Shared Leadership is Lauded as a Strategy that Improves Team Performance, Team Creativity, and Organization's Effectiveness

Dr. John Motsamai Modise
South African Police Service

Abstract:- The purpose of this paper is to extend the theoretical understanding and conceptualization of shared leadership is lauded to be a team performance-enhancing approach, team creativity, and effectiveness of an organization. Shared leadership is a complex and dynamic phenomenon, and there is still much that we do not understand about it. By extending our theoretical understanding and conceptualization of shared leadership, we can better understand how it can be used to enhance team performance, creativity, and effectiveness. Shared leadership is a leadership approach in which power and responsibilities are distributed among team members. This approach is lauded for its ability to enhance team performance, creativity, and effectiveness.

More studies need to investigate the relationship between shared leadership and team performance and their different functions. To address the above-mentioned gaps, the purpose of this paper is to identify the underlying dimensions of shared leadership and examine the relationships among team members' perceptions of shared leadership, and team performance. To achieve these the following research questions: The first question, "What are the underlying dimensions of shared leadership?" is essential for understanding how shared leadership works. By identifying the different dimensions of shared leadership, we can better understand how they contribute to team performance. The second question, "How does shared leadership affect team trust?" is also important. Team trust is a critical factor for team success, and shared leadership can help to build trust among team members. By understanding how shared leadership affects team trust, we can better understand how it can be used to improve team performance.

The third question, "How does team trust mediate the relationship between shared leadership and team performance?" is also interesting. This question explores the possibility that team trust is a mechanism through which shared leadership affects team performance. If this is the case, then it would suggest that shared leadership can improve team performance by building trust among team members.

The way shared leadership has been conceptualized may be the cause of the inconsistent results of shared leadership and its aspects. Many management fields have praised shared leadership as a performance-improving strategy with practical implications. It is envisioned as an ever-evolving dynamic team process. The lack of research that has looked at its temporally pertinent border requirements for the success of the team is remarkable, nevertheless.

However, compared to its good effects, existing research on shared leadership's negative effects is still dispersed. Since there isn't a literature review that systematically summarizes these potential drawbacks, the academic community lacks a thorough understanding of these negative effects. The current study seeks to close this gap by offering a thorough literature analysis that will explain the detrimental impacts of shared leadership and create an all-encompassing analytical framework in accordance. This essay aims to clarify whether the harmful impacts of shared leadership have been empirically or theoretically proved, when and why shared leadership causes these harmful effects, and what research approaches are likely to yield positive results in the future. In addition to providing the academic community with a more thorough and balanced understanding of the impact of shared leadership, the current study also identifies several directions for future research by responding to the research calls for exploring the potential negative aspects of shared leadership.

A new leadership approach called "shared leadership" places a focus on sharing, involvement, and collaboration between team members and leaders. This paper's goal is to review the current body of knowledge regarding shared leadership, including its definitions, traits, influencing variables, and effects on people and organizations. It has been discovered through a review, summary, and analysis of the pertinent literature that shared leadership improves employee creativity while lowering stress levels and raising job satisfaction. The mechanisms and methods of shared leadership implementation, as well as the study of shared leadership in various cultural contexts, should be further investigated in future research.

Keywords:- *Shared Leadership, Negative Effects in Leadership, Team Creativity, Team Effectiveness Three Dimensions, Team Performance.*

I. INTRODUCTION

In the last two decades, shared leadership has been popular as a dynamic leadership paradigm that encourages team members to share leadership responsibilities and power (Carson et al., 2007; Pearce et al., 2014). The team as a whole exercises leadership rather than just those at the top or in formal leadership positions, as has been the focus of leadership research in recent years (Carson et al., 2007; Pearce et al., 2014).

As a result, the idea of shared leadership has been given increased attention in the literature already in existence. According to Pearce and Conger (2003), shared leadership is "a dynamic, interactive influence process among individuals in groups for which the objective is to lead one another to the achievement of group or organizational goals or both" (p. 1). Shared leadership, as stated by Acar (2010), signifies a major departure from the idea of a single, elected leader in favor of the notion that team members influence each other and jointly share leadership tasks, responsibilities, and functions.

Recent empirical research (Nielsen and Daniels, 2012; Nicolaides et al., 2014; Sousa and Van Dierendonck, 2016; Sun et al., 2016) has demonstrated the significance of shared leadership in organizations. Even more intriguingly, several research even concluded that shared leadership has a greater impact on team effectiveness than conventional vertical leadership (Pearce and Sims, 2002; Ensley et al., 2006). However, there are still at least three significant gaps in our knowledge regarding the relationship between shared leadership and team effectiveness as well as the circumstances under which it is more likely to be successful.

In the given situation, it is crucial to recognize the circumstances that foster creativity when working in teams. Research from the past has shown that team creativity is significantly influenced by leadership, among other things (Eisenbeiss et al., 2008). Vertical leadership and shared leadership are the two basic categories into which leadership research in the setting of teams can be divided (Avolio et al., 2009; Nicolaides et al., 2014). When only one individual serves as the team's leader, this is known as vertical leadership.

However, in the past, a few leadership experts (Katz and Kahn, 1978; Gibb et al., 1954a) conceived leadership as a group phenomenon. In the past twenty years, this strategy has drawn more attention. This method views leadership as a collaborative responsibility rather than the exclusive purview of a single person. According to the shared leadership idea, leadership is a function in which team members share leadership responsibilities and roles. Distributed leadership (Gibb et al., 1954a), collective leadership (Contractor et al., 2012), and shared leadership (Pearce and Conger, 2003) are a few titles that researchers have given. Instead of being in opposition to one another, vertical leadership and shared leadership are at opposite ends of the same continuum (Gronn, 2002).

Another crucial component for preparing firms to meet the difficulties of the modern day is team learning initiatives (Ashauer and Macan, 2013). These initiatives are brought about by technical improvements, globalization, and growing social and environmental responsiveness. To foster innovation at work, team learning is also essential (Barker and Neailey, 1999; Pandey et al., 2019). Similar to the literature on creativity, there is a wealth of study on team learning that has looked at the function of leadership but has primarily, either implicitly or explicitly, focused on vertical leadership (Koeslag-Kreunen et al., 2018). Even though shared leadership is becoming more and more important, there isn't much research on team learning in this setting.

II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Theoretical Foundation According to Carson, Tesluk, and Marrone (2007), shared leadership is a team characteristic that develops as a result of the distribution of leadership influence across numerous team members. Relationship-oriented shared leadership (ROSL), task-oriented shared leadership (TOSL), and creativity-oriented shared leadership (COSL) were the sub-dimensions we employed. The body of scholarly research on ROSL and TOSL is well-established. Activities that are coordinated are associated with TOSL (Yukl, 2006), and ROSL behaviors respect team members' perspectives and build emotional connections with them (Mannix & Neale, 2005). The three shared leadership sub-dimensions are:

- Relationship-oriented shared leadership (ROSL) refers to a team member's capacity to forge bonds with others, foster trust, and foster a supportive environment.
- Task-oriented shared leadership (TOSL) is a dimension that describes a team's members' capacity for goal-setting, activity planning and coordination, and problem-solving.
- Creativity-oriented shared leadership (COSL): This dimension relates to a team's members' capacity to come up with original ideas, think creatively, and take calculated risks.

Although ROSL and TOSL have a strong body of scholarly research, COSL has received less attention. COSL, however, may play a significant role in team performance, especially in creative or inventive environments, according to some data. To comprehend how leadership might be spread in teams, the shared leadership theoretical framework is helpful. It can also be used to pinpoint the various competencies required for effective shared leadership. COSL is a more recent dimension than ROSL and TOSL.

