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Abstract

Purpose – While digitalisation requires facilities management (FM) organisations to change at an increasing rate, little is known about the mechanisms that create ownership and enable individuals to implement changes in everyday FM practice. In this study, these mechanisms are explored from a stewardship perspective. The purpose of this paper is to provide insights in the dynamics of organisational change in FM by analysing how stewardship behaviour leads to change.

Design/methodology/approach – A process model for implementing organisational change is constructed, based on existing theoretical insights from stewardship and intrapreneurship literature. The model is evaluated in a case study through analysis of critical events. Interviewing was the key data collection method.

Findings – The process model gives an event-driven explanation of change through psychological ownership. Analysis of multiple critical events suggests that the model explains intra-organisational as well as inter-organisational change. The case data further suggests that, compared to intra-organisational change, tailored relational and motivational support is more important for inter-organisational change because of the higher risks involved. Job crafting emerged as an unanticipated finding that offers interesting prospects for future FM research.

Originality – Stewardship and intrapreneurship are combined to provide insights on organisational change in FM. The study demonstrates how intrapreneurial behaviour and stewardship behaviour can be linked to create innovation within and between organisations.

Practical implications – The process model offers guidance for leaders in FM organisations on providing tailored support to internal and external employees during periods of organisational change.
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Article classification: Research paper
**Introduction**

Digitalisation is a key driving force shaping the future of facilities management (FM) (Ahmed *et al.*, 2017; Wong *et al.*, 2018; Bröchner, 2019; Dahanayake, and Sumanarathna, 2021). For FM organisations however, the benefits of digitalisation do not come from the technology itself but from the way it is used to create efficiency gains and innovation (Love *et al.*, 2019; Munir *et al.*, 2020). To realise the benefits of digitalisation, organisational changes therefore are required. These changes may, for example, relate to implementing plan-do-check-act data quality controls during construction, the adoption of new practices by maintenance engineers, or the alignment of standardised naming conventions with the asset owners’ data management processes (Love *et al.*, 2019).

Implementation of organisational changes have been addressed earlier by FM researchers. Barret (2000), for that matter, argues that strategic digital innovation in FM requires a strong relationship network. Gluch and Svensson (2018) provide a multi-layered analysis of change driven by a sustainability agenda. Tucker and Aderije (2016) provide guidance on how to build strong relationships with external providers, and Noor and Pitt (2009) argue that, to innovate, FM organisations must think and act beyond organisational boundaries. Lindkvist and Elmualim (2010) identify tensions and conflicts between actors during innovation projects. While most authors recognise that FM is embedded in relationships, and that changes will be adopted more easily when individual agents in these relationships are owner of the change (Pierce *et al.*, 2001; Hernandez, 2012), there is no consensus on how change ownership can be propelled and spread by managers in periods of digitalisation. Therefore, this paper addresses the implementation of organisational changes related to digitalisation in FM.

Changing existing FM processes, can be seen as controversial by business partners and employees. Resistance from professionals who must learn to work with unfamiliar methods for structuring information may be encountered (Love *et al.*, 2019). Changing FM processes may therefore involve some risk-taking. Proactiveness, innovativeness and risk-taking are attributes of intrapreneurial behaviour that are considered crucial in the identification and exploitation of opportunities (Rigtering and Weitzel, 2013).

The purpose of this paper is to provide insights in the dynamics of organisational change in FM by analysing how stewardship behaviour leads to change. Fundamental to stewardship behaviour is taking responsibility for the outcome of one’s actions. An existing framework on stewardship behaviour by Hernandez (2012) will be adapted for this study, using concepts from intrapreneurship literature. The research is guided by the following research question: How can managers in FM implement organisational changes through stewardship interventions? In the following section, a process model for implementing organisational change through stewardship interventions is constructed. The methodology section then describes how a case study is used to empirically evaluate the process model through analysis of critical events. Following this, we present the findings and discuss their implications for theory development and FM practice. Finally, we discuss some limitations of this study and formulate conclusions about the connections between stewardship and intrapreneurship.

**Theoretical framework**

A process model for implementing change through *stewardship interventions* provides an event-driven explanation of change implementation (Figure 1). The theoretical process model is conceived using abductive analysis (Van de Ven, 2007 p101), triggered by encountering an intrapreneurship inspired ownership within the FM organisation studied. The process model is based on this understanding of *ownership*, adapting an existing stewardship model from Hernandez (2012) that theorises psychological ownership.

