team leader, however the reaction is general. There is no detailed information as to what the team leader's exact actions were. We do know there were conversations in order to find a solution, but there are no extra details given about this. We cannot trust on this source completely, because the information given is not detailed enough. ● Moderate confirmation of proposition 8 	<p>4min: Interviewer: "I was wondering, how does the idea of trying it another way come about? (...) Is that also something that's being discussed with the group?" Interviewee: "It depends, now for the planning (...), that came partly from the team. It begins with they report: 'this doesn't work anymore', and then we don't have an answer to that immediately. So by talking about it together regularly, like okay this doesn't work, but what could work? And then it's looking for: what could work." > Team leader explains that they don't have an answer immediately, but that they talk about in within the team, trying to find a solution.</p>
<p>●<i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 8</i></p>	<p>With this single piece of evidence P8(i), we can confirm the presence of the proposition 8. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation</u> moderately warranted, given p8(i): is modest evidence of 'reaction from team leader'.</p>	

9	<p><u>Theorized part:</u> Team leader confirms the importance of the problem and manages the discussion by proposing some kind of problem-solving setting with the whole team as a way to increase the likelihood of recovery and continuing reliable performance.</p>	
	<p><u>Observable manifestations:</u> Expect to find fingerprints about the top-down measures that will be undertaken by the team leader. The severity of the problem is acknowledged, either the team members get the signal that they have to take care of the problem or they get help from the team leader with certain top-down measures. Evidence for this part can be found in the communication of the ‘communicator’ team member (who went to the team leader to ask about the measures) to the rest of the team about the reaction of the team leader. This could be on a team meeting or informal one (trace evidence).</p>	
<p>● <i>observation P9(i)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence, Interview II team members Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II <i>Observation on reaction team leader within the team</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu. This observation is empirically unique. It tells us something about the involvement of the team leader in the problem-solving setting. We can also infer that the problem was important for the team leader, because as mentioned, she helped find a solution for the problem. The process of finding a solution seemed to be a joint process between the team members and the team leader, but the final decision was in the hands of the team leader. ● Strong confirmation of proposition 9 	<p>27min: Interviewer: "To implement the different approach to work planning, did that idea come from the group or did it come from somewhere else?" Interviewee 1: "From higher up, I guess." Interviewee 2: "Yeah, but from the group, too." Interviewee 3: "We have Project 2020" (...) Interviewee 2: "With the group we always try, if something went wrong we try to do things differently or X (cf. team leader) asked 'what are your ideas or how do you see it'." Interviewer: "Was that the case with this too?" Interviewee 2: "Yes with the planning as well and then the Project 2020 came about and that was that with the star roles and that's how we tried it out." Interviewee 3: "Then it was everyone's turn and then X (cf. team leader) asked who thinks that's fun and who wants to keep doing that?" > These star roles refer to the two team members who make the planning in the second week.</p>
<p>● <i>observation P9(ii)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence, Interview II team members Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II <i>Observation on reaction team leader within the team</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu. This piece of observation tells us something about the initiative of the team leader. Interviewees state that the team leader proposed this problem-solving setting in the light of a policy plan from higher up. The team leader clearly had an influence on the solution. We trust the source, because the team members seemed to be on the same page here. Also, this piece of evidence is unique, because the interviewer specifically asks about the planning situation. ● Strong confirmation of proposition 9 	<p>29min: Interviewer: "At the time, were there any other ideas to address this planning issue? Were there alternatives or something like that?" Interviewee 2: "No." Interviewee 1: "Now I also think that X (cf. team leader) has sent us in this direction, because then that Project 2020 came there." > Team member states that the team leader sent the team in the direction of this new work agreement concerning the planning.</p>

<p>●<i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 9</i></p>	<p>Because both pieces of evidence are found, we can confirm the presence of the proposition 9. If only p9(i) or p9(ii), are found we can still confirm, since we do not need both pieces of evidence to infer that P9 is present (team members observations). Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation</u> strong warranted, given p9(i) and p9 (ii) are accurate evidence of the importance of the problem and the problem-solving setting proposed with the whole team, but with the team leader in the decision- making seat.</p>	
<p>10</p>	<p><u>Theorized part:</u> Team members agreed with the existing proposal because they feel listened to/taken seriously as the issue is put on the agenda by the team leader for its resolution. The cognitive discrepancy is reduced although not yet eliminated.</p>	
	<p><u>Observable manifestations:</u> Expect to see evidence of activities reflecting that after having checked the undertaken top-down measures, the team has to move further with a long-term solution. This can be observed in a team meeting where work agreements are made. Possibilities are given by all individual team members and there's a discussion. Evidence for this part can be found in the interview with participants (account evidence) by asking about the long-term solution for this problem and how this came about. A written report of this meeting can also be a piece of evidence (trace evidence).</p>	
<p>●<i>observation P10(i)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence, Interview II team members Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II <i>Observation on reflecting on the undertaken measures</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu. The observation as a whole clearly tells us something about the team members agreeing with the existing proposal, because it solves a lot of their frustrations. Team members are able to give firsthand information and they confirm each other, which is why we trust the source. This piece of evidence is unique, because it details the positive outcome of the proposed solution to the planning issues. ● Strong confirmation proposition 10 	<p>9min30: Interviewee 3: "Now we have more time to talk about these things. Also, in my opinion less mistakes happen towards the clients, for the planning itself. Clients that get the schedule. I don't know, it goes quicker, it can be controlled more closely." Other interviewees confirm. Interviewee 2: "Yes, our planning hours (c.f. time foreseen to make the planning) have been rearranged to allow for more client reviews, because you only have a certain number of hours to use for that." Interviewee 3: "And if it always had to be done in those hours, there wouldn't be much time left for anything else".</p>
<p>●<i>observation P10(ii)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence, Interview II team members Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II <i>Observation on reflecting on the undertaken measures</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu. The evidence is empirically unique, it shows why team members wanted this issue to be taken seriously. The lack of time to talk about client situations impacted their daily work routine, so for them it was important to do something about this. We trust the source, because it is first line information about the way of working and negative consequences of the cue. ● Strong confirmation proposition 10 	<p>10min: Interviewer: "Why is it important for you to discuss that client information?" Interviewee 2: "We don't see each other every day, and then that's really a moment when you can really say something about a client, tell about a situation, or ask advice from colleagues." Interviewee 1: "Because then you also find out everything about your colleagues, because the clients act different with each colleague."</p>
<p>●<i>observation P10(iii)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence, Interview II team members Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II <i>Observation on search for a permanent solution</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu. The observation as a whole tells us something about the way in which team members deal with going back to 	<p>29min: Interviewee: "And the idea of rotating, that team members come here to make the schedule, how was that received by the team members when the idea was proposed?" Interviewee 1: "There are many team members who have</p>

		<p>work. Making the planning during the second week is something many team members don't like. This rotation system is therefore not sustainable in the long term, which is why the topic is still on the agenda. We trust the source, because all interviewees are on the same page and they confirm each other's statements. This piece of evidence is unique, because the interviewer asks about the rotation system in detail.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong confirmation proposition 10 	<p>said: I don't want to do that, we'd rather not." Other interviewees confirm.</p> <p>> The new work agreements about the planning are received well, but this also consists of two team members having to make the planning during the second week. For this task, there's a rotation system: everyone should do it. Team members state that making the planning isn't something every team member likes to do. There were many team members who said: I'd rather not do that.</p>
	<p>● <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 10</i></p>	<p>With these three pieces of evidence found, we can confirm the presence of the proposition 10. If only p10(i) and p10(ii) are found, we cannot confirm, since we need at least the presence of p10(iii). We might infer that p10 is present if at least p10(iii) is found (search for permanent solution) in combination with any of the other observations (reflecting on undertaken measures). Sources are relatively independent.</p> <p><u>Overall confirmation</u> strong warranted, given p10(iii) is strong evidence of what teams are doing to move further with long term solutions and also p10(i) and p10(ii) are accurate evidence of the presence of preoccupation with failure as a contextual condition.</p>	
<p>O u t c o m e</p>		<p><u>Theorized outcome</u>: Total dissonance is reduced (although not eliminated), which means that an internal balance/harmony is restored because the 'perceived issue' is in the agenda for further solution.</p>	
		<p><u>Observable manifestations</u>: It includes a kind of intention of planning that is subject to change, but where the issue is being dealt with by the team, with or without help from the team leader. The solution from the team does not have to be set in stone, there are unexpected things that could force the solution to be adapted. Evidence for this part can be found by asking how the team dealt with the problem eventually and what work agreements are still standing and how they are possibly changing (account evidence).</p>	
	<p>● <i>observation O1(i)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence, Interview II team members Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II</p> <p><i>Observation on possibly changing work agreements</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu. The observation as a whole tells us something about the rotation system and how every team member was involved in this. Everyone had to make the planning at least one time to try it out. The long-term solution is still on the agenda at this point, to be discussed how the team should handle this (see mechanism Perspective Taking). We trust the source, because the team members are again on the same page with this statement. This evidence is empirically unique, because there is no other explanation for the rotation system, we know for sure it's about the planning agreements. • Strong confirmation presence of the outcome 	<p>31min: Interviewer: "How did the team get convinced to try that out, to make sure everyone took their turn?" Interviewee 2: "X (cf. team leader) said that, everyone had to try it." Other team members confirm.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition O1</i> 	<p>A strong single piece of evidence is found. We can confirm the presence of the outcome. Sources are relatively independent.</p> <p><u>Overall confirmation</u> strong warranted, O1(i) is strong evidence of how the problem is put in agenda due to the intentions of going back to work routines. Based on cognitive dissonance theory, we assume that once the topic is put in the agenda the problem is considered as relevant with a potential solution, reducing the dissonance although not eliminating it, because further steps need to be disentangled for this purpose.</p>
---	---

Roadmap Perspective Taking

Case 2: Planning (Familiehulp Leuven – Team Kessel-Lo II)

<p><u>Causal relationship</u> <i>The causal mechanism links the detection of a work-related problem with the design of a solution through the cognitive process of differentiating and integrating different viewpoints.</i></p> <p><u>Prior relatively low</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● There is no existing research about the cases. 		
<p>C a u s e</p>	<p><u>Theorized part:</u> Team member detects a disturbance during the operation of her/his work activities.</p>	
	<p><u>Observable manifestations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sequential & Trace: the initial detection of the problem happens before the design of the solution to the problem. - Account: team members remember the occurrence of the problem by being able to explain what was detected and how (how it all started). — Htu³ ● Theoretical certainty not formulated (no priors) ● High theoretical uniqueness: there is no other plausible explanation for observing this fingerprint 	
<p>● <i>observation</i> CI(i)</p>	<p>Trace evidence, Briefing document “Experiment plannen” Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II <i>Observation on detection of the problem before the design of the solution</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Mu – The collected evidence shows that the problem preceded the work solutions, because the problem was the reason to revise the existing work agreements and look for a solution. However, due to this is a document drawn up by the team leader, we are not entirely sure whether the detection of the problem really happened before the design of the solution. This would mean we cannot trust the source. However, there would be no reason to change work 	<p>PDF document “Experiment plannen” (March 2017): This document was sent by the team leader to the team members to inform them officially about the new planning method they were going to try out. The record shows the detection of the problem as the reason to try out this new method.</p>

³ Note: Htu= high theoretical uniqueness; Hu = High uniqueness; Mu = Moderate uniqueness; Lu = Low uniqueness.

	<p>agreements if everything was going fine and no problems occurred. Also, the document is scanned and there's a date written on it, so it seems the team leader did not adapt the document and just scanned it in.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderate confirmation of condition 1 	
<p>● <i>observation C1(ii)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence: Interview I team leader Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II</p> <p><i>Observation on how it all started</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mu – The observation tells us something about the how the team members detect a disturbance during their work activities. They report this and this is how the search for a solution begins. It is a joint process of team members and team leader. However, even if the interviewer specifically asks about changing the planning method, we cannot trust the source completely, because the information given is not detailed enough. • Moderate confirmation of condition 1 	<p>4min: Interviewer: “I was wondering, how does the idea of trying it another way come about? (...) Is that also something that's being discussed with the group?”</p> <p>Interviewee: “It depends, now for the planning (...), that came partly from the team. It begins with they report: ‘this doesn't work anymore’, and then we don't have an answer to that immediately. So by talking about it together regularly, like okay this doesn't work, but what could work? And then it's looking for: what could work.”</p> <p>> Team leader explains that they don't have an answer immediately, but that they talk about in within the team, trying to find a solution.</p>
<p>● <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition C1</i></p>	<p>In general, the presence of the cause seems to be supported by evidence, because both observations are found. We can, therefore, confirm the presence of the condition moderately.</p> <p>If only C(i) or C1(ii) is found, we cannot confirm, because in both pieces of evidence we cannot completely trust the source. Sources are relatively independent.</p> <p><u>Overall confirmation:</u> moderately warranted, given C1(i) and C1(ii) are moderate evidence of the presence of the condition being a problem situation related to the work organization.</p>	
<p>1</p>	<p><u>Theorized part:</u> The team member tries to find an adequate explanation (cf. to make sense) for the observed disturbances in terms of the team work organization (drawing on her/his existing knowledge about the work organization) that enables her/him to design an adequate solution but is unable to do so.</p> <p><u>Observable manifestations:</u></p> <p>- Account: Team member states that she/he had some kind of explanation of how the problem was caused in terms of the work organization but that this explanation was (self-)judged as incomplete.</p> <p>— Ltu</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Theoretical certainty not formulated (no priors) • Low theoretical uniqueness: contacting team members could have been done for several reasons other than a realization of interdependence 	
<p>● <i>observation P1(i)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team members Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II</p> <p><i>Observation on incomplete cause of the problem</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu – This piece of evidence shows team members discussing what causes the problems in the planning. Interviewee 2 sees the service phone colleagues as (a part of) the cause of the problem but is a bit cautious with statements about this and seeking confirmation with other 	<p>15min: Interviewee 1: “In the beginning the service phone colleagues were often accused in my opinion.” Interviewee 2: “Yes, I did that too: ‘They didn't pass it on’. But from the current week it is the service phone colleagues right.”</p> <p>> The team members have a discussion on the cause of the planning problems. They state that problems in the current week are the responsibility of the service phone colleagues</p>

	<p>team members (“right?”). Interviewee 1 states the service phone colleagues are often accused, but it’s clear that they do not know that for sure. This explanation is (self-) judged as incomplete by interviewee 1. Uniqueness is high, because the interviewees are discussing the planning issue, there is no other explanation. We trust the source, because it is clear team members are not certain about their explanation for the cause of the problem and this is exactly what proposition 1 entails.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong confirmation of proposition 1 	
<p>• <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 1</i></p>	<p>In general, the collected evidence confirms the need for a collective solution. Also, it is clear the explanation the team members had for the cause disturbance was (self-)judged as incomplete by a team member. We can confirm the presence of proposition 1. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation:</u> strongly warranted, given P1(i) is unique and the source can be trusted.</p>	
<p>2</p>	<p><u>Theorization:</u> The team member contacts other team members, before a formal meeting, to explain and discuss the problem situation on a formal meeting in order to find an explanation that enables an adequate solution.</p> <p><u>Observable manifestations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Trace & Account: A record of the attempt making contact with team members through some means of team communication such as email, post-its, a log in a work diary, a meeting agenda... - Account: The contact to other team members contained (among other possible things) a request to deal with the problem. <p>— Mtu</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Theoretical certainty not formulated (no priors) • Modest theoretical uniqueness: contacting team members could have been done for several reasons other than a realization of interdependence, however it is unlikely that a request is made to problem solve when the problem solving is not the goal. <p>• <i>observation P2a(i)</i> Account evidence. Interview II team members Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II</p> <p><i>Observation on discussing issues within the team</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mu – This piece of evidence shows that when misunderstandings happen often, this is handled as a topic on the meeting agenda. This is what normally happens in such a situation. This evidence suggests this has been the case for the planning issues as well, because there were also multiple misunderstandings, although no further details are given about this. Therefore, we cannot fully trust the source. • Moderate confirmation of proposition 2 	
		<p>24min: Interviewer: “How is this discussed?” Interviewee 1: “X (team leader) asks everyone (...) ‘is there something special or something’ (...) Interviewer: “And like an example you gave (cf. about the planning issues), is that more in the form of an announcement or is that discussed in detail?” Interviewee 1: “Yeah, that can always happen right, if it should happen often that there are misunderstandings then that would be a topic on the agenda.” Interviewer: “Does that happen often?” Interviewee 2: “Not really right?” Interviewee 1: “No, not really.”</p>

<p>● <i>observation P2a(ii)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview I team members Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II <i>Observation on contact with other team members about the issues</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Mu – The evidence tells us something about how team members contact other colleagues about certain issues. The interviewer specifically asks about discussions around the planning issue. Team members respond that it was the team leader who initiated the discussion. This suggests that team members didn't really perceive this as an urgent problem. We can assume the team members talked about this issue among each other, but we cannot trust the source completely. ● Moderate confirmation of proposition 2 	<p>54min: Interviewer: “Those times you were talking about that self-planning, was there really a signal from the group we're going to have to talk about it?” Interviewee 2: “No, X (cf. team leader) just asked that like... Interviewee 1: “How is that going?” Interviewee 2: “Yes and then everyone was allowed to give their opinion a bit and that's how it started(...)” > Team members are talking about their team meeting (cf. wijkteam) where this subject was discussed.</p>
<p>● <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 2</i></p>	<p>In general, although we cannot confirm that team members contacted each other before their team meeting (cf. wijkteam), we can confirm that the contact was made via the regular team meeting. If only P2(i) or P2(ii) is found, we cannot confirm the evidence. However, if both observations are found (discussions / contact), we can moderately confirm the presence of P2. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation:</u> moderately warranted, given P2(i) and P2(ii) are not strong accurate evidence of the presence of proposition 2.</p>	
<p>3</p>	<p><u>Theorized part:</u> Team members share their experiences (cf. exemplars) with problems, their pending explanation of the problem situation in terms of the work organization and facilitate mutual understanding.</p> <p><u>Observable manifestations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Trace & Account: Team members recollect the date and location of when they shared viewpoints. - Account: Team members mention how they shared experiences about the problem and ideas on how it relates to the work organization (not being focused on interpersonal issues). - Account: Team members mention that efforts were made to understand each other (e.g. asking questions, clarify statements, ...) <p>— Mtu</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Theoretical certainty not formulated (no priors) ● High theoretical uniqueness: meeting could have taken place for several reasons and with several outcomes, however the outcome is written down in the document which shows the problem was a topic on the meeting. This fingerprint is difficult to explain by other theories than those used in the mechanism. 	
<p>● <i>observation P3(i)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team members Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II <i>Observation on contact with other team members about the issues</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Mu. The evidence is moderate. The interviewer specifically asks about an example that was given by an interviewee concerning a planning issue. Team members respond that the reaction of team members is mostly 	<p>23min: Interviewer: “The example you gave, concretely, that one time it wasn't clear who had to do what and who had to inform who. Are those things you discuss in the team? (...) More generally, do you share those things in the team?” Interviewee: “Those are the moments on the meetings (cf. wijkteams) that you come together and you can say like that was annoying or this has happened, most of the times we try</p>

