



## **Leadership under construction: A qualitative exploration of leadership processes in construction companies in Sweden.**

Downloaded from: <https://research.chalmers.se>, 2026-04-04 17:09 UTC

Citation for the original published paper (version of record):

Löwstedt, M., Fasth, J., Styhre, A. (2021). Leadership under construction: A qualitative exploration of leadership processes in construction companies in Sweden.. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management - ASCE*, 147(12). [http://dx.doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)CO.1943-7862.0002205](http://dx.doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)CO.1943-7862.0002205)

N.B. When citing this work, cite the original published paper.

1 **To cite this paper:**

2 Löwstedt. M. ; Fasth. J & Styhre. A (2021) Leadership under construction: A qualitative  
3 exploration of leadership processes in construction companies in Sweden. *Journal of*  
4 *Construction Engineering and Management*. 147(12)

5  
6 DOI: 1 <https://ascelibrary.org/doi/10.1061/%28ASCE%29CO.1943-7862.0002205>

7  
8 **Link to ASCE library:**

9 <https://ascelibrary.org/action/doSearch?AllField=leadership+under+construction>

10

11 **Leadership under construction: A qualitative exploration of**  
12 **leadership processes in construction companies in Sweden**

13

14 **Martin Löwstedt\*, Jonas Fasth^, and Alexander Styhre^^**

15

16 \*Associate Professor, Department of Technology Management, Chalmers University of  
17 Technology, Gothenburg, 412 96 Sweden.

18 e-mail: [martin.lowstedt@chalmers.se](mailto:martin.lowstedt@chalmers.se), Phone: +46731542398

19

20 ^ Senior Lecturer, Department of Business Administration, University of Gothenburg,  
21 Gothenburg, 411 24 Sweden.

22

23 ^^ Professor, Department of Business Administration, University of Gothenburg,  
24 Gothenburg, 411 24 Sweden.

25

26

**Abstract**

27

28 Leadership has increasingly been advocated as a potent organizing practice, linked positively to several  
29 performance dimensions as well as successful organizational development and change. Despite these  
30 alleged promises, the specific characteristics of leadership processes as they unfold in a construction  
31 context have not been fully captured by construction researchers. This paper is predicated on an identified  
32 lack of methodological richness underlying leadership studies in construction. While a growing number of  
33 contributions have quantitatively tested the ideas and models of leadership scholars, few have qualitatively  
34 explored the experiences and interpretations of the actual people that practice leadership in their daily work  
35 in construction companies. Drawing on a rich qualitative interview study, this paper analyzes open-ended  
36 stories about leadership in the largest construction companies in Sweden. The findings show how  
37 leadership styles have been shaped to align with traditional work and organizing principles, but also how  
38 they, by the same token, pose a seemingly unresolved tension with change initiatives that seek to  
39 reorganize to improve organizational performance. Altogether these findings indicate that there are  
40 grounds to question the transformative potential of leadership in construction companies, as practiced  
41 today. The paper concludes by outlining the practical implications of these findings, together with some  
42 analytical generalizations that can serve as pointers for a strengthened leadership agenda in construction  
43 research, one that is characterized by an increased methodological richness and accentuated focus on the  
44 context-specific aspects of leadership.

45

46 Keywords: construction companies, leadership; managerial work; qualitative method; social process

47

48

## 49 **INTRODUCTION**

50 There is no mistaking that leadership is a hot topic today, frequently portrayed as a core  
51 principle for every modern organization and industry aspiring for eminence and success. This  
52 popularized discourse is grounded on a myriad of positive correlations established in  
53 leadership research. Successful leadership has been linked to, for instance, increased work  
54 morale and well-being (Alvesson et al., 2017); strengthened self-esteem (Mhatre and Riggio,  
55 2014); enhanced creativity (Sundgren och Styhre, 2006); decisiveness and power of initiative

56 (Parker and Wu, 2014); and an accentuated sense of meaning related to a collective  
57 organizational vision (Alvesson and Spicer, 2014). Translated to the organizational levels, it  
58 has furthermore been shown that leadership can explain a substantial degree of performance  
59 variances (Day and Lord, 1988, see also Wang et al., 2011), as well as being a potent  
60 nostrum for organizational development and change (Bass and Avilio, 1993; Nadler and  
61 Tushman, 1994; Appelbaum et al., 1998; Yukl, 2002; Kisfalvi, 2002; Gilley et al., 2009).

62

63 Considering this, there is a curious absence of a matured leadership agenda in construction  
64 research. The construction industry is continuously criticized for its lack of performance  
65 regarding a broad pallet of areas. Governmental reports in numerous countries have  
66 concluded that the construction industry suffers from excessive production costs, low  
67 efficiency, slow delivery, and failure to innovate, among other things (see Chan and Cooper,  
68 2010, for an overview). Grounded in this criticism, construction research is rich in  
69 contributions of how the industry should transform according to improved structures,  
70 processes, technologies, materials, and management concepts, not seldom adopted and  
71 translated from other industries and contexts. Yet have leadership perspectives seldom been  
72 adopted to frame and explore the *specifics* of these industry conditions and challenges.

73

74 Reviewing and reflecting on the accumulated insights drawn from leadership studies in  
75 construction research, it is possible to identify an urgent gap, which can be inferred from a  
76 lack of methodological variation. As it will be argued in the next section, leadership has been  
77 explored with a salient proclivity towards testing quantitatively the ideas and models of  
78 leadership scholars, rather than to explore qualitatively the experiences of the actual people  
79 that might or might not practice leadership in their daily work in the construction industry.

80 This methodological homogeneity has resulted in a lack of studies that incorporate the

81 various “extraneous factors” of leadership (Alvesson and Spicer, 2014) that are embedded on  
82 the industry-, organizational-, and day-to-day local levels, and condition the nature of leader-  
83 follower interactions (Liden and Antonakis, 2009). This has left a blind spot, not only  
84 regarding how the specifics of various construction contexts shape leadership processes, but  
85 also how leadership might shape construction.

86

87 The purpose of this paper is to provide an initial filling of this gap by exploring the tensions  
88 and alignments that underlie the ongoing uptake of leadership in a situated construction  
89 context. Adopting a qualitative methodology, this paper draws on rich stories about  
90 leadership in large construction companies in Sweden. These stories were collected and  
91 analyzed specifically to highlight the recursive dynamics between leadership and the specific  
92 conditions and challenges that underlie managerial work in these companies. The results  
93 show a growing appreciation and adoption of certain ‘modern’ leadership practices, as  
94 portrayed in contemporary leadership research. However, with that said, the actual uptake  
95 and enactment of these practices seem to lack much of the alleged potential of leadership as a  
96 transformative force. The results show instead how the ongoing adoption of leadership also  
97 seems to work to sustain (and even further reinforce) traditional work- and organizing  
98 practices in these companies, not the least by providing mandate and socially mediated  
99 governance for a high degree of independence and freedom in the management of various  
100 construction tasks. In addition to this, the results also illustrate a certain tension between the  
101 identified leadership styles and an ongoing strive to increase organizational performance by  
102 developing and implementing more standardized processes and routines. The paper concludes  
103 by outlining the practical implications of these results and elucidating further the analytical  
104 generalizations that can serve as pointers for a strengthened leadership agenda in construction  
105 research.

106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130

## **THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL (RE)ORIENTATION**

### **Towards a situated understanding of leadership in construction**

Over 25 years ago, Langford et al. (1995) noted a substantial shortage of leadership studies in construction research and argued that this might be explained by the lack of understanding of the industry on the part of social scientists and a lack of understanding of the social sciences on the part of those engaged with the industry. While leadership studies in construction have been slowly growing since then (Toor and Ofori, 2007), it appears as if the argument still holds insofar as the contributions reflect a dominant research tradition in construction that is grounded in quantitative and positivistic methods, rather than the methodological richness that characterizes the social sciences (Dainty, 2007; Dainty, 2008; Fellows, 2010; Sage and Vitry 2018). A scrutiny of the studies that brought the topical area of leadership into construction research shows a prominent preference for research designs and methods that rely on quantitative testing of established leadership models, such as Fiedler’s Contingency Model (Bresnen et al.,1986; Seymour and Abd Elhaleem, 1991), Fiedler’s LPC questionnaire (Fellows et al., 2003), BARS (Dulaimi and Langford, 1999), the MLQ model (Chan and Chan, 2005; Butler and Chinowsky, 2006; Ozorovskaja et al., 2007), the MSQ model (Giritli and Oraz, 2004), or the Kouzes-Posner Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) (Skipper and Bell, 2006).

