

LEADERSHIP AND PROJECT SUCCESS IN PROJECT-BASED ORGANIZATION. A FUZZY-SET ANALYSIS

Magdalena GĘBCZYŃSKA

Silesian University of Technology, Faculty of Organization and Management; Magdalena.Gebczynska@polsl.pl,
ORCID: 0000-0002-0463-0144

Abstract: This study analyzes the impact of leadership style characteristics such as idealized influence-charisma, inspirational motivation, individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation, contingent reward and management by exception on project success in project-based organizations. This paper argues that these factors simultaneously, in different configurations, affect project success. The data for the empirical analysis come from a survey of 17 cases – Polish consultancies. This study employs a configurational approach, using fuzzy set Qualitative Comparative Analysis (fs/QCA), to assess the different combinations of mentioned factors.

Keywords: leadership, project-based organization, fuzzy-set Qualitative Comparative Analysis (fs/QCA).

1. Introduction

Global competition and a business world of permanent change put ever-greater demands on organizations and the projects that these companies manage. The latest way to respond to fast changing market and environment is to adopt a relatively new organizational form: project-based organization (PBO). This serves as an ideal alternative form of organizational structure for dealing with the emerging features of the temporary and unique demands that rise up within a complex and turbulent market. The main advantage that project-based organizations hold is their flexibility, and this enables them to quickly adapt to changing environments and to the demands of individual clients, as well as to support innovation (Bresnen et al., 2004).

With regard to this approach, Hobday (1998, 2000) introduced the concept of the project-led or project-supported organization wherein, the usual main business processes are routinely practiced, but where project-based working makes a significant contribution to operations. Turner and Keegan (2001, 2002), in turn, defined the project-based organization as one in which the majority of products or services delivered are bespoke designs for customers.

They emphasized that when a company delivers bespoke products or services, it necessarily needs to use project organization to deliver them. Canonico and Söderlund (2010) contributed the view of the multi-project organization being an organizational unit that relies on many projects being executed at the same time. Puranam et al. (2014) in following this up, held that the project-based organization is a new form of organization, and after Gareis and Huemann (2007), concludes that it is one which uses the management of temporary organizations in the form of projects and programs as their primary business processes. A project-based organization, therefore, adheres to the dynamic environment and produces results at the request of specific customer need (Söderlund, and Tell, 2011). Moreover, they are organizations that conduct their main external and internal activities by means of projects (Söderlund, and Tell, 2011). In the modern economy and society, project-based organizations are, hence, an important element and are increasingly widespread.

In project management, project managers' competencies and their leadership style are found to be central to their success (Crawford, 2005; Geoghegan, and Dulewicz, 2008). Generally, however, there is little empirical research on relationships of leadership styles and project success (Yang et al., 2011; Aga et al., 2016). Some studies indicate a link between the transformational leadership style and project success (Yang et al., 2011; Gundersen et al., 2012; Aga et al., 2016;), whereas some findings suggest a relationship between the transactional leadership style and project success (Yang et al., 2011). Jiang (2014) explored the leadership style and its relationship with project success. He found that leadership style helps the project to be successful in different ways, including: collaboration in teamwork, management of source and communication with subordinates and clients. Müller and Turner (2007) hold that the project managers' leadership style influences project success. Geoghegan and Dulewicz (2008) found that increased competencies of leadership increase the chances of success of the project, and state that leadership style has an impact on the project's success. Feger and Thomas (2012) state that there is no leadership style that is suitable for all projects because of the uniqueness of each project and specific environment.

The purpose of this paper is, hence, to investigate what leadership characteristic (in different configurations) simultaneous influences project success in project-based organizations – Polish consulting firms. This research is a part of a research project on project-based organization. Research results on job satisfaction and project-based organization have already been published (Gębczyńska, 2019).

This paper applies fuzzy-set Qualitative Comparative Analysis (fs/QCA), a set-theoretic approach with the ability to handle high degrees of complexity in how different causal conditions combine to bring about an outcome (Ragin, 2000, 2008). Following this introduction, the second part of this paper presents the theoretical framework, the third part describes the research method, the fourth part contains research findings and discussion, and the last presents the conclusions.

2. Theoretical framework

All projects in different sectors are unique in nature and cover risks across many issues throughout the process, therefore, project-based organizational practices are most appropriate for businesses that face several complex tasks at once and have a fast changing environment. Typical businesses within this changing environment are high-technological and service providing corporations that carry out knowledge-intensive projects, for example: consulting, advertisement, law (Thiry, and Deguire, 2007). Projects, however, are often criticized for their delays, budget deviances, low productivity and low product quality, and an unsuccessful project can bring about calamities to project stakeholders (Maqbool et al., 2017). According to Humphrey (2002), all successful projects share a number of similarities, and argues that the features that characterize projects that have been successful are connected with the management of these projects. Notably, they have been clearly defined of what must be done, are well organized and those that manage them have had a good overview with regard to their budget limits and time schedule. Project managers/leaders are the ones who select the projects, implement and coordinate/oversee the work done by project teams. Thus, project teams should be carefully selected and be given proper leadership (Heeralall, 2013).

