



Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

International Journal of Project Management

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/ijproman

Corrigendum to “Single versus multiple project teams and individual performance: Do they ask for different leadership behaviors?” [Int. J. Proj. Manag., 42 (2024), 102563]

Renata Kenda^{a,*}, Nicoleta Meslec^a, Leon Oerlemans^{a,b}

^a Department of Organization Studies, Tilburg University, Postbus 90153, 5000 LE Tilburg, the Netherlands

^b Department of Engineering and Technology Management, University of Pretoria, Private Bag X20, Hatfield, Pretoria 0028, South Africa

We regret that a mistake was made in the manuscript, which came to our attention after the paper's publication. We thank two members of the PhD committee for pointing it out.

The General Linear Model (GLM) analysis applied does not fully answer the two hypotheses proposed in the paper, since it focuses on the change between OS1 and OS2. Consequently, additional t-tests were performed to test whether the difference between the two conditions (Charismatic leadership vs. Boundary spanning leadership) was indeed statistically significantly different in OS1 (the single team condition) as well as in OS2 (the multiple team condition). After performing these two additional t-test analyses, Hypothesis 1 is no longer supported, while Hypothesis 2 still holds. Accordingly, the following paragraphs in the paper were revised as follows:

Abstract:

Multiple project team membership is a prevalent phenomenon in modern organizational life. However, is any leadership behavior beneficial to individual team members' performance in such a setting? Our study suggests that working in a multiple project team setting requires particular types of leadership. In an experimental design, we manipulated charismatic and boundary-spanning leadership behaviors in single and multiple team project settings and studied their effects on project members' performance. When workers are part of a single team, there is no statistically significant difference between charismatic and boundary spanning leadership concerning their performance. When members are part of two project teams concurrently, boundary-spanning leadership behavior becomes more beneficial for individual performance compared to charismatic leadership. The main theoretical contribution lies in the insight that different organizational project forms ask for different leadership behaviors to nurture individual performance. Practically, (future) project leaders must be prepared for operating in different project settings.

Section 3.6 – Paragraph 2:

To test if there are statistically significant differences between the two leadership styles in each of the two conditions (STM and MTM), we

used an independent samples t-test. Furthermore, although not hypothesized, we wanted to test if there is a statistically significant difference in performance when considering charismatic vs boundary spanning leadership in STM vs MTM. The dependent variable (individual task performance) is a count variable, whereas the independent variable indicates whether a project member is exposed to one of two leadership behaviors. We measured these variables at two points in time (OS1 in a single team setting and OS2 in a MTM setting). Hence we used a repeated measure ANOVA, also known as GLM (see Park et al., 2009).

Section 4.4:

4.4. Independent samples t-test and General linear model (GLM) analysis

Results of independent samples t-tests indicated that on average STM participants exposed to charismatic leadership ($M = 58.45$, $SD = 26.02$) scored higher on individual performance than participants exposed to boundary-spanning leadership ($M = 55.63$, $SD = 22.79$). However, this difference was not statistically significant, $t(114) = -.62$, $p = .27$, hence Hypothesis 1 was not supported. Furthermore, the independent sample t-test indicated that, on average, MTM participants exposed to charismatic leadership ($M = 62.37$, $SD = 48.37$) scored lower on individual performance than participants exposed to boundary-spanning leadership ($M = 78.16$, $SD = 53.14$). This difference was statistically significant, $t(114) = 1.64$, $p = .05$, thus supporting Hypothesis 2.

The results show that the general change in individual performance from OS1 to OS2 is statistically significant $F(1) = 8.84$, $p = .004$, indicating that individual performance is higher in OS2. When looking at leadership differences in individual performance in general (combining results from OS1 and OS2), the results show a statistically non-significant effect $F(1) = 1.14$, $p = .287$. Finally, when looking at changes in individual performance between organizational settings when comparing the boundary spanning with charismatic leadership behavior, we found a statistically significant interaction $F(1) = 4.38$, $p = .039$.¹ The boundary spanning leadership shows a significant increase in individual performance between OS1 and OS2 at a significantly greater

DOI of original article: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2024.102563>.

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: r.kenda@tilburguniversity.edu (R. Kenda).

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2024.102621>

Available online 2 August 2024

0263-7863/© 2024 The Author(s). Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

level of change than the increase of charismatic leadership shows between OS1 and OS2 (Fig. 2).

Discussion – Paragraph 2:

The results of our experimental study revealed that in an STM project context, there was no statistically significant difference in individual performance between individuals exposed to a signaling perspective of charismatic leadership or boundary spanning leadership. However, in an MTM project work setting (as opposed to an STM setting), individual team members excelled when they were exposed to a boundary spanning leader. Finally, when comparing the project team members' performance in the two contexts with the assigned leadership behavior (STM vs. MTM and charismatic vs. boundary spanning leadership), the analyses showed that individuals exposed to an MTM project working environment led by a boundary spanning leader performed significantly higher.

Section 5.1 – Paragraph 3:

Second, we did not focus solely on MTM, but we combined organizational setting variations (STM vs. MTM) and leadership behaviors (charismatic vs. boundary spanning), to capture the dynamics of project

member performance when switching from single-team settings to multiple team settings. Our results reveal that the boundary spanning leadership has a more salient role for the performance of employees in MTM settings as compared with the STM setting. These findings are in line with the previous studies (e.g., Lee-Kelley, 2002; Müller & Turner, 2007), which suggest that a distinct project setting requires distinct leadership.

Section 5.2 – Paragraph 1:

This study offers practical implications for organizations that rely on projects and multiple team structures and provides insights on how leaders in highly interdependent multiple project teams should function to maximize followers' performance. Organizations should be aware that MTM is structurally different from traditional STM settings, which may consequently require a different leadership approach. Leaders should not merely cling to the traditional leadership styles when focusing on individual performance but look beyond it and, where appropriate, match adequate other leadership theories and approaches with solutions at hand (Lee-Kelley, 2002; Wright, 2017).