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ABSTRACT

The contextual changes create numerous demands on organizations to address stakeholders' expectations. In our contemporary dynamic society, characterized by rapid changes and sustainability, two main observations can be done. First, stakeholders have changed forms and new stakeholders have appeared in the context of project organizations. These are developed to address rapid changes especially in regards to those in the context of sustainability. Second, the stakeholders' expectations have been shifting in relation to economic, environmental and social sustainability. Taken together, managing project stakeholders' expectations in regards to sustainability is becoming a challenge for the project's own sustainability and success, and thus for the project organization as a whole. Thus, project organizations need to build sustainable relationships with their stakeholders in order to manage these rapid changes. The argument in this paper is that securing and building sustainable relationships require trusting relationships with stakeholders in temporary organizations. Additionally, trusting relationships become especially important when the project outcome has a sustainable scope and when they have agile life cycles. The purpose of this paper is to theoretically explore the importance and effects of trust between stakeholders in agile projects in the lens of current research on trust and project management. Trust has been found to be a central component of the stakeholders' relationship. The research discloses the effects of trust on internal and external processes as well as appearances, in stakeholder relationship-building, in order to reach sustainability. The main value of this paper is that concept “trust” is not a template to use depending on the kind of project, but a concept that needs to be worked with in every new relationship and maintained with the ones existing.
INTRODUCTION

New stakeholders with expectations about sustainability

The contextual economic, societal and environmental changes create numerous demands on organizations to address stakeholders' expectations, especially in terms of sustainability. In fact, in our contemporary society characterized by dynamic and rapid changes as well as by sustainability, two main observations can be done. First, especially in regards to projects that practice to cope with rapid changes; new stakeholders are appearing to be central. Second, the stakeholders' expectations have been shifting towards sustainability in terms of economic, environmental, and social sustainability.

Considering project-based organizations, a new outlook on stakeholders is emerging. Indeed, stakeholders such as the project team, the users and/or the client, have a significant effect on the success of the project. These also finally decide and judge the actual relevance of the process and outcome of the projects (Cobb, 2012). The kind of relationships the project team has with these diverse new stakeholders depends on the scope of the project. Some stakeholders have a direct relationship to the project, which needs to be nurtured; e.g. the client. Other stakeholders have a greater effect on the outcome, but have no direct relationship with the project team (Wysocki, 2009). Most often the users evaluate the outcome of the projects as well as the process of the project from a sustainable perspective i.e. economic, social and/or environmental sustainability. The relationship with these new stakeholders must thus be managed from a sustainability perspective. Additionally, considering the sustainability movement, other new stakeholders become central. As long as stakeholders can be defined as organizational (e.g managers and employees), economic (e.g. customers, shareholders) and societal stakeholders (e.g. governmental and non-governmental stakeholders) (see Werther & Chandler, 2011), the focus and expectation of each may be of diverse natures. Meaning societal stakeholders may focus on social and environmental sustainability while economic stakeholders may emphasize on economic sustainability.

Combining temporary organization with addressing sustainable concerns makes the stakeholder perspective essential. As a matter of fact, managing stakeholders could have been linear and particularized beforehand in traditional project management, where the goals and how those must be attained is set before hand, newer projects forms such as agile (which represents up to 70% off all projects starting) or extreme project form, need to work with more fluctuating and varying stakeholder management (Wysocki, 2009). This is because the expectations and goals are throughout the project changing. In line with the landscape of project management, agile project management is when the goal is clear but the solution, to get to that goal, is unclear (Wysocki, 2009). Extreme project management emerges when there is neither a clear goal nor a clear solution and extends to the remotest project management styles (Wysocki, 2009). In both of these project forms, the level of collaboration with the client is higher in order to reach stakeholder anticipations (Wysocki, 2009). Agile project are developed to better be able to reach these, especially in regards of the clients' expectations. The agile project management approach involves a high risk and demands a lot of stakeholder (especially the client) involvement to be able to succeed. As a result the communication needs to be honest and open. In extreme project management there is no more planning than an eventual bigger or smaller time-frame. This project form demands a maximum requirement of flexibility from both the client and the project team, which is the direct opposite of traditional project management form (Wysocki, 2009). Even if it is to different extents, both types of forms demand great flexibility as well as staff- and economical resources, beyond the participation of the client, to be able to reach the culminated goal and expectations of the stakeholders. In comparison to traditional projects, these two types clearly involve more unclear guidelines to the project team,
higher uncertainty in regards to internal and external stakeholders, and higher clients' involvement (Wysocki, 2009). All in all, the relationships among these new stakeholders and newer project cycles are rendered more complex. Whereas there are diverse ways of positioning and defining stakeholders in organizations; one way is to talk about external and internal stakeholders, the external being stakeholders outside the project team, in regards to the project leader plus team (see Cobb, 2012).