Project management is defined as an application of knowledge, skills, and techniques to oversee activities in order to meet the needs of project requirements (Heagney, 2011). Therefore, leadership is required to enhance successful project deliverables. Organizations need leaders who can manage in uncertain and competitive environments, increasingly diverse teams and achieve during the time of the project's existence, organizational profitability and success. In order to meet these objectives, organizations are often faced with the challenge of finding the right skills and leadership to deliver the desired results.

Determinants that influence project success are an important theme of research in the project management literature (Ika et al., 2012; Söderlund, 2011; Nauman et al., 2010). Scholars, in regard to define project success, disagree on its measure or in clearly defining what it is. The Project Management Institute (PMI) defines project success as balancing the competing demands for project quality, scope, time, and cost, as well as meeting the varying concerns and expectations of the project stakeholders (PMI, 2008). Shenhar et al. (2001) explains that most commonly, it is perceived and understood that project success means the completion of a project on time, within budget and enables the short-run success of a business.

According to Westerveld (2003), it is not possible to design one set of typical criteria for project success and performance, because every project has its own criteria based on project complexity, size and uniqueness. The traditional measure of project success has been the iron triangle of scope, cost, and time (PMI, 2008), Many other criteria were added more recently, for example: benefit to the organization, benefit to stakeholders or benefit to project personnel.

Some authors suggest that defining project success is a difficult and “elusive concept” (Thomas, and Fernández, 2008). Gudienne et al. (2013) proposed a conceptual critical success factors model for projects that is divided into seven major groups, namely: external factors, institutional factors, projects related factors, project management/team members related factors, project manager related factors, client related factors and contractor related factors.

As mentioned previously, the three basic constraints in project management are time, cost, and scope. Meeting these is often used to measure the success of projects. Herein, Lindhard and Larsen (2015), in conducting research on the key process factors that affect project success, noted that cost and time are directly measurable, unlike scope and quality, which are subjective and therefore complex to measure.

Leadership is among the most widely discussed concepts in project management, as it is believed to form the basis for success of any structure, company, organization, institution and nation (Nel et al., 2014; Harper, and Hall, 2015). Leadership is comprised of various components, skills, styles and attributes. Descriptions of leadership includes being motivating and inspiring (Avolio, 2004) while directing others to achieve concrete results. Leadership is defined, thus, as the process of one individual influencing a group or followers to successfully attain a specific goal (Clark, 1997). Chemers (2014) thought leadership to be the process of persuading a group of followers to attain certain objectives and to channel an organization to a direction that it is more cohesive and coherent. Yukl (2012) defines leadership as the process of influencing others to identify and come to an agreement about what must be done and how it should be done. He also considers it to be the process of expediting individual and combined efforts to achieve shared objectives.

There is one common element within these definitions, namely that leadership is about influencing others towards successfully gaining a certain objective (Clark, 1997; Yukl, 2012; Nel et al., 2014). Maseko and Proches (2013) emphasize that there are certain leadership styles and characteristics identified as being critical for successful project delivery. Sohmen (2013) sees three leadership styles: transformational, transactional and laissez-faire. Laissez-faire leadership is non-leadership – it is where a leader abdicates responsibilities and avoids making decisions (Bass, 1998). Laissez-faire leadership style, in turn, is considered as destructive in nature (Skogstad et al., 2007).

Chan and Chan (2005) postulate the existence of two main types of leadership styles: transformational and transactional leadership (Yang et al., 2011). Transactional leadership can be identified simply as entering into transactions between leaders and subordinates in an effort to improve subordinate performance. Transactional leadership represents those exchanges that the leader and the followers engage in, that, in turn, influence the reciprocal relationship from employees of attaining something of value (House, and Antonakis, 2014). Transactional leadership style, hence, involves a sort of a carrot and a stick approach or a combination of reward and punishment (Thomas, 2016).

Transformational leadership lies on the opposite end of the spectrum, in that this type of leader strives to inspire and “transform” their employees in order to improve their performance. Transformational leadership was treated as a new paradigm and leaders can utilize its principles it to create an adaptive organization (Bagraim et al, 2011). In addition, transformational leadership stimulates creativity, innovation and new ideas, which help the organization to grow faster and adapt well to a dynamic environment (Bushra et al., 2011). Transformational leadership style leads to a positive change among the followers, who are then persuaded to do what is best for the organization as a whole (Thomas, 2016). Transformational leadership style is positively linked to project performance (Keller, 1992), and project success (Aga et al., 2016; Anantatmula, 2010; Yang et al., 2011).

According to Susan (2014), transformational leaders have four features that enable them to motivate others. These are: idealized influence (charisma), inspirational motivation, individualized consideration and intellectual stimulation.

