Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies
Volume 14 Number 4
May 2008 332-341
© 2008 Baker College
10.1177/1548051808315549
http://jlos.sagepub.com
hosted at
http://online.sagepub.com

Leadership Style and Team Processes in Self-Managed Teams

Stephanie T. Solansky
University of Houston–Victoria

Team leadership merits continued attention because leaders have an impact on how the team develops and performs. In this article, team processes are explored within self-managed teams that develop different leadership styles. In particular, two leadership styles are compared: shared leadership and single leadership. The results of the study suggest that teams with shared leadership have motivational and cognitive advantages over teams that took the traditional approach of relying on a single leader. The article concludes with a discussion of the results, implications, and future research opportunities.

Keywords: *leadership; shared leadership; self-managed teams; motivation; cognition*

Two key concepts in organizational studies are explored in this article: leadership and teams. In particular, this article represents an empirical analysis of leadership styles and team processes within self-managed teams. Self-managed teams have the autonomy to make important decisions concerning their team processes (Katzenbach & Smith, 1993; S. G. Cohen, 1991; Yukl, 1998). A key team process is leadership. Without leadership, team members are unlikely to identify with team objectives (Sivasubramaniam, Murry, Avolio, & Jung, 2002). Barry (1991) argued that self-managed teams need more leadership than conventional teams around both task-related issues and team development issues. However, because leadership is not designated in self-managed teams, an interesting question is: What do leadership processes look like in these types of teams?

The motivation behind this article is to explore the notion that if the necessity of leadership does not disappear in teams where no leader is designated, then do self-managed teams emerge with a single leader who assumes a dominant position or a collective sense of leadership where the functions of leadership are shared among the team members? In addition, the other key processes that self-managed teams must attend to are likely impacted by which type of leadership emerges. In other words, how are team motivational, cognitive, and social processes impacted by whether a dominant person assumes the leadership role or if the team shares the leadership function? It is the purpose of this article to provide some exploratory, empirical evidence of how these key processes (motivational, cognitive, and social) are influenced by the type of leadership process that emerges within self-managed teams.

Literature Review

Organizations are increasingly employing teams as their fundamental organizing unit (Salas & Fiore, 2004). For example, some estimates claim 80% of companies with 100 or more employees rely on teams and groups for their everyday work (Peterson, Mitchell, Thompson, & Burr, 2000; S. G. Cohen & Bailey, 1997). In addition, Offerman and Spiros (2001) found that managers spend almost 40% of their time working with teams or groups, and almost 50% of these managers report that the demand for team development will increase. Organizations have clearly found teams to be effective. The combination of skills, expertise, and resources of team members enable the team to potentially optimize the speed and efficiency in which complex tasks can be completed (McComb, Green, & Compton, 1999).

A team is a group for which there are assigned role functions, usually limited life span membership, and a conscious awareness of interdependency (Salas,

Dickinson, Converse, & Tannenbaum, 1992). Several team processes need to be undertaken to maintain these role functions and awareness of interdependency. Peterson et al. (2000) and Yoo and Kanawattanachai (2001) suggested that there are different types of team processes (motivation, cognition, and socialization) and argued that research needs to examine these multiple processes at work in teams. Team motivation is a critical team process because without it teams are not going to exert the necessary effort to complete tasks (Zaccaro, Rittman, & Marks, 2001). Team socialization is a critical team process because teams need to be cohesive to perform well and be committed to the team's objectives (House & Shamir, 1993). Team cognition is a critical team process because it represents the acquisition, storage, manipulation, and use of information within teams (Klimoski & Mohammed, 1994). The goal in this article is to understand how motivational, social, and cognitive team processes are impacted in regard to leadership style.

Shared Leadership and Self-Managed Teams

Often work teams are allowed to self-manage their team processes, that is, the team has the authority and responsibility to manage how their team functions. In addition, typically self-managed teams have no formal leader designated by the authority that creates the team. Rather, the team is allowed to designate its own leader. What is interesting from the standpoint of leadership is whether a self-managed team over time emerges with a "leader" in the traditional sense of someone who assumes a dominant position and is the major source of influence for both task and social processes or if the team develops a collective sense of leadership where the traditional functions of the leader are shared among the team members.