The need of sustainable relationships
Every project will have a relationship towards different stakeholders, some relationships are being addressed or maintained, and some aren’t. This is one of the primary objectives and arduousness for the project managers of temporary organizations. In case of agile1 projects, the project manager need to contemplate which relationships to prioritize, especially in regards to how and to which extent the choices and management of the relationships will affect the sustainability of the projects process and outcome. Additionally, as the project is more fluctuant, time- and resource restricted, they have a tendency to create a lot of ad-hoc relationships; both inside the team but also towards stakeholders, which results in some relationships being overlooked (Cobb, 2012; Wysocki, 2009). Taken together, managing agile projects stakeholders' expectations especially in regards to stakeholders expectations and differing views on sustainability, is becoming a challenge for the project manager. The result of managing these ad-hoc relationship impacts the project's own sustainability, its sustainable success, and in the long run the project organization as a whole. To answer this challenge, project-based organizations would need to build sustainable relationships with their stakeholders. This would be in line with the CSR and strategic CSR movement (See Werther & Chandler, 2012). One way of securing these relationships is by fostering and developing trusting stakeholder relationships. The argument of this paper is that by securing and building trusting stakeholder relationships, the projects and projects organizations appearance and processes become sustainable.

Trust as a key for sustainable relationship?
Thus, trust becomes the key for the sustainability of the relationships as well as the sustainability of the temporary organization. Trust is a result of a coagency between two or more people, which is based on relationships and interactions, that individuals feel and use logically (Shoorman, Mayer, & Davis, 2007; Zand, 1972). It can be seen as a psychological state where the individual feel expectations based on previous experience of the person or situation. Both parties of the relationships express vulnerability and anxiety for the different motives and intentions of the other (Kramer, 1999; Rosseau & Tijoriwala, 1999). As a result, trust can be looked at from two perspectives. The first one is the knowledge of the person you are dealing with can be trusted (something you feel), and the second one is the incitement that the one you trust, is living up to it trustworthiness (something that you think of in a logic manner) (Kramer, 1999). In practice, trust is therefore something that people feel and transmit because of the experience of trustworthiness in the relationships, which develops over time. Thus, in relation to temporary organizations becomes harder. Furthermore because all trust is transmitted and built on perception, it is easily removed and the building of the relationship then needs to start from the foundation (Nootenboom, 2002).

Purpose and research questions
The importance of stakeholder relationships is clear in relation to the attainment of project objectives and the projects' sustainability, from the diverse mentioned aspects, therefore securing and building these stakeholder relationships through trust becomes essential. Because trust is transmitted, and based on meeting people’s expectations, it needs a forum for doing so in project management. It considers being the project leaders' role to create such forum and create adequate communicative practices with all stakeholders, as well as external as internal. By doing so, social bonds and social

---

1 We will refer to agile project including extreme projects as they have a higher degree of agility.
capital enables understanding about expectations in terms of culminated goals and sustainability in agile and extreme projects. Trust assumes the base of sustainable relationships for the projects sustainability. Whereas the link between trust, sustainable relations and sustainable project management make sense, it is largely less researched and not explore in the literature. Therefore, the aim of this paper is to theoretically explore the importance and effects of trust between stakeholders in agile projects in the lens of current research on trust and project management. To support this explorative inference, two research questions are set as follows:

1. How does trust affect the agile projects external processes and appearance toward the stakeholders?
2. How does trust affect the teams’ internal processes as well as appearance of temporary agile organizations?