According to Leight et al. (2018), COSL is a significant aspect of shared leadership, particularly in creative or innovative situations. They pointed out that COSL promotes the safe exchange of novel ideas, which can boost innovation and creativity. Shared leadership is favorably associated with team performance, according to other researchers. According to a theoretical argument made by Ensley, Pearson, and Pearce (2003), increased team member participation, communication, and cooperation can

improve team performance. In a study of Japanese industrial teams, Ishikawa (2012) discovered that shared leadership was positively associated with team performance.

A meta-analysis by D'Innocenzo et al. (2016) supported the assertion that shared leadership and team performance are positively correlated. Although research on shared leadership is still in its infancy, it is evident that this style of leadership can be successful in raising team productivity. Consider establishing shared leadership if you want to boost your team's performance. The theory that shared leadership improves team performance has not always been supported by research. In a study of software development teams, for instance, Boies, Lvina, and Martens (2010) discovered that shared leadership was unrelated to team effectiveness.

In any team, trust is a key component, but shared leadership teams can benefit greatly from it. Team members are more likely to share authority and responsibility when they have mutual trust. Additionally, they are more willing to take risks and be receptive to criticism. Better decision-making, problem-solving, and innovation may result from this. Wu, Cormican, and Chen's (2018) meta-analysis of shared leadership revealed that intragroup trust significantly influenced the association between shared leadership and team outcomes. This indicates that when there is a high level of trust among team members, the relationship between shared leadership and team outcomes is greater.

Other studies have found support for this conclusion. For instance, research on student project teams by De Jong, Dirks, and van Knippenberg (2014) discovered that trust moderated the relationship between shared leadership and team performance. According to the study, shared leadership behaviors were more prevalent in teams with higher levels of trust, and these behaviors themselves were linked to improved team performance.

- *You can Utilize the following Research Techniques to Confirm that Trust Mediates between Shared Leadership with new Dimension (COSL) and Team Performance:*

✓ A statistical method that can be used to test mediation models is structural equation modeling (SEM). You can test the direct and indirect effects of COSL, shared leadership, and trust on team output using SEM.
✓ Another statistical method that can be used to test mediation models is path analysis. SEM and path analysis are comparable, however, path analysis is simpler and works with fewer datasets.
✓ An experiment is a controlled study in which the independent variable (shared leadership) can be altered while the dependent variable (team performance) is measured. In the experiment, you can also gauge the mediator (trust).
✓ Survey: A survey is a questionnaire you can use to get information from team members regarding their opinions about shared leadership, COSL, trust, and group performance.

Depending on the particular research issue you are attempting to answer, the ideal research methodology will vary.

III. SHARED LEADERSHIP

Studies on shared leadership have demonstrated that this style of leadership has favorable effects on people, teams, and organizations. For example, job satisfaction can be improved (Drescher and Garbers, 2016; Serban and Roberts, 2016), team creativity can be enhanced (Ali et al., 2020; Gu et al., 2022), and performance can be improved (Chen et al., 2022; D'Innocenzo et al., 2022). Additionally, recent meta-analyses (e.g., Nicolaides et al., 2014; Wang et al., 2014) have shown that shared leadership has a distinctive influence in explaining the variation in team performance when compared to traditional vertical leadership. Because of its favorable effects on several desirable objectives, shared leadership therefore receives its name.

A leadership approach known as "shared leadership" emphasizes teamwork, participation, and sharing. Shared leaders build a connection of equality, openness, and support with the team, enticing people to share information, viewpoints, and resources and to take part in decision-making. Shared leadership emphasizes interactions between the leader and the team, with a focus on the development of emotional ties, trust, and respect.

Shared leadership, according to Pearce and Conger (2003), is "a dynamic, interactive influence process among individuals in groups for which the objective is to lead one another to the achievement of group or organizational goals or both... [L]eadership is broadly distributed among a set of individuals instead of centralized in [the] hands of a single individual who acts in [the] role of a superior" (Pearce and Conger, 2003: 1). Shared Leadership is a team-level phenomenon where the leadership role is shared by several team members rather than being the sole duty of one person (Bligh et al., 2006).

According to the shared leadership theory (Friedrich et al., 2009), in teams, the direction of influence need not be constant and might alternate amongst team members at various points in time. To accomplish the team's goals, shared leadership enables individuals to both influence and be impacted by others. According to research, different team members may assume the role of leader at various times over the team's life cycle. As stated by Pearce and Conger in 2003, "individuals... can rise to the occasion to exhibit leadership and then step back at other times to allow others to lead" (p. 2).

Despite the literature's overwhelming support for shared leadership, several academics have expressed worries about its potential negative aspects (Pearce et al., 2007; Zhu et al., 2018). The intrinsic characteristics of shared leadership, such as time-consuming, equitable, and dispersed power, would have negative consequences on team members, the team's formal leaders, and the overall

work groups, according to Zhu et al. (2018). Empirical data also warns against treating shared leadership in an unduly hopeful manner. For instance, empirical data is starting to show that shared leadership can cause information concealing (Zhao, 2013), power struggles (Ji, 2018), and role stress (Wang and Peng, 2022), all of which reduce team performance. The aforementioned phenomena demonstrate that while shared leadership has beneficial outcomes, it can also have negative outcomes for the team. In this context, academics have been urged to adopt a more thorough and impartial perspective when considering shared leadership (Zhu et al., 2018: 849).

Shared leadership is not a rigid either-or category, but rather occurs in every group at different levels, according to Carson et al. (2007). This means that shared leadership is not a rigorous either-or category but rather occurs in every group at various levels. Leadership experts have acknowledged the value of shared leadership and have sought to comprehend how to define, measure, and evaluate the effects it has on teams. Conceptually speaking, shared leadership is a team-centric phenomenon, as demonstrated (Ensley et al., 2006; and Serban), where team members take on "leadership roles and responsibilities on behalf of the team" and embrace the leadership of their colleagues (Aubé et al., 2017: 199). Furthermore, according to Avolio et al. (2009), shared leadership is an emergent, dynamic phenomenon that develops over time rather than being a static process.

While there has been advancement in shared leadership definitions, much empirical research has focused on the effects that shared leadership has. According to numerous studies (Sivasubramaniam et al., 2002; Ensley et al., 2006; Mehra et al., 2006; Carson et al., 2007; Drescher et al., 2014), shared leadership and team performance are positively correlated. Furthermore, it has been shown that shared leadership has a positive impact on team performance (Bergman et al., 2012), team proactive behavior (Erkutlu, 2012), team and individual learning (Liu et al., 2014), team member diversity and emotional conflict (Acar, 2010), and team members' trust, autonomy, and satisfaction (Robert and You, 2018).

These positive results point to the necessity of more advanced designs for the shared leadership concept. As a result, this study expands a line of research to more thoroughly evaluate its relationship with team performance. It also goes beyond straightforward associations to examine whether shared leadership has a bigger or weaker impact on a team's effectiveness.

➢ *Shared Leadership Characteristics*

The following traits define shared leadership: First, it emphasizes the equality of the connection between the team's leader and members. The leader serves as both a commander and a team member. Second, team engagement and cooperation are the main points of shared leadership.

A leadership style known as shared leadership distributes authority and accountability among team members. As a result, everyone in the team is accountable for leadership, rather than just one individual. Shared leadership requires both of the qualities you listed. First off, everyone on the team has a voice and a responsibility because of the leader and team members' equality. Not just the leader who exercises authority or makes choices. Instead, everyone is accountable for making a difference in the success of the team. Second, team members are encouraged to collaborate and share ideas as a result of the emphasis on participation and cooperation. Better decision-making, problem-solving, and innovation may result from this.