The point here is *not* to argue for the strengths and weaknesses of different methodological approaches, but how a certain methodological homogeneity by the part of construction researchers (Dainty, 2008) seems to have resulted in a gap in our understanding of the specific characteristics and meanings of leadership in a construction context. While the preference for large data sets and closed-question questionnaires supports both the reliability

131 and generalizability of the causalities found in relation to leadership (Taylor et al., 2010), it  
132 has consequently also downplayed our understanding of the meaning and experience that the  
133 actors themselves assign to leadership in relation to their daily work in construction (McCabe  
134 et al., 1998).

135

136 Toor and Ofori (2008) argue for the need to strengthen the leadership agenda in construction  
137 by moving beyond the “conventional transactional mentality and task-orientation of industry  
138 professional” (ibid: 620), towards an accentuated focus on inter-personal skills and relations,  
139 such as leadership. However, it appears as if the shifting focus from task-based to person-  
140 based perspectives not merely has served as the starting point for leadership studies in  
141 construction, but also to some extent the reoccurring conclusions. Whether the focus has been  
142 on construction projects (Bresnen et al., 1986; Seymour and Abd Elhaleem, 1991; Fraser,  
143 2000; Fellows et al., 2003) or organizations in the construction industry more broadly  
144 (Dulami and Langford, 1991; Odusami et al., 2003; Chan and Chan, 2005; Kasapoğlu, 2014),  
145 it is possible to discern a certain converging and general conclusion that an increased  
146 attentiveness to inter-personal relations, on top of construction tasks, is correlating positively  
147 with increased performance in various construction operations.

148

149 However, this correlation seems not only to be generalizable across several different  
150 construction contexts but is also reported in meta-analyses of a broad range of other contexts  
151 and industries (Wang et al., 2011). Rather than being concerned about the generalizability of  
152 the leadership-related causalities found in construction contexts (e.g., Odusami et al., 2003;  
153 Chan and Chan, 2005; Kasapoğlu, 2014), it seems timely to also problematize them for being  
154 too general; and for merely reiterating the general ideas and promises of leadership, without

155 offering any detailed understanding of how leadership have been conditioned by the specifics  
156 of construction (and vice versa).

157

158 Such an understanding is essential, not least because there exists no shared and stable  
159 definition of leadership (Bass, 2008). Every attempt to provide or reuse a concise leadership  
160 definition is deemed to leave something out or oversimplify what, in reality, is a complex,  
161 dynamic, and evolving process (Day, 2014). The growing number of construction scholars  
162 (e.g., Chan and Chan, 2005; Butler and Chinowsky, 2006; Ozorovskaja et al., 2007;  
163 Kasapoğlu, 2014) drawing on the seminal transactional and transformational models of  
164 leadership (e.g., Bass and Avolio, 1994; Bass and Riggio, 2006; Diaz-Saenz, 2011) are,  
165 therefore, not only adopting a preconceived definition of leadership but also assume that  
166 ‘leadership’ is encapsulating almost every activity that various managers in a construction  
167 setting are performing in their work. Those that are critical of such reuses of ready-made  
168 leadership definitions and frameworks argue that if ‘leadership’ is used uniformly to describe  
169 a broad range of different managerial activities, we risk serious inflation in the meaning (and  
170 value) of leadership, not least by making it indistinguishable from ‘management’ in general  
171 (Alvesson and Spicer, 2012). A more situated understanding of leadership is therefore not  
172 only to acknowledge that leadership is largely shaped by its surroundings, but also that  
173 leadership is only one out of many other organizing principles that managers have at their  
174 disposal when trying to navigate their organizational realities (Alvesson et al., 2017).

175

176 The overreliance on quantitative testing of ready-made leadership models and perspectives on  
177 the part of construction researchers seems to have produced such lack of nuances in our  
178 understanding of leadership in the construction industry. Prioritizing preconceptions about  
179 leadership before the actor’s own interpretations of their experiences from practicing

180 leadership (Alvesson and Spicer, 2014) have, altogether, placed the actual *persons* that  
181 engage in these *inter-personal* relations as being detached from the specifics of the context  
182 they are acting in (Barker, 2001). To start addressing this gap, it is therefore essential to view  
183 and explore leadership in the construction industry as a processual undertaking, involving  
184 leaders, followers, and several contexts in an ongoing interaction of co-operation,  
185 collaboration, and co-creation, accomplished over time through enacted processes, situated  
186 practices, and dialogue (e.g., Bolden and Gosling, 2006; Carroll, 2008; Crevani et al., 2010;  
187 Cunliffe and Eriksen, 2011; Bolden et al., 2011; Alvesson and Spicer, 2014; Collinson et al.,  
188 2018).

189

190 Understanding leadership as a social process that is being imbued with meaning when it is  
191 enacted in context also reminds us about the recursiveness between leadership and context.  
192 Paying closer attention to how leadership – the verb and not the noun (Crevani et al., 2010) –  
193 has been shaped by, but also might shape, various aspects of the construction context, might  
194 also support an extension of the gaze beyond the linkages between leadership and *current*  
195 construction operations, to encompass also an understanding of leadership processes  
196 embedded in a trajectory that permeates the past, the present, and the future of the  
197 construction industry (Chan and Cooper, 2010).

198

199 Rather than offering any detailed theoretical framing, the arguments put forward here are  
200 bridging over to a general methodological reorientation. To prioritize situated interpretations  
201 of leadership (Alvesson and Spicer, 2014) in construction, this paper follows the  
202 methodological assumptions that underlie qualitative studies of leadership (Bryman, 2004;  
203 Fairhurst, 2007). Therefore, the next section elaborates these arguments with details about the  
204 design of a qualitative interview study of leadership in construction companies.

205

206

## 207 **RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHOD**

208 This paper draws on data from 24 in-depth and open-ended interviews about leadership  
209 conducted with middle- and top-level managers in the largest construction companies in  
210 Sweden. The purpose of the study was to explicitly foreground the managers' own  
211 interpretations of leadership processes as they unfold in these particular organizations, rather  
212 than testing any pre-existing leadership models, definitions, or hypotheses. We, therefore,  
213 designed an interview study grounded in an explorative and inductive research methodology.  
214 The interviews were carried out during 2020 and included middle- and top-level managers  
215 from the six largest (measured in turnover) construction companies in Sweden. This paper  
216 identifies these companies using the pseudonyms ConstracORP, ConstructINC, ConcrETE,  
217 ContraORG, ConstructION, and ConSTRUCT. The interviewees will be referred to as  
218 "managers" instead of "leaders" throughout the paper. This is to reflect a central tenet of the  
219 research, under which leadership is considered a distinct social process as opposed to the  
220 formal role of being an appointed manager (Alvesson et al., 2017). The 24 managers were  
221 selected equally across the six companies (i.e., four from each company) and included the  
222 following formal positions: Regional Manager (n = 6), Division Manager (n = 4), Project  
223 Manager (n = 3), District Manager (n = 2), Business Area Manager (n = 2), Development  
224 Manager (n = 2), Site Manager (n = 2), Production Manager (n = 1), Marketing Manager (n =  
225 1), HR-Manager (n = 1).

226

227 When selecting these interviews, several different sampling criteria were considered. The  
228 first consideration was to select interviewees from several different construction companies  
229 to explore any possible variations in leadership. However, as the study progressed, we found

230 striking similarities across the companies, suggesting that the study might best be  
231 characterized as a single case study (Flyvberg, 2006) of leadership in large construction  
232 companies in Sweden. The minor variations found are outlined in the result section. Still,  
233 they also strengthen the idea that leadership processes in construction companies may overlap  
234 with a certain community of practice (Dubois and Gadde, 2002).

235 A second consideration regarded which managers to select for interviews. We decided to  
236 include a mixture of managers from both the line organization and the central functions.  
237 Under this general idea, the managers were selected according to a snowballing principle,  
238 which provided us with an interesting sample. Not the least since the managers tended to  
239 direct us further, either to the manager immediately above or below them in the hierarchy.  
240 Based on this, the interview data provided us with the possibility to triangulate their stories  
241 about leadership by comparing different versions of the leader-follower processes as they  
242 permeate various organizational levels.