The remainder of this paper is based on an overview of the methods used for the literature review in part 2. Part 3 and 4 are respectively discussing the research questions 1 and 2. Part 5 includes a discussion of the importance and effects of trust in projects. Part 6 provides a short conclusion.
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METHOD OVERVIEW
This paper is based on a qualitative and inductive literature review. The choice of literature review came from a lack of clear research combining the four areas of concerned: trust, sustainable management, sustainability and temporary organization. Firstly, the review started in project management field, researching the in table 1 presented keywords. Secondly, literatures about sustainability were scanned. The review process was skimming through the literature by starting with books and then continuing with scientific articles, using the different combinations of the presented keywords to find scientific resources. Finally, while reviewing, an arising detail was similarities in the literature concerning trust and concepts such as bounded rationality, legitimacy and transactional cost and groupthink. This lead to a sequential search on keywords such as: "Cyert & March and transactional costs" or "Janis and groupthink". Table 1 presents an overview of the literature search where diverse methods and keywords have been used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Keywords</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Google Scholar, Wiley database</td>
<td>Trust, Sustainability management, CSR, Strategic CSR, Sustainability, External Stakeholders, Internal stakeholders, Leadership, trustworthiness, stakeholders, Interrelationship, relationship, Intrarelationships, Project(s), Temporary organizations, Agile, Agile project management, Traditional project management, Extreme project, Emertime projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors, that have been searched, after coming across in the articles found previously</td>
<td>Williamson, Lundin, Söderhamn, Cyert, March, Simon, Pfeffer, Pfeffer and Salancik, Beccara &amp; Gupta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Science</td>
<td>Trust, Sustainability management, CSR, Strategic CSR, Sustainability, External Stakeholders, Internal stakeholders, Leadership, trustworthiness, stakeholders, Interrelationship,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The internal consistency of the research relied on the systematic use of keywords that are aligned with the four major themes; project management, sustainability, sustainability management and trust but also has enabled few other aspects to emerge. Indeed, the collection and analysis of the literature is a simultaneous process so that coding of the literature has been done while searching for the literature and the keywords in table 1 are a representation of the coding made. The validity relied on the fact that searches were done several time while selecting the included literature. Considering the inference of this research, the relative broad scope of search and the focus on the four concepts increased the validity and reliability of this research.

**HOW DOES TRUST AFFECT THE PROJECTS EXTERNAL PROCESSES AND APPEARANCE TOWARDS THE STAKEHOLDERS?**

When it comes to agile projects, the main difference in contrast to traditional projects is the high stakeholder involvement needed in order to drive the projects to success. This is grounded in the outline of an agile project: an unclear goal relying on higher stakeholder involvement with the purpose of managing the dynamic project life-time (especially in regards to finding the wanted outcome) (Wysocki, 2009). As a result of the high stakeholder involvement the stakeholder relationships need special attention: among one is maintaining these relationships through trust (McEvily, Perrone, & Zaheer, 2003).

Individuals tend to want to do business with people they trust; creating a positive atmosphere with both stakeholders and organizational staff (Giotis & Matthey, 2008). One first connection between the project process and trust is how people in organizations forecast ahead (Cobb, 2012). Doing risk-analysis, analyzing possible threats based on previous happenings and through the act of narration. As a result from the high client involvement in agile projects, the phase of forecasting is riskier and creates a higher demand on the project team to maintain the stakeholder relationships. First, in order for the relationship with stakeholders to progress, communication needs to be honest and open, primarily based on trust (Inkpen, 1998). When there is a lack of trust, communication and information exchange can be low in accuracy and comprehensiveness as the stakeholders are not willing to take risks involved with sharing information. These issues could consequently be eliminated with trust; as trust increases between stakeholders and the mutual, the understanding increases and the alliance knowledge becomes accessible (Inkpen, 1998). At the same time, a risk that comes with increased communication is the increase of opportunities for opportunistic behavior. When a person is behaving opportunistically, the person behave mercenary in his/her own favor. In the case of project management, this can result in stakeholders that are acting passively, twisting information or not disclosing important information for their own gain: which can have crucial effects on the project (Williamson, 1975). Because people are aware of these behaviors, people emanate that individuals are likely to behave opportunistically, as they have their own interest to look to (Cyert & March, 1963). In agile projects, the project needs to be built on mutual understanding of the
relationship: open communication on a, as much as possible, non-opportunistic ground and by mutually perceived trust. A last element that has an effect on trust and on opportunism is bounded rationality. The cognitive restrictions of a human can limit the ability for individuals to understand the information and transfers the restrictions to an organizational aspect: obtainability of the information (Simon, 1997). Applying this organizational theory on the temporary organization, the limited information has an effect on the possibilities to obtain full knowledge about the situations. When a project manager and the team forecast, they consequently need to relate to these fundamentals: opportunistic behavior and bounded rationality of both the team and especially in regards of the other stakeholders, building communication networks to eliminate uncertainties (Cobb, 2012).