➢ *Characteristics of Shared Leadership:*

- It is emergent: Shared leadership is a process that takes time. Team members must gradually come to trust one another and learn to delegate authority and responsibility.
- It is adaptable: Shared leadership may be used for various teams and projects.
- It depends on the situation and the team in question for shared leadership to be effective.
- Encourage team members to contribute their ideas, experiences, and knowledge and to actively engage in decision-making by praising their efforts to cooperate. Better decision-making and problem-solving, as well as increased team ownership and commitment, can result from this.
- Sharing of resources: Team leaders assist members in obtaining required resources and promote resource sharing within the group. This can promote a sense of camaraderie and collaboration within the team as well as aid in guaranteeing that everyone gets the resources they need to be successful.

The cohesion and cooperation of the team can be improved by developing emotional and trusting bonds between the team's leaders nd members. Team members are more inclined to be receptive to criticism, take calculated risks, and cooperate when they feel respected and trusted.

Although shared leadership is a sophisticated and complex style of leadership, it has the potential to significantly boost team productivity. Leaders may foster a more inclusive and collaborative environment where everyone can contribute to the success of the team by recognizing the various traits of shared leadership. Although shared leadership is a relatively new method of leadership, it has recently grown in acceptance. This is because it has been proven to be successful in enhancing team effectiveness, innovation, and performance. Shared leadership is an excellent choice to take into consideration if you're seeking a more inclusive and collaborative style of leadership.

Team members are encouraged by their leaders to actively contribute to decision-making by sharing their thoughts, experiences, and knowledge. Third, shared leadership places a strong emphasis on resource sharing. Leaders assist team members in obtaining necessary resources and promote resource sharing within the team. Finally, trust and emotional relationships are a key component of shared leadership. Team cohesion and cooperation can be improved through developing emotional ties and trust between team leaders and members.

Present-day organizations frequently use cross-functional teams, and the demand for leadership sharing between superiors and subordinates is expanding (Pearce and Conger, 2003). These factors have accelerated the development of shared leadership theory and practice. According to definitions given by Carson et al. (2007) and Pearce and Conger (2003), shared leadership is "an emergent team phenomenon in which the leadership functions and responsibilities are broadly shared among internal team members to better achieve team goals."

The shared leadership theory stresses the agency role of team members in the process of team leadership, in contrast to the classic vertical leadership theory, which emphasizes the styles and actions of formally designated leaders (Carson et al., 2007). Notably, the study by Zhu et al. (2018) distinguished the theoretical overlaps and differences between shared leadership and six other related leadership constructs (i.e. collective leadership, empowering leadership, team leadership, emergent leadership, self-leadership, and participative leadership), and refined the key features of shared leadership into three aspects, including the source of leadership influence, units of analysis, and distributions of leadership influence.

First, when it comes to the source of leadership influence, shared leadership encompasses both top-down hierarchical influence from team leaders to team members as well as horizontal/lateral influence among team members and even bottom-up influence from team members to team leaders (Pearce and Conger, 2003). As a result, shared leadership can create a sophisticated network of influence within the organization.

Second, shared leadership views leadership as a team-level phenomenon for the units of analysis, which sets it apart from leadership models that concentrate on the individual-level or dyadic-level phenomenon, such as empowering leadership, self-leadership, participative leadership, and others (Carson et al., 2007).

Third, there are many leader-follower dualistic interactions inside the group as a result of the leadership positions and influences being widely distributed among team members under shared leadership conditions (Drescher et al., 2014). As team members may play both of these roles simultaneously, the distinction between leader and follower becomes increasingly hazy (Nicolaides et al., 2014). Last but not least, shared leadership is said to be dynamic in character, which means that team members will take on

leadership roles as needed, depending on the demands of the work and their potential (Pearce and Conger, 2003).

According to studies by D'Innocenzo et al. (2016), Lorinkova and Bartol (2021), and Wang et al. (2017), shared leadership is a more accurate predictor of individual and team effectiveness than traditional vertical leadership due to the aforementioned qualities. However, they also have several detrimental effects, including power struggles (Ji, 2018), role stress (Wang and Peng, 2022), and ineffective decision-making (Zhu et al., 2018).

IV. THE ADVANTAGES OF SHARED LEADERSHIP IN A TEAM

First, shared leadership has been promoted as a strategy to increase team effectiveness in recent years by scholars and practitioners. Ramthun and Matkin (2012), for instance, claimed that shared leadership is frequently advantageous since followers are more likely to follow the individual who has the best knowledge and abilities rather than relying entirely on the traditional leadership style's vertical influence process. Numerous additional empirical research has shown that shared leadership teams produce superior team effectiveness (Pearce and Sims, 2002; Wang et al., 2014; Serban and Roberts, 2016). We must note, though, that this isn't always the case.

This large and beneficial association was not supported by Fausing et al. (2013) or Mehra et al. (2006), and Boies et al. (2011) even discovered that shared leadership has a detrimental effect on team effectiveness. Such ambiguous results highlight the need for additional empirical data. As a result, the initial goal of our research is to specifically look at the relationship between shared leadership and team success to further our understanding of the benefits of shared leadership. The degree to which teams live up to organizational expectations is how we define team performance in this study (Essens et al., 2009). This frame of view motivates us to consider team efficiency from a variety of angles.

As a result, we adopt the viewpoints of Aube and Rousseau (2005), Balkundi and Harrison (2006), and Mathieu et al. (2008), who analyze team performance from two unique perspectives: team task performance and team viability. Team viability is the ability of teams to retain their members and function effectively over time, whereas team task performance is how well the group achieves (or even surpasses) job objectives (Balkundi and Harrison, 2006).

➢ *A leadership style known as shared leadership distributes authority and accountability among team members. On the other hand, shared leadership is a more cooperative strategy in which team members share leadership. This implies that everyone in the team has the chance to share their ideas and talents, as well as to assume leadership responsibilities as necessary. This strategy is praised for its capacity to improve team effectiveness, innovation, and performance. Some of the benefits of shared leadership:*

- Better teamwork and communication: Effective teamwork and communication are essential components of shared leadership. Better decision-making and problem-solving may result from this.
- Greater innovation and creativity: This occurs when team members feel empowered to take chances and voice their opinions. As a result, they are more likely to develop original and creative solutions.
- Greater team cohesion: Team members' connections can be strengthened with the aid of shared leadership. A more effective and cohesive team may result from this.
- Enhanced learning: Increased participation and engagement: Team members are more likely to be involved and motivated when they believe they have a voice in decision-making.

➢ *Development: Shared Leadership can give Team Members the Chance to Pick up New Abilities and Skills. Improved Decision-Making:*

- It can result in better conclusions that are more likely to be agreed upon by all parties when numerous persons are involved in the decision-making process.
- Greater adaptation and flexibility: Teams that have shared leadership are more adaptable and flexible.
- Increased accountability might result from everyone sharing responsibility for the team's performance.

Of course, shared leadership has its challenges. It might take time to divide up roles and duties, and it can be difficult to persuade everyone to agree on decisions. However, shared leadership provides benefits that outweigh its disadvantages. If you want to boost your team's output, creativity, and effectiveness, shared leadership is an excellent method to consider.

➢ *Factors that Influence Shared Leadership*
Internal team environment shared objectives. The team's fundamental objectives are understood by all members. They will next take steps to guarantee that the work is directed toward the common objective. Teams that have a common purpose and predetermined objectives are more likely to be motivated, empowered, and devoted to their work and the team as a whole, according to numerous studies.

Team leadership responsibilities are more readily accepted when all members are committed to the same objective and feel highly motivated, empowered, and engaged. There is also a shared objective and course of action. The emergence of employee goal orientation and leadership behaviors to better manage team activities as a whole is facilitated by the fact that team members are more inclined to set their own goals and take actions that help other team members.

Social Assistance: relates to the mutually supportive emotional and psychological assistance among team members. Mutual encouragement and appreciation of individual contributions and team accomplishments foster a sense of support within the team. Team members feel

recognized and valued in this setting for their ideas. Team members who are emotionally supported and actively involved in the group are more likely to collaborate and generate a sense of shared accountability for the group's success.