Leadership in teams is an area that merits more attention because its potential impacts on team functioning are key. Zaccaro et al. (2001) maintained that leadership processes influence team cognitive, motivational, and affective processes. Moreover, the leadership process affects the attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors of the team members (Ensley, Pearson, & Pearce, 2003). Thus, leadership processes and team processes are closely linked. This article examines the influence of leadership style on three team processes. Specifically, this article reports an exploratory study that shows teams can develop different approaches to leadership processes: Some teams rely on a single leader, and others rely on a collective sense of shared leadership. The leadership process (shared vs. nonshared) in turn affects motivational, social, and cognitive team processes.

Most definitions of leadership assume that it is a process of intentional influence by one person over others "to guide, structure, and facilitate activities and relationships in a group or organization" (Yukl, 1998, p. 3). The traditional view of leadership is that it is in the "hands" of a single individual. However, the concepts of shared or distributed leadership have made their way into recent research agendas. Yukl (1998) for example argued that a controversy in the field of leadership research is based on whether leadership should be viewed as a role played by an individual or as a social influence process. The traditional perspective of a single leader suggests that the leadership function is a specialized role that cannot be shared without jeopardizing group effectiveness. This view represents the more hierarchical leadership in which the leader directs all activities (Ensley et al., 2003). In contrast, shared leadership represents teams whose members are empowered to share the tasks and responsibilities of leadership (Ensley et al., 2003; Katzenbach, 1997). Those who view leadership as a shared process argue "important decisions about what to do and how to do it are made through the use of an interactive process that involves many different people who influence each other, not by a single person" (Yukl, 1998, p. 3).

The notion of shared or distributive leadership is not novel, though it has been somewhat ignored in comparison to solo leadership (Ensley et al., 2003; O'Toole, Galbraith, & Lawler, 2002). The resistance to shared leadership "stems from thousands of years of cultural conditioning . . . in the popular mind, leadership is always singular" (O'Toole et al., 2002, p. 65). Some early behavioral research that mentioned the possibility of the leadership function being shared among group members rather than performed by a single individual is present in the work of Gibb (1954), Slater (1955), and Bowers and Seashore (1966). Other, more recent work includes M. H. Brown and Hosking (1986), Barry (1991), Katzenbach and Smith (1993), Bass (1997), Yukl (1999), and Gronn (2002).

Gronn (2002) suggested that the exploration of leadership would be better served if the units of analysis were expanded beyond the individual. In addition, Yukl (1999) argued that several members of a group can share leadership functions and that the actions of an individual leader are less important than the possibilities of a collective leadership. Some research supports the notion that shared leadership is likely to

occur in self-managed teams (Yukl, 1998), largely due to their autonomy in developing group processes. Individuals in self-managed teams have much of the responsibility and authority to make important decisions turned over to them (Katzenbach & Smith, 1993; S. G. Cohen, 1991). Self-managed teams are given the power to make decisions, set goals, assign work, determine schedules, and so on (Yukl, 1998). However, the necessity of leadership processes does not disappear because a team is self-managed. Barry (1991) in fact argued that self-managed teams need more leadership than conventional teams. He claimed that "in addition to needing task-based leadership (such as project definition, scheduling, and resource gathering), self managed teams require leadership around group development processes (developing cohesiveness, establishing effective communication patterns, and so forth)" (p. 32). Without leadership, team members are unlikely to identify with or be motivated by team objectives (Sivasubramanian et al., 2002).

The usual assumption however is that a single individual emerges to direct and coordinate both task and social processes. Yet single individual leadership does not always emerge. Sometimes teams manage themselves relying on collective or shared leadership processes. Bradford (1976) suggested that teams that share the leadership function will be more satisfied with their team, and Katzenbach and Smith (1993) found that teams that engage in shared leadership are more effective than other teams. Teams with shared leadership have better coordination and cooperation (Yeatts & Hyten, 1998), and Perry, Pearce, and Sims (1999) argued that shared leadership enhances the team's interpretation of needs. Based on a review of recent research, Ensley et al. (2003) suggested that "shared leadership is a more important predictor of team effectiveness than simply the leadership exhibited by the team leader" (p. 333). In addition, teams that shift the leadership function are more effective in regard to performance (Katzenbach, 1997). In sum, shared leadership is proposed to be beneficial to team processes in part because there are more "heads" and "hands" (i.e., leaders) to attend to the team's developmental and functioning needs, particularly the motivational, social, and cognitive processes needed for the team's performance.