In a context of continuous changes, it is impossible to have full control over resource dependence and demands from various external stakeholders in the organization’s surrounding world. However the project team can do diverse things to address these issues (Eriksson- Zetterqvist, Kalling, & Styhre, 2006). The contextual perspective questions the ability to plan and organize something fully and optimally and therefore demands flexibility in planning (Eriksson- Zetterqvist, Kalling, & Styhre, 2006). Agile project become thus central, as they are more flexible, hence most adapted to these changes, especially in regards to the client, involving them and changing the solutions for the project along the way (Wysocki, 2009). By building trustworthy relationships with the stakeholders, the required adaptability becomes easier to deal with (Beccerra & Gupta, 1999). As the opportunistic behavior of stakeholders and employees can affect the possibility of getting symmetric information, the agile project team, or usually the host organization for the project as the team is usually built on ad-hoc relationships, should work on creating and fostering legitimacy (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978). This is to make sure that the team has a steady flow of resources, employees and clients. The legitimacy contributes to the organizational position on the market, which contributes with power, which in turn contributes to the possibility of more information from stakeholders (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978). Towards the external stakeholders the project manager can enforce legitimacy through addressing the clients and other external stakeholder’s demands (Wysocki, 2009; Werther & Chandler, 2011). Furthermore, who the project chooses to work with helps to enforce the legitimacy of the project vis-à-vis other contestant (Pfeffer, 1976). Therefore a stakeholder analysis must be undertaken, in which the project team goes through the diverse stakeholder’s demands and chooses which demands will be addressed, noticeably addressing primarily stakeholders so that the project endures. Another possibility is to work on the relationships by making the temporary organization resource independent (Tolbert & Hall, 2009). The legitimacy could then be seen as trust that cultivates in between the diverse stakeholders being working close and trustworthy relationships.

In relation to the project being resource independent, trust affects the temporary organization through the value of exchange, which is when the organization is making transactions on goods or services. The temporary organization needs to calculate, with the help of transactional cost theory, if it is more valid to produce the goods or service by themselves or if they should out-source it. This is done by a calculation of the organization as well as the market:

\[
T + P > I \quad \text{(the work is done by someone inside the organization)}
\]
\[
T + P < I \quad \text{(the work is done by someone outside the organization)}
\]

In this case T stands for transactional cost, P for the market price and the: I for the organizational costs to do the service or good by themselves (Tolbert & Hall, 2009). The transactional cost importance in temporary organizations is depending on the possible resources given by the host organization. There are two already mentioned aspects that affect transactional cost theory which are connected to trust. The first one is opportunism and the other one is bounded rationality. Having trust
in the temporary organization makes the opportunistic behavior and bounded rationality of the individuals somewhat diminish: as the confidence and trust increases individuals to feel more at ease with each other (Porter, 1996). Because trust reflects what the stakeholder promised to be reliable, it is ground for believing that they will fulfill their obligations. The Work Breakdown Structure, other juridical papers and processes often stem from a lack of trust between partners, which all increases transactional cost (Inkpen, 1998). In the case of agile projects the making of WBS will only include the core elements as the team does not know the goal of the project in the initial planning stage, which lowers the transactional costs (Wysocki, 2009).

Evidently, if the project would be in a context that was unchangeable and the future could be predictable, the decision-making would be easy and no bigger integration with client would be needed. The combination of opportunistic behavior, the cognitive restriction (bounded rationality), the contextual changes and the effects on trust, makes the calculations and decisions in temporary organizations harder to make (Eriksson-Zetterqvist, Kalling, & Styhre, 2006). In a broad-spectrum: because it costs to find new stakeholder to work with, and at the same time guard that relationship so it is not built on the act of opportunistic behavior, the transactional costs becomes immense, therefore one should build sustainable relationships towards their stakeholders where trust is a part of the main building blocks (Porter, 1996).

**HOW DOES TRUST AFFECT THE TEAM’S INTERNAL PROCESSES AND APPEARANCE?**

As a part of the initial stage in project management, the project team needs to gain general approval of the objectives and business value of the project (Cobb, 2012). In project management there is an essentiality of having a common goal, mission and vision in order to survive. It is crucial that everyone are well informed about the common grounds, to be able to work towards the same goal (Werther & Chandler, 2011). In terms of agile projects, these goals are based on the interrelationships between the project team and the stakeholders, but primarily based on the interrelationships inside the project team. This project type therefore needs a special kind of work set and team to accomplish these changing objectives (Wysocki, 2009). At the same time, when it comes to planning in agile projects, it is not necessary to make plans and solutions in every detail as it is done without or to a changing interference and regards to the outside world (Wysocki, 2009). However, the plans, e.g. WBS, Gantt-Schemes need to exist, in order to show primary stakeholders even though poor descriptions of what actually will be carried out. These plans show in fact that the project team is competent enough and therefore can be trusted, from an external stakeholder perspective (Lundin & Söderholm, 1995; Wysocki, 2009).