Employee counsel: This refers to the extent to which team members have a voice and are actively participating in the process of attaining the team's goals. Voice strengthens members' commitment to crucial team decisions when it is associated with involvement in decision-making and constructive discussion. Each person's strengths should be fully utilized in the process of accomplishing the organization's goals to foster a high level of team building where members may actively support the team in achieving its goals.

These three elements interact and strengthen one another. When employees actively participate and offer advice, they demonstrate more leadership. Members of a team are more inclined to actively voice their opinions when they are working toward a common objective as a group. Participate in both giving leadership and following other people's leadership. Employees are more eager to share duties, work together, and be more dedicated to achieving the organization's common goals when they feel appreciated and supported by their co-workers.

➢ *For Teams: External Advice*
We refer to the leaders of the organizational division to which the shared leadership team belongs as external mentors. They just provide direction on the work, not actual leadership to the team. The two Hackmans and Wagemans claim. Through engagement with the team, external team coaching seeks to assist team members in properly coordinating and using the group's resources by the task to complete the team's task.

External team leaders can assist the growth of shared leadership in a variety of ways through encouraging mentoring. First, by encouraging, supporting, or promptly rewarding team members who show leadership qualities, team members come to understand that they have autonomy, which makes them more willing to do so. Second, by boosting employees' common commitment to the team and its objectives, external coaching raises the possibility that team members will make individual ideas. Third, ensuring that team members' actions are in line with work requirements by providing relevant strategic recommendations to staff members.

Under the correct circumstances, external leaders instruct members on how to efficiently manage their tasks and procedures. For a team that lacks shared objectives, where members are not fully engaged, and where members are unable to offer social support to one another, the leadership of the external leader is particularly crucial. Particularly, external leaders support team members in developing a shared commitment to the group's work, facilitating the alignment of team activities with task requirements, and encouraging member autonomy.

Teams that have not been able to fully create shared leadership through the team's internal processes will be better able to do so with the assistance of such mentoring, which serves as a motivator and a source of counseling. External team coaching can also assist team members in recognizing how their skills and abilities differ from one another and how they should work together to fulfill the team's purpose. In this manner, encouraging mentoring from outside the team can enable shared leadership even if the group hasn't yet established a strong level of social support, shared objectives, and voice.

➢ *Shared Leadership's Impact*

Positive results of shared leadership are shown in both people and organizations. Shared leadership can boost employee creativity on a personal level. Shared leadership may foster creativity and innovation by encouraging staff to pool their ideas and resources. Shared leadership might also help employees feel less stressed. Shared leadership helps employees feel less stressed by distributing demands and duties around the team. Shared leadership has the potential to improve employee happiness on a corporate level. Shared leadership can boost employee identification and satisfaction with the organization by fostering a culture of support and positivity.

• *Positive Outcomes from Shared Leadership are Possible for Both People and Organizations:*

✓ Shared leadership can boost employee creativity on an individual basis. Shared leadership may foster creativity and innovation by encouraging staff to pool their ideas and resources. This is because when workers are aware that they are part of a team that values their efforts, they feel more emboldened to express their ideas and take risks.

✓ Shared leadership can enhance team performance at the organizational level. Shared leadership duties increase team members' motivation and engagement. Additionally, they are more likely to collaborate and communicate efficiently, which can help them make better decisions and solve problems.

✓ Additionally, shared leadership can promote unity and trust within teams. Team members are more inclined to encourage one another and be eager to lend a hand when they believe that they are all working towards the same objective.

• *In general, shared leadership is an effective style of leadership that can be advantageous for both people and businesses. Shared leadership is an excellent strategy to take into consideration if you're looking for a means to increase your team's productivity and effectiveness. Other outcomes of collaborative leadership include:*

✓ Greater job satisfaction: Employees are more likely to be happy with their jobs when they feel like they have a voice in decision-making.

✓ Lower turnover: Employees are less likely to leave their positions when they feel like they are valuable members of the team.

✓ Better customer service: Employees are more likely to offer better customer service when they are engaged and motivated.

✓ Increased organizational learning can result from the participation of numerous persons in decision-making.

✓ Greater adaptability to change: Teams that share leadership are more adaptable to change. Team members are more likely to be able to adjust to change successfully if they are accustomed to working together and sharing leadership duties.

In general, shared leadership is an effective style of leadership that can help both individuals and organizations in a variety of ways. Shared leadership is an excellent strategy to take into consideration if you're looking for a means to increase your team's productivity and effectiveness.

V. EFFECTIVENESS OF SHARED LEADERSHIP

Unanswered questions must be addressed to develop a more detailed understanding of the effects of shared leadership. The effectiveness of the time-relevant modifiers should be properly investigated. Researchers have emphasized that shared leadership is a dynamic, emergent, time-varying construct (Avolio et al., 2009) that is influenced by task characteristics as well as the team environment (Carson et al., 2007; Wu et al., 2020). Therefore, ongoing changes in the inputs, procedures, and outputs of various project life cycle stages may have an impact on the development of shared leadership in teams as well as its link to team performance (Wu and Cormican, 2016).

This important unaddressed gap requires further attention to provide insights into the boundary conditions regarding when shared leadership is more or less influential to team effectiveness. Therefore, the second research goal is to focus on the dynamic nature of shared leadership and in particular, how this dynamic nature may be affected by the project life cycle.

Together, these studies aim to deepen our understanding of shared leadership's workings and explore if and under what conditions engineering design teams' effectiveness is positively correlated with shared leadership. To do this, we calculated network density, produced binary matrices, and sociograms, and used the social network approach to measure the concept of shared leadership. Nine items made up of two distinct, theoretically generated subscales—team task performance and team viability—were used to measure team effectiveness. To evaluate the validity and reliability of our measurement model, confirmatory factor analysis and internal.

Then, in this work, we performed a two-way moderated hierarchical regression analysis (Carson et al., 2007; Erkutlu, 2012; Fausing et al., 2013) to test the theories put out. As a result, our study contributes in several important ways. (1) It advances a line of inquiry and specifically explores the connection between shared

leadership and team performance; (2) It capitalizes on the dynamic nature of shared leadership and is among the first to look at a key temporal moderator, the project life cycle, for the efficacy of shared leadership; (3) It builds on the dynamic nature of shared leadership; and (4) It builds on the dynamic nature of shared leadership; (3) It advances the academic discussion by demonstrating the shared leadership theory's applicability to engineering design teams. (4) It contributes insightful ideas to the field of project management by offering helpful advice to business project managers who want to implement best practices in their organizations.

➤ *Collective Creativity and Shared Leadership*

According to Amabile (1998) and Mumford and Gustafor (1988), creativity is the production of original and practical ideas. Technical skills, artistic skills, and motivation are all part of it (Wu and Chen, 2018). In the framework of a collaborative environment, creativity frequently manifests itself (Taggar, 2002). "Production of novel and useful ideas concerning products, services, processes, and procedures by a team of employees working together" (Shin and Zhou, 2007: 1715) is what is meant by "team creativity."

Organizations promote creativity in the workplace because it results in innovation when creative ideas are turned into new goods and procedures. Teams with higher levels of creativity are better equipped to spot possibilities and take advantage of them by using original techniques (Chen, 2007). Diverse sources of knowledge must be incorporated for innovative ideas to arise (Pirola-Merlo and Mann, 2004).

Based on the idea that a team's leadership should not be centralized on one person, but rather change depending on the circumstance, shared leadership was developed (Pearce, 2003). Collaboration may result in innovative outputs, according to previous studies (DeCusatis, 2008). Due to the substantial interconnectedness at work, shared leadership teams would be collaborative by nature. Teams with shared leadership would communicate information more frequently (Hoch, 2013).