Motivation Process: Collective Efficacy and Shared Leadership

Efficacy is a motivational term that refers to an individual's belief in his or her ability to perform job duties with skill (Gist, 1987; Spreitzer, 1995). *Efficacy* is often used interchangeably with *competence* (Spreitzer, 1995), and a sense of competence is believed to enhance persistence (Gecas, 1989). Efficacy within a team is referred to as *collective efficacy* and reflects team members' confidence that the team can perform well (Zaccaro, Blair, Peterson, & Zazanis, 1995). Zaccaro et al. (2001) suggested that the more confidence among the team, the more motivated its members will be.

Collective efficacy (performance confidence) emerges from team influence processes (Bandura, 1982), and efficacy may be the leader's most important motivational task (Zaccaro et al., 2001). But, such collective efficacy is likely to be more powerful when several team members are pursuing it rather than a single individual. That is, when leadership is shared, team members are motivating each other, creating a team climate of interdependent reinforcement (Ensley et al., 2003).

Hypothesis 1: Teams that establish shared leadership will have higher collective efficacy scores than those without shared leadership.

Social Process: Relationship Conflict and Shared Leadership

Conflict has two primary dimensions: task conflict and relationship conflict (Jehn, 1999). Relationship conflict is a social process and is defined as tension generated by emotional and interpersonal struggles. Relationship conflict is dysfunctional conflict because it inhibits teams from accomplishing tasks. In addition to enhancing efficacy, an important leader task is minimizing the team's relationship conflict and building team cohesion and identity (M. E. Brown & Gioia, 2002). The leader is the champion and keeper of the team's values, and the team's values provide the core of its identity, the sense of "who we are" (Sivasubramaniam et al., 2002). Teams with more cohesion and less relationship conflict often perform well because the leader has personalized individual commitment to the team's objectives (House & Shamir, 1993).

Ensley et al. (2003) noted that shared leadership enables a kind of interaction and socialization that is manifest in cohesion. In its essence, minimizing relationship conflict enhances group cohesion and a shared vision. Moreover, Ensley et al. alluded to the positive relationship of shared leadership and collective vision by suggesting the development of team vision is less

likely to occur if imposed by a solo leader than if imposed by multiple team members. O'Toole et al. (2002) suggested that individuals involved in shared leadership systems are more willing to adhere to the values and be committed to their teams and thus demonstrate less relational conflict. It seems shared leadership allows for stronger team cohesion, which means less relational conflict because that cohesion is allowed to emerge naturally rather than be imposed by a single leader (M. E. Brown & Gioia, 2002). Thus, shared leadership should be associated with less relational conflict.

Hypothesis 2: Teams that establish shared leadership will have lower relational conflict scores than those without shared leadership.

Cognitive Process: Transactive Memory System and Shared Leadership

Team cognition is an important part of basic team functioning. Team cognition relates to the processes that acquire, store, manipulate, and use information for the purpose of creating a group-level intellectual product (Klimoski & Mohammed, 1994). Cognitions generally require the team to develop shared maps and models of incoming data that will aid meaningful interpretation and reduce both information overload and uncertainty (Klimoski & Mohammed, 1994). That is, the team develops a shared or common way of thinking about themselves and their activities. Transactive memory is a critical cognitive component to team processes because it represents a shared system for encoding, storing, and retrieving information; it is the metaknowledge of who knows what in the team (Moreland, 1999; Wegner, 1987; Yoo & Kanawattanachai, 2001). It basically represents knowing what other team members know. A transactive memory system exists if team members know what special knowledge or expertise others on the team possess. Each team member knows "who to go to" for answers.

The essence of the transactive memory function is the identification of capabilities and understanding what is possible based on who knows what. Although a single leader may be able to enable the development of the team's transactive memory, it seems more likely that broader participation among team members will allow the team a more comprehensive understanding of their potential and understanding of team capabilities to complete tasks (Vroom & Yetton, 1973). Thus, shared leadership may be more effective in diagnosing and solving problems (Zaccaro et al., 2001) because there are multiple people attending to the awareness of team member skills. Teams with shared leadership may be more willing to take initiative to understand where skills and capabilities are located through a transactive memory system and thus act intelligently and with a sense of urgency (O'Toole et al., 2002). Ensley et al. (2003) argued that teams with shared leadership tend to understand more, thus shared leader teams are likely to have a better understanding of team member skills and capabilities.