	<p>shared with each other (and with the team leader) on their weekly meetings (cf. wijkteams). However, this is a general statement and it doesn't explain how this situation in particular went. We can assume the issues were talked about in the meetings (cf. wijkteam), but we cannot trust the source completely.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderate confirmation of proposition 3 	<p>to look for a solution with everyone and then X (cf. team leader) writes that down.”</p>
<p>● <i>observation P3(ii)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview I team members Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II</p> <p><i>Observation on efforts to understand each other</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mu – The evidence confirms the proposition as it shows how ideas were shared and how efforts were made to understand each other. The team leader starts the topic, but he/she listens carefully to each team member and asks if there are any ideas/possible solutions to try out. This piece of evidence is empirically unique, there is no alternative explanation, because the interviewer was asking about the planning issues. However, we cannot trust the source completely, because no details are given about how the conversation went specifically. • Moderate confirmation of proposition 3 	<p>53min30: Interviewer: “Do you know where it was decided like ‘from now on...’ (...).” Interviewee 2: “Never, nothing was ever decided all at once, everything has come with trying and gradually and at some point there has been a meeting (cf. wijkteam) where they said they wanted to try it like this right now.” Interviewer: “And who brings that on?” Interviewee 1: “X (cf. team leader), she brings that in.” Interviewee 2: “Yes, X asks do you have ideas and if something turns out right, then we try it.” Interviewee 1: “And if it’s not good, then X just takes that into account. X always asks us...” Interviewee 2: “We are allowed to decide everything in the team actually.” Interviewee 1: “Yes we decide everything in the team itself.”</p>
<p>● <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 3</i></p>	<p>In general, the collected evidence only generally confirms that perspectives were shared during the meeting, the evidence is not detailed enough to understand the conversations team members had. If only P3(i) or P3(ii) is found, we cannot confirm the evidence. However, if both observations are found (contact /effort), we can moderately confirm the presence of P3. Sources are relatively independent.</p> <p><u>Overall confirmation:</u> moderately warranted, given P3(i) and P3(ii) are not accurate evidence of proposition 3.</p>	
<p>4</p>	<p><u>Theorized part:</u> Team members discuss each other’s experiences and explanations by identifying similarities and differences (incl. contradictions) between explanations in terms of the problem and solution.</p> <p><u>Fingerprints:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Trace/Account: Team members recollect the date and location of when they discussed the problem situation in detail. - Account: Team members mention how understandings of the problem and ideas about the solution were discussed in terms of the team work organization. <p>— Mtu</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Theoretical certainty not formulated (no priors) • Modest theoretical uniqueness: The substantive focus of the meeting in fingerprint 1 could be different depending on the motivation of the team whether or not they want to actually solve the problem. Although, it’s hard to explain the occurrence of the second fingerprint through other theories. 	

<p>●<i>observation P4(i)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team members Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II</p> <p><i>Observation on discussing ideas about the solution</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu – This observation is empirically unique. It tells us something about the involvement of the team members and team leader in the problem-solving setting. The process of finding a solution seemed to be a joint process between the team members and the team leader, but the final decision was in the hands of the team leader. This piece of evidence is about the rotating system, a part of the solution to the planning issues. We trust the source, because details are given about how the discussion went. ● Strong confirmation of proposition 4 	<p>27min: (...) Interviewer: “Was that the case with this too?” Interviewee 2: “Yes with the planning as well and then the Project 2020 came about and that was that with the star roles and that’s how we tried it out.” Interviewee 3: “Then it was everyone’s turn and then X (cf. team leader) asked who thinks that’s fun and who wants to keep doing that?”</p> <p>> These star roles refer to the two team members who make the planning in the second week.</p>
<p>●<i>observation P4(ii)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team members Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II</p> <p><i>Observation on discussing understandings on the solution to the problem</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu – This piece of evidence is unique, because the interviewer asks targeted questions. We trust the source, because the team members tell the story in details and they confirm each other’s statements. This piece of evidence tells us more about how the team members reacted to the solutions that were suggested. It’s clear that some team members didn’t want to take on this new role as a planner. This shows not all team members were eager to go through with this, although team members stated that everyone would try it (on request of the team leader) and then afterwards they would decide who would get the planner role permanently. ● Strong confirmation of proposition 4 	<p>29min: Interviewer: “For example, that idea that the team members would start making the schedule themselves, so in the week between, how was that received by the team itself?” Interviewee 2: “That was started by the team itself. In the beginning they didn’t send their entire schedule, just if there was something special with a client they would send it like there you have to take that into account and eventually they started to send their entire schedule.” Interviewer: “And the idea to rotate so that team members come here, to the office, to make up the schedule. How was that received by the team members when the idea was proposed?” Interviewee 2: “A lot of them said: I won’t do it.” Other interviewees confirm. Interviewee 3: “A lot of responsibility.” Interviewee 1: “I’ve heard a lot of the reaction of we get more responsibility continuously, but you don’t get paid more, that’s what a lot said. (...) You’ve got some who didn’t like that (cf. making the planning) at all, because it’s so hectic.”</p>
<p>●<i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 4</i></p>	<p>In general, the collected evidence confirms discussions about the problem and suggested solutions. The evidence is empirically unique, and we trust the source. All three interviewees were on the same line and provided detailed information. If only P4(i) or P4(ii) is found, we cannot confirm the evidence, whereas if both observations are found we can strongly confirm the presence of P4, because they reinforce each other for a better confirmation.</p> <p><u>Overall confirmation:</u> strong warranted, given P4(i) and P4(ii) are accurate evidence of the presence of proposition 4.</p>	
<p>5</p>	<p><u>Theorized part:</u> Team members propose and discuss collective solutions (using pending the individual understandings of the problem situation and solution within the team) and reach agreement based on convergent individual perceptions of the solution at least being relevant and adequate in solving the problem situation.</p> <p><u>Fingerprints:</u></p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Trace & Account: Team members recollect the date and location of when they worked together to design a solution. - Account: The solutions proposed transcended job functions/work activities from individual team members but related to the collective process (cf. team task comprising different functions) - Account: Team members mention how they individually evaluate(d) the solution was as relevant and adequate as it made sense given the initial problem it tried to deal with. <p>— Mtu</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Theoretical certainty not formulated (no priors) ● Modest theoretical uniqueness: This interaction could have been organized for very different types of problem solving than the one proposed in the mechanism. (a) It is not very plausible that this proposition is not related to integration of information originating from ideas or viewpoints held by other people; (b) Adequacy and relevance do not necessarily mean that an individual team member is personally convinced that this is the best or most efficient, effective or optimal solution possible. However, individual team members need to be convinced (cf. makes logically sense) that it might work. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>observation P5(i)</i> 	<p>Trace evidence. E-mail and word document “WT Kessel-Lo 2” Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II <i>Observation on solution: rotation system</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu – The collected evidence shows the solution discussed within the team: the rotating system. These are the moments team members and team leader worked together to make the planning and avoid issues and mistakes caused by unnecessary changes in the planning. This evidence is empirically unique. This is a document drawn up by the team leader, so we are not entirely sure whether nothing was modified. Although there is no reason to assume the team leader would benefit from changing the document, therefore we trust the source. ● Strong confirmation of proposition 5 	<p>E-mail and Word document rotating system “WT Kessel-Lo 2” The document shows the rotating system where every team member alternately makes the planning together with the team leader. In the e-mail the team leader explains this was the beginning of the planning solution, where the team leader made the planning in the second week together with a team member. Names of clients were anonymized.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>observation P5(ii)</i> 	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team members Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II <i>Observation on discussing understandings on the solution to the problem</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu – The collected evidence confirms that team members individually evaluate the solution as relevant and adequate, as it made sense given the initial problem it tried to deal with. Team members confirm each other’s statements when they talk about less calling, which means there are less changes in the planning, so there are less issues. Also, the team states a lot of things can be solved themselves, so without the mediation of the service phone. This evidence is empirically unique because the interviewer asks a direct question about the planning context. We trust the source, 	<p>17min: Interviewer: “Is that different now with the new way of planning?” Interviewee 1: “Now you call a lot less.” Other interviewees confirm. Interviewee 1: “Now it’s (cf. the planning) usually in order.” Interviewee 2: “You don’t have the feeling you have to call for everything, you can solve a lot of things yourself.”</p>

	<p>because all interviewees are on the same page and they give a clear example of why the solution is adequate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong confirmation of proposition 5 	
● <i>observation P5(iii)</i>	<p>Account evidence: Interview II team leader Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II</p> <p><i>Observation on solutions transcending job functions</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu – The evidence details the planning process and how the rotating system is built up. This evidence is empirically unique, and we trust the source, because it’s a very detailed story and the interviewee remembered it well. This solution clearly transcends the job functions, which is where some team members were not happy with (see P4(iii)), but the team was able to adapt the solution by picking team members who wanted to be the planner and are good at it. • Strong confirmation of proposition 5 	<p>7min: Interviewee: “The plan itself, we originally started from we do that with two, together with me there, so with 3 we were. And it should be everyone's turn. A rotating system. But some people like to do that and some people don't like to do that at all. A number of people can do that well, a number of people can do that much less well. And then we actually got three people out of that who like to do it and can do it well, who have a feeling for it. And they plan now. And then the next step was (...) now they plan on their own, I'm (cf. team leader) no longer present.”</p>
● <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 5</i>	<p>In general, three pieces of evidence are found. We can confirm the presence of proposition 5. If only P5(i) is found, we cannot confirm the evidence, because this doesn't entail an evaluation of the solutions, whereas if P5(ii) or P5(iii) are found, we can confirm. Sources are relatively independent.</p> <p><u>Overall confirmation:</u> strongly warranted, given P5(ii) and P5(iii) are accurate evidence of the presence of proposition 5.</p>	
O u t c o m e	<u>Theorized part:</u> Team members hold a shared perspective on what needs to be done.	
	<p><u>Observable manifestations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Account: Team members state that during the implementation less issues were reported due to team members understanding things differently. - Sequential & Trace: the solution is designed after the initial detection of the problem. <p>— Mtu</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Theoretical certainty not formulated (no priors) • Modest theoretical uniqueness: The fact to enact the work solution in a similar manner is the result of the previous parts of the mechanism in which they construct a shared understanding of what needs to be done. The fact that the solution comes after the problem detection does not explain that team members hold as shared perspective. 	
● <i>observation O(i)</i>	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team members Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II</p> <p><i>Observation on issues due to understanding things differently</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lu – The collected evidence tells us something about how less mistakes happen in the planning. We assume there are still mistakes, because the interviewees don't say no mistakes at all happen. However, we cannot confirm the mistakes that do happen are a consequence of team members understanding things differently. It could also be 	<p>9min: Interviewee 1: “In my opinion, less mistakes happen, for the planning itself, the clients who get the schedule. It goes more fluent.” The other interviewees confirm.</p>

	<p>an honest mistake. The evidence is empirically unique, but we cannot trust the source completely.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderate confirmation of the outcome 	
<p>● <i>observation O(ii)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence: Interview II team leader Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II</p> <p><i>Observation on shared perspective</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu – This piece of evidence details the feelings of the team members towards the new work agreements around the planning issues. The team leader states that team members are happy with the proposed solution and that there is more time to discuss clients (one of the initial concerns of the team members). This evidence is empirically unique, there is no other explanation. We trust the source, because it is clear team members’ concerns are heard and the new work agreements are a solution to that. • Strong confirmation of the outcome 	<p>6min: Interviewee: “That went a lot better, they noticed that if we make the planning on the meeting, we still have an hour and a half we make planning for 1 week, then we have time left. And in that time that is left, you can discuss a number of clients, discuss problems, time is freed up and they also come out a little calmer. So that was already a good solution for them like it is more feasible to make that planning, we get it done within the foreseen time and we sometimes have time left in which we can discuss other things than strict planning.”</p>
<p>● <i>observation O(iii)</i></p>	<p>Trace evidence: E-mail and Word document on the evaluation of the “planning experiment”</p> <p>Sequential evidence:</p> <p><i>Observation on shared perspective</i></p> <p><i>Observation on solution designed after the problem detection</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu – This trace evidence is empirically unique. This is a document drawn up by the team leader, so we are not entirely sure whether the detection of the problem really happened before this evaluation of the solution and whether the statements are true. However, we do not believe the team leader lied about this evaluation. Therefore, we can trust the source. • Strong confirmation of the outcome 	<p>Word document “evalutie Innovatief omgaan met de wijkwerkingsuren” (April 2018)</p> <p>This document details an evaluation of this solution to the planning issues. The team leader states that team members are happy with the solutions and that there is more time to discuss clients. The team leader also mentions that the team members who got the role of the “planner” are very competent in this.</p>
<p>● <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition PO</i></p>	<p>We can only indirectly assume that team members understood the solution similarly, because team members and team leader are positive about the outcome of the solution.</p> <p>If only O1(ii) and O1(iii) are found, we can only confirm the outcome moderately, because this would be a one-sided story of the team leader. However, the team leader gives clear examples of why there is a shared perspective. Adding O1(i) makes sure we can confirm the outcome, because this adds the side of the team members and all interviewees are positive about the new solutions.</p> <p><u>Overall confirmation:</u> strongly warranted, given O1(i), O1(ii) and O1(iii) is accurate evidence of the presence of the outcome.</p>	

Roadmap Motivation

Case 2: Planning (Familiehulp Leuven – Team Kessel-Lo II)

<p><u>Causal relationship</u> The mechanism is triggered as team member(s) detect(s) a disturbance in the workflow and it becomes clear that the problem situation affects their work and the team task (cf. identified it as a problem that surpasses his or her individual job).</p> <p><u>Prior relatively low</u> ●There is no existing research</p>			
C	<p><u>Theorized cause:</u> Team member(s) detect(s) a work- related problem</p>		
	<p><u>Observables manifestations:</u></p> <p>u - Sequential & Trace: The initial detection of the problem happens before the design of the solution to the problem.</p> <p>s - Account: Team members tell a consistent story about the occurrence of the problem by being able to explain what was detected and how (how it all started). — Htu⁴</p> <p>●Theoretical certainty not formulated (no priors) ●High theoretical uniqueness: there is no other plausible explanation.</p>		
	<p>●<i>observation</i> CI(i)</p>	<p>Trace evidence, Briefing document “Experiment plannen” Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II <i>Observation on detection of the problem before the design of the solution</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Mu – The collected evidence shows that the problem preceded the work solutions, because the problem was the reason to revise the existing work agreements and look for a solution. This is a document drawn up by the team leader, so we are not entirely sure whether the detection of the problem really happened before the design of the solution. This would mean we cannot trust entirely in the source. However, there would be no reason to change work agreements if everything was going fine and no problems occurred. Also, the document is scanned and there’s a date written on it, so it seems the team leader did not adapt the document and just scanned it in. ● Moderate confirmation condition 1 	<p>PDF document “Experiment plannen” (March 2017): This document was sent by the team leader to the team members to inform them officially about the new planning method they were going to try out. The record shows the detection of the problem as the reason to try out this new method.</p>
	<p>●<i>observation</i> CI(ii)</p>	<p>Account evidence: Interview I team leader Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II <i>Observation on how it all started (detection of the problem by team members)</i></p>	<p>4min: Interviewer: “I was wondering, how does the idea of trying it another way come about? (...) Is that also something that’s being discussed with the group?” Interviewee: “It depends, now for the planning (...), that came partly from the team. It begins with they report: ‘this doesn’t</p>

⁴ Note: Htu= high theoretical uniqueness; Hu = High uniqueness; Mu = Moderate uniqueness; Lu = Low uniqueness.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mu – The observation tells us something about how the team members detect a disturbance during their work activities. The team leader explains how they detected and reported this to the team leader. However it is not detailed how the team members detected this disturbance. Uniqueness is moderate, because the interviewer specifically asks about changing the planning method, but we cannot trust the source completely, because the information given is not detailed enough. Observation C1(iii) gives us this information. • Moderate confirmation condition 1 	<p>work anymore’, and then we don’t have an answer to that immediately. So by talking about it together regularly, like okay this doesn’t work, but what could work? And then it’s looking for: what could work.”</p> <p>> Team leader explains how team members are able to detect the problem and how they communicate that to the team leader. Team leader says that they don’t have an answer immediately, but that they talk about it within the team, trying to find a solution.</p>
<p>• <i>observation C1(iii)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview I team leader Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II</p> <p><i>Observation on how it all started (how the problem was detected by team members)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu. Given that evidence relates to the presence of discontinuity of organizational routines, the accuracy can be evaluated as relatively high. We can observe the reasons why team members gave attention to this disturbance provoked by the shortcomings of the planning: changes in the planning cause the team members and their clients a lot of insecurity. Therefore, we have a clear evidence of the occurrence of the alteration of the workflow. We can trust this source because it is the team leader who speaks out of his/her own experience with the unexpected event. There are no reasons to mention this, if a disturbance of workflow is not happening. • Strong confirmation of condition 1 	<p>3min: Interviewee: “There were a lot of reactions from team members saying the first week a lot changes, but the second week so much changes. They get 3 times changes via e-mail, but also clients get three times a notification: “Next week they’re coming on Tuesday morning, oh no it will be in the afternoon, oh no it’s...” (...) It gives (the team members) a lot of insecurity.”</p>
<p>• <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition C1</i></p>	<p>Due to these three pieces of evidence are found, we can confirm the presence of the condition C1, even if it was present being a problem situation related to the work organization.</p> <p>If only C1(i) or C1(ii) are found we cannot confirm, since we need C1(iii) to infer that C1 is present, because the evidence tells us about the detection of the problem and C1(iii) details how the problem was detected.</p> <p><u>Overall confirmation:</u> moderately warranted, there is a significant amount of evidence on the presence of the team members detecting a work-related problem.</p>	
<p>1</p>	<p><u>Theorized part:</u> The team member feels addressed to take action by emphasizing the importance of effective performance of the team task.</p> <p><u>Observable manifestations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Account: Team member states that the team task is of personal significance to her/him. - Account: Team member states that she found it important that the problem needed to be dealt with as it would become disruptive. <p>— Mtu</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Theoretical certainty not formulated (no priors) ● Moderate theoretical uniqueness: (a) It is not plausible to find this fingerprint when the team member is not engaged with her/his work. However, the report by the team member might be biased (forced or socially desired). (b) The team member might find it important to act because of external control or pressure in the group. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>observation P1(i)</i> 	<p>Account evidence. Interview I team members Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II</p> <p><i>Observation on importance of dealing with problem</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu – The evidence is empirically unique. The interviewer specifically asks about discussions around the planning issue. Team members respond that it was the team leader who initiated the discussion. It is clear that the team leader found it important that the problem was dealt with as it would become disruptive. ● Strong confirmation proposition 2 	<p>54min: Interviewer: “Those times you were talking about that self-planning, was there really a signal from the group we’re going to have to talk about it?” Interviewee 2: “No, X (cf. team leader) just asked that like...” Interviewee 1: “How is that going?” Interviewee 2: “Yes and then everyone was allowed to give their opinion a bit and that’s how it started(...)”</p> <p>> Team members are talking about their team meeting (cf. wijkteam) where this subject was discussed. They state their team leader was the one to put the issue forward on the team meeting.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>observation P1(ii)</i> 	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team members Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II</p> <p><i>Observation on personal significance to team members</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu. This piece of evidence is a clear statement on the failing work routines: changes in the planning cause frustration to team members and their clients. Clients are not happy with the service the team members provide. The planning system is not flexible enough to provide good service to clients. Therefore, we have a clear evidence of the negative consequences for the team members and how they experience this, therefore we assume this is of personal significance to the team members. We can trust this source because the interviewees are team members who speak out of their own experience with the planning issues. Uniqueness is high, because there’s no alternative explanation. ● Strong confirmation of proposition 1. 	<p>15min: Interviewee: “Clients have become harder to deal with, if you’re not allowed to enter (their home) then it’s clear right, they were just not satisfied.”</p> <p>> Team members state that clients have higher expectations and that their planning system is not flexible enough to handle this. Team members are not allowed to enter clients’ houses when they are there at the wrong hour and this is because of issues with the planning. It becomes clear from the interviews that they don’t like this situation, because they want to deliver good service to their clients.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 1</i> 	<p>Because both pieces of evidence are found, we can confirm the presence of part 1 of the mechanism. If only P1(i) or P1(ii) is found, we cannot confirm. We need both observations to infer that P1 is present, because of the importance of dealing with problem (i) and the personal significance to team members (ii). Sources are relatively independent.</p> <p><u>Overall confirmation</u>: strongly warranted, given our pieces are accurate evidence of the importance of dealing with the issue and the personal significance to team members.</p>	