243

244 The third consideration was how many interviews to conduct. Here we were guided by an  
245 overall sensitivity to an ongoing degree of saturation concerning the content of the leadership  
246 narratives collected (Patton, 2002); that is, we conducted additional interviews until no or  
247 very few additional insights were deemed to follow from yet another interview. While there  
248 is no universal number for when saturation in qualitative interviewing usually occurs,  
249 research suggests that 24 interviews would fall well within the critical scope (Guest et al.,  
250 2006).

251

252 During the interviews, we let the managers act as free storytellers (Cladinin and Connelly,  
253 2000) as much as possible. In this case, collecting open-ended stories about leadership were  
254 considered to support a receptiveness for the links between experience and meanings related

255 to leadership and the particularities of the contexts in which these meanings are constructed  
256 (Cladinin and Connelly, 2000; Gill, 2001; Alvesson and Sköldberg, 2017). Instead of  
257 following a detailed interview guide, we probed the managers to tell their stories across a  
258 number of interrelated themes (see Table 1).

259

260 **[INSERT TABLE 1 HERE]**

261 *Table 1. Overview of the overarching themes used in the interviews.*

262

263

264 The managers typically covered most of the themes using their own narrating, although not  
265 always in the order presented above and often in a more interrelated and overlapping fashion.  
266 The interrelation between the themes, were, in fact, commonly used as a cue for our follow-  
267 up questions. As were brief follow-up questions asking “why?..why?..why?”, “can you  
268 explain further?”, and “can you give a concrete example?”, all to support the overall research  
269 ambition to understand leadership as it was related to the daily work of these managers. Each  
270 interview lasted between 60 and 90 min and was recorded and transcribed verbatim,  
271 amounting to 18–30 A4 pages of written text.

272

273

## 274 **ANALYSIS**

275 The interview transcripts were analyzed in three phases: (1) open coding, (2) axial coding,  
276 and (3) selective coding (cf. Strauss and Corbins, 1990). With the inductive approach as a  
277 starting point (Thomas, 2006), the analytical process was inspired by the general intentions  
278 and guidelines within Grounded Theory, but without strictly following all the steps outlined  
279 by Strauss and Corbin (1990). Instead, the aim was to maintain, as far as possible, an open

280 mind for different interpretations of leadership and thus joining the more interpretative  
281 approach of Strauss and Corbins (1990), Czarniawska (2004), and Charmaz (2006) to the  
282 analysis of interview data; seeking to create a coherent story that captures the meaning of the  
283 situated events.

284

285 Following this, the three analytical phases overlapped in multiple step-based readings of the  
286 material and iterations between the data set and emerging findings (Alvesson and Kärreman,  
287 2011), as well as ongoing joint discussions between all the authors of this paper, to strengthen  
288 the validity of the interferences made (Taylor et al., 2010). The first rounds of readings were  
289 open, searching for any interesting patterns of consensus and/or variances concerning  
290 leadership. After this initial reading, we focused on phase 1, collecting a wealth of *open*  
291 *codes* (Strauss and Corbins, 1990) that captured the most central aspects of the interviewees'  
292 leadership narratives. Considering the explorative nature of this study, there were no  
293 preconceptions and/or hypotheses about leadership that were deemed suitable to pre-code  
294 using any software (such as NVivo). Instead, we conducted this step as a very timely manual  
295 endeavor, guided by the overall themes described in Table 1. This resulted in four thematic  
296 clusters of open codes, including the importance and role of leadership (see Category A,  
297 Table 2), leadership styles and perspectives (Category B), alignments between leadership and  
298 current organizational principles (Category C), and tensions between leadership and future  
299 organizational principles (Category D). In this phase, we also searched for open codes  
300 concerning 'leadership training' and 'origins of leadership', but found too few descriptions to  
301 proceed with these open codes in phase 2) and 3).

302

303 Phase 2) and 3) of the analysis sought to investigate and conceptualize the relationship  
304 between the concepts identified in the open coding process. Here we drew directly on Strauss

305 and Corbin (1990) and treated the difference between the Axil codes and the Selective code  
306 merely in terms of an increased level of abstraction (with the Selective code being the overall  
307 Result category). Again, these phases involved a lot of re-reading of the material to validate  
308 the emerging Axial and Selective codes against the contextual use and meaning of the Open  
309 codes found in the interview transcripts (Strauss and Corbin, 1990). A detailed overview of  
310 the three analytical phases is outlined in Table 2 below, followed by a result section that  
311 presents and explains both the meaning and the interrelations between four core categories of  
312 leadership processes found in the construction companies studied.

313

314 **[INSERT TABLE 2 HERE]**

315 *Table 2. A detailed overview of the analytical process*

316

## 317 **RESULTS**

### 318 **Adding leadership on top of construction expertise**

319 When describing the details of the professional profiles that had qualified them for their  
320 current positions, the vast majority of the managers emphasized the importance of  
321 construction expertise and experience. The results elucidated that this view echoed across all  
322 the various managerial positions and echelons because it reflected a certain logic relating to  
323 the career progression in these companies.

324

325 *Every project is unique, and you, therefore, have to adapt to unique circumstances...  
326 this requires a very specific set of skills and experience. Therefore, to qualify for the  
327 highest positions in a construction company...say, for instance, regional manager...  
328 you need to have experience from these all steps... those promoted to regional*

329 *managers have vast experience from all the different steps of the hierarchal ladder.*

330 (Manager 14, Business Area Manager, ContraORG)

331

332 Leadership skills were also perceived to be important, but only *on top* of construction-  
333 specific expertise and experience.

334

335 *An extensive construction experience is needed indeed...that you have experience*  
336 *from various positions. I mean, we have this career progression...it is not 100 percent*  
337 *like this, but the majority of the highest positions, like regional managers, have been*  
338 *district managers before, and before that project managers. But great leadership*  
339 *skills are also required to manage both customers and employees in a good way.*

340 (Manager 4, Regional Manager, ConstracORP)

341

342 However, the general view that leadership skills were perceived as being of secondary  
343 importance was often expressed in a self-ironic and critical fashion.

344

345 *In that regard, I think we distinguish ourselves a bit [construction companies*  
346 *compared to other companies] ...we have too many engineers that have become*  
347 *leaders or managers...that might not necessarily be the best leaders. I believe that our*  
348 *sector has a lot of work to do in relation to this. To start promoting the best leaders,*  
349 *rather than only the best engineers.* (Manager 6, Development Manager,

350 ConstructINC)

351

352 And:

353

354 *I really hope that the construction industry can start to value leadership more. It is*  
355 *not the least by starting to appoint managers, not only because they are skilled at*  
356 *managing construction projects, but also because they have strong leadership skills. I*  
357 *really hope we can speed up that development. To value leadership skills more as*  
358 *opposed to only technical skills (Manager 5, Production Manager, ConstructINC)*

359

360 While many of the managers were critical regarding the overly relaxed pace of increasing the  
361 legitimacy of leadership alongside the current dominant managerial ideals, many also  
362 perceived this to be an already matured process.

363

364 *I have experienced this change myself. We are much more aware of the importance of*  
365 *leadership. We measure leadership these days, and we participate in leadership*  
366 *courses. I would say that the managers we had ten years ago focused only on money.*  
367 *These kinds of managers have now lost ground to those that are more people-focused.*  
368 *Ten years ago, a successful manager was the one that earned the most money for the*  
369 *company. Today, a successful manager is one that both earns money and focuses on*  
370 *the more human values (Manager 10, Regional Manager, ConcrETE).*

371

372 While there existed varying opinions regarding just how far they have come in their uptake of  
373 leadership perspectives and practices, these variations – when taken together – point  
374 convergingly to the fact that leadership has gained increased traction, or at least attention, in  
375 these construction companies.

376

377 With that said, it was possible to find in the data a more quantitative measurement that  
378 indicated that leadership, despite this perceived transition, has yet to become a prioritized

379 concern for managers in construction companies. By means of distilling all the narrative  
380 passages that addressed the managers' professional backgrounds, we found that 20 out of the  
381 24 managers have worked their whole careers in construction companies, and only four have  
382 been recruited from outside (see also Table 2). These figures indicate that construction  
383 expertise still trumps leadership skills when these companies appoint their managers,  
384 including the top echelons. Put differently; in the sample of our interviews, few, if any,  
385 managers have been recruited solely based on their leadership skills. This homogeneity that  
386 permeates the managerial profiles seems furthermore to translate into certain collective views  
387 on leadership, as highlighted in the next section.