The first characteristic, idealized influence (II) (Boerner et al., 2007), which, in some research, is also described as “charisma” (idealized influence), is defined as a state when a leader provides vision and sense of mission, instills pride and gains respect and trust (Bass, 1990). The term idealized influence has been utilized in place of charisma in various situations, such as training (Bass, 1999) and it is the extent to which the leader acts in a pleasant way that stimulates employees or followers to develop attachment with the leader. Idealized leaders exhibit views, believe in their followers and appeal to their employees (Van Knippenberg, and Sitkin, 2013). Idealized influence is defined as a state when a leader considers followers’ needs over his or her own needs and behaves in a manner consistent to the articulated ethics, principles and values (Boerner et. al, 2007).

The second characteristic of transformational leadership is inspirational motivation (IM), which is defined as state when a leader communicates high expectations, uses symbols to focus efforts, (and) expresses important purposes in simple ways (Bass, 1999). Leaders with IM inspire and appeal to their followers through articulating a vision in a charismatic manner (Bally, 2007). Inspirational leaders challenge their employees by setting high standards, communicating about the future goals and giving meaning to the job at hand (Hackman, and Craig, 2013). Communication is used as the basis for inspiring followers. This implies that inspirational leaders must have robust communication skills (Hackman, and Craig, 2013).

The third characteristic of transformational leadership is intellectual stimulation (IS), which is defined as state when a leader promotes intelligence, rationality, and careful problem solving (Bass, 1990). Intellectual stimulation refers to the extent to which the leader challenges perceptions, lobbies followers’ ideology and takes risks. Bromely, et. al. (2007) describes that this feature as being characteristic of leaders who derive new ideas and creative solutions to organizational problems from their followers, and encourage new approaches for performing tasks (and doing so while giving due credit). It is believed that with this structure, followers will always find a way to overcome obstacles (Northouse, 2015).

The fourth characteristic, of transformational leadership, is individualized consideration (IC). This is considered as being within a state where the leader gives personal attention, treats each employee individually, coaches, (and) advises (Bass, 1990). Individualized consideration refers to the extent to which the leaders attend to the individual needs of employees and guide employees in overcoming or dealing with these concerns. This approach also gives leaders the opportunity to increase achievement and growth in the organization. Of importance, the leader respects and shows appreciation of the contributions made by each member of the team in the organization (Northouse, 2015).

Transactional leadership is an exchange process based on the fulfillment of contractual obligations and is typically represented as setting objectives and monitoring and controlling outcomes. Transactional leadership represents those exchanges that the leader and the followers engage in, and in turn, influences a reciprocal relationship from employees of attaining something of value (Hunter et al., 2013). Transactional leadership style includes: contingent reward, management by exception: active and passive (Judge, and Piccolo, 2004).

The first characteristic – contingent reward (CR) is defined as a state in which leaders engage in a constructive path goal transaction of reward for the effort put by an employee. Moreover, expectations, exchange promises and resources for support of the leaders are clarified (Bernerth et al., 2016). Contingent reward leadership focuses on clarifying role and task requirements and providing followers with material or psychological rewards in exchange for the fulfillment of contractual obligations (Judge, and Piccolo, 2004). Contingent reward is the degree to which the leader sets up constructive transactions or exchanges with followers: the leader clarifies expectations and establishes the rewards for meeting these expectations. Leaders and employees arrange mutually satisfactory agreements, negotiate for resources, exchange assistance for effort and provide commendations for successful follower performance (House, and Antonakis, 2014).

The second characteristic, management by exception (MbE) is, in general, the degree to which the leader takes corrective action on the basis of results of leader–follower transactions. Management by exception is divided into active management by exception and passive management by exception. As noted by Howell and Avolio (1993), the difference between management by “exception—active” and management by “exception—passive” lies in the timing of the leader’s intervention. Active leaders monitor follower behavior, anticipate problems and take corrective actions before the behavior creates serious difficulties. Passive leaders wait until the behavior has created problems before taking action (Judge, and Piccolo, 2004). Active management by exception is defined as a state where leaders monitor followers’ performance or behavior and take corrective action should there be any deviation from the predetermined standards (Bass, 1985). Active corrective transactions refers to the active vigilance of a leader whose goal is to ensure that standards are met (Judge, and Piccolo, 2004). Passive management by exception is defined as a state when leader fails to intervene until a problem gets serious (Judge, and Piccolo, 2004). This kind of management-by-exception

gives followers the freedom to conduct their business without leadership interference (LePine et al., 2013).

3. Methodology of research

The finding that leadership style has a positive or negative effect on project success does not help in understanding which contexts this occurs and in combination with which additional factors. Therefore, rather than estimating the relative importance of different conditions across all cases, it is better to examine which make sense for which kinds of firms to produce a desired outcome (Fiss, 2011). This study adopts fuzzy set Qualitative Comparative Analysis (fs/QCA) to better understand the determinants of project success in project-based organizations.