2	<p><u>Theorized part:</u> The team member assesses her/his range of possible actions*, realizes that the problem can only be adequately solved at the team level and takes initiative to contact other team members to explain the problem situation in order to mobilize 'team resources' to deal with the problem situation. *(considers her/his control opportunities)</p>	
<p><u>Observable manifestations:</u></p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Trace & Account: A record of the attempt making contact with team members through some means of team communication such as email, post-its, a log in a work diary, a meeting agenda... - Account: The team member took the initiative to contact other team members without being instructed to do so. - Account: The team member (from part 1) states that she/he decided to contact other colleagues because she/he was work wise not able to deal with the problem her-/himself adequately and needed help from others. <p>— Mtu</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Theoretical certainty not formulated (no priors) ● Moderate theoretical uniqueness: Contacting team members could have been done for several reasons other than a realization of interdependence. Although there is no other plausible explanation than that the team member reasoned from her/his job function (and control opportunities) and the conclusion they were not enough to deal with the problem situation. 		
<p>● <i>observation P2(i)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team leader Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II</p> <p><i>Observation on initiative to contact team leader</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Mu. This observation shows team members don't go back to their routines. They mention to the team leader that their way of planning is not working. Errors occur and team members feel stressed. We can trust this source, because it is the team leader who speaks out of his/her own experience with the reaction of the team members. However, we don't have information on communication between team members. We only know about the communication towards the team leader. These are things team members said to the team leader. There is no reason to assume the team leader would lie about this. This evidence is highly unique, since the feelings of the team members are clearly about the planning issues and their feelings about this. ● Moderate confirmation of proposition 2 	<p>4min: Interviewee: "Even before (IAO) the care workers mentioned to me: this doesn't work. We all leave the meeting after one and a half hour feeling over stressed, we have no time to discuss client situations. We are always discussing planning planning planning."</p> <p>> Team members mention having no time to discuss client situations, which could cause errors.</p>
<p>● <i>observation P2(ii)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview I team members Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II</p> <p><i>Observation on making contact with other team members; non-ability to deal with the problem his-/herself</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Mu. This piece of information tells us something about how team members are under the impression that the organization is aware of the existing problems with the 	<p>36min: Interviewer: "Was the organization aware of your experiences with the service phone to change the planning? Is that something that was discussed before?" Interviewee 1: "There always have been issues, because (...) we are 10 people who have to be flexible constantly and change things, the service phone is not always the same (cf. not always the same person who does this task). And they don't have a view</p>

	<p>planning. This could be the reason why they don't take initiative to actively solve the problem: we know they reported the issues to the team leader (see P2(i), maybe they are waiting until action is taken top-down. This evidence is empirically unique. We cannot trust on this source completely, because some assumptions are made about the reason why team members act like this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderate confirmation proposition 2 	<p>on where he/she lives (cf. client) and I notice that it goes wrong sometimes. (...) There are too many steps to change and regulate 1 thing." Interviewee 2: "(...) we know where our clients live and we see that, but they (cf. the service phone colleagues) don't see that." Interviewee 1: "But it (cf. changes in the planning) always has to go via them." Interviewee 2: "Yes." Interviewee 1: "And that's where it goes wrong sometimes."</p>
<p>• <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 2</i></p>	<p>Due to the evidence found, we can confirm to reasonable extent that team members were convinced they needed to involve other team members and their team leader to design a work solution. If only P2(i) or P2(ii) is found, we cannot confirm. We need the two observations to infer that P2 is moderately present. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation:</u> moderately warranted, the evidence suggests that P2 is present to some extent.</p>	
<p>3</p>	<p><u>Theorized part:</u> Team members discuss the problem situation using an appropriate style of interaction so that they feel addressed to take action and express their willingness to personally contribute to solving the problems or assign team resources.</p> <p><u>Observable manifestations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Trace: A record of the occasion(s) where the situation was explained to team members such as minutes, reports, communiqué... The record shows a decision to deal with the problem - Account: Team members state that appeals were made on how the problem situation impacted the team task in a way that made them want to solve the problem. - Account: Team members state that they wanted to contribute to solving the problem because otherwise the team task could be impacted. <p>— Mtu</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Theoretical certainty not formulated (no priors) • Moderate theoretical uniqueness: (a) Decisions to engage in problem solving can be made based on very different motivations other than posited by the theory. It confirms that a problem was considered and used as a reason to make a decision and to dedicate resources to. (b) Other explanations would be that team members were forced to solve the problem. However, this would not trigger personal commitment or dedication but most likely punishment-aversion or hesitant attitude. (c) The only plausible explanation is that team members would say this because they are committed to (they care about) the team task. <p>• <i>observation P3(i)</i></p> <p>Trace evidence, Briefing document "Experiment plannen" Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II <i>Observation on explaining the situation and a decision to deal with the problem</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu – The collected evidence is the official communication from the team leader towards the team members to inform them about the issue and a decision to deal with the problem. Uniqueness is high. This is a document drawn up by the team leader, so we are not entirely sure whether the document is genuine. This would mean we cannot trust the source. However, there would be no reason to address this issue if everything was going fine and no problems 	<p>PDF document "Experiment plannen" (March 2017): This document was sent by the team leader to the team members to inform them officially about the new planning method they were going to try out. The record shows the detection of the problem as the reason to try out this new method.</p>

	<p>occurred. Also, the document is scanned and there's a date written on it, so it seems the team leader did not adapt the document and just scanned it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong confirmation condition 3 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>observation P3(ii)</i> 	<p>Account evidence: Interview II team members Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II</p> <p><i>Observation on wanting to contribute</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu. This piece of evidence details the motivation of team members wanting to contribute to the solution. Even though the solution includes tasks that transcend the normal tasks of the team members, they contribute, and they don't mind, because after one time the solution will be adapted by choosing team members who will take on this tasks permanently. This evidence is empirically unique, and we can trust the source, because the team members are on the same page. • Strong confirmation of proposition 3 	<p>31min30: Interviewee: "So how did the team get convinced to do that in the beginning in such a way that everyone got their turn?" Interviewee 1: "X (cf. team leader) had said that. X said 'everyone should try it'." Other interviewees confirm. Interviewee 2: "And after that we were allowed to choose, so nobody really minded that..." Interviewee 3: "No no no no, exactly." Interviewer: "Ok, and has that once again been discussed with the team, after it was everyone's turn, like..." Interviewee 2: "Yes." Interviewee 1: "Who would be happy to do that?"</p> <p>> Team members are motivated to contribute to solving the problem, even though the solution includes making the planning themselves and some team members do not like doing this, because it's a chaotic process. However, they don't mind, because after trying it out one time at the request of the team leader, the team members can choose who wants to keep doing this.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 3</i> 	<p>Because both pieces of evidence are found, we can confirm the presence of part 3 of the mechanism.</p> <p>If only P3(i) is found, we cannot confirm. We need both observations to infer that P1 is present, because the importance for the team members becomes clear in P3(ii).</p> <p>Sources are relatively independent.</p> <p><u>Overall confirmation</u>: strongly warranted, given our pieces are accurate evidence of the importance of dealing with the issue for both the team members (ii) and in the official communication towards the team (i).</p>	
4	<p><u>Theorized part</u>: Team members engage in problem solving using an appropriate style of interaction so that they make a focused effort and invest team resources until a solution is found that is deemed adequate to deal with the problem situation.</p> <p><u>Observable manifestations</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Trace: (Multiple consecutive) moments in which the problem (solving) was discussed. - Account: Team members state that the problem solving was kept on the team agenda for as long as needed. - Account: Team members state they were motivated to solve the problem to safeguard and to contribute to the team task. - Account: Team members were attentive to everybody being engaged to solve the problem. <p>— Mtu</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Theoretical certainty not formulated (no priors) • Moderate theoretical uniqueness: The reason for consecutive moments of problem solving can be explained in several ways. E.g. when the item of problem solving gets postponed due to other topics regarded as more urgent. (a) The underlying reasons for keeping the problem situation on the team agenda as long as needed can be very different. (b) It is highly unlikely to find this evidence when team members would not act out of work engagement. When not engaged they could state other reasons such as they were being controlled in some way (positive or negative external incentive 	

	to engage in problem solving, e.g. punishment, reward, pressure, ...). (c) This proposition is very unlikely to occur when people are being forced into problem solving.	
● <i>observation P4(i)</i>	<p>Account evidence. Interview I team members Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II</p> <p><i>Observation on agenda-setting of the problem</i></p> <p><i>Observation on attentiveness to everybody being engaged to solve the problem</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu – The evidence confirms the proposition as it shows how the issue was kept on the agenda for a long time before a solution was discussed. The solution came gradually and was discussed during team meetings. Ideas were shared and efforts were made to understand each other. The team leader starts the topic, but he/she listens carefully to each team member and asks if there are any ideas/possible solutions to try out. This piece of evidence is empirically unique, there is no alternative explanation, because the interviewer was asking about the planning issues. We trust the source, because the interviewees are on the same page about the supporting role of the team leader in this matter. Also, they explain clearly how the issue was on the team agenda for a long period of time before at some point team leader took initiative to try out a solution. ● Strong confirmation proposition 4 	<p>53min30: Interviewer: “Do you know where it was decided like ‘from now on...’ (...).” Interviewee 2: “Never, nothing was ever decided all at once, everything has come with trying and gradually and at some point there has been a meeting (cf. wijkteam) where they said they wanted to try it like this right now.” Interviewer: “And who brings that on?” Interviewee 1: “X (cf. team leader), she brings that in.” Interviewee 2: “Yes, X asks do you have ideas and if something turns out right, then we try it.” Interviewee 1: “And if it’s not good, then X just takes that into account. X always asks us...” Interviewee 2: “We are allowed to decide everything in the team actually.” Interviewee 1: “Yes we decide everything in the team itself.”</p> <p>> The team members explain that this issue was not solved at once, it was not decided immediately how to deal with this. It was kept on the agenda for a long time and at some point a solution was discussed within the team on a meeting (cf. wijkteam).</p>
● <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 4</i>	<p>In general, the evidence P4(i) can confirm that the issue was on the team agenda for a long time and that team members and team leader were attentive to everybody being engaged to solve the problem by listening to each other and supporting each other.</p> <p>Sources are relatively independent.</p> <p><u>Overall confirmation:</u> Strongly warranted because P4(i) is accurate evidence of the team leader and team members’ engagement in problem solving using an appropriate style of interaction.</p>	
<p>O</p> <p>u</p> <p>t</p> <p>c</p> <p>o</p> <p>m</p> <p>e</p>	<p><u>Theorized part:</u> Team members come up with a work solution to the problem situation and commit to it.</p> <p><u>Observable manifestations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Trace & account: Team members (that relate to the problem situation and/or were involved in the problem solving) report there is a working solution for the work problem that they are personally convinced the solution is adequate and relevant (= identification). - Account: Team members report that the solution is being implemented consistently by every team member (= realized commitment). - Sequential & Account & Trace: The solution is implemented after the initial detection of the problem. <p>— Mtu</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Theoretical certainty not formulated (no priors) ● Moderate theoretical uniqueness: The fact there is a solution and that this comes after the problem does not mean people are necessarily committed to the solution. The fact that the solution is implanted consistently is the result of the previous parts of the mechanism in which team members behavior is driven by their engagement towards the team task and motivation to find a solution. 	

<p>● <i>observation O1(i)</i></p>	<p>Trace evidence: E-mail and Word document on the evaluation of the “planning experiment” Sequential evidence: <i>Observation on working solution</i> <i>Observation on solution designed after the problem detection</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu – This record makes it clear that the team leader and team members are personally convinced the working solution is adequate and relevant. This trace evidence is empirically unique. This is a document drawn up by the team leader, so we are not entirely sure whether the team members really feel this way, but there would be no reason to believe the team leader would lie about this. Therefore, we trust the source. Also, the document was drawn up in April 2020, which is after the detection of the problem with the start of the experiment in 2017. ● Strong confirmation of the outcome 	<p>Word document “evalutie Innovatief omgaan met de wijkwerkingsuren” (April 2018) This document details an evaluation of this solution to the planning issues. The team leader states that team members are happy with the solutions and that there is more time to discuss clients. The team leader also mentions that the team members who got the role of the “planner” are very competent in this.</p>
<p>● <i>observation O1(ii)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team members Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II <i>Observation on working solution</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu – The collected evidence tells us something about how team members feel that less mistakes happen in the planning and it goes more fluent in general with this new working solution. We trust the source, because all interviewees were clearly on the same page about this. They were all positive about this working solution and the outcome. The evidence is empirically unique. ● Strong confirmation of the outcome 	<p>9min: Interviewee 1: “In my opinion, less mistakes happen, for the planning itself, the clients who get the schedule. It goes more fluent.” The other interviewees confirm.</p>
<p>● <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition O1</i></p>	<p>In general, the collected evidence can confirm the presence of the outcome. If only O1(i) is found, we cannot confirm, because we need O1(ii) to confirm the attitude of the team members towards the working solution. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation</u>: Strongly warranted presence of the outcome, because O1(i) details the attitude of the team leader and O1(ii) of the team members.</p>	

Roadmap Pattern Recognition: key part analysis – cause & key part cognitive versatility

Overview cases
Case 3: Interns (Familiehulp Turnhout – Subregioteam Turnhout) OK
Case 4: Weekend work arrangements (Familiehulp Leuven – Zorgteam Kessel-Lo II)
Case 5: Planning outside working hours (Familiehulp Roeselare – Zorgteam Ledegem)
Case 6: Mobile hoist (St. Barbara vzw Kimpenhof – Team Vlindertuin)
Case 7: Incontinence (St. Barbara vzw Beversthuis – Team Tip)
Case 8: Contingency plan (St. Barbara vzw Beversthuis – Team Zonnehoeve)

Road map:

<p><u>Causal relationship</u> <i>Causal mechanism linking ecological change as discontinuity of organizational routines (cues), with cognitive discrepancy (situation) that eventually produces cognitive dissonance (unpleasant feeling). Within a context of ‘no previous experience with similar cues’ (pathway 1), ‘peer experience with similar cues’ (pathway 2) or ‘experience with similar cues’ (pathway 3).</i></p> <p><u>Prior relatively low</u> ● There is no existing research about the cases.</p>		
C a u s e	<p><u>Theorized cause:</u> Ecological change (discontinuity of organizational routines), which is perceived as something unexpected at work, producing a variation change, or disturbance in the environment.</p>	
	<p><u>Observable manifestations:</u> We expect to find fingerprints concerning the disturbance in the routine organizational workflow (environment). Evidence can be found in interviews asking about what routine and non-routine is; the origin of the issue and why employees gave attention to this issue. — Htu¹</p> <p>● Theoretical certainty not formulated (no priors) ● High theoretical uniqueness, as observing this observable manifestation necessarily means that the presence of an ecological change or discontinuity of a workflow routine is taking place (Weick, 2009, 2006, 1995, 1977).</p>	
	<p><i>Case 3: Interns</i></p>	
<p>● <i>observation</i> <i>CI(i)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview I team members Familiehulp Subregioteam Turnhout <i>Observation on the presence of a disturbance at work that altered the workflow routine. Reasons why team members gave attention to the issue.</i></p>	<p>1u18: Interviewee 1: “That also started with the e-mail I send right.” Interviewee 2: “Yes, that was the e-mail that started it. You sent to A how do we have to do this or something.” Interviewee 1: “I had to take over for a colleague who was on vacation and all of a sudden I got a phone call from the school of that intern ‘he/she starts then’ and I thought oei (cf.</p>