388

### 389 **Responsive leadership**

390 The managers generally perceived leadership as *a distinct set of practices* rather than  
391 anything that per default was encapsulated in their formal roles. In fact, they marked a clear  
392 distinction between "management" and "leadership", in which the former had to do with  
393 formal procedures and processes, tasks, and bureaucracy, and the latter with inter-personal  
394 relations. We also learned that they generally associated leadership with a positive  
395 connotation and management with a negative one.

396

397 By far, the most frequent description of the managers' leadership perspectives and styles was  
398 *responsiveness*. Responsiveness is the English translation of the Swedish word "lyhörd",  
399 which according to the dictionary is defined as "to readily apprehend and pay regard to  
400 something". In the manager's stories, responsiveness was used both directly as a keyword  
401 and as a central general perspective to describe a leadership style characterized by carefully  
402 listening to their employees to understand their personal needs related to work and then trying  
403 to accommodate those needs (see also Table 2, for a detailed overview).

404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427

*I am very personal in my leadership ...personal in the way that I try to listen and be responsive to their needs [the followers]. I really like to talk to and meet with people. I care a lot about them enjoying their work ... and that we have fun together. (Manager 13, Business Area Manager, ContraORG)*

Another:

*My leadership style is to listen carefully to people ... and to provide them with the right circumstances for commitment and development. I try to meet their specific requirements and wishes...for instance, by trying to find projects and tasks that fit every person. (Manager 1, District Manager, Constracorp)*

A central tenet of leadership-as-responsiveness was to take seriously the idea that each person is different and then adapt to these differences. The results highlight how the managers have developed the skills required to adapt to all the different and unique construction management tasks and all the different and unique employees. Leadership as responsiveness thus encapsulates a type of situation-based work approach applicable for both people and tasks.

*I practice a very situation-based leadership, and I am good at responding to the situation I am in.... both to different situations and different people. The benefits of this are that I tend to get both employees and customers on my side. (Manager 9, Division Manager, ConcrETE)*

428 When asking them to describe what kind of skills are needed to be a responsive leader, the  
429 managers used examples such as “people skills”, “communication skills”, “being like a  
430 psychologist”, “being like a friend”. However, it was also common for them to emphasize the  
431 advantages of having vast construction experience, thus linking their leadership styles to the  
432 managerial ideals highlighted in the previous section.

433

434 *I believe that the key to leadership is listening and responsiveness....and when I say*  
435 *responsiveness, then I mean to understand the realities of the people you are leading.*  
436 *[...] In my view, a successful middle manager, for instance, should have the ability to*  
437 *do the site manager’s job if needed...and a site manager, in turn, should be able to be*  
438 *a team leader and so on. If you have those abilities, then you can truly understand the*  
439 *realities and challenges of those you are leading ....and then I think it is much easier*  
440 *to support them in your leadership. (Manager 19, Division Manager, ConSTRUCT)*

441

442 A question that lingered as the researchers listened to these descriptions of responsive  
443 leadership was how it aligns with the kind of organizing that might require more top-down  
444 directions.

445

446 *Researcher: How do you use leadership to progress organizational change?*

447

448 *Manager: First of all, you have to really listen to people. I need to understand what*  
449 *they really feel about the initiatives I am proposing. The key is then to nudge wisely...*  
450 *and entice carefully. To make [naming a subordinate] really want to use whatever I*  
451 *am proposing in their work. No one will buy into changes if they think I am being too*  
452 *rigid about it. (Manager 3, Development Manager, ConstracORP)*

453

454 Leadership as responsiveness seemed to be aligned with a permeating idea of not telling other  
455 experienced workers how to do their job. This relation could thus explain how leadership has  
456 become embedded in some of the specific conditions in these construction companies.

457

#### 458 **The alignment between leadership and *current* organizing principles**

459 The results indicate that the responsive leadership styles are aligned with ongoing processes  
460 of delegating tasks and responsibilities down the organizational levels. In addition to  
461 “dictatorship” as a contrasting ideal, the managers also frequently used the idiom of “pointing  
462 with the whole hand” as a more detailed account of how they *didn't* want to lead. While the  
463 managers stressed that they had no problems making tough decisions when needed, this was  
464 considered only as an exception to an overall status quo of passing down a high degree of  
465 freedom and responsibility downwards the managerial echelons.

466

467 *Manager: I really don't want to be the kind of leader that is pointing with the whole*  
468 *hand.*

469

470 *Researcher: Ok, but how do you organize and direct your employees then?*

471

472 *Manager: As little as possible. I have always had a problem with those managers that*  
473 *want to intervene with what I do and how I do it. Therefore, I just explain the task,*  
474 *and when the deadline is...and after that, I try to intervene as little as possible in their*  
475 *[the followers] work towards that goal. Being too detailed about how to do things*  
476 *kills creativity. I mean, if I were to tell my employees how they should do their jobs*  
477 *...then it would be no different from merely handing it over to a machine. I don't think*

478 *that is very value-adding for the person either. It is people that do this job after all.*

479 (Manager 7, Project Manager, ConstructINC)

480

481 As this example shows, the idea of mandating high degrees of freedom was a reciprocal  
482 process, as this manager expected the same degrees of freedom from his [sic] manager. The  
483 common leadership styles were thus embedded in a permeating organizing principle that  
484 mandated the rather homogenous group of skilled and experienced construction managers to  
485 perform their work within very free realms. This dominant principle was readily confirmed  
486 when the managers reflected on the differences between leadership in construction compared  
487 to other contexts.

488

489 *Here [in construction companies], you are delegated a lot of responsibility and*  
490 *freedom to do what you want. It is actually an enormous amount of freedom that is*  
491 *given to you. My wife is working in a very high position in the car industry... and I*  
492 *have learned from her that they are far more micro-managed than we are [in*  
493 *construction companies]. We are pretty bad at processes...we reinvent the wheel and*  
494 *all that...but we are highly skilled at problem-solving...because we are constantly*  
495 *given these high degrees of freedom and responsibilities. And I must say that this is a*  
496 *really exciting aspect of this line of work. (Manager 2, Project Manager,*  
497 *ConstraCORP)*

498

499 The freedom in work governed by their leadership perspectives and styles seemed also to  
500 span beyond the rational domains. Scrutinizing their explanations, we also found many more  
501 emotionally laden accounts linked to these permeating logics.

502

503 *I don't know for sure, since I never worked outside construction...but my view is that*  
504 *the car industry, for instance, seems to be much more structured and micro-managed,*  
505 *compared to construction. [...] and I don't think many of us working in construction*  
506 *could handle to work in any other industry, just because the degree of control would*  
507 *be so much higher. We are just so used to 'navigate our own ships'. (Manager 7,*  
508 *Project Manager, ConstructINC)*

509

510 The preferred leadership styles were thus related both to the organizational tasks per se and a  
511 consensus about what makes work-life enjoyable in these construction companies.

512

513 When the managers reflected on the differences between leadership in construction and other  
514 industries, almost all of them used the car industry as their comparative example. As it turned  
515 out, one of four managers (see Table 2) that had been recruited from outside of construction  
516 had actual experience from working in a large international car manufacturer and could  
517 therefore readily confirm the collective perceptions.

518

519 *The work is very unstructured here in ConstructINC compared to the car industry*  
520 *[...] That is actually a big difference for me... how unstructured the work is here [in*  
521 *construction]. I am actually surprised that it is even possible to run operations in*  
522 *such an unstructured way as we do here...and I cannot help thinking about how*  
523 *extremely well we could do and how much money we could make if only we had more*  
524 *structure. These circumstances are actually a major challenge for me as a relatively*  
525 *inexperienced leader in construction (Manager 5, Production Manager,*  
526 *ConstructINC).*

527

528 While confirming the differences, this manager viewed them in a much more critical manner.  
529 Rather than positively associating the lack of structures with personal freedom embedded in  
530 professional work, this manager conceived of the general leadership styles as posing a  
531 threshold for increased organizational performance.

532

### 533 **The tension between leadership and *future* organizing principles**

534 The results offer snapshots of how certain leadership styles have gradually aligned with the  
535 overarching organizing principles in the construction companies studied. However, the results  
536 also point out a salient tension in relation to ongoing organizational transformations.