The process model combines constructs from the stewardship framework of Hernandez (2012) with intrapreneurship concepts and describes how an organisational change is
implemented through the *identification of change opportunity* and the *resolution of change opportunity*. The managerial context is reflected through two context variables. First, *long-term, other-regarding frames* relate to the way managers frame their team or organisation’s role in the larger business and societal context. Second, *relational and motivational support* relates to the trust-building social exchanges between team members and their direct supervisor or manager.

Intrapreneurship is included in the model through the concepts of *identification of change opportunity*, *resolution of change opportunity* and *intrapreneurial self-efficacy*, as will be discussed below.

---

**Figure 1: Process model for change implementation through stewardship intervention**

**Identification of change opportunity**
Recognising change opportunities in existing organisations is part of everyday practice in the social exchanges between managers and their team members (Jarzabkowski, 2005). In these social exchanges, managers can manipulate a problem formulation, or certain contextual features of a situation, with the aim of influencing others’ decision-making processes (Kühberger, 1998). Kaplan (2008) describes how managerial cognitive framing influences strategy implementation. Rigtering *et al.* (2019) describe how managerial framing can be used to provide employees with examples of previous entrepreneurial projects. By framing problems
in a specific way, managers can highlight emerging change opportunities and mobilise action in favour of the organisation’s long-term objectives (Kaplan, 2008; Benford and Snow, 2000).

Psychological ownership
Psychological ownership refers to a state-of-mind in which an individual feels as though the target of ownership is theirs (Pierce et al., 2001). In organisational change, this state-of-mind is created through social exchanges between leader and follower (Hernandez, 2012). In the event-driven process model used in this study, the psychological ownership of change opportunities, as a state-of-mind, is triggered by the way change opportunities are identified. If managers provide their managerial frames of strategic organisational challenges in such a way that employees, from their practice, can recognize their personal change opportunity, this will enable employees to psychologically own the change opportunity through a cognitive process of personal understanding and decision making (Hernandez, 2012). Pierce et al. (2001) posit that a change opportunity can be psychologically owned by employees if they feel in control over the change involved and when they can use it as a vehicle for personal identification and growth (Pierce et al., 2001). This feeling of control is created in the manager–employee relationship. Therefore, in the process model, psychological ownership is also influenced by relational and motivational support provided by the manager (Hernandez, 2008, 2012).

Resolution of change opportunity
When individuals recognise the personal development and growth opportunities of change, and when they feel in control over the change opportunity, they will act as owners of the change and start exercising influence (Pierce et al., 2001). In the event-driven explanation of the process model therefore, psychological ownership triggers the resolution of change opportunities. Change owners who become proactive, are likely to challenge existing rules and conventions. They will probably go beyond everyday job descriptions, and sometimes may even act without the permission of higher management, taking a certain level of risk (Rigtering and Weitzel, 2013). The actual intervention itself therefore requires more than psychological ownership: it also requires self-belief, which in the model is conceptualised as intrapreneurial self-efficacy as described below.

Stewardship intervention
A stewardship intervention is defined as an action or series of actions that change a working practice for the long-term interests of the organisation (Hernandez, 2012). The intervention may benefit from coaching that raises the level of intrapreneurial self-efficacy. Self-efficacy is a person’s belief in their abilities to perform a certain task successfully and can be enhanced through coaching (Malone, 2001). It is broadly accepted as one of the main characteristics of intrapreneurial employees (Mair, 2005; Wakkee et al., 2010; Neessen et al., 2019). Given that self-efficacy largely depends on a person’s previous experiences, a person’s level of self-efficacy is task or domain specific. We define intrapreneurial self-efficacy as a person’s belief in his or her abilities to perform proactive, risky, or innovative activities that deviate from existing practices. While some studies suggest that intrapreneurial self-efficacy can be influenced by coaching and managerial support (e.g., Neessen et al., 2019), a survey by Wakkee et al. (2010) failed to find empirical evidence for such a relationship unless this coaching takes place within a trusting manager–employee relationship (Wakkee et al., 2010). Therefore, in the process model, relational and motivational support influences intrapreneurial self-efficacy.
Managerial context: framing, and relational and motivational support

In leading employees to act as stewards, Hernandez (2008) distinguishes contextual support, relational support, and motivational support. Contextual support is related to the organisational context in which the leader and followers work. It is provided by managers through cognitive frames that communicate the broader organisational mission and explain organisational strategies. Previous studies have confirmed the crucial role of middle managers in providing managerial frames and coaching for intrapreneurs (Hornsby et al., 2002).