¹ Note: Htu= high theoretical uniqueness; Hu = High uniqueness; Mu = Moderate uniqueness; Lu = Low uniqueness.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu. Given that evidence relates to the presence of discontinuity of organizational routines, the accuracy can be evaluated as relatively high. We can observe the reasons why team members gave attention to this disturbance provoked by a lack of information about responsibilities concerning interns. The team member was confronted with an unexpected call from a school, asking about an intern introduction. The team member did not know anything about this, nor did he/she know what to do. Therefore, we have a clear evidence of the occurrence of the alteration of the workflow. We can trust this source, because it is a team member who speaks out of his/her own experience with the unexpected event. There are no reasons to mention this, if a disturbance of workflow is not happening. • Strong confirmation of condition 1 	<p>oh no) I don't know anything about this and neither does my colleague I think, or else he/she would have briefed me.</p>
<p>● <i>Aggregation of evidence for observable manifestations C1</i></p>	<p>Because C1(i) is found, we can confirm the presence of the condition 'ecological change' as discontinuity of organizational routines. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation:</u> strong warranted, given C1(i) is strong and accurate evidence of the occurrence of an 'altered workflow' at the organization.</p>	
<p><i>Case 4: Weekend work arrangements</i></p>		
<p>● <i>observation C1(i)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview I team leader Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II <i>Observation on why employees gave attention to the issue</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu. This piece of evidence confirms the team members had frustrations about the weekend work arrangements. This evidence does not come straight from the team members themselves, but we do trust the source, because the team leader has a good overview of what team members are struggling with. Also, there would be no reason for the team leader to give attention to this issue if there wasn't a problem for the team members. • Strong confirmation of condition 1 	<p>9min: "Yeah, well, I know around the weekend work there were some discussions. And if we'd made arrangements, we'd put that down on paper and then we'd send it on. (...) You're with a group of ten, we're expected to work during the weekend, but actually our weekend work is voluntary, but we have to do it anyway. Then there are always people who want to do it and people who do not. There was a lot of frustration there."</p>
<p>● <i>Aggregation of evidence for</i></p>	<p>Because C1(i) is found, we can confirm the presence of the condition 'ecological change' as discontinuity of organizational routines.</p>	

<p><i>observable manifestations C1</i></p>	<p>Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation:</u> strongly warranted, given C1(i) is strong and accurate evidence of the occurrence of an ‘altered workflow’ at the organization.</p>	
<p><i>Case 5: Planning outside working hours</i></p>		
<p>●<i>observation C1(i)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team members Familiehulp Roeselare team Ledegem <i>Observation on why employees gave attention to the issue</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu. This evidence clearly shows why team members gave attention to the issue. The planning has to be made outside of working hours, which causes the team members to feel frustrated. In their view, this should not be the routine way of working. This evidence is empirically unique, because there’s no alternative explanation and team members confirm each other’s statements. ● Strong confirmation of condition 1 	<p>1h45: Interviewee: “But you're working on it in your spare time?” Interviewee 1: "Yes, a lot, and especially in such busy weeks." Interviewee 3: "Yeah, I think the care workers more than us (cf. household help)." Interviewee 1: "I say it, we call... I certainly call in such a busy week 20 minutes and then 10 minutes work planning. That's half an hour a week I think we work outside our hours..." Interviewee 2 confirms.</p>
<p>●<i>Aggregation of evidence for observable manifestations C1</i></p>	<p>Because C1(i) is found, we can confirm the presence of the condition ‘ecological change’ as discontinuity of organizational routines. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation:</u> strongly warranted, given C1(i) is strong and accurate evidence of the occurrence of an ‘altered workflow’ at the organization.</p>	
<p><i>Case 6: Mobile hoist</i></p>		
<p>●<i>observation C1(i)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview I team members Sint Barbara Kimpenhof team Vlindertuin <i>Observation on why employees gave attention to the issue</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu. This evidence clearly shows why team members gave attention to the issue and felt frustrated. Work agreements have been made for the mobile hoist, but certain team members do not honour the agreements. One of the team members caught someone not respecting the rules and spoke on it. The team member clearly states this frustrated him/her. This evidence is empirically unique, because there’s no alternative explanation and team members confirm each other’s statements. ● Strong confirmation of condition 1 	<p>1u48: Interviewee 2: “The other day it happened manually again... yeah... I caught it and then I said I'm really not happy with it, we made that agreement. I don't want to see it again, because I'm not happy. And then you can say ‘I didn't find the mobile hoist’. Yeah then you go look for it...” Interviewee 1: "It's for your own safety too, you pick that person up and you feel something in your back..." Interviewee 2: "Yes if that person falls... That person (cf. resident) was sitting loose on the toilet, so to speak, and called like ‘I’m done’ and I was before that other colleague, because I also had the beeper with me and I see that person calling and I think oh I'm going to pick him/her up from the toilet and I see that person sitting loose (cf. on the toilet), yes that was out of control for a moment.”</p>

<p>●<i>Aggregation of evidence for observable manifestations C1</i></p>	<p>Because C1(i) is found, we can confirm the presence of the condition ‘ecological change’ as discontinuity of organizational routines. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation</u>: strong warranted, given C1(i) is strong and accurate evidence of the occurrence of an ‘altered workflow’ at the organization.</p>
<p><i>Case 7: Incontinence</i></p>	
<p>●<i>observation C1(i)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team members Sint Barbara Beversthuis team Tip <i>Observation on why employees gave attention to the issue</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu. This piece of evidence shows what the issue is all about. The team members had various discussions about work agreements proposed by one team member (cf. the star role: responsible for incontinence materials). We trust the source, because the interviewee seemed to remember the story in detail and the other interviewee confirmed it. There’s no alternative explanation. ● Strong confirmation of condition 1 <p>1u11: Interviewer: “What was that situation, what was the reason?” Interviewee 1: "I then give the diapers, for the day and for the night I decide which one and which one I use and the person of the night shift was not always in agreement with me. Yeah she wanted the sticky diaper or how should I say and I wanted the two-piece." Int 2: "Yes, a sleeper that's..." (...) Interviewee 1: "I always have to watch that I don't consume too much (cf. of the material), after three months I get a meeting every time (...). But I have to see that my residents get what they need. I thought they were better with those. And the person of the night shift says: 'no I want the expensive one'. The expensive one means that residents were actually allowed to keep it on all night, then they shouldn't check it. (...) But that didn't work for him (cf. the resident) and he was still wet every morning. So I said: put on a small one, but look at it at 4 o'clock at night, then put on another one and it will be even cheaper than taking the expensive one. But they didn't agree to that and then they had something of us put aside. And I say yes no I try to do good for everyone, residents, for upstairs (cf. management) and for my consumption. And they were like ‘no you don't know about it and this and that and they were like we’re being excluded’.” Other interviewee confirms. > Interviewee 1 has a star role for incontinence, which means this is the person who decides which resident gets which materials. The work agreements proposed by the star role team member were deemed insufficient by the night shift team members, which led to discussions.</p>
<p>●<i>Aggregation of evidence for observable manifestations C1</i></p>	<p>Because C1(i) is found, we can confirm the presence of the condition ‘ecological change’ as discontinuity of organizational routines. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation</u>: strong warranted, given C1(i) is strong and accurate evidence of the occurrence of an ‘altered workflow’ at the organization.</p>

<i>Case 8: Contingency plan</i>		
<p>● <i>observation C1(i)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team leader Sint Barbara Beversthuis team Zonnehoeve</p> <p><i>Observation on why employees gave attention to the issue</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu. This evidence is empirically unique. The team leader explains in detail why team members gave attention to the issue: they were not sure they would get every task done. We trust the source, because the team leader gives details about the conversation he/she had with the team members. Also, there's no alternative explanation, because the interviewer specifically asks about the contingency plan. ● Strong confirmation of condition 1 	<p>8min30: Interviewer: "The contingency plan you just said, that's actually something new?" Interviewee: "(...) Yes, that's actually because I noticed, during a couple of days of leave, that the team members were fully occupied and that it was apparently chaos after all. Then they also called me saying 'it's 11 o'clock here and that last resident still has to be washed and how is it going to be with the weekend and so on?'</p> <p>> Team leader explains the team members called him/her, panicking and saying that they wouldn't be able to get all their tasks done.</p>
<p>● <i>Aggregation of evidence for observable manifestations C1</i></p>	<p>Because C1(i) is found, we can confirm the presence of the condition 'ecological change' as discontinuity of organizational routines.</p> <p>Sources are relatively independent.</p> <p><u>Overall confirmation:</u> strong warranted, given C1(i) is strong and accurate evidence of the occurrence of an 'altered workflow' at the organization.</p>	
<p>Key part Cognitive Versatility (part 5 in pathway 1; part 6 in pathway 2; part 4 in pathway 3)</p>		
<p>4/</p> <p>5/</p> <p>6</p>	<p><u>Building block:</u> Cognitive versatility.</p> <p><i>Pathway 1 (new cue situation):</i> <u>Theorized part 5:</u> Individual team member compares the selected 'signs' [the new information] with their expectations (what they expect as result of routinely workflow) and bracket them with the organizational framework according to the organizational flow of experience.</p> <p><i>Pathway 2 (peer experience with existing cue situation):</i> <u>Theorized part 6:</u> Using this new (value)knowledge, individual team member brackets the problem that matched with the framework according to the organizational flow of experience referred by peers</p> <p><i>Pathway 3 (experience with existing cue situation):</i> <u>Theorized part 4:</u> Using this knowledge from key sources, individual team members identify the cue they face and brackets the cue that matched with the framework according to the organizational flow of experience referred by peers.</p> <p><u>Observable manifestations:</u> We expect to find fingerprints about the link between the real work situation and the disturbance the team member thinks is going to happen where normal work routines are not sufficient. Evidence can be found by asking the team members how this link would fit into their team structure and activities. — Htu</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Theoretical certainty not formulated (no priors) ● Relatively high theoretical uniqueness. Highly unlikely to find this fingerprint without the mechanism of 'cognitive dissonance reduction' being operative, because the search of support about 'what to do' with the cue noticed, implies a social acknowledge of the alteration of the work flows and a search for solutions within a dissonant cognitive environment. 	
<i>Case 3: Interns (pathway 1)</i>		
<p>● <i>observation P5(i)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview I team members Familiehulp Subregioteam Turnhout</p>	<p>4min: Interviewee: "You get involved from the moment you hear that someone is coming to do an internship in your</p>

	<p><i>Observation on comparing signs with expectations and bracket this with the organizational framework</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu. This piece of evidence is a very clear statement on the failing work routines: work agreements for interns are not clear and they cause chaos in the team. Therefore, we have evidence of what the team member thinks is going to happen when normal work routines are not sufficient: tasks will not be executed, because it's not clear who is responsible. We can trust this source because the interviewees are team members who speak out of their own experience with the intern issues. There's no alternative explanation. This piece of evidence is empirically unique. • Strong confirmation of proposition 5. 	<p>team, B used to be the one who took care of everything, contacts with schools, who also invited the interns to come by to give explanations. The only thing you had to do as a care partner when they came here was to get acquainted and possibly give them a schedule. Then it went from B to A and suddenly it was chaos, then suddenly it was all different, then we all had to do it ourselves while we didn't really know that.”</p> <p>> Interviewee mentions that from the moment an intern is coming to the organization, it's important for the team members to know what to do. Before, work routines used to be sufficient, but with current routines there is chaos and no one knows for sure who's responsibility the interns are.</p>
<p>● <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 5</i></p>	<p>If P5(i) is found, we can confirm the presence of proposition 5. Observation (i) is relevant in terms of uniqueness and trust, and information of what we can interpret. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation</u> strongly warranted, given P5(i) is strong evidence of team members bracketing signs of a disturbance in the organizational framework.</p>	
<p><i>Case 4: Weekend work arrangements (pathway 1)</i></p>		
<p>● <i>observation P5(i)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview I team leader Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II</p> <p><i>Observation on comparing signs with expectations and bracket this with the organizational framework</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lu. The observation tells us something about the signs the team leader gets from the team. We assume the team leader could be worried these feelings of frustration might blow up, probably causing a fight within the team or causing not enough team members to wanting to do weekend work. This would result in the organizational framework failing because of these frustrations, because weekend work needs to be done. This is an assumption, therefore we cannot evaluate this evidence as unique. • Weak confirmation of proposition 3 	<p>9min: "Yeah, well, I know around the weekend work there were some discussions. And if we'd made arrangements, we'd put that down on paper and then we'd send it on. (...) You're with a group of ten, we're expected to work during the weekend, but actually our weekend work is voluntary, but we have to do it anyway. Then there are always people who want to do it and people who do not. There was a lot of frustration there."</p> <p>> The team leader explains how the team members are frustrated about the weekend work planning. We can assume she/he expects the issues to blow up or it could be that there are not enough team members to do the weekend work.</p>
<p>● <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 5</i></p>	<p>If only P5(i) is found, we cannot confirm the evidence because we need stronger evidence of what the team leader thinks is going to happen and how this will impact the organizational framework. Sources are relatively independent.</p>	

		<u>Overall confirmation</u> : weakly warranted, given P5(i) is weak evidence of bracketing signs of a disturbance in the organizational framework.
<i>Case 5: Planning outside working hours (pathway 3)</i>		
● <i>observation P4(i)</i>	Account evidence. Interview II team members Familiehulp Roeselare team Ledegem <i>Observation on comparing signs with expectations and bracket this with the organizational framework</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Mu. The observation tells us something about what the team members expect to happen when they wouldn't use their private time anymore to make agreements within the team. We can trust the source because all three team members are on the same page about this issue. However, no details are given to what they mean by the "chaos" and the concrete consequences. ● Moderate confirmation of proposition 4 	1u07 Interviewee 2: "If we would say that we are not going to call each other in between or outside of working hours, then..." Interviewee 3: "Then it would be a big chaos." Interviewee 1: "It would go completely wrong." Interviewee 2 confirms: "It would go completely wrong."
● <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 4</i>	If P4(i) is found, we can moderately confirm the presence of proposition 4. Observation (i) is relevant in terms of uniqueness and trust, but it does not contain detailed information about bracketing the signs of the disturbance in the organizational framework. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation</u> moderately warranted, given P4(i) is moderate evidence of team members bracketing signs of a disturbance in the organizational framework.	
<i>Case 6: Mobile hoist (pathway 3)</i>		
● <i>observation P4(i)</i>	Account evidence. Interview II team members Sint Barbara Kimpenhof team Vlindertuin <i>Observation on comparing signs with expectations and bracket this with the organizational framework</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu. This piece of evidence is a clear statement on the consequences of the failing work routines: work agreements concerning the mobile hoist are not followed by every team member, which causes the residents to be lifted unsafely. This evidence shows what the team members think is going to happen when normal work routines are not sufficient: residents will take a fall and possibly become less mobile because of this. We can trust this source because the interviewees are team members who speak out of their own experience with the issues. There's no alternative 	59min: Interviewee 1: "That woman had slipped." Interviewee 2: Yes, and then you get a call once, you think 'Oh, she has to go to the toilet', you come in there, that woman is lying there on the floor. Yeah, that's... A woman, one meter eighty, eighty kilos, go ahead. Semi-sided paralyzed, start lifting that. That's with the passive one (cf. the passive mobile hoist)." Interviewee 1: "And then she had nothing, but worst case she would break a lot. And then she can do a lot less herself. So in the end..." > Team members discuss how using the mobile hoist is necessary to lift residents in a safe way. If not used, they could fall and break something, which would make them even less mobile.

		<p>explanation. This piece of evidence is empirically unique.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong confirmation of proposition 4 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>observation P4(ii)</i> 	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team leader Sint Barbara Kimpenhof team Vlindertuin</p> <p><i>Observation on comparing signs with expectations and bracket this with the organizational framework</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu. This piece of evidence is a very clear statement on the consequences of the failing work routines: work agreements concerning the mobile hoist are not followed by every team member, which causes the residents to be lifted unsafely. This evidence shows what the team leader thinks is going to happen when normal work routines are not sufficient: residents will take a fall and family members could be angry for this. We can trust this source because the interviewee is the team leader who speaks out of her own experience with the issues. There's no alternative explanation. This piece of evidence is empirically unique. • Strong confirmation of proposition 4 	<p>39min: Interviewee 1: "I've been a care worker, too. I didn't mind showers. 'Go get a mobile hoist, okay now we lose two minutes, less if you didn't take the elevator but the stairs.' In the long run, you win. Because you have no complaints, your resident is safe. What if your resident falls? Who's going to explain it to the family? 'How did that happen?' 'We put them in the chair.' 'How could they fall out of that mobile hoist?'"</p> <p>> Team leader explains how the mobile hoist prevents residents from falling and care workers from having complaints and back problems. He/she also specifies which consequences not using the mobile lift could mean for the organizational framework: family members expect care workers to use the mobile hoist, therefore they would be angry if the resident would fall, because that would mean care workers are not doing their job correctly.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 4</i> 	<p>Both pieces of evidence are found out and both have strong confirmation. We can, therefore, confirm the presence of the proposition 4.</p> <p>If only one of the observations is found, we can only confirm moderately, because we need both observations to infer that P4 is present. P4(i) tells us something about the view of the team members, whereas P4(ii) details the view of the team leader. Sources are relatively independent.</p> <p><u>Overall confirmation</u> strongly warranted, given P4(i) and P4(ii) are strong evidence of team members bracketing signs of a disturbance in the organizational framework.</p>		
<p><i>Case 7: Incontinence (pathway 1)</i></p>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>observation P5(i)</i> 	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team members Sint Barbara Beversthuis team Tip</p> <p><i>Observation on comparing signs with expectations and bracket this with the organizational framework</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu. The evidence is empirically unique. The interviewee explains that without a proper evaluation, no decision can be made about changing the incontinence material. So, the team member foresees nothing will change as long as the work agreements are not followed (failing work routines). We trust the 	<p>1u25 Interviewee 1: "I had tested several things. (...) One day in that week it was very badly filled in and I tell people I can't work with this, this has to be scored again, I don't change before that. So they had those two or three weeks the same, from my system, because I said we have to use it and they had something like you do nothing about it. I say yes, but if nobody fills out that paper, there's nothing I can do."</p> <p>> The interviewee explains how the score sheet has to be filled in for every use of incontinence material. It's an evaluation, based on which the star role (interviewee 1) can make a</p>	

		<p>source, because the team member is responsible for this subject (incontinence) and he/she remembers the story in detail. Also, there is no alternative explanation for this evidence: it's clearly about the incontinence issue.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong confirmation of proposition 5 	<p>decision: go further with the current material or change it. The evaluation couldn't be made, because the sheet wasn't properly filled in. The team member feels a bad decision could be made when the evaluation is not done properly. This is what makes the team members of the night shift frustrated, because they feel like nothing is done about this issue.</p>
	<p>● <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 5</i></p>	<p>If P5(i) is found, we can confirm the presence of proposition 5. Observation (i) is relevant in terms of uniqueness and trust, and information of what we can interpret. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation</u> strongly warranted, given P5(i) is strong evidence of team members bracketing signs of a disturbance in the organizational framework.</p>	
<i>Case 8: Contingency plan (pathway 3)</i>			
	<p>● <i>observation P4(i)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team leader Sint Barbara Beversthuis team Zonnehoeve <i>Observation on comparing signs with expectations and bracket this with the organizational framework</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu. This evidence is empirically unique. The team leader explains in detail what concerns team members have when experiencing the signs of a disturbance: they are not sure they will get everything done. We trust the source, because the team leader gives details about the conversation he/she had with the team members. Also, there's no alternative explanation, because the interviewer specifically asks about the contingency plan. • Strong confirmation of proposition 4 	<p>8min30: Interviewer: "The contingency plan you just said, that's actually something new?" Interviewee: "(...) Yes, that's actually because I noticed, during a couple of days of leave, that the team members were fully occupied and that it was apparently chaos after all. Then they also called me saying 'it's 11 o'clock here and that last resident still has to be washed and how is it going to be with the weekend and so on?'" > Team leader explains what the team members expect to happen when they are comparing the signs of the disturbance and bracketing them with the organizational framework.</p>
	<p>● <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 4</i></p>	<p>If P4(i) is found, we can confirm the presence of proposition 4. Observation (i) is relevant in terms of uniqueness and trust, and information of what we can interpret. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation</u> strongly warranted, given P4(i) is strong evidence of team members bracketing signs of a disturbance in the organizational framework.</p>	