The collective ground for any team is the project description: where the objectives, mission, vision, duties and enslacement are stated. It is for the team members to know their responsibilities (Andersen, Grunde, & Haug, 2004). The development of such descriptions is correlated to the process and building progress of trust inside the team. The first correlation is of human nature, which has been stated before, the theory of bounded rationality. Because it is impossible for a human brain to address all possibilities and outcomes at ones, there is negative influence on the planning (Simon, 1997). The restrictions generate problems like: e.g. enablement of assessing risk and seeing other conceivable solutions (Tolbert & Hall, 2009). The fact is that trust does not eliminate the effects of bounded rationality but generates good relationship atmosphere to work in (Beccerra & Gupta, 1999).

As previously stated the bounded rationality is correlated with the contextual changes, hence affects the relationship with the external stakeholders. The same restrictions appear when working within
the team. Because it is impossible to have full control over contextual changes in the organizations' environment, the project team can only act according to their best possibilities (Eriksson-Zetterqvist, Kalling, & Styhre, 2006; Simon, 1997). By building trustworthy relationships, the process of being flexible to the contextual changes becomes easier to manage (Beccerra & Gupta, 1999). This is closely related to the internal responsibility of the team. Trust and high confidence within the team enable team-members to accept each other’s ideas and contributions. With trust, teams have a greater possibility to achieve consensus and understanding on important task-related issues. Trust also increases the quality of processes like brainstorming as high trust leads to the possibility and willingness of expressing other opposing ideas (Leana, 1985). This is even expected as the team compositions in temporary organizations usually are amorphous and have people with diverse skills: entering and leaving at different stages of the project (Porter, 1996). Unfortunately, trust may on the other side lead to groupthink; less compelled team members to challenge ideas and positions of fellow team members and as a result leads to poorer decision-making (Janis, 1982).

From an organizing perspective, there are difficulties in incorporating the team in the construction of the project description. Incorporated team results in numerous positive aspects, such as; larger commitment to the project, which leads to enlarged motivation and creativity (West, 2004). Trust among the members creates the base for people to become creative, which leads to project members being motivated and thus more committed (West, 2004; Porter, 1996). By involving the members, readability of the text can be clearer, which results in clearer understanding of what to do, when it is supposed to be done and by whom. Unfortunately, logistical difficulties in gathering all the team members may occur and therefore easier to have the project manager making the decisions (Cobb, 2012). The feasibility of doing the project description together is therefore partly connected to the size of the project.

As trust effects the commitment to the team, there are possibilities where the trust can be low but the task commitment is high. This can be seen when team members, individually, have diverse goals and objectives for participating (Morgan & Hunt, 1994). However, trust is a crucial element for developing commitment in internal stakeholders as commitment is a building stone to build trust and vice versa (Morgan & Hunt, 1994). Generally, commitment within the team is based on the expectations and experiences gathered together and therefore also the ground for the motivation, leadership and communication (Lundin & Söderholm, 1995). Because task processes becomes easier, as the trust becomes a behavioral indicant for the team’s ability to reach consensus, there is a decrease of conflicts in the team performance. But again, when the task process is poor, as a possible consequence of the team members not being involved in the process of setting up the goals, the team might have harder to reach consensus and therefore the performance will be affected negatively (Porter, 1996).

As the agile project is bound by the need of extremely well co-working team members, with high team cohesiveness and commitment, it is usually recommended that these projects are co-located in order for the team members to be able to meet and communicate frequently (Wysocki, 2009). So as the agile projects complexity increases, the flexibility of the team increases and therefore choosing a team that is acceptable with adaptability is crucial (Wysocki, 2009). Furthermore as the adaptability increases in these projects: trust between the team members becomes highly essential.

**DISCUSSION: SUSTAINABLE TRUSTING RELATIONSHIP**

Sustainability can be seen as an elusive concept where the overall idea is to enable future generation to have similar possibilities as currently possible (see Werther and Chandler, 2011), but what does that mean in practice?
Noticably there is a possibility for the internal and external stakeholders to have diverse understanding of what sustainable outcomes are and diverse expectations about sustainable processes in temporary organizations. When it comes to external stakeholders, this can lead to opportunistic behaviors that are anchored in a bounded rationality dilemma of an unknown future. This can also engender the relationship with the external stakeholders to search for opportunity to cut costs on the expense of long-term sustainable outcomes. When it comes to internal stakeholders in agile projects, project members will be unable to rely on their traditional project management tools enabling clear direction. However, as pointed out while discussing questions 1 and 2, these risks and internal issues, can be addressed through trust.