537

538 *We have this strong tradition in construction of a very decentralized structure and*  
539 *extremely high levels of autonomy related to project management...and how these*  
540 *'strong heroes' manage the end results in their own individualized ways. But I think*  
541 *that we here at ConstracORP, as well as ConstructING and ConstructION, now have*  
542 *started to become much more centralized and structured, compared to other*  
543 *construction companies [...]. But even when having all these structures, business*  
544 *models, and process.... this old logic still remains strong. (Manager 3, Development*  
545 *Manager, ConstracORP)*

546

547 The manager in this example refers to an ongoing change that is contrasting the leadership  
548 processes that govern delegation of individual freedom and personalized problem-solving.  
549 While the results point to a collective set of preferred leadership styles, they also capture  
550 several contrasting accounts regarding the future. Among those are accounts that testify to  
551 another ongoing change relating to the implementation of more structures, processes, and  
552 collective routines, altogether following a more standardized top-down type of organizing

553 that is grounded in an overarching strive to improve organizational performance (see also  
554 Table 2, for an overview of these accounts).

555

556 The results show that the managers seemed to be unwillingly aware of this and that it evoked  
557 a lot of emotions. Next follows a series of three quotes from three different managers, all  
558 working in one of these companies, independently reflecting on these issues.

559

560 The first, Manager 9, now working in ConcrETE, but having experience also from  
561 ConstrACORP, is voicing this in a critical manner:

562

563 *At ConcrETE, it is the people that are the most important part of the company. They*  
564 *are the ones that are doing the job... and represent the 'entrepreneurs within all of*  
565 *us'. This differs from my experience working at ConstrACORP, where they tried to*  
566 *'cast us all in the same mold'. (Manager 9, Division Manager, ConcrETE)*

567

568 Another, Manager 10:

569

570 *Here at ConcrETE, we are down to earth, and we are personal. ConcrETE isn't like*  
571 *ConstrACORP, for instance.... we are more soft and more human I would say. We are*  
572 *not nearly as top-managed here. Of course, we still have our own structures and*  
573 *routines, but I believe these are not as strict as in other construction companies... and*  
574 *that is just the way we like it here at ConcrETE. We have actually been paying a lot of*  
575 *attention to preserve that specific aspect of work (Manager 10, Regional Manager,*  
576 *ConcrETE)*

577

578 And another, Manager 12:

579

580 Researcher: *If we consider leadership styles, how have they changed during the past ...let*  
581 *us say 10 years?*

582

583 Manager: *Can we say 20 years instead? [laughter] ... I would say that the leadership*  
584 *supported even more freedom back then. The project managers were 'Kings' ...restricted*  
585 *by much fewer formal rules and processes compared to now. My experience is that those*  
586 *employees that choose to leave Constracorp, ConstructINC or us at ConcrETE ....*  
587 *actually, we are not as micro-managed here at ConcrETE compared to Constracorp and*  
588 *ConstructINC ...but anyway...those that leave often do so because they want to work at*  
589 *companies where these old degrees of freedom still exist, most notable the smaller or*  
590 *medium-sized construction companies. (Manager 12, Business Area Manager, ConcrETE)*

591

592 In one of the previous sections, we presented an account from a manager that worked in  
593 Constracorp and positively proclaimed how much freedom and maneuvering space was  
594 delegated to you in construction, compared to other industries. While in this section,  
595 managers that worked for ConcrETE positively proclaimed the same, but when comparing to  
596 Constracorp. Manager 12, from the last example here, was, however more ambiguous, and  
597 pointed instead to the smaller construction companies as the true realms for the much valued  
598 and traditional 'professional freedom'. However, the variations found were only differing in  
599 scale and not in terms of the main characteristics they highlight. Altogether, they lend weight  
600 to certain leadership styles that gradually – from the past to the present – have aligned with  
601 the dominant organizing principles in these construction companies. But now – going from  
602 the present to the future – these seem to pose an unresolved tension with ongoing (albeit

603 seemingly slow) organizational transformation intended to improve construction management  
604 and organizing.

605

## 606 **DISCUSSION**

607 The results of this paper show that managers in construction companies view ‘leadership’ as a  
608 distinct set of principles and practices that they use, to varying degrees, in their day-to-day  
609 work. One such clear distinction was how the managers perceived of leadership as belonging  
610 to the ‘person-based’ domains of their work, as opposed to the ‘task-based’ domains under  
611 which they sorted all activities more directly related to the formal construction management  
612 and organizing (cf. Bass and Avolio, 1994; Conger and Kanungo, 1998; Yukl 2006;  
613 Northouse, 2016).

614

615 With that said, the managers also testified to overlaps between these two domains:  
616 emphasizing a salient alignment between their leadership styles and the inherent nature of  
617 their managerial tasks. Most notable is how ‘responsiveness’ – sensing and adapting to a  
618 constant stream of ad hoc challenges – was applied as a central principle for both their  
619 leadership of *people* and management of *tasks*. While this could point to a certain reciprocal  
620 alignment between project-based organizing and leadership (Tyssen et al., 2014) in  
621 construction companies, the results also remind of the need to critically scrutinize the  
622 underlying mechanisms of this dynamic; not least to understand to what extent leadership is  
623 transforming or being transformed by the situated organizational context at hand (e.g.,  
624 Crevani et al., 2010; Cunliffe and Eriksen, 2011; Bolden et al., 2011).

625

626 Even though leadership gradually seems to have received increased attention in the  
627 construction companies studied, it is still clearly being overshadowed by certain pervasive

628 managerial ideals relating to the significance of having profound experience and expertise of  
629 construction – that is, being foremost task-oriented. The results suggest that the uptake and  
630 legitimacy of leadership practices are largely preconditioned by embedded practices that are  
631 linked to these dominant ideals; more specifically, it appears as if leadership has foremost  
632 been adopted and enacted to strengthen and sustain traditional work and organizing in these  
633 construction companies, rather than being used to change and improve it. This is most notable  
634 in relation to how the collective leadership styles serve to broadly govern and mandate a  
635 multi-level pattern of delegation of free and independent work, under which the homogenous  
636 group of “construction experts” continue to work according to their own best practices. This  
637 finding resonates well with previous studies that have explored the uptake of other change  
638 and development-oriented practices in construction companies, such as strategic plans  
639 (Löwstedt and Räisänen, 2012), strategy workshops (Löwstedt et al., 2018), and innovation  
640 management (Nam and Tatum, 1997); altogether concluding that such ‘exogenous’ practices  
641 tend to be downplayed and shaped by existing ‘indigenous’ managerial practices, rather than  
642 having much success changing them.

643

644 While leadership seemed to have been adopted to align with current construction  
645 management and organizing, the results also point out apparent tensions in relation to  
646 envisioned future states. Table 2 (category 4) lists the most pressing organizational  
647 challenges for construction companies, as perceived by the interviewed managers; elucidating  
648 a permeating need to transform organizing and management principles to support more  
649 efficient and standardized organizational processes (to, ultimately, increase construction  
650 production performance). This puts into serious question the appropriateness of leadership  
651 styles geared foremost to be responsive to support and govern the individualized freedom and  
652 independence that construction experts have grown accustomed to.

653

654 Altogether, this study points to a lot of internal ambiguity regarding the role that current  
655 leadership styles might play to transform construction. Instead of trying to advocate for one  
656 preferred leadership style, the results are rather pointing to the fact that this ambiguity is best  
657 to be unpacked by paying more critical attention to the variances of leadership in  
658 construction. The results suggest that the homogenous leadership styles practiced by the  
659 managers can be linked to their homogenous professional backgrounds and profiles.  
660 Following the lead of the few critical voices represented in the result section might, therefore,  
661 offer an important reminder to start to question, or at least further explore, the dominant  
662 views that seem to have established that the preferred leadership styles in construction  
663 companies (for all managerial echelons) are those that are well aligned with current  
664 construction organizing practices, rather than those that might challenge and transform them.  
665 For change in construction, it might therefore be beneficial to have among the homogenous  
666 group of ‘responsive listeners’, a manager that, at least occasionally, is leading in new future  
667 directions, ‘using the whole hand’.