Roadmap Cognitive Dissonance: key part analysis – cause & key part 3

Overview cases
Case 3: Interns (Familiehulp Turnhout – Subregioteam Turnhout)
Case 4: Weekend work arrangements (Familiehulp Leuven – Zorgteam Kessel-Lo II)
Case 5: Planning outside working hours (Familiehulp Roeselare – Zorgteam Ledegem)
Case 6: Mobile hoist (St. Barbara vzw Kimpenhof – Team Vlindertuin)
Case 7: Incontinence (St. Barbara vzw Beversthuis – Team Tip)
Case 8: Contingency plan (St. Barbara vzw Beversthuis – Team Zonnehoeve)

Road map:

	<p><u>Causal relationship</u> <i>Causal mechanism linking motivational force as sense of urgency within a context of high magnitude of dissonance, with the success of complex team problem-solving.</i></p> <p><u>Prior relatively low</u> ● There is no existing research about the cases.</p>		
C a u s e	<p><u>Theorized cause:</u> Due to the dissonance caused by 'unexpected events' [violation of expectations] at work, individual team member feels pressure to reduce it because he/she is aware that unresolved dissonance could interfere with (1) his/her effective job performance' and group performance, and (2) because it is psychologically unpleasant.</p>		
	<p><u>Observable manifestations:</u> Expect to find evidence in the empirical record of employees' (who work in Flemish companies; individual team members, team leader, team members) activities relating to 'feelings of frustration' or violated expectations about the work-flow routines planning, along with activities relating to the 'preoccupation with the failure' of the consequences of this dissonance in the own performance, group performance and the emotional state. Evidence for this can be found by asking employees about their feelings and thoughts when an unexpected event has modified the planned work routines. This could be measured using account evidence (from interviews with involved actors). — Htu¹</p> <p>● Theoretical certainty not formulated (no priors) ● High theoretical uniqueness, as observing this observable manifestation necessarily means the presence of a <i>cognitive dissonance arousal</i> (Festinger, 1957).</p>		
	<i>Case 3: Interns</i>		
	<p>● <i>observation</i> C1(i)</p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview I team members Familiehulp Subregioteam Turnhout <i>Observation on violated expectations</i></p>	<p>1u18: Interviewee 1: "I had to take over for a colleague who was on vacation and all of a sudden I got a phone call from the school of that intern 'he/she starts then' and I thought oei</p>

¹ Note: Htu= high theoretical uniqueness; Hu = High uniqueness; Mu = Moderate uniqueness; Lu = Low uniqueness.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu. The observation tells us something about the existence of an unpleasant feeling the team member gets when the expectations about the work organization are violated. The team member is not informed and feels pressure to search for information and to know what's going on in order to reduce the dissonance. There is no alternative explanation for this evidence and we trust the source, since it's a team member speaking out of his/her own detailed experience with the events. Therefore we evaluate this evidence as unique. • Strong confirmation of the condition 1 	(cf. oh no) I don't know anything about this and neither does my colleague I think, or else he/she would have briefed me. > Team member expresses the unpleasant feeling (uncertainty, surprise/shock) when getting a call from the school about an intern the team member has no information of.
●Aggregation of evidence for observable manifestations C1	Because C1(i) is found, we can confirm the presence of the condition 'motivational force as sense of urgency'. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation:</u> strongly warranted, given C1(i) is strong evidence in terms of a motivational force to reduce dissonance.	
<i>Case 4: Weekend work arrangements</i>		
●observation C1(i)	Account evidence. Interview I team leader Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II <i>Observation on feelings of frustration</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu. This piece of evidence confirms the team members had frustrations about the weekend work arrangements. This evidence does not come straight from the team members themselves, but we do trust the source, because the team leader has a good overview of what team members are struggling with. Also, there would be no reason for the team leader to give attention to this issue if these frustration feelings from the team members were not present. • Strong confirmation of condition 1 	9min: "Yeah, well, I know around the weekend work there were some discussions. And if we'd made arrangements, we'd put that down on paper and then we'd send it on. (...) You're with a group of ten, we're expected to work during the weekend, but actually our weekend work is voluntary, but we have to do it anyway. Then there are always people who want to do it and people who do not. There was a lot of frustration there."
●Aggregation of evidence for observable manifestations C1	Because C1(i) is found, we can confirm the presence of the condition 'motivational force as sense of urgency'. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation:</u> strongly warranted, given C1(i) is strong evidence in terms of a motivational force to reduce dissonance (feelings of frustration from the team members).	
<i>Case 5: Planning outside working hours</i>		

<p>●<i>observation</i> <i>C1(i)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team members Familiehulp Roeselare team Ledegem <i>Observation on feelings of frustration</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu. This evidence confirms the team members having feelings of frustration about planning outside of working hours. We can trust this source because the team members speak out of their own experience with the problem. They give details about why making the planning at home frustrates them: it takes them half an hour outside of working hours and they are not compensated for this. There is no alternative explanation. ● Strong confirmation of condition 1 	<p>1h45: Interviewee: "But you're working on it in your spare time?" Interviewee 1: "Yes, a lot, and especially in such busy weeks." Interviewee 3: "Yeah, I think the care workers more than us (cf. household help)." Interviewee 1: "I say it, we call... I certainly call in such a busy week 20 minutes and then 10 minutes work planning. That's half an hour a week I think we work outside our hours..." Interviewee 2 confirms. > Interviewee 3 experiences less frustration as a household help, but at the same time acknowledges the frustration of the other interviewees as care workers. This is because the household help planning is more straightforward and easier to prepare at home, so it automatically takes less time.</p>
<p>●<i>Aggregation of evidence for observable manifestations</i> <i>C1</i></p>	<p>Because C1(i) is found, we can confirm the presence of the condition 'motivational force as sense of urgency'. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation:</u> strongly warranted, given C1(i) is strong evidence in terms of a motivational force to reduce dissonance (feelings of frustration from the team members).</p>	
<p><i>Case 6: Mobile hoist</i></p>		
<p>●<i>observation</i> <i>C1(i)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview I team members Sint Barbara Kimpenhof team Vlindertuin <i>Observation on feelings of frustration</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu. This evidence clearly shows why team members felt frustrated. Work agreements have been made for the mobile hoist, but certain team members do not honour the agreements. One of the team members caught someone not respecting the rules and spoke on it. The team member states this frustrated him/her. This evidence is empirically unique, because there's no alternative explanation and team members confirm each other's statements, so we trust the source. ● Strong confirmation of condition 1 	<p>1u48: Interviewee 2: "The other day it happened manually again... yeah... I caught it and then I said I'm really not happy with it, we made that agreement. I don't want to see it again, because I'm not happy. And then you can say 'I didn't find the mobile hoist'. Yeah then you go look for it..." Interviewee 1: "It's for your own safety too, you pick that person up and you feel something in your back..." Interviewee 2: "Yes if that person falls... That person (cf. resident) was sitting loose on the toilet, so to speak, and called like 'I'm done' and I was before that other colleague, because I also had the beeper with me and I see that person calling and I think oh I'm going to pick him/her up from the toilet and I see that person sitting loose (cf. on the toilet), yes that was out of control for a moment."</p>
<p>●<i>Aggregation of evidence for observable manifestations</i> <i>C1</i></p>	<p>Because C1(i) is found, we can confirm the presence of the condition 'motivational force as sense of urgency'. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation:</u> strongly warranted, given C1(i) is strong evidence in terms of a motivational force to reduce dissonance (feelings of frustration from the team members).</p>	

<i>Case 7: Incontinence</i>		
<p>● <i>observation</i> C1(i)</p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team leader Sint Barbara Beversthuis team Tip <i>Observation on feelings of frustration</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Mu. The team leader states that the team members of the night shift felt like their opinions were not taken into account and that they were not listened to. This is what caused the incontinence issue. We trust the source, because the team leader has a good overview of what happened and he/she knows the team very well. However, the team leader doesn't go into detail about the discussions between the two parties, there's little information about that. There's no alternative explanation for this evidence. ● Moderate confirmation of condition 1 	<p>23min: Interviewee: "That incontinence thing with us is that A, who does that very well. That person is very consistent in that. Everybody's open to that, it's discussed. And then that's evaluated. And then A cuts certain knots, but everyone is open to A's feedback. (...). At that moment (cf. the issue with the incontinence decisions) the team members from the night shift felt their opinions were not heard and that they were not involved."</p>
<p>● <i>observation</i> C1(ii)</p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team members Sint Barbara Beversthuis team Tip <i>Observation on violated expectations</i> <i>Observation on feelings of frustration</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu. This piece of evidence clearly shows the team members were frustrated: they want to make good decisions, but that's not possible due to lack of information, which leads to the team members of the night shift thinking no effort is put into trying to fix the issues (violated expectations). We trust the source, because the interviewee seemed to remember the conversation in detail. There's no alternative explanation, because the interviewer specifically asked about the feelings of frustration. ● Strong confirmation of condition 1 	<p>1h36: Interviewer: "The frustrations were a bit high, when did that come up and where?" Interviewee 1: "Yes that was in the morning in that quarter of an hour that we saw each other that they inform us and they left to go home and said like 'A please do something about it'. Then I said 'yes, but I've got my hands in my hair. I have to score a week (...)' So every 15 minutes in the morning it was the same discussion." > Interviewee 1 has a star role for incontinence, which means this is the person who decides which resident gets which materials. The work agreements proposed by the star role team member were deemed insufficient by the night shift team members, which led to frustration.</p>
<p>● <i>Aggregation of evidence for observable manifestations</i> C1</p>	<p>Because both pieces of evidence are found, we can confirm the presence of the condition 'motivational force as sense of urgency'. If only C(i) is found, we cannot confirm, whereas if C1(ii) is found, we might infer that C1 is present. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation:</u> strongly warranted, given C1(i): is moderate evidence of 'frustration' in the team according to the team leader and C1(ii) strongly shows the view of the team members on this.</p>	
<i>Case 8: Contingency plan</i>		

<p>● <i>observation</i> C1(i)</p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team members Sint Barbara Beversthuis team Zonnehoeve <i>Observation on violated expectations</i> <i>Observation on feelings of frustration</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu. This piece of evidence shows the team members were fed up with how things were going: they expect to be able to do all the work they need to, but with all the team members who were sick that was not possible (violated expectations). They mention how they couldn't keep taking over shifts anymore. It's clear they had frustrations about this. We trust the source, because the interviewee seemed genuine and they were both on the same page about this. There's no alternative explanation, because the interviewer specifically asked about the contingency plan and their feelings about this. ● Strong confirmation of condition 1 	<p>2min: Interviewer: "That was in response to so many sick people? Interviewee 2: "Yes at the same time." Interviewer: "And is that something X (cf. team leader) came up with as a proposal or is that something you as a team...?" Interviewee 1: "We did it that way, because in general we have to take over shifts for a lot of people and it became a bit... Yeah, you can't keep taking over shifts, can you? And with that it is put to work so that no extra nurses or care workers have to come and take over a shift, but that they (cf. physiotherapist and animator for example) take care of that for a small part and somehow we try that all the work is done, but without extra people ... so without people who were normally free that day, that they didn't have to come do extra shifts. Because that happened a lot and that didn't work anymore."</p>
<p>● <i>Aggregation of evidence for observable manifestations</i> C1</p>	<p>Because C1(i) is found, we can confirm the presence of the condition 'motivational force as sense of urgency'. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation:</u> strongly warranted, given C1(i) is strong evidence in terms of a motivational force to reduce dissonance (feelings of frustration from the team members and violated expectations).</p>	
<p>Key part 3 search for social support</p>		
<p>3</p>	<p><u>Theorized part:</u> Due to this increase of dissonance, individual team members search for social support - by communicating the perceived signs of trouble to other peers - in order to know what to do.</p>	
<p><u>Observable manifestations:</u> Expect to find - in the empirical record - teams members' activities relating to searching some kind of support via communication about what to do, along with activities relating to understanding the problem that the perceived cue is generating and what to do to solve it. Evidence for this part can be found by asking employees (account evidence) whether the team members meet each other (formal/informal) to communicate their concern and which other persons are involved. — Htu</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Theoretical certainty not formulated (no priors) ● Relatively high theoretical uniqueness. Highly unlikely to find this fingerprint without the mechanism of 'cognitive dissonance reduction' being operative, because the search of support about 'what to do' with the cue noticed, implies a social acknowledge of the alteration of the work flows and a search for solutions within a dissonant cognitive environment. 		
<p><i>Case 3: Interns</i></p>		

<p>● <i>observation P3(i)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence: Interview I team members Familiehulp Subregioteam Turnhout <i>Observation on team members communicating</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu. The observation clearly tells us something about the existence of communication among peers and information related to what to do with the problem. It is clear the individual team member needs information from their colleague(s) in order to be able to understand the problem and reduce dissonance. We can trust the source, because team members confirm each other's stories and they seem to remember it correctly. There is no alternative explanation for this observation, which is why this evidence is empirically unique. ● Strong confirmation of proposition 3 	<p>1u18: Interviewee 1: "That also started with the e-mail I send right." Interviewee 2: "Yes, that was the e-mail that started it. You sent to A how do we have to do this or something." Interviewee 1: "I had to take over for a colleague who was on vacation and all of a sudden I got a phone call from the school of that intern 'he/she starts then' and I thought oei (cf. oh no) I don't know anything about this and neither does my colleague I think, or else he/she would have briefed me. And then I thought ah A is responsible for the introductions and for the interns, so I e-mailed her: 'this is what I hear from a school, is this right?'. Interviewee 1: "And that started it, yes." (...)</p>
<p>● <i>observation P3(ii)</i></p>	<p>Trace evidence: E-mail conversation Familiehulp Subregioteam Turnhout <i>Observation on team members communicating</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu. The observation as a whole tells us something about the existence of team members' engagement in the problem. The fact that the team member thinks it's important to choose a moment where everyone can be there to discuss the problem, shows they are involved. We can trust the source because we do not see other reasons why team members could get involved in a work arrangement caused by a cue, if it is not because they want to know what to do to solve it. The question from the interviewer gets a firm answer from the interviewee. Both interviewees state that it's necessary to know everyone's take on the problem to be able to solve it. So, we can assume they remember correctly. ● Strong confirmation of proposition 3 	<p>E-mail conversation between Interviewee 2 and A (HR-manager) about responsibilities regarding intern introductions (see annex)</p>
<p>● <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 3</i></p>	<p>Both pieces of evidence are found out and both have strong confirmation. We can, therefore, confirm the presence of the proposition 3. If only P3(i) is found, we cannot confirm the evidence because we need both observations to infer that p3 is present. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation</u> strongly warranted, given P3(i) is strong evidence of contacting peers via e-mail to communicate their concerns regarding the cues and P3(ii) supports that with trace evidence of the e-mails.</p>	
<p><i>Case 4: Weekend work arrangements</i></p>		

<p>●<i>observation P3(i)</i></p>	<p>Part 3 not found</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Predicted evidence of proposition 3 is not observed. ● No inferences can be made 	<p>It seems that team members do not search for social support concerning this issue. But we do not know, because we could not gain access to the empirical record to assess the presence of this proposition. The actual trigger to make arrangements is unclear and participants said there was no specific cause or underlying issue.</p>
<p>●<i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 3</i></p>	<p>Predicted evidence of proposition 3 is not observed. A not observed proposition does not mean that P3 is absent in this case, because we did not have full access to the empirical record, i.e. impossibility to make another round of account evidence to assess this particular proposition due to global health issues (covid-19). For this reason, no inferences would be possible even if we do not observe the predicted evidence of social support. Overall confirmation: No inferences can be made.</p>	
<p><i>Case 5: Planning outside working hours</i></p>		
<p>●<i>observation P3(i)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team members Familiehulp Roeselare team Ledegem <i>Observation on team members communicating</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Lu. This evidence shows team members call each other outside of work to ask questions, to talk about clients or to make their planning. We can assume the issue of using their free time is also a topic they discuss. During the interview it seemed it was an issue that was talked about before. The team members don't think it's fair that they have to spend half an hour a week working outside of normal working hours. This evidence is not empirically unique, because we cannot know for sure if they actually talked about using their private time to make the planning. This means there could be an alternative explanation. ● Weak confirmation of proposition 3 	<p>1h45: Interviewee: "But you're working on it in your spare time?" Interviewee 1: "Yes, a lot, and especially in such busy weeks." Interviewee 3: "Yeah, I think the care workers more than us (cf. household help)." Interviewee 1: "I say it, we call... I certainly call in such a busy week 20 minutes and then 10 minutes work planning. That's half an hour a week I think we work outside our hours..." Interviewee 2 confirms. > Interviewees talk about calling each other outside of working hours. It seems that the interviewees have talked about this with each other before, like it's an issue that has been talked about before, although they do not specify this.</p>
<p>●<i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 3</i></p>	<p>If P3(i) is found, the presence of the proposition 3 can only be confirmed in a weak way. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation</u> weakly warranted, given P3(i) is weak evidence of contacting peers to communicate their concerns regarding the cues.</p>	
<p><i>Case 6: Mobile hoist</i></p>		
<p>●<i>observation P3(i)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team leader Sint Barbara Kimpenhof team Vlindertuin <i>Observation on team members communicating</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Mu. The observation tells us something about the existence of communication among peers and 	<p>43min: Interviewee: "Yeah, yeah. They share that part of being irritated, then they blame it on the kind of hoist. And they're right about that for a point. If that elevator has to be replaced we replace it with another brand, a better brand, an easier elevator. So they have a point in that. The advantages, yes, they</p>