Both relational and motivational support aim to generate trust and self-belief amongst employees and influence the level of intrapreneurial self-efficacy of followers. Relational support is demonstrated by showing concern, respect and fairness to the followers’ needs and interests (Hernandez, 2008). Motivational support is demonstrated by helping employees gain self-efficacy and self-belief in developing skills and capabilities to perform the work-related activities.

Methodology

Organisational change in real-life is an ongoing process. As such, case studies are very well suited to explore the complexities and richness of such phenomena (Yin, 2014; Gibbert et al., 2008) An extreme case can be chosen to obtain information from an unusual situation at the far end of a particular dimension of interest (Flyvbjerg, 2006). Here, an extreme case (a FM organisation’s asset management community of practice) was studied as a ‘high quality’ example of organisational change. A community of practice is defined as a group of people with shared concerns that work and learn together through formal and informal practices (based on Brown and Duguid, 1991). The rationale behind selecting this extreme case is that it will be particularly informative: it can provide detailed insights into the factors that facilitate stewardship interventions in FM.

The selected case is situated in a university with approximately 85,000 students at the time of the study. The university owned and operated approximately 120 buildings across multiple campuses. In the university’s corporate FM organisation, both the construction client function and the maintenance and operation function were merged as described by Jensen (2008). The organisation comprised the following organisational units: capital works, campus planning services, real estate, facilities & asset management, and risk reporting and compliance. The gross floor area serviced amounted to roughly 488,000m². During initial interviews with leaders and key informants of the university’s internal FM organisation in negotiating access, an unusually high level of professional development could be discerned. In 2017 the university was the first to achieve the ISO 55000 certification. To achieve this, it had to experience a significant level of organisational change. In an independent comparative study, the university was highlighted as a national example of best practice in asset management. Further, it had won several international facilities and asset management industry awards.

Primary data collection was through interviews carried out over a four-month period, achieving 20 semi-structured interviews. The respondents were selected from multiple departments for their role in the asset management community of practice (Table I). To validate findings from other interviews and raise questions on emerging topics, multiple interviews were conducted with two respondents in key decision-making positions (the director and senior manager of the asset management team). External respondents included contractors and service providers. Individual interviewees were identified with the assistance of the key informants through the snowballing technique. All interviews were recorded, transcribed, and anonymised, and then sent to the respondents to comment with the possibility to add or delete information. The interview transcripts were manually coded.
Table I: Selected interview respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Department/team</th>
<th>Role/job title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Facilities and asset management (F&amp;AM)</td>
<td>Director (2 interviews)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Procurement</td>
<td>Senior category manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Procurement</td>
<td>Vendor manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>Senior manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>Property manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>F&amp;AM/Asset management</td>
<td>Senior manager (3 interviews)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>F&amp;AM/Asset management</td>
<td>Asset database officer (2 individuals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>F&amp;AM/Asset management</td>
<td>Senior coordinator lifecycle planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Capital works</td>
<td>Senior manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Capital works</td>
<td>Project manager (2 individuals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Risk reporting and compliance</td>
<td>Utilities manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor A</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Key account manager building services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor A</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Product manager data capture software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor A</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Asset data capture specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor B</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Service technician</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While interviewing was the primary data collection method, the study was also informed by other data sources. Documents were collected including information system documentation, minutes of contract governance meetings and asset register documentation. Organisational policy documents included, but were not limited to, organisational charts, presentations, and contract governance structure documentation. The first researcher joined a project handover meeting as an observer and visited an equipment site with a service technician. Finally, secondary data were collected from a government audit report on asset management in universities and from online news articles. During the overlapping periods of data collection and analysis, the researcher kept a diary and took notes from informal and occasional conversations. These were used to help interpret the data and adjust the interview questions during the data collection.

Given the richness of the available data, and the unique opportunity to reconstruct a case of profound organisational change in a digitalising FM environment, it was decided to conduct a critical events analysis. Through the events, in this case change implementations, the process model can be evaluated. The process model explains the temporal order and sequence in which a discrete set of events occurs based on a story or historical narrative. The data were coded in two stages. During the first stage, the data were coded to identify milestones for the organisational development of the university’s FM organisation. In the second stage, the data on the four critical events were separately analysed to evaluate the process model.