Unlike regression-based techniques, fs/QCA defines configurations of different features or conditions instead of separating cases into independent features (Fiss, 2011; Cheng et al., 2013; Schneider et al., 2010). The fuzzy-set theoretic method of QCA, as propounded by Charles Ragin, is a comparative case-oriented research technique that uses the concepts of Boolean algebra for the analysis of social science statements in terms of set relations (Marx et al., 2013). Therefore, fs/QCA is especially well suited for identifying different configurations leading to outcome, because the method identifies how membership of cases in causal conditions (i.e., selected leadership characteristics) is linked to membership in the outcome variable (i.e., success in project-based organization).

As shown in the Results and Discussion section, no single condition was found to be sufficient on its own to predict an outcome. Fs/QCA can identify asymmetrical relationships between antecedents and outcomes, detect multiple causal recipes that lead to the same outcome (equifinality), recognize that the same causal recipe can lead to different outcomes (multifinality), and permit a configuration of conditions to be sufficient (or necessary) for an outcome even though the individual constituent conditions may not be sufficient (or necessary) for that outcome to occur (conjunctural causation) (Rihoux, and Ragin, 2009; Woodside, 2013). Ragin (2000) argues that the logic of the comparative case study is configurational, whereby cases (or firms) are considered as the configuration (or constellation) of attributes, and can only be analyzed holistically as packages.

The fs/QCA 2.5 software developed by Ragin (2006) was used to analyze the data. Fs/QCA is carried out in several stages (Ganter, and Hecker, 2014). In the first stage, a truth table is developed. The second step includes applying the Quine-McCluskey algorithm to reduce the number of rows in the truth table and reduce the number of statements (Ragin, and Fiss, 2008). Determining the necessary conditions allows distinguishing the cases that lead to the outcome. Cases where the outcome is not present are irrelevant, and are thus absent when testing propositions. Third, after a review of the truth table, an algorithm is applied to simplify

combinations and minimize solutions. For our work, the cutoff value was set to 0.80, as this value is both in line with the theory (Rihoux, and Ragin, 2009), and with the distribution of consistency scores as observed in the truth table. In applying fs/QCA, the original scales first have to be calibrated into set membership values (indicating the degree of membership in a set) in the range from 0 to 1. Fuzzy sets allow researchers to account for the varying degree of membership of cases to a particular set by using the anchors of 1 to designate “fully in” a particular set, 0 for non-membership (fully out), and 0.5 as the point of maximum ambiguity to mean neither in, nor out, of a particular set. The crossover point (or the point of maximum ambiguity) designates when a case is more in or more out of the set. Table 1 shows the calibration process and indicates the transformation of both the outcome and the factors into fuzzy terms.

The fs/QCA methodology is often used in social science, but is largely absent from management research. One Polish researcher who uses this method in management research is Anna Kwiotkowska (e.g.: 2018, 2019).

Table 1.

Distribution of each variable and its corresponding set

Variable	Full non-membership (0.05)	Crossover point (0.5)	Full membership (0.95)
Idealized influence	0.257	0.373	4.620
Inspirational motivation	0.239	2.294	4.617
Individualized consideration	0.348	3.149	5.342
Intellectual stimulation	0.324	3.095	5.869
Contingent reward	0.239	3.588	5.765
Management by exception	0.385	2.520	4.716
Project success	0.220	1.744	2.941

Source: own study.

In this study, the shortened form of the Northouse' (2015) Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, Form 6-S (MLQ-6S) was used, as developed by Bass and Avolio (1992). This shortened form of MLQ was applied in the past in empirical research, by, among others, Vinger and Cilliers (2006). Tejada (2001) found that a reduced set of items from the MLQ appeared to show preliminary evidence of predictive and construct validity, and this research tool is referred to as the most frequent and well researched and validated leadership instrument in the world (Tejada, 2001).

The transformational leadership scales comprise the following factors: idealized influence (charisma), inspirational motivation, individualized consideration and intellectual stimulation (Tejada, 2001), while the transactional scales consist of contingent reward and management-by-exception (active and passive). Although there is also a scale dealing with laissez-faire leadership that includes three statements, scales dealing with laissez-faire leadership style, as indicated earlier, were not used in this study. The project success measure is comprised of 14 items adopted from Aga et al. (2016).

The survey includes seven scales (idealized influence – charisma, inspirational motivation, individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation, contingent reward, management by exception and project success) in the form of statements to which respondents indicate their level of agreement/disagreement on a five-point Likert scale. All item loadings are higher than 0.7. An extensive review of the relevant literature supports the validity of the scales (Table 2).