		<p>information related to what to do with the problem. The team leader states that team members share their view on things and try to convince others. We don't trust the source completely, because the team leader says 'I think that...' which means he/she is not entirely sure about whether this happens during the break. However, the team leader also states that team members try to find like-minded people and how that happens more than it used to. It doesn't matter when the team members communicate (during the break or another time), it matters they have communication about these issues. There's no alternative explanation for this evidence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderate confirmation of proposition 3 	<p>discuss that too. But they usually just give a start, and I think that, because after the briefing there's a break, and I think in that break that will continue. And what they're trying to do is find a buddy to get reinforcements. So if someone with an opinion is looking for 'who shares that opinion' and together they're going to convince the other one. That happens more now. I'm not so alone anymore. You used to have a lot more of 'I'm alone with my opinion and I'll keep quiet'. Now they're trying to find some reinforcements to bring it up.”</p> <p>> Team leader explains how team members communicate with each other during a briefing in the break. Team members will try to find like-minded team members or try to convince them of their opinion.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>observation P3(ii)</i> 		<p>Account evidence. Interview II team members Sint Barbara Kimpenhof team V Lindertuin</p> <p><i>Observation on team members communicating</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu. The observation tells us something about the existence of communication among peers and information related to what to do with the problem. The team member who saw the colleague breaking the rules (not using the mobile hoist) communicated to that colleague directly. The team member did not bring this to a briefing with the other team members, but states that when this would happen more often, that the team leader would be involved. The team member details that when this happens, they hear it from their colleagues. This indicated communication with other colleagues as well, although the team member states this wasn't the case for this particular incident. We trust the source, because the team member tells a very detailed story and vividly remembers the reaction of the confronted colleague. There's no alternative explanation for this evidence. • Strong confirmation of proposition 3 	<p>59min: Interviewer: “And when colleagues see that from each other, that they don't use the mobile hoists when they should. Is that something that's mentioned or discussed at briefings?”</p> <p>Interviewee 2: “I don't do that. I know, when I found out, I just picked it up separately (cf. with that colleague separately). Actually, just sort of... Saying, ‘Look, I'd rather not. <i>Potverdekke</i>, think about how we should do it. And then you get nine chances out of ten the 'Sorry' and the explanation why that was done, but you don't have an explanation for not following the rules. So if you just say, ‘Look, just get that elevator, don't be like that... Just because you can still do it, doesn't mean someone else can.’ And then it just stops. You're not gonna go on and on about it. It's just like, ‘Look, goddamn it, back in line.’ Of course, if they keep going out of line and you hear from colleagues 'That's already happened' or 'That's already done to me', then you can take that to X (cf. team leader) and say: 'Look, we've already gone to this point. We've already spoken to each other. We've already spoken to two/three colleagues about it, he/she keeps on doing so'.”</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 3</i> 		<p>If both pieces of evidence are found, we can confirm the presence of the proposition 3.</p> <p>If only P3(i) is found, we cannot confirm the evidence because we need the observation regarding the team members to infer that P3 is present.</p> <p>Sources are relatively independent.</p>	

		<u>Overall confirmation</u> : strongly warranted, given P3(i) and P3(ii) are strong evidence of ‘team communication’ and ‘team involvement’. Both are accurate evidence of the presence of searching social support via communication about ‘what to do’ and ‘formal/informal talks’ to communicate their concerns regarding the cues.
<i>Case 7: Incontinence</i>		
● <i>observation P3(i)</i>	Account evidence. Interview II team members Sint Barbara Beversthuis team Tip <i>Observation on team members communicating</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Mu. The observation clearly tells us something about the existence of communication among peers and information related to what to do with the problem. The communication about this issue was mostly non-verbal, which led to some frustration for the team member who was addressed in these writings. Therefore, the team member went to the team leader to ask: what should I do with this. There’s no alternative explanation for this issue and we can trust this source, because the interviewee responds firmly and the other interviewee confirms and adds to the story. However, the interviewee doesn’t go into detail about conversations with other team members. ● Moderate confirmation of proposition 3 	1h42: Interviewee 1: “I had my paper and the team member from the night shift had written it down in giant letters: LOOK FOR A SOLUTION!, and they were really a bit... Interviewee 2: “Agitated.” Interviewee 1: “Almost aggressive, and many times written down in the diary in giant letters ‘problem problem solution needed’. And then I asked X (cf. team leader) what to do with this and then she said ‘ask the night shift maybe...’. That was just after the briefing, just between the two of us.” Other interviewee confirms. > Interviewee says there had been communication between the team members through the diary (where all observations and important things are written down by colleagues), but that this was very aggressive. After a briefing (cf. short, more informal team meeting about daily routines) the interviewee went to the team leader to discuss this and ask what to do about it.
● <i>observation P3(ii)</i>	Account evidence. Interview II team members Sint Barbara Beversthuis team Tip <i>Observation on team members communicating</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu. The observation clearly tells us something about the existence of communication among peers and information related to what to do with the problem. The problem was discussed during the short briefings (meetings of 15min where team members saw each other during the shift change). There’s no alternative explanation for this issue and we can trust this source, because the interviewee can repeat the conversation in detail. ● Strong confirmation of proposition 3 	1h36: Interviewer: "The frustrations were a bit high, when did that come up and where?" Interviewee 1: "Yes that was in the morning in that quarter of an hour that we saw each other that they inform us and they left to go home and said like ‘A please do something about it’. Then I said ‘yes, but I've got my hands in my hair. I have to score a week (...)’ So every 15 minutes in the morning it was the same discussion." > The interviewees explains what the discussions looked like during the briefings (cf. short meetings) in the morning.
● <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 3</i>	Because both pieces of evidence are found, we can confirm the presence of proposition 3. If only P3(i) is found, we cannot confirm, whereas if P3(ii) is found, we might infer that P1 is present. Sources are relatively independent.	

		<u>Overall confirmation</u> : strongly warranted, given P3(i) is moderate evidence of ‘team communication’ and ‘team involvement’ and P3(ii) is accurate evidence of the presence of searching social support via communication about ‘what to do’ and ‘formal/informal talks’ to communicate their concerns regarding the cues.
<i>Case 8: Contingency plan</i>		
● <i>observation P3(i)</i>	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team members Sint Barbara Beversthuis team Zonnehoeve</p> <p><i>Observation on team members communicating</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Mu. This piece of evidence proves that there was communication between team members, since both interviewees confirm this. However, the details of these conversations are not given. Therefore, we cannot trust the source completely. There’s no alternative explanation, because the interviewer specifically asked about discussions within the team. ● Moderate confirmation of proposition 3 	<p>3min Interviewer: "And if you say that was no longer possible, would you have discussed it with each other in the team like ‘we see that is no longer possible or’? Interviewee 1: "Yes that was indicated (cf. by the team right). That that just doesn't..." Interviewee 2: "Yes, but not as a team, but among each other, but as a team of 'ok we don't want to take over for sick people anymore', no that as far as I know was never reported. Interviewee 1 : "To X (cf. team leader), right? (...) I remember the team meeting when we had to decide if A could go or not? I guess that was then... (...) Yeah, you know, that's dragging on, huh, that's not gonna happen overnight, is it?"</p>
● <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 3</i>	<p>This piece of evidence is found out and has moderate confirmation. We can, therefore, confirm the presence of the proposition 3 moderately.</p> <p>Sources are relatively independent.</p> <p><u>Overall confirmation</u> moderately warranted, given P3(i) is moderate evidence of ‘team communication and team involvement’ and the presence of searching social support via communication about ‘what to do’ and ‘formal/informal talks’ to communicate their concerns regarding the cues.</p>	

Roadmap Perspective Taking: key part analysis – cause & key part 5

Overview cases
Case 3: Interns (Familiehulp Turnhout – Subregioteam Turnhout)
Case 4: Weekend work arrangements (Familiehulp Leuven – Zorgteam Kessel-Lo II)
Case 5: Planning outside working hours (Familiehulp Roeselare – Zorgteam Ledegem)
Case 6: Mobile hoist (St. Barbara vzw Kimpenhof – Team Vlindertuin)
Case 7: Incontinence (St. Barbara vzw Beversthuis – Team Tip)
Case 8: Contingency plan (St. Barbara vzw Beversthuis – Team Zonnehoeve)

Road map:

<p><u>Causal relationship</u> <i>The causal mechanism links the detection of a work-related problem with the design of a solution through the cognitive process of differentiating and integrating different viewpoints.</i></p> <p><u>Prior relatively low</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no existing research about the cases. 		
C a u s e	<p><u>Theorized part:</u> Team member detects a disturbance during the operation of her/his work activities.</p>	
	<p><u>Observable manifestations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sequential & Trace: the initial detection of the problem happens before the design of the solution to the problem. - Account: team members remember the occurrence of the problem by being able to explain what was detected and how (how it all started). <p>— Htu¹</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Theoretical certainty not formulated (no priors) • High theoretical uniqueness: there is no other plausible explanation for observing this fingerprint 	
<i>Case 3: Interns</i>		
<p>• <i>observation</i> C1(i)</p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview I team members Familiehulp Subregioteam Turnhout</p> <p><i>Observation on detection of the problem</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mu – The problem of unclear work agreements around interns became apparent at this point. The team member was not informed about the intern, nor was he/she informed about responsibilities that came with this. This 	<p>1u18: Interviewee 1: “I had to take over for a colleague who was on vacation and all of a sudden I got a phone call from the school of that intern ‘he/she starts then’ and I thought oei (cf. oh no) I don’t know anything about this and neither does my colleague I think, or else he/she would have briefed me.</p>

¹ Note: Htu= high theoretical uniqueness; Hu = High uniqueness; Mu = Moderate uniqueness; Lu = Low uniqueness.

	<p>evidence is not highly unique, because it could be that the colleague forgot to mention this to the team member and this is the reason why he/she was not informed, not because of unclear work agreements. However, the team members explained how the responsibilities went from one colleague to another, so it's plausible the agreements were not clear.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderate confirmation condition 1 	<p>> Team member explains how he/she didn't know what to do when getting a call from the school about an intern the team member had no information of.</p>
<p>● <i>Aggregation of evidence for observable manifestations C1</i></p>	<p>Because C1(i) is found, we can confirm the presence of the condition being a problem situation related to the work organization. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation:</u> moderately warranted, given C1(i) is moderate evidence of the occurrence of a problem situation related to the work organization.</p>	
<p><i>Case 4: Weekend work arrangements</i></p>		
<p>● <i>observation C1(i)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview I team leader Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II <i>Observation on detecting a disturbance</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu. This piece of evidence shows us how the team leader detects that the team members had frustrations about the weekend work arrangements. This evidence does not come straight from the team members themselves, but we do trust the source, because the team leader has a good overview of what team members are struggling with. Also, there would be no reason for the team leader to give attention to this issue if these frustration feelings from the team members did not disturb the workflow. • Strong confirmation of condition 1 	<p>9min: "Yeah, well, I know around the weekend work there were some discussions. And if we'd made arrangements, we'd put that down on paper and then we'd send it on. (...) You're with a group of ten, we're expected to work during the weekend, but actually our weekend work is voluntary, but we have to do it anyway. Then there are always people who want to do it and people who do not. There was a lot of frustration there."</p>
<p>● <i>Aggregation of evidence for observable manifestations C1</i></p>	<p>Because C1(i) is found, we can confirm the presence of the condition being a problem situation related to the work organization. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation:</u> strongly warranted, given C1(i) is strong and accurate evidence of the occurrence of a problem situation related to the work organization.</p>	
<p><i>Case 5: Planning outside working hours</i></p>		
<p>● <i>observation C1(i)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team members Familiehulp Roeselare team Ledegem <i>Observation on detecting the disturbance</i></p>	<p>1u12: Interviewer: "Do you remember when you started to make the preparation at home?" Interviewee 3: "From last year." Interviewee 2: "Last year, but when..." Interviewee 3: "That was to save time, that we had to prepare at home and take</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu. Team members recollect when they first started to make this preparation at home and how this all started. The interviewees say: “we think”, so they are not entirely sure when it was, but that is not as important as the fact that they know the moment when the disturbance occurred: from the moment they had to prepare the planning at home. That’s clear for all team members. Therefore, we evaluate this evidence as empirically unique. • Strong confirmation of condition 1 	<p>it with us to the meeting and then they said if we come here we will only have to go over it. In their case (cf. care workers) so much changes, they have to do the work two times: they make the planning at home, they have to send it to the team leader, team leader controls it, it has to be discussed... It’s double work.” Interviewee 1: “The conclusion is since one year and a half, we think.” Interviewee 2: “Yes.”</p>
<p>● <i>Aggregation of evidence for observable manifestations C1</i></p>	<p>Because C1(i) is found, we can confirm the presence of the condition being a problem situation related to the work organization. Sources are relatively dependent with C1(i) case 5 in the causal mechanism “Perspective Taking”. . <u>Overall confirmation:</u> strongly warranted, given C1(i) is strong and accurate evidence of the occurrence of a problem situation related to the work organization.</p>	
<i>Case 6: Mobile hoist</i>		
<p>● <i>observation C1(i)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview I team members Sint Barbara Kimpenhof team Vlindertuin <i>Observation on detection of the problem</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu. This evidence details the moment where the problem was detected by one of the team members (interviewee 2). Work agreements have been made for the mobile hoist, but certain team members do not honour the agreements. One of the team members caught someone not respecting the rules and spoke on it. This evidence is empirically unique, because there’s no alternative explanation and it’s the team member involved who is the interviewee, so we trust the source. • Strong confirmation of condition 1 	<p>1u48: Interviewee 2: “The other day it happened manually again... yeah... I caught it and then I said I'm really not happy with it, we made that agreement. I don't want to see it again, because I'm not happy. And then you can say ‘I didn't find the mobile hoist’. Yeah then you go look for it...” Interviewee 1: "It's for your own safety too, you pick that person up and you feel something in your back..." Interviewee 2: "Yes if that person falls... That person (cf. resident) was sitting loose on the toilet, so to speak, and called like ‘I’m done’ and I was before that other colleague, because I also had the beeper with me and I see that person calling and I think oh I'm going to pick him/her up from the toilet and I see that person sitting loose (cf. on the toilet), yes that was out of control for a moment.”</p>
<p>● <i>Aggregation of evidence for observable manifestations C1</i></p>	<p>Because C1(i) is found, we can confirm the presence of the condition being a problem situation related to the work organization. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation:</u> strongly warranted, given C1(i) is strong and accurate evidence of the occurrence of a problem situation related to the work organization.</p>	
<i>Case 7: Incontinence</i>		
<p>● <i>observation C1(ii)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team members Sint Barbara Beversthuis team Tip</p>	<p>1u12: Interviewee 1: "But I have to see that my residents get what they need. I thought they were better with those. And the</p>

	<p><i>Observation on detection of the problem</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu. This piece of evidence clearly shows when the interviewee detected the problem, which led to a discussion between colleagues about which incontinence material that should be used. The evidence shows how the problem was detected and who was involved. We trust the source, because the interviewee was involved in detecting the issue and seemed to remember the story in detail. There's no alternative explanation. ● Strong confirmation of condition 1 	<p>person of the night shift says: 'no I want the expensive one'. The expensive one means that residents were actually allowed to keep it on all night, then they shouldn't check it. (...) But that didn't work for him (cf. the resident) and he was still wet every morning. So I said: put on a small one, but look at it at 4 o'clock at night, then put on another one and it will be even cheaper than taking the expensive one. But they didn't agree to that and then they had something of us put aside. And I say yes no I try to do good for everyone, residents, for upstairs (cf. management) and for my consumption. And they were like 'no you don't know about it and this and that and they were like we're being excluded'." Other interviewee confirms.</p> <p>> Interviewee 1 has a star role for incontinence, which means this is the person who decides which resident gets which materials. The work agreements proposed by the star role team member were deemed insufficient by the night shift team members, which led to frustration.</p>
<p>● <i>Aggregation of evidence for observable manifestations C1</i></p>	<p>Because C1(i) is found, we can confirm the presence of the condition being a problem situation related to the work organization. Sources are relatively independent.</p> <p><u>Overall confirmation:</u> strongly warranted, given C1(i) is strong and accurate evidence of the occurrence of a problem situation related to the work organization.</p>	
<p><i>Case 8: Contingency plan</i></p>		
<p>● <i>observation C1(i)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team leader Sint Barbara Beversthuis team Zonnehoeve</p> <p><i>Observation on detecting the problem</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu. This piece of evidence clearly shows when the problem was detected. The team members didn't feel like they were with enough colleagues to do all the work they had to do that day. The team leader wasn't present, so that's why this became a problem the team felt they couldn't solve themselves. We trust the source, because the team leader has a good overview of the team and what happens and seemed to remember the story well. There's no alternative explanation. ● Strong confirmation of condition 1 	<p>1h21: Interviewee: "That's actually because people panic... ah yes... This also came from those two days I was free, that there was chaos on the floor, for example. And then it had to be fixed at the weekend, because there were sick colleagues. And then they came knocking on B's (cf. director) door with some team members, that was the problem."</p> <p>> Team leader explains how the problem was detected. Having to take over from other colleagues had been going on for a long time (see also Cognitive Dissonance mechanism). But when the team leader took a few days off, the team members went to management (physically) and they were panicking about what to do, because they felt like they couldn't do all the work with the people who were present at that time.</p>

<p>● <i>Aggregation of evidence for observable manifestations C1</i></p>	<p>Because C1(i) is found, we can confirm the presence of the condition being a problem situation related to the work organization. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation:</u> strongly warranted, given C1(i) is strong and accurate evidence of the occurrence of a problem situation related to the work organization.</p>	
<p>Key part collective solutions (part 5)</p>		
<p>5</p>	<p><u>Theorized part:</u> Team members propose and discuss collective solutions (using pending the individual understandings of the problem situation and solution within the team) and reach agreement based on convergent individual perceptions of the solution at least being relevant and adequate in solving the problem situation.</p>	
	<p><u>Fingerprints:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Trace & Account: Team members recollect the date and location of when they worked together to design a solution. - Account: The solutions proposed transcended job functions/work activities from individual team members but related to the collective process (cf. team task comprising different functions) - Account: Team members mention how they individually evaluate(d) the solution was as relevant and adequate as it made sense given the initial problem it tried to deal with. <p>— Mtu</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Theoretical certainty not formulated (no priors) ● Modest theoretical uniqueness: This interaction could have been organized for very different types of problem solving than the one proposed in the mechanism. (a) It is not very plausible that this proposition is not related to integration of information originating from ideas or viewpoints held by other people; (b) Adequacy and relevance do not necessarily mean that an individual team member is personally convinced that this is the best or most efficient, effective or optimal solution possible. However, individual team members need to be convinced (cf. makes logically sense) that it might work. 	
<p><i>Case 3: Interns</i></p>		
<p>● <i>observation P5(i)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team members Familiehulp subregioteam Turnhout <i>Observation on evaluating solution as relevant and adequate</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Lu – The collected evidence shows that team members don't really know what has been decided and what the work agreements are. They state they will try to figure that out when needed, so if they get an intern. The team members don't evaluate the solution as relevant and adequate, because they don't even know what the solution is. The content doesn't tell us the whole story, there is missing information. The interviewee doesn't know about the solution, so it's not possible to evaluate it. The information provided by the interviewee is 	<p>31min: Interviewer: "Where do you stand now with this?" Interviewee: "Good question. I don't know. I'm probably gonna ask that when I get an intern. That's the way it works here, I don't really know, but it's not up for discussion yet, I'll figure it out by then."</p>