Hypothesis 3: Teams that establish shared leadership will have higher transactive memory system scores than those without shared leadership.

Method

Sample

This article reports the results of a laboratory study of 20 work teams. The team members were students in an undergraduate management class at a large university in the Southwestern United States. The individuals were on average 24.9 years old, and half of them were women. Teams ranged from three to five members with an average size of four. All teams had gender and ethnical diversity represented within their team. The instructor did not choose the team members; instead, teams were allowed to form on a voluntary basis.

Throughout 16 weeks, the teams competed against one another in various activities, including the creation, design, and construction of products and services. The competitions included activities designed by the instructor, which included creating a clothing article; building a novel, model piece of furniture; and designing and building a bridge. The activities also included competitions chosen by the teams, which included writing a children's story, developing a slogan for their university, and creating a music video. All teams took these activities very seriously as they represented a significant proportion of their final course grade. The only role of the instructor during these competitions was to facilitate timing, bring in the necessary materials for each team, and provide a general idea of what the tasks were. The teams were self-managed in that the instructor did not assign roles, provide goals, or provide suggestions about how the team should manage itself, communicate, or interact. Each team had complete autonomy in establishing how and to what extent it would meet its goals.

Data Sources

Surveys. The team members filled out surveys measuring collective efficacy, relational conflict, and transactive memory system. Participants responded to the items using a 7-point Likert scale, with 1 = *strongly disagree* and 7 = *strongly agree*.

Collective efficacy. Collective efficacy was measured using the competency items of Spreitzer's (1995) measure of psychological empowerment. Spreitzer generated these items based on Gist's (1987) definition of efficacy. The three items were adapted to measure team efficacy (competency) rather than at the individual level.

Relational conflict. Relational conflict was measured by an adapted version of a three-item scale initially developed by Jehn (1999) and revalidated by Pearson, Ensley, and Amason (2002). The items were aggregated and averaged to measure relational conflict.

Transactive memory system. Transactive memory was measured using three items adopted from Faraj and Sproull (1998) and used by Yoo and Kanawattanachai (2001). The scale captures the extent to which team members perceive that they know who possesses what knowledge in the team. The team members' responses were averaged to attain an overall team score for transactive memory system.

Please see Appendix A for a list of the items and their respective Cronbach's alphas. Interrater agreement was calculated for each variable for each team to ensure the appropriateness of aggregating individual responses to the team level of analysis using the James, Demaree, and Wolf (1984) procedure. All interrater measures for all teams and constructs were above .75, which indicates aggregation is appropriate.

Role charts. Each team reported on who fulfilled various roles using a sociogram nominating process. Each team member reported on his or her role on the team and also the roles of teammates. Reports of leadership behavior were evaluated using content analysis. A team was considered to have shared leadership if at least 50% of the team members identified multiple individuals as their leaders. Teams in which only one leader was identified are categorized in the nonshared leadership group.

Journal entries. Team processes were also measured by examining a journal that each team member kept. That is, the journal entries were used as another way to capture the team members' sense of team process and as a check on the emergence of a single leader or shared leadership. The team members were free to describe their team's functioning any way they wished, and again, content analysis was used to document the emergence of either a single leader or shared leadership within each team. Journal entries were not shared with teammates to encourage forthrightness and honesty in the team's assessment: Only the instructor saw the journal entries. Sample comments from the journals are presented in Appendix B. Overall, the leadership patterns (either single leader or shared leadership) were both clearly and consistently reported in the journals.

Control Variables

Control variables were used in this study to account for possible variations in regard to team size and whether the individuals had been on teams together before. Team size may impact team processes because those with more members may be better able to share the workload, or conversely, smaller teams might be easier to manage. Team size was calculated as the total number of group members. Whether the individuals had been on teams together before might impact the teams' processes because some aspects of motivational, cognitive, and social development may be present within those members because they have already worked together. The participants were asked to answer yes or no to "Have you ever worked with any of your teammates before this class?" Prior team experience was determined by calculating the percentage of team members who had worked with other members prior to this particular class.

Data Analysis

Analysis of variance was used to test collective efficacy, relational conflict, and transactive memory system for differences between teams with shared leadership and teams with a single (i.e., nonshared) leader. First, the teams were assigned to one of two categories: shared leadership or nonshared leadership. Of the teams, 11 identified only one leader and thus were assigned to the nonshared leadership category; 9 of the teams were assigned to the shared leadership category because at least two leaders were identified by more than 50% of their team members.