Table 2.
Scales measurement

Conditions	Adapted from	Cronbach Alpha
Idealized influence	Construct was measured by 3-items from Vinger and Cilliers (2006)	0.73
Inspirational motivation	Construct was measured by 3-items from Vinger and Cilliers (2006)	0.84
Individualized consideration	Construct was measured by 3-items from Vinger and Cilliers (2006)	0.74
Intellectual stimulation	Construct was measured by 3-items from Vinger and Cilliers (2006)	0.81
Contingent reward	Construct was measured by 3-items from Vinger and Cilliers (2006)	0.78
Management by exception	Construct was measured by 3-items from Vinger and Cilliers (2006)	0,75
Project success	Construct was measured by 14-items from Aga et al. (2016)	0.91

Source: own study.

Data on the 17 cases of Polish consultancies were collected by means of a series of interviews with Project Leaders/Managers (January 2018 - January 2019).

Project-based organizational practices are appropriate for businesses that face several complex tasks at once and operate within a fast changing business environment (Sundbo, 1997). Thiry and Deguire (2007) state that, typically, these enterprises are service companies, such as consulting firms. Polish consultancies, which are the subject of these research, are focused on using project management to produce and deliver professional services to their clients, and, therefore, these consulting firms are a pure form of project-based organizations.

4. Results and discussion

The results of the empirical research are presented in Table 3, and reveal the derived solutions that illustrate the causal recipes (i.e. sufficient conditions) that lead to high membership in the outcome condition-project success. Each column represents a combination of causal conditions with their corresponding raw coverage, unique coverage and solution consistency. Consistency “assesses the degree to which the cases sharing a combination of conditions agree in displaying the outcome in question” (Ragin, 2008). Coverage “assesses the degree to which a causal combination accounts for instances of an outcome” (Ragin, 2008).

As three different constellations influence project success, coverage can be partitioned into a configuration's raw coverage (i.e. proportion of outcome cases covered by a given constellation) and its unique coverage (i.e. proportion of outcome cases exclusively covered by

a given constellation (Ragin, 2000). The numbers at the bottom of the table represent the coverage and consistency of the solution as a whole. Utilizing the notation system from (Ragin, and Fiss, 2008), each column in the Table 3 represents a configuration of conditions linked to the respective outcome. Full circles (●) indicate the presence of a condition, while barred circles (⊖) indicate a condition's absence; blank spaces indicate "don't care".

Each panel represents the alternative causal combinations or paths for the outcome (Ragin, and Fiss, 2008). These are consecutively numbered C1, C2 and C3. After calculating the consistency scores for all possible complex causal combinations that lead to the outcome condition, a comparison with the usual cutoff consistency score of 0,80 follows. Combinations with consistency scores higher than this threshold remain in the final solution. All consistency values are higher than 0,80 and most coverage values range between 0,25 and 0,65, as suggested in literature.

Table 3.
Combination of factors lead to project success

Factors	Combinations		
	C1	C2	C3
Idealized influence		⊖	●
Inspirational motivation	⊖		●
Individualized consideration	●	●	
Intellectual stimulation	●		
Contingent reward	●	●	●
Management by exception		●	
Consistency	0,92	0,90	0,93
Raw coverage	0,33	0,36	0,29
Unique coverage	0,05	0,07	0,06
Solution consistency	0,89		
Solution coverage	0,56		

Source: own study.

According to the results of the analysis, the solution yields a coverage that is closed to 56% and a consistency of 89%.

The first combination C1 indicates that individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation and contingent reward with the absence of inspirational motivation lead to job satisfaction (consistency = 0,92; coverage = 0,33). This configuration combines the extent to which the leaders attend to the individual needs of employees and guide employees in overcoming or dealing with these concerns, with a state wherein a leader promotes intelligence, rationality, and careful problem-solving and with a state wherein leaders engage in a constructive path goal transaction of reward for the effort put by an employee that leads to project success, even if inspirational motivation is not present.

The second combination C2 indicates that individualized consideration, contingent reward and management by exception with the absence of idealized influence lead to project success in project-based organizations (consistency = 0,90; coverage = 0,36). This configuration of leadership characteristics combine the extent to which the leaders attend to the individual needs of employees and guide employees in overcoming or dealing with these concerns, with the focus on clarifying role and task requirements and providing followers with material or psychological rewards in exchange for the fulfillment of contractual obligations, and with the degree to which the leader takes corrective action on the basis of results of leader–follower transactions to achieve project success, if idealized influence is not present.

The third combination C3 indicates that if three characteristics of leadership style: idealized influence, inspirational motivation and contingent reward are present, project success will be achieved (consistency = 0,93; coverage = 0,29). This configuration combines the extent to which the leader acts in a pleasant way that stimulates employees or followers to develop attachment with the leader, with the state wherein a leader communicates high expectations, uses symbols to focus efforts, (and) express important purposes in simple ways, with agreed mutually satisfactory agreements, negotiations for resources and assistance, for efforts in developing successful follower performance that leads to project success.

It is worth noting that in these three combinations of factors, the contingent reward is an important factor by which the project success in project-based organization is achieved, so the degree to which the leader sets up constructive transactions or exchanges with followers, i.e. the extent to which the leader clarifies expectations and establishes the rewards for meeting these expectations, generally affect project success.