High information sharing would result in a greater number and variety of ideas and opinions because when several team members feel empowered to assume the role of leader, they are free to challenge each other's ideas, evaluate them in light of their knowledge backgrounds, and engage in divergent perspectives. Divergent viewpoints, which mix many ways of seeing things, lead to creativity (Mumford and Gustafson, 1998). It is anticipated that teams with shared leadership will be more creative because there will be a greater influx of various ideas and viewpoints.

Team processes may serve as a mediating factor between leadership and innovation, according to a previous study (Nicolaides et al., 2014). We suggest team learning as a moderator in the relationship between shared leadership and creativity. Team learning is "an ongoing process of collective reflection and action and it includes (a) exploring,

(b) reflecting, (c) discussing errors and unexpected outcomes of actions, (d) seeking feedback, and (e) experimentation with and as a team" (Edmondson, 1999; Savelsbergh et al., 2009: 582). This team learning strategy views learning as a process rather than an outcome, hence it describes learning in terms of action or behavior.

➤ *Team Dynamics, Interpersonal Dynamics, Motivational Dynamics, and Performance*

Employees must understand how to collaborate well in teams (Han and Beyerlein, 2016). The foregoing three functions serve as keys to enabling team effectiveness (Kozlowski and Ilgen, 2006), hence a framework for team processes is offered that includes (a) behavior, (b) affective/motivational, and (c) cognitive components (Valentine et al., 2015). A sense of (a) a behavioral component of collaborative effort, (b) an affective/motivating component of work toward a common objective, and (c) a cognitive component of knowledge sharing emerges to facilitate team activities (Valentine et al., 2015). The framework's three parts each represent a different team process, overlapping to capture some of the complexity and volatility of teams.

The actions used by team members to complete interdependent tasks are referred to as team behavior processes; as a result, behavior processes comprise behaviors like coordination and communication (Valentine et al., 2015). According to Valentine et al.'s (2015) review of team survey instruments, coordination of activities and communication were the most often evaluated behavioral aspects of teamwork processes.

Socio-emotional states like trust, group emotions, team commitment, or team cohesiveness are referred to in the literature on team motivational processes as being an element of the team's emotional climate (Barsade and Gibson, 2012; Gully et al., 2012; Kasper-Fuehrera and Ashkanasy, 2001; Valentine et al., 2015). People's level of motivation and affect determine how much effort they will put into an activity. Affective/motivational processes at the team level refer to the common dedication of team members to their shared objectives and have an impact on team success (Kozlowski and Ilgen, 2006).

Teamwork in a group without a clear leader develops as a "mutual influence process" (Pearce, 2004: 48) that is "relationally produced, emerging through interactions and communication between actors in a context" (Denis et al., 2012: 49). Since team process elements can be divided into three levels—behavior, affective/motivational factors, and cognitive process—we assumed that shared leadership could influence these factors. The effort put forth, the number and quality of communication linked to the activity, and task coordination are all examples of behavior processes (Rico et al., 2008). Goal commitment is one of the motivating processes (Kukenberger et al., 2012). Learning and information sharing are related to cognitive processes (Valentine et al., 2015).

Initially, some academics theorized that shared leadership was favorably associated with team performance (Ensley et al., 2003); however, additional researchers discovered this relationship (Carson et al., 2007; Chen et al., 2007; Ishikawa, 2012). The meta-analytic findings of D'Innocenzo et al. (2014) support the hypothesis that shared leadership improves team effectiveness. According to Lorinkova et al. (2013), teams with high degrees of shared leadership performed better over time as a result of improved levels of team learning, cooperation, empowerment, and mental model building.

However, multiple research (Boies et al., 2010, Mehra et al., 2006) failed to uncover evidence to support the notion that shared leadership improved team performance since Boies et al. (2010) discovered that utilizing a transformational leadership feature of shared leadership had detrimental effects on team performance. According to another study (Srivastava et al., 2006), management teams' performance did not directly correlate with empowered leadership.

Teams that are confident in their talents can perform at higher levels because they put in more effort (Gully et al., 2002). The existing literature indicates the favorable impact that team goal commitment may have on team performance, even if it may be difficult to generate collective affective/motivational processes in a team context because of the lack of time for team building and interactions (Hecht et al., 2002). Researchers discovered a strong correlation between team dedication to its goals and performance (Aubé et al., 2014).

Researchers have found a correlation between shared leadership and better team performance in adult education settings (Han, Lee, Beyerlein, & Kolb, 2018; Mathieu, Kukenberger, D'innocenzo, & Reilly, 2015). Academics disagree on several specific characteristics of shared leadership, though (Zhu, Liao, Yam, & Johnson, 2018).

> *Prospects for Future Research*

There are still some problems that need to be resolved even though shared leadership has been the subject of much study and attention. First, future studies should go deeper into shared leadership implementation strategies and methods. Currently, there is some confusion and uncertainty surrounding how to put shared leadership into practice.

Second, future studies should take into account the analysis of shared leadership in various cultural contexts. Further research on the implications of shared leadership in various cultural contexts is required since diverse cultural contexts may have an impact on how shared leadership is implemented.

Finally, future studies should concentrate on the long-term effects of shared leadership. Future studies should concentrate on the effects of shared leadership on team performance and organizational performance because it is currently unknown how shared leadership will affect people over the long run.

> *Practical Implications*

- *Organizations can Encourage Shared Leadership Inside the Company, which will Increase Team Creativity. Increased Team Creativity may be Achieved through the use of Shared Leadership. the following are some Organizational Applications of Shared Leadership:*

✓ Establish a culture of cooperation and trust. Team members must have mutual trust and be eager to work together if shared leadership is to occur. By being open and transparent, appreciating everyone's efforts, and offering opportunities for team members to get to know one another, leaders may foster a climate of trust and collaboration.
✓ Promote innovation and taking risks. Shared leadership can aid in fostering an atmosphere where team members feel free to take chances and contribute fresh ideas. By supporting novel ideas, offering resources for experimentation, and recognizing triumphs, leaders may promote risk-taking and innovation.
✓ Present chances for advancement. Team members must possess the required abilities and expertise to lead to practice shared leadership. By delivering instruction, coaching, and mentoring, leaders can provide possibilities for growth.
✓ Celebrate accomplishments. It's crucial to recognize team members who take on leadership roles. This might encourage team members and maintain their interest.

By encouraging shared leadership, businesses can foster team creativity by adhering to these practical implications.

- *Following are some Additional Pointers for Organizations Seeking to Encourage Shared Leadership:*

✓ Ensure that shared leadership is supported by the organizational culture. Collaboration, participation, and empowerment should be valued in the workplace culture.
✓ Offer team members and leaders chances for training and growth. This will make it possible to guarantee that everyone possesses the abilities and information required to take part in shared leadership.
✓ Establish a framework to recognize and reward shared leadership. Team members will be encouraged to continue delegating leadership roles as a result.
✓ Be persistent and patient. Creating shared leadership takes time. Don't count on seeing results right away.

These guidelines can help businesses establish a shared leadership culture that fosters innovation and performance among teams.

VI. CONCLUSION

A new leadership approach called "shared leadership" places a focus on sharing, involvement, and collaboration between team members and leaders. Reviewing the studies on shared leadership to date reveals that these three areas—creativity, stress reduction, and employee satisfaction—are

all positively impacted by shared leadership. The mechanisms and methods of shared leadership implementation, as well as the study of shared leadership in various cultural contexts, should be further investigated in future research.

This article offers additional proof that effective team outcomes depend on shared leadership. In the essay, shared leadership was particularly linked to team task performance responsibilities. The paper backs up Ford and Sullivan's (2004) assertion that creative concepts and tactics developed early in the team cycle are more likely to be appreciated and used in successful outcomes. Shared leadership has consistently been demonstrated to be crucial for enhancing individual and team performance.