Results

Table 1 presents the descriptive and correlation information for all variables. Table 2 presents the

Table 1
Descriptives and Correlations ($N = 20$)

	Leader Type (1 = *not shared*; 2 = *shared*)	Collective Efficacy	Relational Conflict	Transactive Memory	Team Size	Prior Experience
Mean	1.45	5.79	2.21	5.35	4.25	0.10
Standard deviation	0.51	0.50	0.87	0.65	0.79	0.20
Leader type	1					
Collective efficacy	0.60**	1				
Relational conflict	–0.28	–0.69**	1			
Transactive memory	0.54*	0.57**	–0.26	1		
Team size	0.10	–0.10	0.15	–0.04	1	
Prior experience	0.08	–0.23	–0.07	–0.01	–0.03	1

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed); *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 2
Means and Standard Deviations

	Shared Leadership Teams		Nonshared Leadership Teams	
Variables	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Collective efficacy	6.11	.42	5.52	0.40
Relational conflict	1.94	.55	2.43	1.03
Transactive memory	5.74	.47	5.04	0.63
Team size	4.33	.87	4.18	0.75
Prior experience	0.11	.22	0.08	0.18

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 3
ANOVA Results

	Sum of Squares	*df*	*F*	*p* Value
Collective efficacy				
Between	1.72	1	10.19	.01
Within	3.04	18		
Total	4.76	19		
Relational conflict				
Between	1.16	1	1.59	.22
Within	13.11	18		
Total	14.27	19		
Transactive memory				
Between	2.38	1	7.51	.01
Within	5.71	18		
Total	8.09	19		

descriptive statistics based on type of leadership for all variables. Table 3 presents the analysis of variance results. The data in Table 3 support Hypothesis 1. Collective efficacy is higher for the shared leadership teams (6.11 vs. 5.52; $F = 10.19$; $p < .01$). Hypothesis 2 is not supported. The differences in scores for relational conflict is not significant ($F = 1.59$; $p = .22$); however, shared leadership teams did have lower averages (less relational conflict) than nonshared leadership teams (1.94 vs. 2.43). Hypothesis 3 is supported. The differences in scores for transactive memory system reach conventional levels of statistical significance (5.74 vs. 5.04; $F = 7.51$; $p = .01$).

As an extension of analysis of variance between the teams representing each quadrant, analysis of covariance is used to explore the differences between the quadrants while controlling for team size and prior experience with each other. ANCOVA, by removing the influences of these variables, can increase the power of the *F* tests, which is useful when the sample size is small (Pallant, 2001). The results of this analysis are presented in Table 4. According to this table, the differences between the teams with shared leadership and those without are still significant in regard to collective efficacy and transactive memory system even when the other variables are controlled for.

Discussion

This study provides evidence that a work team can find a stronger sense of competence (efficacy) and a stronger transactive memory system when leadership is shared. Although this study did not demonstrate conventional levels of significance in regard to relational conflict scores, the scores for teams with shared leadership were on average lower than scores of teams with traditional leadership. Leadership is traditionally considered to be an exercise in the influence of a single individual, and so the idea of several people fulfilling a leader's function for a work team

Table 4
Analysis of Covariance Results

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	Significance
Corrected model	Collective efficacy	2.22	3.00	0.74	4.66	.02
	Relational conflict	1.64	3.00	0.55	0.69	.57
	Transactive memory	2.47	3.00	0.82	2.34	.11
Intercept	Collective efficacy	24.67	1.00	24.67	155.31	.00
	Relational conflict	1.14	1.00	1.14	1.44	.25
	Transactive memory	20.13	1.00	20.13	57.31	.00
Team size	Collective efficacy	0.13	1.00	0.13	0.85	.37
	Relational conflict	0.45	1.00	0.45	0.57	.46
	Transactive memory	0.07	1.00	0.07	0.19	.67
Prior experience	Collective efficacy	0.38	1.00	0.38	2.37	.14
	Relational conflict	0.02	1.00	0.02	0.03	.87
	Transactive memory	0.02	1.00	0.02	0.06	.81
Shared versus not shared	Collective efficacy	1.92	1.00	1.92	12.06	.00**
	Relational conflict	1.26	1.00	1.26	1.60	.22
	Transactive memory	2.46	1.00	2.46	6.99	.02*
Error	Collective efficacy	2.54	16.00	0.16		
	Relational conflict	12.63	16.00	0.79		
	Transactive memory	5.62	16.00	0.35		
Total	Collective efficacy	674.79	20.00			
	Relational conflict	111.92	20.00			
	Transactive memory	581.50	20.00			
Corrected total	Collective efficacy	4.76	19.00			
	Relational conflict	14.27	19.00			
	Transactive memory	8.09	19.00			