5. Conclusion

The results of this empirical study contribute to research on project success by presenting several characteristics that create combinations affecting project success in project-based organizations – Polish consulting firms. Previous studies analyzed whether and which single factors influence project success. This study, hence, contributes to management science and practice (especially), by its investigation of the collective effect of different characteristics of leadership style on project success.

The results of this research have practical implications for Project Managers/Leaders, by providing them with three configurations of conditions that lead to project success in project-based organizations. Fs/QCA reveals new patterns in the data set, and, therefore, provides information that is of greater value to managers and researchers. Use of fs/QCA is an original contribution to management science, particularly in the field of project success in PBO, by studying the effect of all of selected factor simultaneously.

Management science has been supplemented by specifying that individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation and contingent reward with absence of inspirational motivation (C1); individualized consideration, contingent reward and management by exception with absence of idealized influence (C2); and idealized influence, inspirational motivation and contingent reward (C3) influence project success in PBO. This study, however, has several limitations that, when revealed, can help to improve future research.

The limitation relates to the data source, because the data in this study come from a limited research sample – Polish consulting firms. This may reduce the generalizability of the results. Future research could replicate this study in other project-based organizations operating within different industries to examine whether the findings hold in those contexts. It might also be worth examining other variables affecting project success in project-based organizations.

References

1. Aga, D.A., Noorderhaven, N., and Vallejo, B. (2016). Transformational leadership and project success: The mediating role of team-building. *International Journal of Project Management*, 34(5), 806-818.
2. Anantatmula, V.S. (2010). Project manager leadership role in improving project performance. *Engineering Management Journal*, 22(1), 13-22.
3. Bagraim, J., Cunningham, P., Pieterse-Landman, E., Potgieter, T., and Viedge, C. (2011). *Organisational behaviour: A contemporary South African perspective*, A. Werner (Ed.). Pretoria, SA: Van Schaik.
4. Balley, J.M. (2007). The role of nursing leadership in creating a mentoring culture in acute care environment. *Nursing Economics*, 25(3), 143-149.
5. Bass, B.M. (1985). *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations*. New York: Free Press.
6. Bass, B.M. (1990). *Bass & Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership — Theory, Research and Managerial Applications*. New York: Free Press.
7. Bass, B.M. (1999). Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8, 9-32.
8. Bass, B.M., and Avolio, B.J. (1992). Developing transformational leadership: 1992 and beyond. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 14(5), 21-27.
9. Bernerth, J.B., Walker, H.J., and Harris, S.G. (2016). Rethinking the benefits and pitfalls of leader– member exchange: A reciprocity versus self-protection perspective. *Human Relations*, 69(3), 661-684.

10. Boerner, S., Eisenbeiss, S.A., and Griesser, D. (2007). Follower behavior and organizational performance: The impact of transformational leaders. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 13(3), 15-26.
11. Bresnen, M., Goussevskaia, A., and Swan, J. (2004). Embedding New Management Knowledge in Project-Based Organizations. *European Group for Organizational Studies*, 25(9), 1535-1555.
12. Bromley, H.R., and Kirschner-Bromley, V.A. (2007). *Are You a Transformational Leader? The Physician Executive*, 54-58. Retrieved from: <http://search.ebscohost.com.proxy.lib.siu.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bth&A=27880805&site=ehost-live&scope=site>, 5.11.2018.
13. Bushra, F., Usman, A., and Naveed, A. (2011). Effect of transformational leadership on employees' job satisfaction and organisational commitment in banking sector of Lahore (Pakistan). *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 2(18), 261-267.
14. Canonico, P., and Söderlund, J. (2010). Getting control of multi-project organizations: combining contingent control mechanisms. *International Journal of Project Management*, 28(8), 796-806.
15. Chan, A.T.S., and Chan, E.H.W. (2005). Impact of Perceived Leadership Styles on Work Outcomes: Case of Building Professionals. *Journal of Construction Engineering Management*, 413-422. doi: 10.1061/(ASCE)0733- 9364(2005)131:4(413).
16. Chemers, M. (2014). *An integrative theory of leadership*. New York, USA: Psychology Press.
17. Cheng, C.F., Chang, M.L., and Li, C.S. (2013). Configural paths to successful product innovation. *Journal of Business Research*, 66(12), 2561-2573.
18. Clark, D. (1997). *Big dog leadership*. Retrieved from <http://www.nwlink.com/~donclark/leader/leader.html>, 5.11.2018.
19. Crawford, L. (2005). Senior management perceptions of project management competence. *International Journal of Project Management*, 23(1), 7-16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2004.06.005>.
20. Feger, A.L.R., and Thomas, G.A. (2012). A framework for exploring the relationship between project manager leadership style and project success. *The International Journal of Management*, 1(1), 1-19.
21. Fiss, P.C. (2011). Building better causal theories: A fuzzy set approach to typologies in organizational research. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(2), 393-420.
22. Ganter, A., and Hecker, A. (2014). Configurational paths to organizational innovation: Qualitative comparative analyses of antecedents and contingencies. *Journal of Business Research*, 67(6), 1285-1292.
23. Gareis, R., and Huemann, M. (2007). Maturity models for the project-oriented company. In J.R. Turner (Eds.), *The Gower Handbook of Project Management* (pp. 183-208). Gower, Aldershot.