Results
For the FM organisation of the university, a period of organisational change and digitalisation commenced with the university's sustainability programme. The aim of this investment programme (€82 million) was to reduce CO2 emissions. Through the programme, 77 buildings across three campuses were upgraded and adapted. Energy performance contracts were agreed with two energy service companies (ESCOs). Energy savings were guaranteed by the ESCOs provided maintenance was carried out according to their requirements. A timeline of events is provided in Table II. Four events were viewed by the respondents as critical for the sustained organisational change of the FM organisation, because they had disruptive impact on daily
work practices of the professionals involved. These are analysed, describing the leader and follower roles in the change context.

**Table II: Timeline of critical events**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Critical event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Start Sustainability programme (feasibility stage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Start of contract with ESCOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td><strong>1</strong> Reorganising the project handover process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Generation 1 maintenance outsourcing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Start asset deterioration modelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Entrance of new Facilities and Asset management director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td><strong>2</strong> Partner involvement in systematic condition assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td><strong>3</strong> Development of asset data framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/2018</td>
<td>Generation 2 maintenance outsourcing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>ESCOs’ guarantee period commences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td><strong>4</strong> Introduction of asset data capturing tool to technicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Entrance of an ICT/technology provider in the network</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Event 1: reorganising the project handover process (Figure 2)**

Within the FM organisation, there was a history of conflict and misunderstanding between the facilities and asset management department, and the capital works department. Capital works had built a reputation through the delivery of prestigious buildings designed by famous architects, while the facilities and asset management department suffered with an inferiority complex (Figure 2, trigger #1). Prior to 2014, there was hardly any communication and collaboration between the two teams. In that year, the senior manager of the asset management team (follower) initiated a process to restore trust and collaboration between both departments. The opportunity to reorganise the process of handing over projects was enabled by the way the executive leader of the FM organisation (leader) framed the university’s needs, stressing a transition from project to life cycle management (Figure 2, trigger #2). The senior manager of the asset management team used this understanding (trigger #3) to take ownership (trigger #4) and engage in a series of interactions with both the capital works and facilities and asset management people (trigger #5,6), searching for a common agenda: “...let’s talk about how we find a medium where we can meet and table a common agenda”. Through his stewardship interventions, the collaboration improved: “So that kind of drove a much more teamwork environment. It helped. Less fighting, more talking”. Through this proactive behaviour, he challenged existing inter-team prejudices, assumptions, and beliefs, and looked for opportunities to improve relations. During these meetings, the project handover process was developed, and this created a shared understanding of how the capital works could hand projects over to facilities and asset management, supplying the right digital data in adequate formats.
Event 2: partner involvement in systematic condition assessment (Figure 3)

Prior to 2016, the university did not monitor the condition of its assets and a pilot project to record its assets and their condition had proven costly (Figure 3 trigger #1). In the same period, the procurement department and the executive director of the FM organisation started to frame the university’s maintenance function as one of providing management information (trigger #2). This understanding of the data supply role (trigger #3,4), lead the facilities and asset management (F&AM) director (follower) to initiate a programme for condition monitoring in collaboration with external contractors and the university’s civil engineering department. Stewardship interventions were made by the F&AM director during the implementation of the condition monitoring programme in engaging other stakeholders (trigger #5,6). He used a broad definition of teamwork: “My team, when I say ‘my team’ it extends to our supply chain”. By getting students and staff involved in large-scale asset condition surveying, he developed an innovative staffing solution that saved the university money and created learning opportunities for students. Relational and motivational support (trigger #5,8) was provided to the F&AM director by the executive director (leader) whose relational and motivational interaction style was described by others as “intelligent, competent, challenging, visionary, accessible, modest, facilitating”.

Figure 2: The process model for Event 1
Event 3: development of asset data framework (Figure 4)
When digital data volumes increased, the senior manager of the asset management team (follower), at the same time, wanted the contractors to use the data definitions provided by the university, but also learn from the main contractor’s expertise and experience (Figure 4 trigger #1). A managerial frame for collaboration in a relationship network (trigger #2) was provided by the F&AM director (leader). The senior manager of the asset management team transformed the problem of incompatible data definitions into a change opportunity through his understanding of this relationship network (trigger #3,4). He engaged teams from both the FM organisation and the contractor in a series of meetings over several months (trigger #6,7) to discuss asset hierarchies; the naming of conventions for mechanical, electrical, hydraulic, and other assets; and cost allocation units. This went as far as detailing and defining the data hierarchies, formats, and syntax. The output of this process was a detailed list of asset terms and definitions. Managerial support was provided by the F&AM director (leader) who relationally and motivationally supported his employees. In working with his team, he deployed ‘you-time’ (trigger #5,8): “You-time, and what it is, is basically my time with them to talk about them, not to talk about work or what I want, not to talk about performance …. what do they want? …. where do you want to be? … how can I help you on that journey?” In so doing, he created a safe learning environment with his employees: “… first thing I tell whether
it is a new supply chain or existing supply chain, or new staff or existing staff, is, you're allowed to fail". By stimulating his employees to try new things and take risks, he stimulated innovation and intrapreneurial behaviour.