*Significant at the 0.05 level; **Significant at the 0.01 level.
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

does not seem readily apparent, or even manageable. Yet, teams in this study with shared leadership enjoy motivational, social, and cognitive advantages over the teams led by a single individual.

Managerial Implications

There are several important implications for organizations associated with this study. First, shared leadership has the potential to provide great benefits for all types of teams, not just self-managed teams. Shared leadership provides team members with confidence, satisfaction, and ownership because they are part of the creation and maintenance of team processes and objectives. Second, even though a leader is not designated within a team, one person may still take on this role with or without the overall team's approval, and this impacts critical processes within the team that likely impact team performance. Finally, there are several team processes at work within teams that impact the extent to which teams meet expectations. Managers must attend to how teams are accomplishing their work and develop ways to capture how functional teams are behaving in regard to leadership, motivation, socialization, and cognition.

Limitations

The study reported in this article has several limitations. First is the use of a laboratory study with students. Kerlinger and Lee (2000) considered the laboratory study as "one of the great inventions of all time" (p. 581). This is largely due to the fact that the environment is controlled so that it is possible to isolate the examination of how the variables of interest influence each other while other variables and noise are considered relatively equal, which gives the laboratory setting internal validity. However, a disadvantage of the laboratory setting is poor external validity due to the artificiality of the research situation and the limited generalizability across different participants and situations (Kerlinger & Lee, 2000).

Although the findings may not directly translate into real-world teams, in general, the underlying relationships are likely to occur in similar situations where individuals are allowed to self-manage their team and processes. Real issues are simulated in this study in that teams were faced with challenges, time constraints, and dealing with individuals with different perspectives, personalities, and values. They met and

worked within their teams on a consistent, weekly basis to complete tasks that had real and valuable implications for team members. It is for this reason that these teams, although not operating within actual organizations, help inform us on how self-managed teams function.

The small sample size is also a limitation. There are several weaknesses associated with small samples. These weaknesses include the likelihood of more error present in the study, greater possibility of selecting deviant samples, and difficulty in detecting a significant difference (Cook & Campbell, 1979; Kerlinger & Lee, 2000). However, because significance was detected, the last weakness was overcome with this study.

Future Research

This research provides some preliminary insight into how leadership processes impact other key team processes in self-managed teams. However, more extensive research is needed to complement these findings. For example, a similar study in the field would further validate these laboratory findings. Researchers interested in this domain should also consider examining more structural processes such as timing and scheduling. Other key questions left unanswered in this domain are what triggers the team to develop their leadership style, is it possible for teams to shift from one style to next depending on their tasks, and what role does task complexity play in leadership style emergence. The answers to these questions would provide key insight into the inner workings of self-managed teams.

Conclusion

The results in this study suggest that shared leadership is a phenomenon worth studying seriously, not only because of what it might reveal about leadership but also what it might reveal about team function. The traditional approach to leadership essentially sees the leader as a focal point, a central processing node where responsibility ultimately resides. The centrality of a single leader helps clarify role boundaries, procedures, and hierarchical arrangements. The centrality of the leader provides a singular source for defining direction and enabling climate, motivation, and identity. In many ways, the belief in the singular leader is a vestige of human societies that for millennia saw themselves properly governed by a monarch whose legitimacy was unquestioned. Yet that legitimacy was eventually questioned, and so we today find many societies thriving by successfully applying political models of shared governance. The notion of shared leadership in a work team essentially applies that shared governance political model.

Shared leadership does not guarantee a work team's success. Sharing leadership makes the team environment more complex, and so the team's cohesiveness and ability to communicate become more important than if a single individual were the leader. Moreover, an attempt to share leadership within a work team could turn into a protracted power struggle. But, a single leader, no matter how gifted, cannot be right all the time (O'Toole et al., 2002), so as a practical matter, combining the talents and interests of several individuals likely increases a work team's long-term success simply because greater resources are being devoted to the leadership function.