If trust is a part of the projects temporary sustainable relationships, the sustainability rest on maintaining the relationships with all the stakeholders parting of the triple bottom line; i.e. the societal, environmental and economic stakeholders, and not deceiving any of these stakeholders. We can reflect on that for both external and internal stakeholders.

When looking at it from the external stakeholder perspective: implementing trust as a core could benefit both the short- and long-term economic growth. First, trust in the external stakeholder relationship results as an economic value of lowering the transactional costs, benefiting the legitimacy of both the temporary and host organization, reducing opportunistic behavior and creates a flow of information. Such sustainable relationships do not only stable the supply of resources but also attract customers to work with its employees and company and thus builds the brand (Werther & Chandler, 2011). Second, the project also need to address the relationship towards the societal and environmental stakeholders, making sure that the trust they convey it through their trustworthiness of intentions, capabilities and what they actually do. As the contextual changes, will always be present, the temporary organizations need to be aware that trust among the relationships can change as well. In that regards, communicating on all three aspects of the triple bottom line will enable the external stakeholders to evaluate the process and outcome of the project from a sustainable perspective. This will enable trust and sustainability.

When looking at it from the internal stakeholder perspective, trust affects the effectivity of the team by motivating, fostering creativity and creating opportunity for cohesiveness and commitment. However, the negative aspect, as mentioned, is that too much cohesiveness can lead to groupthink and risk taking, but overall there are primarily positive effects of trust in the organizational temporary organizations. Nonetheless, trust affects the internal processes and appearances by affecting the team behaviors in a positive way: with more positive attitudes, more ability to cooperate and better performance (Dirks & Ferrin, 2001). The creative environment may lead to new entrepreneurial and innovative behaviors essential to sustainability and sustainable development of the organizations in terms of economic sustainability but also environmental and social. Trust and the associated confidence in the team will enable knowledge and expertise to develop so that the business competence will grow reinforcing the potential of higher stakeholders' relationship and its economic consequences. From an accounting perspective, as the projects are often considered a cost & revenue center, trust will economically materialize and visible at the project & team level. However, few risks of trust when it comes to internal stakeholders are not to be forgotten, especially groupthink that will decrease creativity and problem solving which are the core of the role of a project team in "agile" mode as uncertainty and flexibility are higher

In conclusion, today managing project teams is not only about telling people what to do and lead the team to the success, but it is leading together towards a sustainable world. And in order to succeed
trusting relationship, among all stakeholders, is the cornerstone. Trust becomes an essential building block in leading and managing sustainable agile project (see figure 1).

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this paper was to theoretically explore the importance and effects of trust between stakeholders in agile projects in the lens of current research on trust and project management. Trust has been described as a central component of the stakeholders' relationship. This centrality is even higher when it comes to sustainable projects. In line Dirks and Ferrin (2001), incorporating trust may not always directly results in all the desirable outcomes. However by incorporating trust in the project considering all stakeholders, the sustainable outcomes are likelier to occur so that it will lead the project-based organization (in the team and stakeholders outside the team) towards sustainability. The overall finding show that the ‘one size fits all’ mentality is not applicable in project management and building of trust, especially in relation to agile projects. Because of the complex formation of this kind of temporary organization this linear way of thinking is not possible (Wysocki, 2009). Therefore the main value of this paper is that concept “trust” is not a template to use depending on the kind of project, but a concept that needs to be worked with in every new relationship and maintained with the ones existing.

Conversely, bringing trust, sustainability and project management together may raise several issues. Beside the risk associated with high level of trust such as groupthink (mentioned above) or even unethical behavior (see research on pseudo-transformational leader), the sustainability of trust itself is to be questioned. By definition, projects are temporary (time framed) with a start and an end. The first major question is thus how trust is sustainably developed in the early stage of the team when trust will be essential, as scoping is vital for projects. Would the level of trust in that crucial process of the project be enough? How can trust be developed in a short time when projects are short in
nature? Furthermore, can resources that are already scarce be used to team development and if so would that be perceived as sustainable? The second major question is how trust in the team is sustainable developed in the long term as team are by definition selected based on the scope and thus are changing. How trust can be sustained in the long-term beyond the adjournment of the team?

REFERENCES