668

## 669 **CONCLUSIONS**

670 A growing number of construction researchers have pointed at a positive correlation between  
671 leadership and enhanced performance in various dimensions in the construction process – as  
672 it is *currently* organized. This study can conclude that certain distinct practices related to  
673 leadership indeed are perceived to be of great importance for achieving high performance in  
674 the work as a manager in construction companies. However, it can also be concluded that  
675 these same leadership practices seem to preserve status quo in these companies, rather than  
676 supporting change and development. The positive correlation between leadership and  
677 performance is thus much more questionable, if considered from a long-term perspective. The

678 clearest example drawn from this study, is how current leadership processes pose a seemingly  
679 unresolved tension with change initiatives that seek to improve organizational performance  
680 by means of reorganizing construction companies according to more streamlined and  
681 standardized processes. It is suggested that this preserving leadership effect can be linked to  
682 the high (maybe too high) degree of homogeneity that permeates both the leadership styles  
683 and the professional backgrounds of the construction managers practicing leadership.

684

### 685 **GENERALIZABILITY AND FUTURE STUDIES**

686 This study was predicated on the need for a deepened understanding of how leadership  
687 processes relate to the specifics of construction. Based on this, the study was deliberately  
688 designed to foreground in-depth meanings over general causality. Because of this, there is an  
689 inherent limit to the generalizability of the findings. While the level of saturation would  
690 suggest that the results serve to represent situated leadership characteristics in the largest  
691 construction companies in Sweden, many different variations are to be expected, for instance,  
692 in construction companies operating in other countries. This is however not mainly related to  
693 the qualitative methodology used, but rather to the fact that it is well established that  
694 leadership ideals and practices differ significantly across cultural contexts (see Brodbeck and  
695 Eisenbeiss, 2014, for a review of this extensive field of studies). It is, therefore, unsurprising  
696 that studies that have tested leadership variations across cultural contexts in construction  
697 specifically have, indeed, found such differences (Giritli and Oraz, 2004; Mäkilouko, 2004;  
698 Wong et al., 2007; Kasapoğlu, 2014).

699

700 Our case, drawn from the Swedish context, shows how the ongoing adoption of ‘modern’  
701 leadership ideals in construction companies is ridden variously with both alignments and  
702 tensions. ‘Modern’ could be seen as denoting contemporary perspectives of leadership, as it

703 is portrayed both in leadership research and popularized discourses; that, at least in Sweden,  
704 are foregrounding people before tasks, coaching and listening before directing and telling,  
705 and informal empowerment before formal and more coercive power. Seeing the increased  
706 interest and adoption of such ‘modern’ leadership ideals happening in an industry that is often  
707 criticized for being ‘unmodern’, could indeed be interpreted as a promising sign. However,  
708 zooming in on the details of these processes indicates that the transformative potential of  
709 leadership appears to be disappointing in these construction companies. Rather than a sign of  
710 inconclusiveness, these findings reflect the inherent dynamics that underly the local  
711 enactment of leadership as a certain social practice that never solely (or maybe not even  
712 mainly) is invented ‘in-house’, but is also embedded on the level of societies, as various  
713 national and cultural versions.

714

715 A strengthened leadership agenda in construction research would be characterized by a  
716 detailed understanding of the differences between general relations and variations of  
717 leadership and those that can be linked specifically to the situated construction context. By  
718 prioritizing the detailed meaning of leadership processes in construction companies, this  
719 study offers analytical rather than statistical insights (Taylor et al., 2010; Yin, 2013).

720 Therefore, the value of the findings in this paper is not mainly to be judged by how well they  
721 represent an objectified and general reality of leadership in construction, but rather by which  
722 consequences they produce (Ellis and Bochner, 2000). One such fruitful consequence would  
723 be a future stream of leadership studies by construction researchers that are characterized by  
724 an enhanced methodological richness, variously prioritizing both rigor and relevance.

725

726 **DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT**

727 Some or all data, models, or code that support the findings of this study are available from the  
728 corresponding author upon reasonable request.

729

730

## 731 **REFERENCES**

732 Alvesson, M. and Kärreman, D. (2011). *Qualitative Research and Theory Development: Mystery as Method*, Sage Publications, London.

734

735 Alvesson, M. and Sköldböck, K. (2017). *Reflexive Methodology: New Vistas for Qualitative Research*, Sage Publications, London.

737

738 Alvesson, M. and Spicer, A. (2012). Critical leadership studies: The case for critical  
739 performativity. *Human relations*, 65(3), 367-390.

740

741 Alvesson, M. and Spicer, A. (2014). Critical perspectives on leadership. *The Oxford handbook of leadership and organizations*, 40-56.

743

744 Alvesson, M. and Sveningsson, S. (2003). Managers doing leadership: The extra-  
745 ordinarization of the mundane. *Human relations*, 56(12), 1435-1459.

746

747 Alvesson, M., Blom, M. and Sveningsson, S. (2017). *Reflexive leadership: Organising in an imperfect world*. SAGE Publications Inc.

749

750 Antonakis, J. (2012). *Transformational and Charismatic Leadership*. In D. V. Day & J.  
751 Antonakis (Eds.), *The nature of leadership* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., pp. 256-288). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

752

753 Antonakis, J., Bastardo, N., Liu, Y. and Schriesheim, C. A. (2014). What makes articles  
754 highly cited?. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25(1), 152-179.

755

756 Appelbaum, S. H., St-Pierre, N., and Glavas, W. (1998). Strategic organizational change: the  
757 role of leadership, learning, motivation and productivity. *Management Decision*, 36(5), 289-  
758 301.

759

760 Barker, R. A. (2001). The nature of leadership. *Human Relations*, 54(4), 469-494.

761

762 Bass, B. M. and Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership and organizational culture.  
763 *Public administration quarterly*, 112-121.

764

765 Bass, B. M. and Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership*. Psychology press.

766

767 Bresnen, M. J., Bryman, A. E., Ford, J. R., Beardsworth, A. D. and Keil, T. E. (1986). Leader  
768 orientation of construction site managers. *Journal of Construction Engineering and*  
769 *Management*, 112(3), 370-386.

770

771 Brodbeck, F. C. and Eisenbeiss, S. (2014). Cross-cultural and global leadership. In *The*  
772 *Oxford handbook of leadership and organizations*.

773

774 Bryman, A. (2004). Qualitative research on leadership: A critical but appreciative review.  
775 *The leadership quarterly*, 15(6), 729-769.

776

777 Butler, C. J. and Chinowsky, P. S. (2006). Emotional intelligence and leadership behavior in  
778 construction executives. *Journal of management in engineering*, 22(3), 119-125.

779

780 Chan, A. T. and Chan, E. H. (2005). Impact of perceived leadership styles on work outcomes:  
781 Case of building professionals. *Journal of construction engineering and management*, 131(4),  
782 413-422.

783

784 Chan, P. and Cooper, R. (2010). *Constructing Futures: Industry leaders and futures thinking*  
785 *in construction*. John Wiley & Sons.

786

787 Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative*  
788 *analysis*. Sage.

789

790 Cladinin, D.J. and Connelly, F.M. (2000). *Narrative Inquiry: Experience and Story in*  
791 *Qualitative Research*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.

792

793 Conger, J. A. and Kanungo, R. (1998). *Charismatic leadership in organizations*. Thousand  
794 Oaks, CA: Sage.

795

796 Czarniawska, B. (2004). *Narratives in Social Science Research*, Sage Thousand Oaks, CA.

797

798 Dainty, A. R., Cheng, M. I. and Moore, D. R. (2005). Competency-based model for  
799 predicting construction project managers' performance. *Journal of Management in*  
800 *Engineering*, 21(1), 2-9.

801

802 Dainty, A. (2008). *Methodological pluralism in construction management research*. In:  
803 Knight, A., and Ruddock, 622 L. (eds.). *Advanced research methods in the built environment*.  
804 Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 1-13.

805

806 Dainty, A. (2007). *A review and critique of construction management research methods*, in  
807 Hughes, W. (ed.) *Proceedings of Construction Management and Economics 25th Anniversary*  
808 *Conference*, University of Reading, 16–18 July, p. 143

809

810 Day, D. V. (2014). *Introduction: Leadership and organizations*. In D. V. Day (Ed.), *Oxford*  
811 *library of psychology. The Oxford handbook of leadership and organizations* (p. 3–12).  
812 Oxford University Press.