Clearly much more needs to be done, not the least of which is establishing that shared leadership occurs outside the laboratory. If it can be observed in wider contexts, then several other questions present themselves: What kinds of roles are shared, what mechanism allows a team to manage the shared roles, and how does the team maintain a decentralized order without tipping into chaos and confusion? Despite all that needs yet to be done, O'Toole et al. (2002) is likely correct in observing that "collective leadership is here to stay" (p. 82).

Appendix A
Survey Items

Collective efficacy: $\alpha = .82$

1. I am confident about our ability to do our tasks.
2. We have mastered the skills necessary for our tasks.
3. I am self-assured about our capabilities to perform our activities.

Relationship conflict: $\alpha = .89$

1. There was much anger among the team members.
2. There was much personal friction in the team during decisions.
3. There was much tension in the team during decisions.

Transactive memory system: $\alpha = .85$

1. The members of this team have a good "map" of each others talents and skills.
2. Team members know what task-related skills and knowledge each possess.
3. Team members know who has specialized skills and knowledge that is relevant to our work.

Appendix B
Journal Comments

Groups	Comments
Shared leadership teams	I believe our team is very effective because everyone positively contributes to all of our activities and presentations.
	We are willing to listen to one another and are willing to be open with one another.
	All of the members in our group consider ourselves as equal and we all have input in the decision-making process when trying to achieve our goals. We all come up with strategies to maximize the team effectiveness instead of our own self-interests.
	My team works well together because we all have a say in what we do.
Nonshared leadership teams	I am not happy with my team experiences at all. Every time something is due there comes so much negative conflict with it because one person is trying to lead the group and the group feels like that person is just trying to take over and lead down the wrong path.
	I do not believe my team is very effective. We really do not discuss anything. One person tries to control everything we do.
	I think my team would be better if everyone had a say in how we complete our tasks.
	One person tries to dominate and that person is not qualified in my opinion.

References

Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologist*, *37*, 122-147.

Barry, D. (1991). Managing the bossless team: Lessons in distributed leadership. *Organizational Dynamics*, *20*, 31-47.

Bass, B. M. (1997). Personal selling and transactional/transformational leadership. *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, *17*(3), 19-28.

Bowers, D. G., & Seashore, S. E. (1966). Predicting organizational effectiveness with a four factor theory of leadership. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *11*, 238-263.

Bradford, L. P. (1976). *Making meetings work*. La Jolla, CA: University Associates.

Brown, M. E., & Gioia, D. A. (2002). Making things click: Distributive leadership in an online division of an offline corporation. *Leadership Quarterly*, *13*, 397-419.

Brown, M. H., & Hosking, D. M. (1986). Distributed leadership and skilled performance as a successful organization in social movements. *Human Relations*, *39*, 65-79.

Cohen, S. G. (1991). *Teams and teamwork: Future directions*. Los Angeles: Center for Effective Organizations, University of Southern California.

Cohen, S. G., & Bailey, D. E. (1997). What makes teams work: Group effectiveness research from the shop floor to the executive suite. *Journal of Management*, *23*, 239-290.

Cook, T. D. & Campbell, D. T. (1979). *Quasi-experimentation: Design and analysis issues for field settings*. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Ensley, M. D., Pearson, A., & Pearce, C. L. (2003). Top management team process, shared leadership, and new venture performance: A theoretical model and research agenda. *Human Research Management Review*, *13*, 329-346.

Faraj, S., & Sproull, L. (1998). Coordinating expertise in software development teams. *Management Science*, *46*, 1554-1568.

Gecas, V. (1989). The social psychology of self-efficacy. In W. R. Scott & S. Blake (Eds.), *Annual review of sociology* (Vol. 15, pp. 291-316). Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews Inc.

Gibb, C. A. (1954). Leadership. In G. Lindzey (Ed.), *Handbook of social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 877-916). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Gist, M. (1987). Self-efficacy: Implications for organizational behavior and human resource management. *Academy of Management Review*, *12*, 472-485.

Gronn, P. (2002). Distributed leadership as a unit of analysis. *Leadership Quarterly*, *13*, 423-451.

House, R. J., & Shamir, B. (1993). Toward an integration of transformational, charismatic, and visionary theories. In M. Chemers & R. Ayman (Eds.), *Leadership theory and research: perspectives and directions* (pp. 81-107). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

James, L. B., Demaree, R. G., & Wolf, G. (1984). Estimating within-group inter-rater reliability with and without response bias. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *69*, 85-98.