**Figure 4: The process model for Event 3**

**Event 4: introducing data-capturing tools to technicians (Figure 5)**
When, in 2018, the university and the newly contracted supplier entered a ten-year maintenance contract, the university’s data requirements had to be aligned with the processes and systems of the contractor. The field mechanics had a key role to play in capturing and structuring data, but the contractor’s product manager (follower) experienced their resistance in these tasks (Figure 5 trigger #1). Through a contractor induction programme and regular meetings, the university’s senior manager of the asset management team (leader) provided a managerial frame that enabled the contractor’s product manager to take ownership of the data administration opportunity (trigger #2,3,4). The contractor’s product manager (follower) took responsibility for embedding a data administering tool in the social relations of the maintenance network, among in-house technicians as well as technicians from the subcontractors (trigger
Using this tool required a different mindset from the mechanics. According to the contractor’s product manager, they previously had not seen themselves as data capturing officers but as traditional technicians. The product manager engaged in a series of interventions with the technicians, listening to their resistance to the administrative tasks (trigger #7): “…it was a lot more collaboration with the technicians as well, saying what are you finding difficult in capturing this information? … listening to them, getting feedback on how can we make your life better ….”. According to the product manager, this made adoption of the new tool easier. Frequent formal and informal meetings on both the campus and the contractor’s premises seemed to have created a trusting relationship between the senior manager of the asset management team and the product manager that influenced the latter’s self-efficacy for this series of interventions with the technicians (trigger #5,8).

Figure 5: The process model for Event 4
Discussion
Identification of change opportunity
In all events, identification of the change opportunity had its roots in current practices, which can be seen as activity patterns across actors for the performing of daily duties (Jarzabkowski, 2005). Problems in current practices fueled the identification of the change opportunity. In Event 1, the problem was the poor relationship between capital works and asset management, in Event 2, it was related to activities of external agencies and suppliers, in Event 3, it was related to the supply of external information and in Event 4, the problem was the job perception of subcontractor mechanics. In all events, a managerial strategic frame, provided by the senior manager enabled individuals to perceive the problem from a different angle, transforming it into a change opportunity.

In the events analysed, both internal (Events 1,2,3) and external employees (Event 4) identified and resolved intervention opportunities in the FM organisation. The data of Event 4 suggests that the contractor’s software product manager (follower), as external employee, was socially and culturally integrated in the universities FM organisation (Tucker and Aderiye, 2016). Because of this, apparently, he was receptive for the coaching of the university’s asset manager (leader).

Psychological ownership
In all events, the problem source, and the associated change opportunity was located beyond direct control of the followers. To become psychological owner of the change opportunity, the followers went through a cognitive process that contributed to a better understanding of their own situation within the university’s evolving FM organization and the different roles involved in that environment (Jensen, 2008; Van der Voordt, 2017).

Resolution of change opportunity
The data from this study show that followers, in resolving the change opportunity, changed the boundaries and conditions of their job tasks and job relations to make the intervention. In Event 1, the asset manager extended his job tasks and boundaries to include capital works activities. In Event 2, the F&AM director emphasized some job tasks and reframed job relations to encompass the development of employees, partners, and suppliers’ skills. In Event 3, the asset manager was emphasising a specific group of tasks and reframed his relations with the deterioration modellers. In Event 4, the software product manager changed the boundaries and relations of his job to include engaging with the technicians. This redesigning of a job is referred to as job crafting (Wrzesniewski and Dutton, 2001). Berg et al. (2013) distinguish three job crafting techniques: changing tasks, changing relationships, and changing role perceptions. Parker and Grote (2020) discuss job crafting related to digitalisation. Digitalisation and automation induce changes that put other or higher job demands on employees. In FM, this relates to solving practical implementation issues of digital technologies (Wong et al., 2018 p321). According to Parker and Grote (2020), job crafting can be an instrument for teams and individuals to deal with implementation issues of digitalisation. Job crafting can be used to obtain control over automated systems and to bridge gaps between interdependent technologies, systems, and applications (Parker and Grote, 2020 p30).