24. Gębczyńska, M. (2019). *Job satisfaction in project – based organization*.
25. Geoghegan, L., and Dulewicz, V. (2008). Do project managers leadership competencies contribute to project success? *Project Management Journal*, 39(4), 58-67, <http://doi.org/10.1002/pmj.20084>.
26. Gudiene, N., Banaitis, A., Banaitienė, N., and Lopes, J. (2013). Development of a conceptual critical success factors model for construction projects: A case of Lithuania'. *Procedia Engineering. Elsevier B.V.*, 57, 392-397.
27. Gundersen, G., Hellesøy, B.T., and Raeder, S. (2012). Leading international project teams the effectiveness of transformational leadership in dynamic work environments. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 19(1), 46-57.
28. Hackman, M. Z., and Craig, J.E. (2013). *Leadership: A communication perspective*. Illinois: Waveland Press.
29. Harper, C., and Hall, R. (2015). *Organizations: Structures, processes and outcomes*. New York, USA: Routledge.
30. Heagney, J. (2011). *Fundamentals of Project Management*. AMACOM American Management Association.
31. Heeralall, P. (2013). NGOs – projects which find their way to success, <http://www.lemauricien.com/article/ngos-%E2%80%93-projects-which-find-their-way-success>, 5.11.2018.
32. Hobday, M. (1998). Product complexity, innovation and industrial organization. *Research Policy*, 26(6), 689-710.
33. Hobday, M. (2000). The project-based organization: an ideal form for managing complex products and systems? *Research Policy*, 29, 871-893.
34. House, R.J., and Antonakis, J. (2014). Instrumental leadership: Measurement and extension of transformational–transactional leadership theory. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25(4), 746 -771.
35. Howell, J.M., and Avolio, B.J. (1993). Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, locus of control, and support for innovation: Key predictors of consolidated business-unit performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 891-902.
36. Humphrey, R.H. (2002). The Many Faces of Emotional Leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13(5), 493-504.
37. Hunter, E.M., Neubert, M.J., Perry, S.J., Witt, L.A., Penny, L.M., and Weinberger, E. (2013). Servant leaders inspire servant followers: Antecedents and outcomes for employees and the organization. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24(2), 316-331.
38. Ika, L., Diallo, A., and Thuillier, D. (2012). Critical success factors for World Bank projects: An empirical investigation. *International Journal of Project Management*, 30(1), 105-116.
39. Jiang, J. (2014). The study of the relationship between leadership style and project success. *American Journal of Trade and Policy*, 1(1), 51-55.

40. Judge, T.A., Piccolo, R.F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: a meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(5), 755-768.
41. Keller, R.T. (1992). Transformational leadership and the performance of research and development project groups. *Journal of Management*, 18, 489-501.
42. Kwiotkowska, A. (2018). Barriers to the development of spin-offs A fuzzy-set-theoretic approach. *Operation Research and Decision*, 28(4), 31-46.
43. Kwiotkowska, A. (2019). Possibilities of applying the configurational approach to business model research. *Organization and Management Scientific Quarterly*, 2, 75-86.
44. LePine, M.A., Zhang, Y., Crawford, E.R., and Rich, B.L. (2013). Turning Their Pain to Gain: Charismatic Leader Influence on Follower Stress Appraisal and Job Performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 3(7), 765-787.
45. Lindhard, So., and Larsen, J.K. (2015). Identifying the key process factors affecting project performance. *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management*, 23, 657-67.
46. Maqbool, R., Sudong, Y., Manzoor, N., and Rashid, Y. (2017). The Impact of Emotional Intelligence, Project Managers' Competencies, and Transformational Leadership on Project Success An Empirical Perspective. *Project Management Journal*, 48(3), 58-75.
47. Marx, A., Rihoux, B., and Ragin, C. (2013). The origins, development and application of qualitative comparative analysis (QCA): the first 25 years. *European Political Science Review*, 6(1), 115-142.
48. Maseko, B., and Proches, C. (2013). Leadership styles deployed by Woman Project Managers. *Gender and Behaviour*, 11(2), 5663-5674.
49. Müller, R., and Turner, R. (2007). The influence of project managers on project success criteria and project success by type of project. *European Management Journal*, 25(4), 298-309.
50. Nauman, S., Mansur Khan, A., and Ehsan, N. (2010). Patterns of empowerment and leadership style in project environment. *International Journal of Project Management*, 28(7), 638-649.
51. Nel, P., Werner, A., Du Plessis, A., Ngalo, O., Poisat, P., Sono, T., and Botha, C. (2014). *Human Resources Management*. Cape Town, SA: Oxford University Press.
52. Northouse, P. (2015). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. London, UK: Sage publications, Inc.
53. Project Management Institute, PMI (2013). *A Guide to the Project Management Body of Knowledge (PMBOK Guide)*. ISBN: 9781935589679, United States, PA.
54. Puranam, P., Alexy, O., and Reitzig, M. (2014). What's "new" about new forms of organizing. *Academic Management Review*, 39(2), 162-181.
55. Ragin, C.C. (2000). *Fuzzy set social science*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
56. Ragin, C.C. (2006). Set relations in social research: Evaluating their consistency and coverage. *Political Analysis*, 14(3), 291-310.