In conclusion, this research will be extremely helpful to management in a variety of real-world applications. Most critically, the study supports the link between shared leadership and productive teams. It implies that shared leadership can enhance team performance. Therefore, group members who share leadership responsibilities and duties may need assistance, and managers who wish to encourage high levels of effectiveness may want to take measures to ensure that they have many opportunities to interact with one another.

REFERENCES

[1]. Abfalter, D. (2013), "Authenticity and respect: leading creative teams in the performing arts", Creativity and Innovation Management, Vol. 22 No. 3, pp. 295-306, doi: 10.1111/caim.12004.

[2]. Ali, A., Wang, H. and Johnson, R. E. (2020), "Empirical analysis of shared leadership promotion and team creativity: an adaptive leadership perspective", Journal of Organizational Behavior, Vol. 41 No. 5, pp. 405-423, doi: 10.1002/job.2437.

[3]. Amabile, T.M. (1998), How to Kill Creativity, Harvard Business School Publishing Boston, MA.

[4]. Ashauer, S.A. and Macan, T. (2013), "How can leaders foster team learning? Effects of leader-assigned mastery and performance goals and psychological safety", The Journal of Psychology, Vol. 147 No. 6, pp. 541-561.

[5]. Aubé, C. Brunelle, E. and Rousseau, V. (2014), "Flow experience and team performance: The role of team goal commitment and information exchange", Motivation and Emotion, Vol. 38 No. 1, pp. 120-130.

[6]. Aubé, C. Brunelle, E. and Rousseau, V. (2014), "Flow experience and team performance: The role of team goal commitment and information exchange", Motivation and Emotion, Vol. 38 No. 1, pp. 120-130.

[7]. Avolio, B. J., & Gardner, W. L. (2005). Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership. The Leadership Quarterly, 16(3), 315-338.

[8]. Avolio, B.J., Walumbwa, F.O. and Weber, T.J. (2009), "Leadership: current theories, research, and future directions", Annual Review of Psychology, Vol. 60, pp. 421-449.

[9]. Barker, M. and Neailey, K. (1999), "From individual learning to project team learning and innovation: a structured approach", Journal of Workplace Learning, Vol. 11 No. 2, pp. 60-67.

[10]. Barsade, S. G. and Gibson, D. E. (2012), "Group affects its influence on individual and group outcomes", Current Directions in Psychological Science, Vol. 21 No. 2, pp. 119-123.

[11]. Bligh, M.C., Pearce, C.L. and Kohles, J.C., (2006), "The importance of self-and shared leadership in team-based knowledge work: a meso-level model of leadership dynamics", Journal of Managerial Psychology, Vol. 21 No. 4, pp. 296-318.

[12]. Boies, K. Lvina, E. and Martens, M. L. (2011), "Shared leadership and team performance in a business strategy simulation", Journal of Personnel Psychology. Vol. 9 No. 4, pp. 195-202.

[13]. Boies, K., Lvina, E. and Martens, M. L. (2010), "Shared leadership and team performance in a business strategy simulation", Journal of Personnel Psychology, Vol. 9 No. 4, pp. 195-202, doi: 10.1027/1866-5888/a000021.

[14]. Boies, K., Lvina, E., & Martens, M. L. (2010). Shared leadership and team performance in a business strategy simulation. Journal of Personnel Psychology, 9(4), 195.

[15]. Carmeli, A., & Gittell, J. H. (2009). High-quality relationships, psychological safety, and learning from failures in work organizations. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 30(6), 709- 729.

[16]. Carson, J. B. Tesluk, P. E. and Marrone, J. A. (2007), "Shared leadership in teams: An investigation of antecedent conditions and performance", Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 50 No. 5, pp. 1217-1234.

[17]. Carson, J. B., Tesluk, P. E., & Marrone, J. A. (2007). Shared leadership in teams: An investigation of antecedent conditions and performance. Academy of Management Journal, 50(5), 1217-1234.

[18]. Carson, J. B., Tesluk, P. E., & Marrone, J. A. (2007). Shared leadership in teams: An investigation of antecedent conditions and performance. Academy of Management Journal, 50(5), 1217-1234

[19]. Carson, J.B., Tesluk, P.E. and Marrone, J.A. (2007), "Shared leadership in teams: an investigation of antecedent conditions and performance", Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 50 No. 5, pp. 1217-1234, doi: 10.5465/amj.2007.20159921.

[20]. Chen, M.H. (2007), "Entrepreneurial leadership and new ventures: creativity in entrepreneurial teams", Creativity and Innovation Management, Vol. 16 No. 3, pp. 239-249.

[21]. Chen, W., Zhang, J.-H. and Zhang, Y.-L. (2022), "How shared leadership affects team performance: examining sequential mediation model using MASEM", Journal of Managerial Psychology, Vol. 37 No. 7, pp. 669-682, doi: 10.1108/JMP-04-2021-0258.

[22]. Contractor, N.S., DeChurch, L.A., Carson, J., Carter, D.R. and Keegan, B. (2012), "The topology of collective leadership", The Leadership Quarterly, Vol. 23 No. 6, pp. 994-1011.

[23]. \D'Innocenzo, L., Mathieu, J. E., & Kukenberger, M. R. (2016). A meta-analysis of different forms of shared leadership–team performance relations. Journal of Management, 42(7), 1964-1991.

[24]. Day, D. V., Gronn, P., & Salas, E. (2004). Leadership capacity in teams. Leadership Quarterly, 15(6), 857-880.

[25]. DeCusatis, C. (2008), "Creating, growing and sustaining efficient innovation teams", Creativity and Innovation Management, Vol. 17 No. 2, pp. 155-164.

[26]. DeRue, D. S., Nahrgang, J. D., Hollenbeck, J. R., & Workman, K. M. (2012). A quasi-experimental study of after-event reviews and leadership development. Personnel Psychology, 65(2), 397-422.

[27]. D'Innocenzo, L., Kukenberger, M., Farro, A.C., and Griffith, J.A. (2021), "Shared leadership performance relationship trajectories as a function of team interventions and members' collective personalities", The Leadership Quarterly, Vol. 32 No. 5, 101499, doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2021.101499.

[28]. D'Innocenzo, L., Mathieu, J.E. and Kukenberger, M.R. (2016), "A meta-analysis of different forms of shared leadership-team performance relations", Journal of Management, Vol. 42 No. 7, pp. 1964-1991, doi: 10.1177/0149206314525205.

[29]. Drescher, G. and Garbers, Y. (2016), "Shared leadership and commonality: a policy-capturing study", The Leadership Quarterly, Vol. 27 No. 2, pp. 200-217, doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2016.02.002.

[30]. Drescher, M.A., Korsgaard, M.A., Welpe, I.M., Picot, A. and Wigand, R.T. (2014), "The dynamics of shared leadership: building trust and enhancing performance", Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 99 No. 5, pp. 771-783, doi: 10.1037/a0036474.

[31]. Edmondson, A. (1999), "Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams", Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 44 No. 2, pp. 350-383.

[32]. Eisenbeiss, S.A., van Knippenberg, D. and Boerner, S. (2008), "Transformational leadership and team innovation: integrating teamclimate principles", Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 93 No. 6, p. 1438.

[33]. Ensley, M. D. Pearson, A. and Pearce, C. L. (2003), "Top management team process, shared leadership, and new venture performance: A theoretical model and research agenda", *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 13 No. 2, pp. 329-346.

[34]. 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 Resource Management Review, 13(2), 329-346.

[35]. Evans, K., Sanner, B. and Chiu, C. (2021), "Shared leadership, unshared burdens: how shared leadership structure schema lowers individual enjoyment without increasing performance", Group and Organization Management, No. 4, 1059601121 99722, doi: 10.1177/1059601121997225.