813

814 Day, D. V. and Lord, R. G. (1988). Executive leadership and organizational performance:  
815 Suggestions for a new theory and methodology. *Journal of management*, 14(3), 453-464.

816

817 Diaz-Saenz, H. R. (2011). *Transformational leadership*. The SAGE handbook of leadership,  
818 5(1), 299-310.

819

820 Dubois, A. and Gadde, L. E. (2002). The construction industry as a loosely coupled system:  
821 implications for productivity and innovation. *Construction Management and Economics*,  
822 20(7), 621-631.

823

824 Dulaimi, M. F., and Langford, D. (1999). Job behavior of construction project managers:  
825 determinants and assessment. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 125(4),  
826 256-264.

827

828 Duman, D. U., Green, S. D. and Larsen, G. D. (2019). Historical narratives as strategic  
829 resources: analysis of the Turkish international contracting sector. *Construction Management*  
830 *and Economics*, 37(7), 367-383.

831

832

833 Ellis, C. and Bochner, A. (2000). *Autoethnography, personal narrative, reflexivity:*  
834 *researcher as subject*, in Denzin, Norman and Lincoln, Yvonna (eds.) *The Handbook of*  
835 *Qualitative Research*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 733–68.

836

837

838 Fairhurst, G. (2007). *Discursive Leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

839

840 Fellows, R., Liu, A., and Fong, C. M. (2003). Leadership style and power relations in  
841 quantity surveying in Hong Kong. *Construction Management and Economics*, 21(8), 809-  
842 818.

843

844 Fellows, R. (2010). New research paradigms in the built environment. *Construction*  
845 *Innovation*, 10(1), 5-13.

846

847 Flyvbjerg, B. (2006). Five misunderstandings about case-study research. *Qualitative Inquiry*,  
848 12 (2), pp. 219-245.

849

850 Fraser, C. (2000). The influence of personal characteristics on effectiveness of construction  
851 site managers. *Construction management & economics*, 18(1),

852

853 Gardner, W. L., Lowe, K. B., Moss, T. W., Mahoney, K. T. and Cogliser, C. C. (2010).  
854 Scholarly leadership of the study of leadership: A review of *The Leadership Quarterly's*  
855 second decade, 2000–2009. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21(6), 922-958.

856

857 Gilley, A., McMillan, H. S. and Gilley, J. W. (2009). Organizational change and  
858 characteristics of leadership effectiveness. *Journal of leadership & organizational studies*,  
859 *16*(1), 38-47.

860

861 Gill, P.B. (2001). Narrative inquiry: designing the processes, pathways and patterns of  
862 change. *Systems Research and Behavioral Science: The Official Journal of the International*  
863 *Federation for Systems Research*, Vol. 18 No. 4, pp. 335-344.

864

865 Giritli, H. and Oraz, G. T. (2004). Leadership styles: some evidence from the Turkish  
866 construction industry. *Construction Management and Economics*, *22*(3), 253-262.

867

868 Guest, G., Bunce, A. and Johnson, L. (2006). How many interviews are enough? An  
869 experiment with data saturation and variability. *Field methods*, *18*(1), 59-82.

870

871 Kasapoğlu, E. (2014). Leadership styles in architectural design offices in Turkey. *Journal of*  
872 *Construction Engineering and Management*, *140*(2), 04013047

873

874 Kisfalvi, V. (2002) The Entrepreneur's Character, Life Issues, and Strategy Making - A Field  
875 Study, *Journal of Business Venturing*, *17*: 489-518.

876

877 Kotter, J. (1990). *A force for change. How leadership differs from management*, the Free  
878 Press, 1990.

879

880 Langford, DA., Fellows, R., Hancock, M. and Gale, A. *Human resource management in*  
881 *construction*. London: Longman; 1995.

882

883 Liden, R. C. and Antonakis, J. (2009). Considering context in psychological leadership  
884 research. *Human relations*, *62*(11), 1587-1605.

885

886 Lowe, K. B., and Gardner, W. L. (2000). Ten years of the leadership quarterly: Contributions  
887 and challenges for the future. *The leadership quarterly*, *11*(4), 459-514.

888

889 Löwstedt, M. and Räisänen, C. (2012). 'Playing back-spin balls': narrating organizational  
890 change in construction. *Construction Management and Economics*, Vol. 30 No. 9, pp. 795-  
891 806.

892

893 Löwstedt, M., Räisänen, C. and Leiringer, R. (2018). Doing strategy in project-based  
894 organizations: Actors and patterns of action. *International journal of project management*,  
895 36(6), 889-898.

896

897 McCabe, S., Rooke, J., Seymour, D. and Brown, P. (1998) Quality managers, authority and  
898 leadership. *Construction management and economics*, 16(4), 447–457.

899

900 Mhatre, K. H. and Riggio, R. E. (2014). Charismatic and transformational leadership: Past,  
901 present, and future. *The Oxford handbook of leadership and organizations*, 221-240.

902

903 Mäkilouko, M. (2004). Coping with multicultural projects: the leadership styles of Finnish  
904 project managers. *International Journal of Project Management*, 22(5), 387-396.

905

906 Nadler, D. A. and Tushman, M. L. (1994). *Beyond the charismatic leader: Leadership and*  
907 *organizational change*. The training and development sourcebook, 278-292  
908 223-233.

909 Nam, C. H. and Tatum, C. B. (1997). Leaders and champions for construction innovation.  
910 *Construction management and economics*, 15(3), 259–270.

911

912 Northouse, P. (2016). *Leadership: Theory and Practice* (7th Ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

913

914 Odusami, K. T., Iyagba, R. R. O. and Omirin, M. M. (2003). The relationship between  
915 project leadership, team composition and construction project performance in Nigeria.  
916 *International journal of project management*, 21(7), 519-527.

917

918 Ofori, G. (2008). Leadership for future construction industry: Agenda for authentic  
919 leadership. *International Journal of Project Management*, 26(6), 620-630.

920

921 Ozorovskaja, R., Voordijk, J. T. and Wilderom, C. P. (2007). Leadership and cultures of  
922 Lithuanian and Dutch construction firms. *Journal of construction engineering and*  
923 *management*, 133(11), 900-911.

924

925 Parker, S. K., and Wu, C. H. (2014). *Leading for proactivity: How leaders cultivate staff who*  
926 *make things happen*. The Oxford handbook of leadership and organizations, 380-403

927

928 Parry, K W and Bryman, A. (2006). *Leadership in organizations*. In: S. R. Clegg, C. Hardy,  
929 T.B. Lawrence, and W. R. Nord (Eds.), The SAGE handbook of organization studies (2nd  
930 ed.). London: Sage.

931

932 Patton, M. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks,  
933 CA:Sage

934

935 Sage, D and Vitry, C. (2018). *Introduction: Societies Under Construction*, Palgrave  
936 Macmillan, Cham, pp. 115-149.

937

938 Seymour, D. and Abd Elhaleem, T. (1991). 'Horses for courses'—effective leadership in  
939 construction. *International Journal of Project Management*, 9(4), 228-232.

940

941 Skipper, C. O. and Bell, L. C. (2006). Assessment with 360 evaluations of leadership  
942 behavior in construction project managers. *Journal of Management in Engineering*, 22(2),  
943 75-80.

944

945 Strauss, A. L. and Corbin, J. M. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory*  
946 *procedures and techniques*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

947

948 Sundgren, M. and Styhre, A, (2006). Leadership as de-paradoxification: Leading new drug  
949 development work at three pharmaceutical companies, *Leadership*, 2(1): 31-52.