Stewardship intervention
In Events 2, 3 and 4, relational and motivational support for the followers as intervening actors could be identified. However, in comparison, in Event 1 no indications of a relationship between intrapreneurial self-efficacy and relational and motivational support were found. In this Event, the asset manager’s natural intrapreneurial self-efficacy was apparently sufficient for the stewardship intervention. Interestingly, the manager receiving support in Events 1 and
3 was the same individual, and this difference can perhaps be partly explained by the task-specific nature of self-efficacy. As discussed by Wakkee et al. (2010), an individual can have high self-efficacy in one task, and low self-efficacy in another. This could explain why the same asset manager (follower) did not require managerial support in Event 1 but did benefit from it in Event 3.

Another plausible explanation for the differences between Events 1 and 3 relates to the scope of the intervention: in Event 1, the intervention was targeted internally whereas, in Event 3, the intervention had an external target. As such, the relational and contractual impact of this intervention in Event 3 was potentially riskier. In inter-organisational relations, information asymmetries and lack of transparency can easily lead to distrust (Snippert et al., 2015). An inappropriate intervention, or a wrongly communicated one, can backfire and damage a strategic partnership irreversibly. Therefore, we argue that, in Event 3, a higher level of trust was required to increase the asset manager’s intrapreneurial self-efficacy. This suggests that relational and motivational support should be different for internally and externally targeted interventions.

Managerial context: framing, and relational and motivational support
Framing can be used by managers to make FM more proactive (Kaya et al., 2004). In providing long-term, other-regarding, managerial frames, leaders can focus the attention of followers on the corporate context of FM that provides a framework for delivering their work and developing their jobs (Jensen, 2008; Van der Voordt, 2017).

In Events 2, 3 and 4, relational and motivation support was provided to followers in making the stewardship intervention. During these Events, the F&AM director had a senior leadership role in the community of practice in which the events took place. In addressing the professional growth and development needs of his team members, it appears that he was aware that employees with the same job will perform slightly different sets of tasks because they enact their roles differently (Tims and Bakker, 2010; Petrou et al., 2018). Prevention-focused individuals are security, safety, and responsibility oriented, and take their duties seriously. Promotion-focused individuals are oriented towards accomplishment and growth, and are open to new experiences. While changes in FM may offer new experiences to promotion-focused individuals, it might increase the insecurity of prevention-focused individuals. When organisational changes are inadequately communicated by managers and supervisors, prevention-focused employees, in seeking security and safety, tend to react with behaviour that reduces uncertainty and restores previous situations (Petrou et al. 2018). It seems that the F&AM director tailored his coaching to the needs of his individual team members to prevent such ineffective behaviours.

Conclusions
This research aims to provide insights in the dynamics of organisational change in FM by analysing how stewardship leads to change. It is guided by the following research question: How can managers in FM implement organisational changes through stewardship interventions. Using a process model derived from the stewardship framework of Hernandez (2012), an event-driven explanation of the dynamics of organisational change in FM through stewardship interventions is provided. The process model explains intra-organisational as well as inter-organisational change implementation. The findings suggest that, compared to intra-organisational change implementation, the managerial context is more important for inter-organisational change implementation because of the higher risks involved.

A limitation of this study is that most events had taken place in recent past and had to be reconstructed through individual narrative accounts. Despite this limitation, the theoretical underpinning using two theoretical perspectives gives the model credibility. Further field
research is required to increase its robustness and to validate the model beyond the case that was used to develop it. While the model is developed in the context of digitalisation in FM, its generic structure is applicable to a broader class of change implementation problems in and beyond FM.

The process model is developed in the context of digitalisation related organisational change in FM. The events viewed by the FM organisation as critical for sustained organisational change in a period of increased digitalisation, were not related to specific technologies themselves, but to organisational processes and practices required to collaborate. In this respect, job crafting emerged from the data as an emerging concept that offers interesting prospects for further research into digitalisation in FM. It would be interesting to explore how various job crafting techniques (changing tasks, changing relationships, and changing role perceptions) could be used to bridge gaps between different technologies and systems used by clients and contractors. The managerial recommendation for senior leaders in FM therefore is to include job crafting in their digitalisation strategies and to provide education to employees about work design and job crafting related to digitalisation.
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