Jehn, K. A. (1999). Why differences make a difference: A field study of diversity, conflict, and performance in workgroups. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *44*, 741-764.

Katzenbach, J. R. (1997). The myth of top management team. *Harvard Business Review*, *75*, 83-93.

Katzenbach, J. R., & Smith, D. K. (1993). *The wisdom of teams*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Kerlinger, F. N. & Lee, H. B. (2000). Foundations of Behavioral Research, 4th Ed. Thompson Learning.

Klimoski, R., & Mohammed, S. (1994). Team mental model: Construct or metaphor? *Journal of Management*, *20*, 403-437.

McComb, S. A., Green, S. G., & Compton, W. D. (1999). Project goals, team performance, and shared understanding. *Engineering Management Journal*, *11*(3), 7-12.

Moreland, R. (1999). Transactive memory: Learning who knows what in work groups and organizations. In L. Thompson, J. Levine, & D. Messick (Eds.), Shared cognition on organizations (pp. 3-31). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Offerman, L. R., & Spiros, R. K. (2001). The science and practice of team development: Improving the link. *Academy of Management Journal*, *44*, 376-392.

O'Toole, J., Galbraith, J., & Lawler, E. E. (2002). When two (or more) heads are better than one: The promise and pitfalls of shared leadership. *California Management Review*, *44*(4), 65-83.

Pallant, J. (2001). *SPSS survival manual*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Pearson, A. W., Ensley, M. D., & Amason, A. C. (2002). An assessment and refinement of Jehn's Intragroup Conflict Scale. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, *13*, 110-126.

Perry, M. L., Pearce, C. L., & Sims, H. P., Jr. (1999). Empowered selling teams: How shared leadership can contribute to selling team outcomes. *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, *19*(3), 31-35.

Peterson, E., Mitchell, T. R., Thompson, L., & Burr, R. (2000). Collective efficacy and aspects of shared mental models as predictors of performance over time in work groups. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *3*, 296-316.

Salas, E., Dickinson, T. L., Converse, S. A., & Tannebaum, S. I. (1992). Toward an understanding of team performance and training. In R. W. Swezey & E. Salas (Eds.), *Teams: Their training and performance* (pp. 3-29). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Salas, E., & Fiore, S. (2004). Why team cognition? An overview. In E. Salas & S. M. Fiore (Eds.), *Team cognition* (pp. 3-8). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Sivasubramaniam, N., Murry, W. D., Avolio, B. J., & Jung, D. I. (2002). A longitudinal model of the effects of team leadership and group potency and group performance. *Group and Organization Management*, *27*, 66-96.

Slater, P. E. (1955). Role differentiation in small groups. *American Sociological Review, 20*(3), 300-310.

Spreitzer, G. (1995). Psychological empowerment in the workplace: Dimensions, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, *38*, 1442-1465.

Vroom, V. H., & Yetton, P. W. (1973). *Leadership and decision-making*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Wegner, D. M. (1987). Transactive memory: A contemporary analysis of the group mind. In B. Mullen & G. R. Goethals (Eds.), *Theories of group behavior* (pp. 185-208). New York/ Berlin: Springer-Verlag.

Yeatts, D. E., & Hyten, C. (1998). *High performing self-managed work teams: A comparison of theory to practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Yoo, Y., & Kanawattanachai, P. (2001). Developments of transactive memory systems and collective mind in virtual teams. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, *9*, 187-208.

Yukl, G. (1998). *Leadership in organizations* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Yukl, G. (1999). An evaluation of conceptual weaknesses in transformational and charismatic leadership theories. *Leadership Quarterly*, *10*, 285-305.

Zaccaro, S. J., Blair, V., Peterson, C., & Zazanis, M. (1995). Collective efficacy. In J. Maddux (Ed.), *Self-efficacy, adaptation, and adjustment* (pp. 305-328). New York: Plenum.

Zaccaro, S. J., Rittman, A. L., & Marks, M. A. (2001). Team leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, *12*, 451-483.

Stephanie T. Solansky is an assistant professor of management at the University of Houston–Victoria. She received her PhD from The University of Texas at San Antonio. Her research interests include team processes, leadership, inter- and intra-organizational collaboration, and decision making.