950

951 Taylor, J.E., Dossick, C.S. and Garvin, M. (2010). Meeting the burden of proof with case-  
952 study research. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, Vol. 137 No. 4, pp.  
953 303-311

954  
 955 Thomas, D. R. (2006). A general inductive approach for analyzing qualitative evaluation  
 956 data. *American journal of evaluation*, 27(2), 237-246.  
 957  
 958 Toor, S. and Ofori, G. (2007). *Leadership research in the construction industry: A review of*  
 959 *empirical work and possible future directions*. CME 2007 Conference - Construction  
 960 Management and Economics: 'Past, Present and Future' : 993-1003.  
 961  
 962 Tyssen, A. K., Wald, A. and Spieth, P. (2014). The challenge of transactional and  
 963 transformational leadership in projects. *International Journal of Project Management*, 32(3),  
 964 365-375.  
 965  
 966 Yin, R.K. (2013). Validity and generalization in future case study evaluations. *Evaluation*,  
 967 19(3), pp. 321-332.  
 968  
 969 Yukl, G (2008) "Leadership in organizations". New Jersey: Prentice Hall. Upper Saddle  
 970 River.  
 971  
 972 Wang, G., Oh, I. S., Courtright, S. H. and Colbert, A. E. (2011). Transformational leadership  
 973 and performance across criteria and levels: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of research.  
 974 *Group & organization management*, 36(2), 223-270.  
 975  
 976 Wong, J., Wong, P. N. and Heng, L. (2007). An investigation of leadership styles and  
 977 relationship cultures of Chinese and expatriate managers in multinational construction  
 978 companies in Hong Kong. *Construction Management and Economics*, 25(1), 95-106.  
 979

980 **TABLES 1 and 2**

981 *Table 1. Overview of the overarching themes used in the interviews.*

<b>Professional background and competencies</b>
---

*We asked the managers to tell us their professional stories, starting with their educational backgrounds, followed by a description of their career trajectories leading up to their current positions. We also asked them what professional requirements (competencies and experience) had qualified them for their current managerial position.*

### **Leadership definition and orientation**

*We asked for their definitions of leadership and then for a detailed description of their own leadership philosophies, styles, and practices*

### **Leadership practice**

*This perspective informed our follow-up questions throughout all the interviews. Rather than only letting them talk about leadership in abstract and general terms, we constantly asked them to provide concrete and detailed examples from day-to-day organizational life, linking leadership to the actual conditions of their work.*

### **Leadership differences**

*We asked how leadership is different in the construction industry compared to other industries and contexts. While almost none of the managers had any actual experience from working in any other industry, their reflections on the perceived differences offered a rich stock of accounts that elucidated the specifics of construction in terms of a leadership context.*

### **Leadership in change**

*We asked if and how the leadership styles had changed from past to present time. We also asked them to speculate about the future, specifically to reflect on the role that leadership*

*might have for the wide range of challenges faced by construction companies and their managers.*

982

983 *Table 2. A detailed overview of the analytical process.*

<b>Selective code:</b> Leadership vis-à-vis other skills	<b>Axial codes:</b> Informal and formal work requirements	<b>Open codes:</b> Skills and experience needed for the job
Result Category A:  “Adding leadership on top of construction expertise”	Work requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction skills (18)</li> <li>• Business skills (10)</li> <li>• Team Building skills (6)</li> <li>• Organizing skills (6)</li> <li>• Leadership skills (5)</li> </ul>
	Grounds for promotion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong track record of construction management (17)</li> <li>• Ambition (8)</li> <li>• Personal characteristics (7)</li> <li>• Leadership (4)</li> <li>• Collaboration (3)</li> </ul>

**EXPLANATION RESULT CATEGORY A:** The **Open codes** are keywords used to describe the skills and experience required in their jobs (numbers in brackets indicate the number of interviewees that included them as part of their descriptions). Only keywords mentioned in more than one interview are included here. The **Axial codes** distinguish between how they described the work requirements in general and how they answered the direct question: “on what basis did you get promoted to your current position?”. While there exist many possible overlaps across the **Open codes** listed here, the aggregated **Selective Code** represents the strong preference and priority given to construction expertise, experience, and track record, in which other skills, including leadership, are given secondary importance. This analytical inference is further supported by the fact that an aggregated summary of the managers’ professional backgrounds shows that 20/24 of the managers have worked their whole careers in construction companies, and only 4/24 have been recruited from other organizational contexts. Number 1 of these exceptions was recruited from a real estate company. Number 2 started the career in construction and switched over to the transport sector for a brief period of time, but then missed working in construction and therefore returned back. Number 3 worked in academia as a researcher and was recruited to the central functions working with organizational development. Number 4 had a profile that stood out, by having experience from working as a manager in a large multinational car company.

<b>Selective code:</b> Overall Leadership Approach	<b>Axial codes:</b> Leadership themes	<b>Open codes:</b> Keyword used to describe leadership
Result Category B:  “Responsive Leadership”	Listen (rather than telling)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Listen (19)</li> <li>• Trying to understand the needs of others (15)</li> <li>• Facilitate open dialogues (9)</li> <li>• “See” others (8)</li> <li>• Negotiate consensus (8)</li> <li>• Coaching (6)</li> </ul>
	Being personal and flexible	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adapt/adjust leadership to different personalities (15)</li> <li>• Be skilled in the ‘people business’ (15)</li> <li>• Be friendly and informal (14)</li> </ul>
	Accommodate needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trying to accommodate the work-related needs of others (17)</li> <li>• Trying to accommodate the personal development of others (14)</li> </ul>
	Responsiveness (11)	The English translation of the Swedish word “Lyhördhet”, the meaning of which encapsulates a combination of the three previous axial codes: <b>listen</b> and <b>understand</b> the needs of the employees, with the purpose of trying to <b>accommodate</b> those <b>needs</b> by being <b>flexible</b>

**EXPLANATION RESULT CATEGORY B:** The three columns here represent a three-step aggregation of the managers’ leadership descriptions (only descriptions used in more than one interview is included here). “Responsiveness” is listed both as the overall **Selective code** and one of the four **Axial codes**. This is because it was used both directly as a leadership keyword as well as representing a central notion in the descriptions of leadership styles, that permeates all the **Axial codes**. 11/24 of the managers used “Responsiveness” directly

when describing their Leadership style. In addition to those, eight managers used a combination of *all* the other three Axial codes in their descriptions, altogether indicating that 19 of the 24 managers foregrounded “Responsiveness” as their overall Leadership Approach.

<b>Selective Code:</b> Responsive Leadership as an organizing principle	<b>Axial codes:</b> Logical linkages between Responsive Leadership and daily managerial work tasks and organizing challenges	<b>Open codes:</b>
Result Category C:  <b>“The alignment between leadership and current organizing principles”</b>	Delegating “freedom with responsibility” (evaluating work outcomes rather than work methods)	Same as Category B
	Allowing high degrees of flexibility for work tasks is a requirement for the complex problem-solving needed	
	To listen (rather than telling) was perceived as the most effective way to empower employees, which in turn supports task performance	
	Marked a clear contrast to more directing and coercive leadership styles that were deemed inappropriate in general (key metaphors: “NOT being a dictator”, “NOT being a micromanager”, “NOT pointing with the whole hand”)	

**EXPLANATION RESULT CATEGORY C:** Category C prolongs Category B to link “Responsive Leadership” to the corresponding organizing principles. This analytical step thus reviewed all the concrete examples and explanations of “Responsive Leadership” as it was used to support the situated managerial work tasks and organizing challenges in the construction companies studied.

<b>Selective code:</b> Comparing axial codes with Result Categories B and C	<b>Axial codes:</b> Organizing principles	<b>Open codes:</b> Organizational challenges (ongoing and future)
Result Category D:  <b>“The tension between leadership and future organizing principles”</b>	Standardization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Digitalization (12)</li> <li>● Standardization (11)</li> <li>● Reduce costs (10)</li> <li>● Sustainability (9)</li> <li>● Productivity (8)</li> <li>● Efficiency (8)</li> <li>● Industrialization (7)</li> <li>● Attract new competence (6)</li> <li>● Centralization (5)</li> <li>● Increase number of women (4)</li> <li>● Safety (3)</li> <li>● Decrease building time (2)</li> <li>● Knowledge transfer (2)</li> <li>● Increase Innovation (2)</li> <li>● Change the macho culture (2)</li> </ul>
	Centralization	
	Integrated multi-level processes	
	Top-down directions (Mandatory, rather than guiding)	

**EXPLANATION RESULT CATEGORY D:** The **Open codes** list all the organizational challenges (ongoing and future) mentioned by the interviewees (including only those mentioned in more than one interview). The **Axial code** column represents the most accentuated organizing logics that were linked to these challenges. The **Selective code** represents the overall tension found by comparing the converging logic throughout the **Axial Codes** with the Result Categories B and C. In the result and discussion sections we draw also on the fact that most of the organizational challenges outlined here are directly or indirectly related to an overall strive to improve the performance of construction processes and organizing (regarding a variety of different performance dimensions, such as time, cost, quality, productivity, efficiency, waste elimination).

984

985

986

987

988