57. Ragin, C.C., and Fiss, P. (2008). Net effects versus configurations: an empirical demonstration. In C.C. Ragin (Ed.), *Redesigning Social Inquiry, 1* (pp. 190-212). Chicago-London: University of Chicago Press.
58. Rihoux, B., and Ragin, C.C. (2009). *Configurational comparative methods: qualitative comparative analysis (QCA) and related techniques*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
59. Schneider, M.R., Schulze-Bentrop, C., and Paunescu, M. (2010). Mapping the institutional capital of high-tech firms: A fuzzy-set analysis of capitalist variety and export performance. *Journal of International Business Studies, 41*(2), 246-266.
60. Shenhar, A.J., Dvir, D., Levy, O., and Maltz, A.C. (2001): Project success: A multi-dimensional strategic concept. *Long Range Planning, 34*(6), 699-725, [http://doi.org/10.1016/S0024-6301\(01\)00097-8](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0024-6301(01)00097-8).
61. Skogstad, A., Einarsen, S., Torsheim, T., Aasland, M.S., and Hetland, H. (2007). The destructiveness of laissez-faire leadership behavior. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 12*(1), 80-92.
62. Söderlund, J. (2011). Pluralism in project management: Navigating the crossroads of specialization and fragmentation. *International Journal of Management Review, 13*(2), 153-176.
63. Söderlund, J., and Tell, F. (2011). Strategy and capabilities in the P-form corporation: linking strategic direction with organizational capabilities. *Project-Based Organizing and Strategic Management Advances in Strategic Management, 28*, 235-262.
64. Sohmen, V.S. (2013). Leadership and teamwork: Two sides of the same coin. *Journal of IT and Economic Development, 4*(2), 1-18.
65. Sundbo, J. (1997). Management of innovation in services. *The Service Industries Journal, 17*(3), 432-455.
66. Susan, K. (2014). Mission-Driven Followership and Civic Engagement: A Different Sustainable Energy. *Journal of Leadership Education, 13*(14), 76-87.
67. Tejada, M.J. (2001). The MLQ revisited: Psychometric properties and recommendation. *Leadership Quarterly, 12*(1), 31-52.
68. Thiry, M., and Deguire, M. (2007). Recent developments in project-based organisations. *International Journal of Project Management, 25*(7), 649-658.
69. Thomas, G., and Fernández, W. (2008). Success in IT projects: A matter of definition? *International Journal of Project Management, 26*(7), 733-742.
70. Thomas, J. (2016). *Strategic Management: Text and Cases*. Chennai: Pearson Publishers.
71. Turner, J.R., and Keegan, A.E. (2000). The management of operations in the project based organization. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 1*(2), 131-148.
72. Turner, J.R., and Keegan, A.E. (2001). Mechanisms of governance in the project based organization: the role of the broker and steward. *European Management Journal, 19*(3), 254-267.

73. Van Knippenberg, D., and Sitkin, S.B. (2013). A Critical Assessment of Charismatic Transformational Leadership Research: Back to the Drawing Board? *The Academy of Management Annals*, 7(1), 983-1007.
74. Vinger, G., and Cilliers, F. (2006). Effective transformational leadership behaviours for managing change. *Journal of Human Resource Management*, 4(2), 1-9.
75. Westerveld, E. (2003). The Project Excellence Model: linking success criteria and critical success factors. *International Journal of Project Management*, 21, 411-418. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0263-7863\(02\)00112-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0263-7863(02)00112-6).
76. Woodside, A.G. (2013). Moving beyond multiple regression analysis to algorithms: Calling for adoption of a paradigm shift from symmetric to asymmetric thinking in data analysis and crafting theory. *Journal of Business Research*, 66, 463-472.
77. Yang, L.R., Huang, C.F., and Wu, K.S. (2011). The association among project manager's leadership style, teamwork and project success. *International Journal of Project Management*, 29(3), 258-267.
78. Yukl, G. (2012). Effective leadership behaviour: What we know and what questions need more attention. *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, 26(4), 66-85.