		<p>ambiguous (“I don’t know”). The uniqueness of this observation is low.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weak confirmation of proposition 5 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>observation P5(ii)</i> 	<p>Trace evidence. E-mail and Word document “Samenwerking rond stages...” Team leader Familiehulp subregioteam Turnhout <i>Observation proposed solutions</i> <i>Observation on date and time working together to design a solution</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu – The collected evidence confirms that the team leader and the HR colleague worked together to design a solution to solve the unclear agreements concerning interns even before the team members detected the problem. The e-mail confirms this was communicated to the team, through the star role function. This evidence is empirically unique, because the e-mail is genuine (forwarded) and it is sent to the star role functions of each team. The document could not have been adapted, so we trust the source and there’s no alternative explanation. The team should be informed about this, so we can conclude something went wrong with the communication of this information towards the whole team. • Strong confirmation of proposition 5 	<p>E-mail: “Echo overleg rond stagiaires A” (2/12/2019) Word document: “Samenwerking rond stages...” > This e-mail was send to the star roles of each team (cf. the person who communicates personnel information to the team). The document specifies the outcome of the meeting of the team leader and the person responsible for interns (A). In the document a few work agreements are specified clearly, for example: “it’s not the role of the care partners to organize the introductions for the interns”.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 5</i> 	<p>In general, the evidence can confirm the part to a reasonable extent. A meeting took place resulting in actual solutions focused on the teamwork process (cf. interns). Too lesser extent we can confirm that solutions actually represented the different viewpoints within the team, because only the team leader and the HR colleague were present at this meeting. If only P5(i) is found, we cannot confirm the evidence, whereas if P5(ii) are found, we can partly confirm. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation:</u> moderately warranted, given we cannot evaluate P5(i) as accurate evidence of the presence of proposition 5.</p>		
<i>Case 4: Weekend work arrangements</i>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>observation P5(i)</i> 	<p>Account evidence. Interview I team members Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II <i>Observation on discussing understandings on the solution to the problem</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mu – The collected evidence confirms that team members individually evaluate the solution as relevant and adequate, as it made sense given the initial problem it tried to deal with. However, we do not know whether this was the actual cause of the 	<p>1u14: Interviewer: “And the agreements (...) are those made a long time ago?” Interviewee 2: “No, during the vac... half a year I think.” – Other interviewee confirms – “Every colleague works differently, for example, one colleague needs more time with a client, while the other colleague does not need that much time with the client. This is different for everyone. Most of them said 2 hours is enough, the others said 2 hours is too much. And then that dropped to an hour. That’s a good thing for some, but not for others. And then in the end, the team leader</p>	

		<p>frustrations among the team members. It does appear to be, because this was a clear work agreement where there was some disagreement about. Therefore, we can assume this solution is accurate to deal with frustrations of team members, but there's a slight chance there's an alternative explanation. We trust the source, because both interviewees are on the same page and they give a clear explanation of why the solution is adequate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderate confirmation of proposition 5 	<p>asked everyone who did the weekends and then it was discussed to 1,5 hours". Interviewee 1: "The golden mean. And that's going well." Interviewee 2 confirms.</p> <p>> The team members state they reached a compromise about how long a client visit during the weekends can take (cf. now a client visit during weekend can take 1,5 hours).</p>
	<p>• <i>observation P5(ii)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview I team leader Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II</p> <p><i>Observation on discussing understandings on the solution to the problem</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mu – The collected evidence confirms that team members got together with the team leader and discussed the solution. However, no details are given about this meeting, nor does the team leader explain what was discussed and why. • Moderate confirmation of proposition 5 	<p>9min30: "And then at some point we said ok we put ourselves together with the group (cf. meeting). First see what are the frustrations, what is the problem and what appointments can we come to now to which everyone can agree?"</p>
	<p>• <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 5</i></p>	<p>In general, the evidence can confirm the part to a reasonable extent. Meetings took place resulting in actual solutions focused on the teamwork process (cf. weekend work). Too lesser extent we can confirm that solutions actually represented the different viewpoints within the team.</p> <p>If only P5(i) or P5(ii) is found, we cannot confirm the evidence, because we need both the view of the team members P5(i) and the team leader P5(ii) to confirm.</p> <p>Sources are relatively independent.</p> <p><u>Overall confirmation:</u> moderately warranted, given P5(i) and P5(ii) are moderate evidence of the presence of proposition 5.</p>	
<p><i>Case 5: Planning outside working hours</i></p>			
	<p>• <i>observation P5(i)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team leader Familiehulp Roeselare team Ledegem</p> <p><i>Observation on discussing understandings on the solution to the problem</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu – Observation, evidence of the absence of part 5 <p>The collected evidence confirms that the proposed solution is only adequate for one of the team members (the team member who proposed this as a solution). The team leader explains how other team members do not feel this way, concluding there are different</p>	<p>23min: Interviewee: "Certainly in Ledegem, and I also notice some dissatisfaction with certain employees that they say yes we do lose private time because of that. I made a document for that, a column with space to plan 2 weeks (cf. to make it easier, less time-consuming). There is an alternative offered (cf. during a team meeting) by a colleague who says: 'I don't need private time for this, I do this at the client's home during working hours such as "Ok A (cf. client's name), how is next Tuesday and Thursday for you?'" (...) It is feasible during working hours, but many do not like to discuss this with the client. (...) We don't</p>

		<p>understandings on the solution to the problem. This evidence is empirically unique, because there are not alternative empirical explanations to the existence of such opposite observable. In addition, the evidence here shows the contrary of what was posited: absence of team members evaluating the evidence as adequate and relevant. It is clearly evidence of the absence of this proposition. Therefore, we can see that there's a strong disconfirmation of the presence of proposition 5.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disconfirmation of proposition 5 	<p>ask that, we actually ask do it with the client, discuss it with the client, but that doesn't work for them."</p>
	<p>● <i>observation P5(ii)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team members Familiehulp Roeselare team Ledegem <i>Observation on discussing understandings on the solution to the problem</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu – Observation, evidence of the absence of part 5 The collected evidence shows that team members individually evaluate the solution as irrelevant and not adequate, as there is not enough time to make the planning during working hours with the client. Team members confirm each other's statements when they talk about this. The interviewees are on the same page and they explain clearly why the solution is not adequate. This evidence is empirically unique and we can trust on the source. Further, because this evidence shows the contrary of what posited: absence of team members evaluating the evidence as adequate and relevant, we can infer it is evidence of the absence of this proposition. Therefore, we can see that there's a strong disconfirmation of the presence of proposition 5. • Disconfirmation of proposition 5 	<p>18min: Interviewee 2: "Then X (cf. team leader) suggested that we could do that (cf. make the planning) while we were with our clients (...). I'm not going to say that I do it, ..." Interviewee 3: "Yes you see, she hasn't said that yet to us (cf. household helps)." Interviewee 1: "Yes but when should we do that?" Interviewee 2: "Because indeed, when do you have to do that?, but in principle it is allowed. (...) In practice this is not feasible." Other interviewees confirm.</p>
	<p>● <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 5</i></p>	<p>Because two pieces of evidence disconfirming the presence of proposition 5 were found, we cannot confirm the presence of proposition 5. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation: Disconfirmation of proposition 5, because of the absence of observable and evidence of the presence of P5.</u></p>	
<p><i>Case 6: Mobile hoist</i></p>			

<p>● <i>observation</i> P5(i)</p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team leader Sint Barbara Kimpenhof team Vlindertuin <i>Observation on discussing understandings on the solution to the problem</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu – The collected evidence shows us that most team members individually have grown to evaluate the solution as relevant and adequate, as it made sense given the initial problem it tried to deal with. This evidence is empirically unique because the interviewee specifically talks about the mobile hoist agreements and how the team handled this throughout time. We trust the source, because the team leader has a good overview of the team and why they would evaluate the solution as adequate. ● Strong confirmation of proposition 5 	<p>31min: Interviewee: “So in the end they got in there step by step, maybe walked into a wall and learned from it, strengthened by it. And now it's easier. That's not for everyone and for every subject, is it? And plus, they sometimes lose time. Because if that mobile hoist is up here and they have to put someone on 0... 'Quick, she's not here, she doesn't see that'. And then it's up to them to say to the colleague: 'No, you know, I've got a backache or I don't want that, I'm going to pick them up'. (...)” Interviewer: “When was that work agreement introduced?” Interviewee: “Pretty soon, though. I think it must have been almost three years ago. (...) Let me tell you, if you look at the process, it took a good year before it became clear why we're doing this and why it's important to talk to people. In one case it went very well very quickly and in another we are still practicing on it. 'How could you do that?'. What they have grown very good at is that they used to shut up and say, 'I'm not saying anything about that', while now they come and say, 'I'm with that'. Or even: 'Yeah, I said that, but I was scared'. That you do notice 'Okay they grow in there'. Even the colleagues who receive those comments (cf. that they're doing it wrong) know: 'That's no longer a criticism, I shouldn't feel attacked'.”</p>
<p>● <i>observation</i> P5(ii)</p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team leader Sint Barbara Kimpenhof team Vlindertuin <i>Observation on discussing understandings on the solution to the problem</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Mu – The team leader states that the work agreements concerning the mobile hoist are followed by the team members, that this situation became better. The team leader states he/she thinks the team members see the advantage of using the mobile hoist and the expected negative consequences aren't that bad after all. There's no alternative explanation, because the interviewee specifically talks about the mobile hoist agreements. However, we do not trust the source completely, because the team leader 'thinks' the team members would evaluate the solution as adequate. ● Moderate confirmation of proposition 5 	<p>37min30: Interviewee: “Mobile hoist is difficult. Because it is now well used, the situation is no longer that way, but the mobile hoist is something sensitive to discuss.” Interviewer: “And can you put a reason on that?” Interviewee: “A reason? Time. The feeling of: 'I'm wasting time if I have to go and get that lift. Come, just the two of us. I'll take the toughest part, just help me out'.” Interviewer: “And how is that any different now, if that's smoother?” Interviewee: “I think they see the advantage of it, and that they see they don't lose that much time with it in the end.”</p>

<p>●<i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 5</i></p>	<p>In general, the evidence can confirm this part of the mechanism, because two pieces of evidence have been found. If only P5(ii) is found we cannot confirm the evidence, whereas if P5(i) is found we can. We need the evidence of observation 1. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation:</u> moderately warranted, given P5(i) is accurate evidence of the presence of proposition 5.</p>	
<p><i>Case 7: Incontinence</i></p>		
<p>●<i>observation P5(i)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team members Sint Barbara Beversthuis team Tip <i>Observation on discussing understandings on the solution to the problem</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu. This piece of evidence shows the discussions the team members had about the proposed solution. The interviewee explained the concerns he/she had with it to the person who was going to take her role during the night shift. That person was very understanding and they cleared the air about this. We trust the source, because the interviewee was involved in the discussion and seemed to remember the story in detail. There's no alternative explanation. ● Strong confirmation of condition 1 	<p>1h23: Interviewer: "Was that discussed, ok how can we best solve this situation?" Interviewee 1: "Yeah, I wasn't right behind it. Because I thought B (cf. person who got the star role for incontinence during the night shift) was going to say 'look, I also have the star role and I'm allowed to change that too, point on the line and walk along' (...) But B (cf. star role night) said him/herself 'no, I'm not going to do that, I just want to support you with that, that I really only keep an eye on the night, not the rest'. > Team member explains how the solution wasn't evaluated as adequate in the beginning.</p>
<p>●<i>observation P5(ii)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team members Sint Barbara Beversthuis team Tip <i>Observation on evaluating solution as relevant and adequate</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Mu. The interviewee states the solution was eventually evaluated as adequate and relevant, despite concerns beforehand (see P5(i)). However, the interviewee says "I think so", so we cannot fully trust the source. There's no alternative explanation. ● Moderate confirmation of condition 1 	<p>1h27: Interviewee 1: "B is the one who reminds the others of the incontinence this should definitely happen" Interviewer: "That's where she plays your role..." Interviewee 1: "Yes, pass it on to the night shift." Interviewer: "Was that easier?" Interviewee 1: "Yes I think so, she understood my point of view too, I understood her... or I understood all of them too. We did that for that person, of course. ... so I'm really looking at people for what they need. If I see that they're wet, that's not interesting, you can't sleep like that, those people are unhappy." > Team member explains how the solution was eventually evaluated as relevant and adequate to deal with the issue.</p>
<p>●<i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 5</i></p>	<p>Because two pieces of evidence have been found, we can confirm the presence of proposition 5. If only P5(ii) is found, we cannot confirm the evidence, whereas if P5(i) is also found, we can. We need the evidence of observation 1, because it details discussing the understandings on the solution to the problem. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation:</u> moderately warranted, given P5(i) is accurate evidence of the presence of proposition 5.</p>	
<p><i>Case 8: Contingency plan</i></p>		

<p>●<i>observation P5(i)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team leader Sint Barbara Beversthuis team Zonnehoeve <i>Observation on discussing understandings on the solution to the problem</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Mu – The collected evidence confirms that the team leader tried to have a discussion about the proposed solution. We could conclude the solution was evaluated as relevant, because team members didn't have comments on the plan. However, we cannot know this with certainty. Therefore, we don't fully trust the source. There's no alternative explanation, because the team leader talks about 'the plan', which is the contingency plan. ● Moderate confirmation of proposition 5 	<p>1h16: Interviewee: "It hadn't been decided yet like 'now we always go that way, so this will be our plan'. I actually wanted to talk to the team about that, to see if they had any other things we could do. But that (cf. suggestions) didn't come up at the team meeting. (...)" > Team leader states that when the plan wasn't final yet, he/she wanted to have input from the team members on that plan. For example: is there something else we could do? The team leader discussed this during a team meeting, but the team members didn't give suggestions or comments on the plan.</p>
<p>●<i>observation P5(ii)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team leader Sint Barbara Beversthuis team Zonnehoeve <i>Observation on evaluating solution as relevant and adequate</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Mu – The collected evidence shows the team leader thinks the solution is evaluated as relevant and adequate by the team members. However, we don't know how the team members see this. Therefore, we cannot fully trust the source. There's no alternative explanation, because the interviewer specifically asks about the evaluation of the solution. ● Moderate confirmation of proposition 5 	<p>1h22: Interviewer: "But the chaos with which they are standing at the door here like 'it's not working', even though they were with a good occupation at the time: do you feel that plan can give them peace of mind in there? Do you think that's the solution?" Interviewee: "Yes. I think so, because they have to talk to each other then right. They're gonna have to go ask C (cf. colleague who helps when the contingency plan is rolled out) asking 'can you help us'?" > The team leader explains how he/she thinks the contingency plan is a good solution for the team members.</p>
<p>●<i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 5</i></p>	<p>In general, the evidence can confirm the part to a reasonable extent. A meeting took place where the solution was discussed, but we don't have details of this discussion. Too lesser extent we can confirm that solutions actually represented the different viewpoints within the team. If only P5(i) or P5(ii) is found, we cannot confirm the evidence, whereas if both are found, we can to a reasonable extent. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation:</u> moderately warranted, given P5(i) and P5(ii) are moderate evidence of the presence of proposition 5.</p>	

Roadmap Motivation: key part analysis – cause & key part 1

Overview cases
Case 3: Interns (Familiehulp Turnhout – Subregioteam Turnhout)
Case 4: Weekend work arrangements (Familiehulp Leuven – Zorgteam Kessel-Lo II)
Case 5: Planning outside working hours (Familiehulp Roeselare – Zorgteam Ledegem)
Case 6: Mobile hoist (St. Barbara vzw Kimpenhof – Team Vlindertuin)
Case 7: Incontinence (St. Barbara vzw Beversthuis – Team Tip)
Case 8: Contingency plan (St. Barbara vzw Beversthuis – Team Zonnehoeve)

Road map:

<u>Causal relationship</u>		
The mechanism is triggered as team member(s) detect(s) a disturbance in the workflow and it becomes clear that the problem situation affects their work and the team task (cf. identified it as a problem that surpasses his or her individual job).		
<u>Prior relatively low</u>		
●There is no existing research		
C	<u>Theorized cause:</u> Team member(s) detect(s) a work-related problem	
a	<u>Observables manifestations:</u>	
u	- Sequential & Trace: The initial detection of the problem happens before the design of the solution to the problem.	
s	- Account: Team members tell a consistent story about the occurrence of the problem by being able to explain what was detected and how. (how it all started)	
e	— Htu ¹	
	●Theoretical certainty not formulated (no priors)	
	●High theoretical uniqueness: there is no other plausible explanation.	
<i>Case 3: Interns</i>		
● <i>observation</i> <i>CI(i)</i>	Account evidence: Interview I team members Familiehulp Subregioteam Turnhout <i>Observation on what was detected and how</i> ● Hu. The observation clearly tells us something about a team member detecting a disturbance in the workflow that affects their work and the team task. The interviewees tell a consistent story about this, therefore we trust the source.	1u18: Interviewee 1: “That also started with the e-mail I send right.” Interviewee 2: “Yes, that was the e-mail that started it. You sent to A how do we have to do this or something.” Interviewee 1: “I had to take over for a colleague who was on vacation and all of a sudden I got a phone call from the school of that intern ‘he/she starts then’ and I thought oei (cf. oh no) I don’t know anything about this and neither does my

¹ Note: Htu= high theoretical uniqueness; Hu = High uniqueness; Mu = Moderate uniqueness; Lu = Low uniqueness.