[36]. Fletcher, J.K. and Käufer, K. (2003), "Shared leadership: paradox and possibility", in Pearce, C.L. and Conger, J.A. (Eds), Shared Leadership: Reframing the Hows and Whys of Leadership, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 21-47.

[37]. Friedrich, T.L., Vessey, W.B., Schuelke, M.J., Ruark, G.A. and Mumford, M.D. (2009), "A framework for understanding collective leadership: the selective utilization of leader and team expertise within networks", The Leadership Quarterly, Vol. 20 No. 6, pp. 933-958.

[38]. Fu, H., Ye, B.H.B. and Xu, X.Y. (2020), "The cross-level effect of shared leadership on tourism employee proactive behavior and adaptive performance", Sustainability, Vol. 12 No. 15, p. 6173, doi: 10.3390/su12156173.

[39]. Gibb, C.A., Gilbert, D. and Lindzey, G. (1954a), Leadership, Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, Vol. 2.

[40]. Gittell, J. H., & Douglass, A. (2012). Relational leadership for strategic success. Oxford University Press.

[41]. Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader–member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. Leadership Quarterly, 6(2), 219-247.

[42]. Greer, L.L., Jong, B., Schouten, M.E. and Dannals, J.E. (2018), "Why and when hierarchy impacts team effectiveness: a meta-analytic integration", Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 103 No. 6, pp. 591-613, doi: 10.1037/apl0000291.

[43]. Gronn, P. (2002), "Distributed leadership as a unit of analysis", The Leadership Quarterly, Vol. 13 No. 4, pp. 423-451.

[44]. Gu, J., Zhi, C., Qian, H., Liu, H. and Huang, S. (2016), "A multilevel analysis of the relationship between shared leadership and creativity in inter-organizational teams", The Journal of Creative Behavior, Vol. 52 No. 2, pp. 109-126, doi: 10.1002/jocb.135.

[45]. Gu, Q., Liang, B. and Cooke, F.L. (2022), "How does shared leadership affect creativity in teams? A multilevel motivational investigation in the Chinese context", The International Journal of Human Resource Management, Vol. 33 No. 8, pp. 1641-1669, doi: 10.1080/09585192.2020.1783345.

[46]. Gully, S. M. Devine, D. J. and Whitney, D. J. (2012), "A meta-analysis of cohesion and performance effects of level of analysis and task interdependence", *Small Group Research*, Vol. 43 No. 6, pp. 702-725.

[47]. Han, J., Yoon, J., Choi, W. and Hong, G. (2021), "The effects of shared leadership on team performance", Leadership and Organization Development Journal, Vol. 42 No. 4, pp. 593-605, doi: 10.1108/LODJ-01-2020-0023.

[48]. Han, S. J. and Beyerlein, M. (2016), "Framing the effects of multinational cultural diversity on virtual team processes", *Small Group Research,* Vol. 47 No. 4, pp. 351-383.

[49]. Han, S.J., Lee, Y., Beyerlein, M. and Kolb, J. (2018), "Shared leadership in teams: the role of coordination, goal commitment, and knowledge sharing on perceived team performance", Team Performance Management, Vol. 24 Nos 3-4, pp. 150-168, doi: 10.1108/TPM-11-2016-0050.

[50]. Hao, P. (2016), "The effects and mechanisms of shared leadership on the team and individual outputs", Doctoral dissertation, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Wuhan.

[51]. Heifitz, R. and Laurie, D. (1999), "Mobilizing adaptive work: beyond visionary leadership", in Conger, J., Spreitzer, G. and Lawler, E. (Eds), The Leader's Change Handbook, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA, p. 65.

[52]. Hoch, J.E. and Kozlowski, S.W. (2014), "Leading virtual teams: hierarchical leadership, structural supports, and shared team leadership", Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 99 No. 3, pp. 390-403, doi: 10.1037/a0030264.

[53]. Hogg, M. A., & van Knippenberg, D. (2003). Social identity and leadership processes in groups. Advances in experimental social psychology, 35, 1-52.

[54]. Ishikawa, J. (2012). Transformational leadership and gatekeeping leadership: The roles of the norm for maintaining consensus and shared leadership in team performance. Asia Pacific Journal of Management, 29(2), 265-283

[55]. Ji, H. (2018), "Uncovering the dark side of shared leadership: a perspective of hierarchical functionalism", Doctoral dissertation, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou.

[56]. Kasper-Fuehrera, E. C. and Ashkanasy, N. M. (2001), "Communicating trustworthiness and building trust in inter-organizational virtual organizations",*Journal of Management*, Vol. 27 No. 3, pp. 235-254.

[57]. Katz, D. and Kahn, R.L. (1978), The Social Psychology of Organizations, Wiley New York, NY.

[58]. Kaur, A. (2013), "Shared leadership: good or bad for team innovation?", Academy of Management Proceedings, No. 1, 11810, doi: 10.5465/ambpp. 2013.11810abstract.

[59]. Kilduff, G.J., Willer, R. and Anderson, C. (2016), "Hierarchy and its discontents: status disagreement leads to withdrawal of contribution and lower group performance", Organization Science, Vol. 27 No. 2, pp. 373-390, doi: 10.1287/orsc.2016.1058.

[60]. Klasmeier, K.N. and Rowold, J. (2020), "A multilevel investigation of predictors and outcomes of shared leadership", Journal of Organizational Behavior, Vol. 41 No. 9, pp. 915-930, doi: 10.1002/job.2477.

[61]. Koeslag-Kreunen, M., Van den Bossche, P., Hoven, M., Van der Klink, M. and Gijselaers, W. (2018), "When leadership powers team learning: a meta-analysis", Small Group Research, Vol. 49 No. 4, pp. 475-513.

[62]. Kozlowski, S. W., and Ilgen, D. R. (2006), "Enhancing the effectiveness of work groups and teams", *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, Vol. 7 No. 3, pp. 77-124.

[63]. Leight, C., Xie, L., Han, S. J., Beyerlein, M., & Zarestky, J. (2018). Emergence of Complementary Shared Leadership Roles: A Video Analysis of Project Teams. Proceedings of the 2018 Academy of Human Resource Development International Research Conference in the Americas. Richmond, Virginia, USA.

[64]. Li, T. (2019), "The role configurations of shared leadership and their effects on team creativity", Doctoral dissertation, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou.

[65]. Li, X., Zhang, Z., & Song, X. M. (2018). Is it always beneficial to take over your supervisor's job? A social network perspective on subordinate-supervisor similarity in abusive supervision. Journal of Applied Psychology, 103(2), 163-177.

[66]. Liu, C.Y. (2017), "Influencing mechanism of shared leadership style on employee's challenge-oriented organizational citizenship behavior: the mediating role of team reflexivity and psychological empowerment", Doctoral dissertation, South China University of Technology, Guangzhou.

[67]. Liu, D., Liao, H. and Loi, R. (2012), "The dark side of leadership: a three-level investigation of the cascading effect of abusive supervision on employee creativity", Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 55 No. 5, pp. 1187-1212.

[68]. Lorinkova, N. M. Pearsall, M. J. and Sims, H. P. (2013), "Examining the differential longitudinal performance of directive versus empowering leadership in teams", *Academy of Management Journal*, Nol. 56 No.2, pp. 573-596.

[69]. Lorinkova, N.M. and Bartol, K.M. (2021), "Shared leadership development and team performance: a new look at the dynamics of shared leadership", Personnel Psychology, Vol. 74 No. 1, pp. 77-107, doi: 10.1111/peps.12409.

[70]. Mael, F., & Ashforth, B. E. (1992). Alumni and their alma mater: A partial test of the reformulated model of organizational identification. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 13(2), 103-123. 268

[71]. Mannix, E., & Neale, M. A. (2005). What differences make a difference?: The promise and reality of diverse teams in organizations. Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 6(2), 31–55. doi:10.1111/j.1529-1006.2005.00022.x

[72]. Mumford, M.D. (2000), "Managing creative people: strategies and tactics for innovation", Human Resource Management Review, Vol. 10 No. 3, pp. 313-351.