	<p>There is no reason to talk about this if the disturbance didn't occur. There is no alternative explanation for this observation, which is why this evidence is empirically unique.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong confirmation of proposition 3 	<p>colleague I think, or else he/she would have briefed me. And then I thought ah A is responsible for the introductions and for the interns, so I e-mailed her: 'this is what I hear from a school, is this right?'. Interviewee 1: "And that started it, yes." (...)</p>
<p>● <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition C1</i></p>	<p>Because C1(i) is found, we can confirm the presence of the condition. <u>Overall confirmation:</u> strongly warranted, because there is a significant amount of evidence on the presence of a team member detecting a work-related problem.</p>	
<p><i>Case 4: Weekend work arrangements</i></p>		
<p>● <i>observation C1(i)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview I team leader Familiehulp Leuven team Kessel-Lo II <i>Observation on detecting a disturbance</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu. This piece of evidence confirms the team leader detects that the team members had frustrations about the weekend work arrangements. This evidence does not come straight from the team members themselves, but we do trust the source, because the team leader has a good overview of what team members are struggling with. Also, there would be no reason for the team leader to give attention to this issue if these frustration feelings from the team members did not disturb the workflow. • Strong confirmation of condition 1 	<p>9min: "Yeah, well, I know around the weekend work there were some discussions. And if we'd made arrangements, we'd put that down on paper and then we'd send it on. (...) You're with a group of ten, we're expected to work during the weekend, but actually our weekend work is voluntary, but we have to do it anyway. Then there are always people who want to do it and people who do not. There was a lot of frustration there."</p>
<p>● <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition C1</i></p>	<p>Because C1(i) is found, we can confirm the presence of the condition being a problem situation related to the work organization. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation:</u> strongly warranted, given C1(i) is strong and accurate evidence of the occurrence of a problem situation related to the work organization.</p>	
<p><i>Case 5: Planning outside working hours</i></p>		
<p>● <i>observation C1(i)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team members Familiehulp Roeselare team Ledegem <i>Observation on detecting the disturbance: how it all started</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu. Team members recollect when they first started to make this preparation at home and how this all started. The interviewees say: "we think". So they are not entirely sure when it was, but that is not as important as the fact that they know the moment when the disturbance occurred: from the moment they had to prepare the planning at home. That's clear for all team 	<p>1u12: Interviewer: "Do you remember when you started to make the preparation at home?" Interviewee 3: "From last year." Interviewee 2: "Last year, but when..." Interviewee 3: "That was to save time, that we had to prepare at home and take it with us to the meeting and then they said if we come here we will only have to go over it. In their case (cf. care workers) so much changes, they have to do the work two times: they make the planning at home, they have to send it to the team leader, team leader controls it, it has to be discussed... It's double work." Interviewee 1: "The conclusion is since one year and a half, we think." Interviewee 2: "Yes."</p>

		<p>members. Therefore, we evaluate this evidence as empirically unique.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong confirmation of condition 1 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>observation C1(ii)</i> 	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team members Familiehulp Roeselare team Ledegem</p> <p><i>Observation on detection of the disturbance: why and how</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu. Team members discuss they have to make the planning in their free time, which is a disturbance in their workflow. However, they do not mention the start of making the preparation at home was also the start of the team members feeling frustrated about this (so the trigger of it becoming a disturbance). However, we assume it was a frustration for the team members from the beginning, because the consequences are the same: having to give up private time to work on the planning. • Moderate confirmation of condition 1 	<p>1h45: Interviewee: "But you're working on it in your spare time?" Interviewee 1: "Yes, a lot, and especially in such busy weeks." Interviewee 3: "Yeah, I think the care workers more than us (cf. household help)." Interviewee 1: "I say it, we call... I certainly call in such a busy week 20 minutes and then 10 minutes work planning. That's half an hour a week I think we work outside our hours..." Interviewee 2 confirms.</p> <p>> Interviewee 3 experiences less frustration as a household help, but at the same time acknowledges the frustration of the other interviewees as care workers. This is because the household help planning is more straightforward and easier to prepare at home, so it automatically takes less time.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition C1</i> 	<p>Because C1(i) and C1(ii) are found, we can confirm the presence of the condition being a problem situation related to the work organization.</p> <p>If only C1(i) or C1(ii) are found we cannot confirm, since we need both observations to infer that C1 is present in some way, because the evidence tells us complementary things related to (1) how the observation on detecting the disturbance started and (2) why and how it was detected.</p> <p>Sources are relatively independent.</p> <p><u>Overall confirmation:</u> strong warranted, given C1(i) is accurate evidence of the disturbance occurring and C1(ii) is accurate evidence how the team members felt about this, so we can confirm the occurrence of a problem situation related to the work organization.</p>		
<i>Case 6: Mobile hoist</i>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>observation C1(i)</i> 	<p>Account evidence. Interview I team members Sint Barbara Kimpenhof team Vlindertuin</p> <p><i>Observation on detection of the disturbance: why and how</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu. This evidence details why and how the problem was detected by one of the team members (interviewee 2). Work agreements have been made for the mobile hoist, but certain team members do not honour the agreements. One of the team members caught someone not respecting the rules and spoke on it. This evidence is empirically unique, because there's no alternative 	<p>1u48: Interviewee 2: "The other day it happened manually again... yeah... I caught it and then I said I'm really not happy with it, we made that agreement. I don't want to see it again, because I'm not happy. And then you can say 'I didn't find the mobile hoist'. Yeah then you go look for it..." Interviewee 1: "It's for your own safety too, you pick that person up and you feel something in your back..." Interviewee 2: "Yes if that person falls... That person (cf. resident) was sitting loose on the toilet, so to speak, and called like 'I'm done' and I was before that other colleague, because I also had the beeper with me and I see that person calling and I think oh I'm going to pick</p>	

	<p>explanation and it's the team member involved who is the interviewee, so we trust the source.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong confirmation of condition 1 	<p>him/her up from the toilet and I see that person sitting loose (cf. on the toilet), yes that was out of control for a moment.”</p>
<p>● <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition C1</i></p>	<p>Because C1(i) is found, we can confirm the presence of the condition being a problem situation related to the work organization. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation:</u> strongly warranted, given C1(i) is strong and accurate evidence of the occurrence of a problem situation related to the work organization.</p>	
<p><i>Case 7: Incontinence</i></p>		
<p>● <i>observation C1(i)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team members Sint Barbara Beversthuis team Tip <i>Observation on detection of the disturbance: why and how</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu. This piece of evidence shows the interviewee clearly wanted to do what's best for the residents, following the work routines. However, these were evaluated as not sufficient by the night shift team members. The team members had various discussions about work agreements proposed by one team member (cf. the star role: responsible for incontinence materials). We trust the source, because the interviewee seemed to remember the story in detail and the other interviewee confirmed it. There's no alternative explanation. • Strong confirmation of condition 1 	<p>1u11: Interviewer: “What was that situation, what was the reason?” Interviewee 1: "I then give the diapers, for the day and for the night I decide which one and which one I use and the person of the night shift was not always in agreement with me. Yeah she wanted the sticky diaper or how should I say and I wanted the two-piece." Int 2: "Yes, a sleeper that's..." (...) Interviewee 1: "I always have to watch that I don't consume too much (cf. of the material), after three months I get a meeting every time (...). But I have to see that my residents get what they need. I thought they were better with those. And the person of the night shift says: 'no I want the expensive one'. The expensive one means that residents were actually allowed to keep it on all night, then they shouldn't check it. (...) But that didn't work for him (cf. the resident) and he was still wet every morning. So I said: put on a small one, but look at it at 4 o'clock at night, then put on another one and it will be even cheaper than taking the expensive one. But they didn't agree to that and then they had something of us put aside. And I say yes no I try to do good for everyone, residents, for upstairs (cf. management) and for my consumption. And they were like ‘no you don't know about it and this and that and they were like we're being excluded’.” Other interviewee confirms. > Interviewee 1 has a star role for incontinence, which means this is the person who decides which resident gets which materials. The work agreements proposed by the star role team member were deemed insufficient by the night shift team members, which led to discussions.</p>
<p>● <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition C1</i></p>	<p>Because C1(i) is found, we can confirm the presence of the condition being a problem situation related to the work organization. Sources are relatively independent.</p>	

		<u>Overall confirmation</u> : strongly warranted, given C1(i) is strong and accurate evidence of the occurrence of a problem situation related to the work organization.
<i>Case 8: Contingency plan</i>		
● <i>observation</i> <i>C1(i)</i>	Account evidence. Interview II team leader Sint Barbara Beversthuis team Zonnehoeve <i>Observation on detection of the disturbance: why and how</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu. This piece of evidence clearly shows why and how the problem was detected. The team members didn't feel like they were with enough colleagues to do all the work they had to do that day. The team leader wasn't present, so that's why this became a problem the team felt they couldn't solve themselves. Therefore, they went to management. We trust the source, because the team leader has a good overview of the team and what happens and seemed to remember the story well. There's no alternative explanation. ● Strong confirmation of condition 1 	1h21: Interviewee: "That's actually because people panic... ah yes... This also came from those two days I was free, that there was chaos on the floor, for example. And then it had to be fixed at the weekend, because there were sick colleagues. And then they came knocking on B's (cf. director) door with some team members, that was the problem." > Team leader explains how the problem was detected. Having to take over from other colleagues had been going on for a long time (see also Cognitive Dissonance mechanism). But when the team leader took a few days off, the team members went to management (physically) and they were panicking about what to do, because they felt like they couldn't do all the work with the people who were present at that time.
● <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition C1</i>	Because C1(i) is found, we can confirm the presence of the condition being a problem situation related to the work organization. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation</u> : strongly warranted, given C1(i) is strong and accurate evidence of the occurrence of a problem situation related to the work organization.	
Key part feeling addressed to take action (part 1)		
1	<u>Theorized part</u> : The team member feels addressed to take action by emphasizing the importance of effective performance of the team task. <u>Observable manifestations</u> : - Account: Team member states that the team task is of personal significance to her/him. - Account: Team member states that she found it important that the problem needed to be dealt with as it would become disruptive. — Mtu ●Theoretical certainty not formulated (no priors) ●Moderate theoretical uniqueness: It is not plausible to find this fingerprint when the team member is not engaged with her/his work. However, the report by the team member might be biased (forced or socially desired). The team member might find it important to act because of external control or pressure in the group.	
<i>Case 3: Interns</i>		
● <i>observation</i> <i>P1(i)</i>	Trace evidence: E-mail conversation Familiehulp Subregioteam Turnhout <i>Observation on importance of dealing with the problem</i>	E-mail conversation between Interviewee 2 and A (HR-manager) about responsibilities regarding intern introductions (see annex)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mu. The observation as a whole tells us something about the existence of team members' engagement in the problem. The fact that the team member thinks it's important to know what to do in this situation, shows that he/she is preoccupied with the team task. Especially when taking over for another colleague. However, this evidence does not show that the team task is of personal significance to the team member. We do trust the source, because the e-mail conversation is forwarded, so it's genuine. Also, there's no other explanation. • Moderate confirmation of proposition 1 	> Team member tries to find out the work agreement concerning interns, because he/she is not informed about an intern coming by the colleague he/she is replacing at that time.
● <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 1</i>	<p>Because this piece of evidence is found, we can partly confirm the presence of the part 1 of the mechanism. Sources are relatively independent.</p> <p><u>Overall confirmation:</u> moderately warranted, given P1(i) is accurate evidence of the team member feeling addressed to take action by wanting to correctly execute the team task.</p>	
<i>Case 4: Weekend work arrangements</i>		
● <i>observation P1(i)</i>	<p>P1 not found</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Predicted evidence of proposition 1 is not observed. • No inferences can be made 	Team members do not feel addressed to take action, because they don't report issues around weekend work. The reason for this could be that the team members who have these frustrations were not in the interview or that they know of the frustrations, but they don't want to talk about it in order to avoid problems with their colleagues.
● <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 1</i>	<p>Predicted evidence of proposition 1 is not observed. A not observed proposition does not mean that P1 is absent in this case, because we did not have full access to the empirical record, i.e. impossibility to make another round of account evidence to assess this particular proposition due to global health issues (covid-19). For this reason, no inferences would be possible even if we do not observe the predicted evidence of how team member feels addressed to take action for effective performance.</p> <p>Overall confirmation: No inferences can be made.</p>	
<i>Case 5: Planning outside working hours</i>		
● <i>observation P1(i)</i>	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team members Familiehulp Roeselare team Ledegem</p> <p><i>Observation on personal significance to the team members</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lu – The interviewed team members state it's important for them that the problem is dealt with, but on the other hand they don't show engagement to do something about this. Team members feel like there's a work agreement ("planning within working hours"), but that is not feasible. And they come to terms with this, because they haven't asked the team leader what 	<p>1u45 Interviewer: "Is the team leader informed about this?" Interviewee 1: "Yeah." Interviewee 3: "I assume he/she is informed about that."</p> <p>1u49: Interviewer: "Is that something you have asked the team leader: what do we do with that with the extra time we...?" Interviewee 2: "No, I will ask that tomorrow." Interviewee 3: "They're assuming you're supposed to call during your working hours."</p>

		<p>to do about it. They assume the team leader knows about this issue. The frustration is still there, so cognitive dissonance is not reduced at this point. We trust the source, because team members tell the same story and it gives us an impression of what the atmosphere is like within the team concerning this issue.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weak confirmation of proposition 1 	
	<p>● <i>observation P1(ii)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview I team leader Familiehulp Roeselare team Ledegem</p> <p><i>Observation on importance of dealing with the problem</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lu – This piece of evidence confirms the team leader is aware of the problem and states team members do not follow the work agreements around this (cf. making the planning with the client, during working hours). The team leader is aware of the disturbance and frustrations for the team members, but there seems to be no intention to do it differently. Therefore, we evaluate this evidence as not empirically unique. • Weak confirmation of proposition 1 	<p>24min: Interviewee: “You notice that they don't follow it (cf. planning during working hours, not at home), they say ‘this doesn’t work and I don't have time for that’, so yeah...”</p> <p>Interviewer: "Resistance? Interviewee: "Yes." Interviewer: "And do you notice that there are colleagues who do it like this? Interviewee: "Not that it's reported to me, I'll just say, it's usually, often in private time."</p>
	<p>● <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 1</i></p>	<p>Due to these two pieces of evidence are found, we can confirm the presence of proposition 1. If only P1(i) or P1(ii) are found we cannot confirm, since we need both observations to infer that P1 is present in some way, because the evidence tells us different things related to the view of (1) team members and (2) team leader.</p> <p><u>Overall confirmation:</u> weakly warranted, there’s no clear evidence for this proposition 1.</p>	
<p><i>Case 6: Mobile hoist</i></p>			
	<p>● <i>observation P1(i)</i></p>	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team leader Sint Barbara Kimpenhof team Vlindertuin</p> <p><i>Observation on importance of dealing with the problem</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu. This piece of evidence is a clear statement on why the team leader thinks it’s important to deal with the problem. The team leader details the possible consequences of agreements not being followed. The residents are lifted unsafely, residents will take a fall and family members could be angry for this. Also, team members could have complaints when lifting someone manually (e.g. back pain). We can trust this source because the interviewee is the team leader who speaks out of her own experience with the issues. 	<p>39min: Interviewee 1: “I've been a care worker, too. I didn't mind showers. Getting a mobile hoist, okay now we lose two minutes, less if you didn't take the elevator but the stairs. In the long run, you win. Because you have no complaints, your resident is safe. What if your resident falls? Who's going to explain it to the family? ‘How did that happen?’ ‘We put them in the chair.’ ‘How could they fall out of that mobile hoist?’”</p> <p>> Team leader explains how the mobile hoist prevents residents from falling and care workers from having complaints and back problems. He/she also specifies which consequences not using the mobile lift could mean for the organizational framework: family members expect care workers to use the mobile hoist,</p>

		<p>There's no alternative explanation. This piece of evidence is empirically unique.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong confirmation of proposition 1 	therefore they would be angry if the resident would fall, because that would mean care workers are not doing their job correctly.
	● <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 1</i>	<p>Because P1(i) is found, we can confirm the presence of the part 1 of the mechanism. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation</u>: strongly warranted, given P(i) is accurate evidence of feeling addressed to take action by emphasizing the importance of effective performance of the team task.</p>	
<i>Case 7: Incontinence</i>			
	● <i>observation P1(i)</i>	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team members Sint Barbara Beversthuis team Tip <i>Observation on personal significance to the team members</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu. This piece of evidence shows the team members want to find a solution to make the residents as comfortable as possible. We trust the source, because the interviewee seemed to speak very genuinely about this, and the other interviewee confirmed it. There's no alternative explanation. • Strong confirmation of proposition 1 	<p>1h27: Interviewer: "Was that easier?" Interviewee 1: "Yes I think so, she understood my point of view too, I understood her... or I understood all of them too. We did that for that person, of course. ... so I'm really looking at people for what they need. If I see that they're wet, that's not interesting, you can't sleep like that, those people are unhappy." > Team member explains how all team members want to find a good solution in order to make the residents happy.</p>
	● <i>observation P1(ii)</i>	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team members Sint Barbara Beversthuis team Tip <i>Observation on personal significance to the team members</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hu. This piece of evidence shows the team member wants to find a solution to make the residents as comfortable as possible. We trust the source, because the interviewee seemed to speak very genuinely about this, and the other interviewee confirmed it. There's no alternative explanation. • Strong confirmation of proposition 1 	<p>1u13 Interviewee 1: "But that didn't work for him (cf. the resident) and he was still wet every morning. So I said: put on a small one, but look at it at 4 o'clock at night, then put on another one and it will be even cheaper than taking the expensive one. But they didn't agree to that and then they had something of us put aside. And I say yes no I try to do good for everyone, residents, for upstairs (cf. management) and for my consumption."</p>
	● <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 1</i>	<p>Because these pieces of evidence P1(i) and P1(ii) are found, we can confirm the presence of the part 1 of the mechanism. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation</u>: strongly warranted, given our pieces are accurate evidence of the team member feeling addressed to take action by emphasizing the importance of effective performance of the team task.</p>	
<i>Case 8: Contingency plan</i>			
	● <i>observation P1(i)</i>	<p>Account evidence. Interview II team leader Sint Barbara Beversthuis team Zonnehoeve <i>Observation on detection of the disturbance: why and how</i></p>	<p>10min: Interviewer: "How did you go from that situation to such a plan?" Interviewee: "Yes actually, that's what we get briefed daily with the management, with B and D, and it suddenly occurred to me that we have to find something that</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hu. This piece of evidence clearly shows the importance of dealing with the problem for the team leader. He/she explains how certain team members really need a structure, something to hold on to when a colleague is sick. This to avoid having chaos and panic across the team. We trust the source, because the team leader seemed genuine and could explain very well why dealing with the problem was important to him/her. There's no alternative explanation, because the interviewer asks about the 'plan'. ● Strong confirmation of proposition 1 	<p>everyone has a little something to hold on to. You feel that your team members must have a hold on them somewhere because they can't get it fixed themselves. But that also depends on which people are on duty, because one is rather more innovative than the other. There are also people who simply panic when things don't go as normal. And that also means that some people are drawn into that negative spiral. Which makes everyone run like a chicken without a head. I still feel that very much, I still miss that a bit, because I expected that after four years it would be there anyway (cf. the autonomy)."</p>
	<p>● <i>Aggregation of evidence for proposition 1</i></p>	<p>Because P1(i) is found, we can confirm the presence of the part 1 of the mechanism. Sources are relatively independent. <u>Overall confirmation:</u> strongly warranted, given P(i) is accurate evidence of feeling addressed to take action by wanting to create a structure for team members that reduces chaos, stress and panic about occupation.</p>	