[73]. Nicolaides, V.C., LaPort, K.A., Chen, T.R., Tomassetti, A.J., Weis, E.J., Zaccaro, S.J. and Cortina, J.M. (2014), "The shared leadership of teams: a meta-analysis of proximal, distal, and moderating relationships", The Leadership Quarterly, Vol. 25 No. 5, pp. 923-942.

[74]. Nicolaides, V.C., LaPort, K.A., Chen, T.R., Tomassetti, A.J., Weis, E.J., Zaccaro, S.J. and Cortina, J.M. (2014), "The shared leadership of teams: a meta-analysis of proximal, distal, and moderating relationships", The Leadership Quarterly, Vol. 25 No. 5, pp. 923-942, doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2014.06.006.

[75]. Nordbäck, E.S. and Espinosa, J.A. (2019), "Effective coordination of shared leadership in global virtual teams", Journal of Management Information Systems, Vol. 36 No. 1, pp. 321-350, doi: 10.1080/07421222.2018.1558943.

[76]. Pandey, A., Gupta, V. and Gupta, R.K. (2019), "Spirituality and innovative behavior in teams: examining the mediating role of team learning", IIMB Management Review, Vol. 31 No. 2, pp. 116-126.

[77]. Pasarakonda, S., Grote, G., Schmutz, J.B., Bogdanovic, J. and Manser, T. (2021), "A strategic core role perspective on team coordination: benefits of centralized leadership for managing task complexity in the operating room", Human Factors, Vol. 63 No. 5, pp. 910-925, doi: 10.1177/0018720820906041.

[78]. Pearce, C. L., & Conger, J. A. (2003). Shared leadership: Reframing the hows and whys of leadership. Sage Publications.

[79]. Pearce, C. L., & Sims Jr, H. P. (2002). Vertical versus shared leadership as predictors of the effectiveness of change management teams: An examination of aversive, directive, transactional, transformational, and empowering leader

[80]. Pearce, C.L. and Conger, J.A. (2003), "All those years ago: the historical underpinnings of shared leadership", in Pearce, C.L. and Conger, J.A. (Eds), Shared Leadership: Reframing the Hows and Whys of Leadership, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 1-18.

[81]. Pearce, C.L. and Conger, J.A. (2003), Shared Leadership: Reframing the Hows and Whys of Leadership, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 1-18.

[82]. Pearce, C.L., Conger, J.A. and Locke, E.A. (2007), "Shared leadership theory", The Leadership Quarterly, Vol. 18 No. 3, pp. 281-288, doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.03.009.

[83]. Pirola-Merlo, A. and Mann, L. (2004), "The relationship between individual creativity and team creativity: aggregating across people and time", Journal of Organizational Behavior, Vol. 25 No. 2, pp. 235-257.

[84]. Robert, L.P. and You, S. (2017), "Are you satisfied yet? Shared leadership, individual trust, autonomy, and satisfaction in virtual teams", Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, Vol. 69 No. 4, pp. 503-513, doi: 10.1002/asi.23983.

[85]. Savelsbergh, C.M., van der Heijden, B.I. and Poell, R.F. (2009), "The development and empirical validation of a multidimensional measurement instrument for team learning behaviors", Small Group Research, Vol. 40 No. 5, pp. 578-607.

[86]. Scott-Young, C.M., Georgy, M. and Grisinger, A. (2019), "Shared leadership in project teams: an integrative multi-level conceptual model and research agenda", International Journal of Project Management, Vol. 37 No. 4, pp. 565-581, doi: 10.1016/j.ijproman.2019.02.002.

[87]. Serban, A. and Roberts, A.J. (2016), "Exploring antecedents and outcomes of shared leadership in a creative context: a mixed-methods approach", The Leadership Quarterly, Vol. 27 No. 2,

[88]. Serban, A. and Roberts, A.J.B. (2016), "Exploring antecedents and outcomes of shared leadership in a creative context: a mixed-methods approach", The Leadership Quarterly, Vol. 27 No. 2, pp. 181-199, doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2016.01.009.

[89]. Shin, S.J. and Zhou, J. (2007), "When educational specialization heterogeneity is related to creativity in research and development teams? Transformational leadership as a moderator", Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 92 No. 6, p. 1709.

[90]. Srivastava, A., Bartol, K. M. and Locke, E. A. (2006), "Empowering leadership in management teams: Effects on knowledge sharing, efficacy, and performance", Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 49 No. 6, pp. 1239-1251.

[91]. Taggar, S. (2002), "Individual creativity and group ability to utilize individual creative resources: a multilevel model", Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 45 No. 2, pp. 315-330.

[92]. Tajfel, H. and Turner, J. (1986), "The social identity theory of inter-group behavior", in Worchel, S. and Austin, W.G. (Eds), Psychology of Intergroup Relations, Nelson-Hall Publishers, Chicago, pp. 7-24.

[93]. Valentine, M. A. Nembhard, I. M. and Edmondson, A. C. (2015), "Measuring teamwork in health care settings: A review of survey instruments", Medical Care, Vol. 53 No. 4, pp. 16-30.

[94]. Wang, D., Waldman, D.A. and Zhang, Z. (2014), "A meta-analysis of shared leadership and team effectiveness", Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 99 No. 2, pp. 181-198, doi: 10.1037/a0034531.

[95]. Wang, G., Oh, I. S., Courtright, S. H., & Colbert, A. E. (2011). Transformational leadership and performance across criteria.

[96]. Wang, H. and Peng, Q. (2022), "Is shared leadership as perfect as we thought? Positive and negative outcomes of shared leadership on employee creativity", Journal of Creative Behavior, Vol. 56 No. 3, pp. 328-343, doi: 10.1002/jocb.532.

[97]. Wang, L., Jiang, W., Liu, Z. and Ma, X. (2017), "Shared leadership and team effectiveness: the examination of LMX differentiation and servant leadership on the emergence and consequences of shared leadership", Human Performance, Vol. 30 No. 4, pp. 1-14, doi: 10.1080/08959285.2017.1345909.

[98]. Wood, M.S. and Fields, D. (2007), "Exploring the impact of shared leadership on management team member job outcomes", Baltic Journal of Management, Vol. 2 No. 3, pp. 251-272, doi: 10.1108/17465260710817474.

[99]. Wu, C.M. and Chen, T.J. (2018), "Collective psychological capital: linking shared leadership, organizational commitment, and creativity", International Journal of Hospitality Management, Vol. 74, pp. 75-84.

[100]. Wu, Q. and Kathryn, C. (2016), "Shared leadership and team creativity: a social network analysis in engineering design teams", Journal of Technology Management and Innovation, Vol. 11 No. 2, pp. 2-12, doi: 10.4067/s0718-27242016000200001.

[101]. Wu, Q., Cormican, K., & Chen, G. (2018). A Meta-Analysis of Shared Leadership: Antecedents, Consequences, and Moderators. Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 1548051818820862.

[102]. Yuki, G. (2006) Leadership in Organizations (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice-Hall

[103]. Yukl, G., & Van Fleet, D. D. (1992). Theory and research on leadership in organizations. Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology, 2, 147-198.

[104]. Zhao, T. (2013), "A study on the influence of shared leadership on knowledge hiding", Doctoral dissertation, Jinan University, Guangzhou.

[105]. Zhu, J.L., Liao, Z.Y., Yam, K.C. and Johnson, R.E. (2018), "Shared leadership: a state-of-the-art review and future research agenda", Journal of Organizational Behavior, Vol. 39 No. 7, pp. 834-852, doi: 10.1002/job.2296.