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Introduction

• Understanding and requirements on team leadership have changed: Top-down oriented forms of leadership are supplemented by more lateral and collective forms of leadership (Contractor et al., 2012; DeRue & Ashford, 2010)

• Central role of shared leadership as an internal and informal source of team leadership (Morgeson, DeRue, & Karam, 2010)

Contribution

• Interplay between different antecedents of shared leadership
• Testing an IPO-model with time-lagged and multi-source data
• Considering multilevel structure by taking a deeper look at individual perceptions and team level emergent states
Theory

Shared leadership

- Chiu and colleagues define shared leadership as a „cohesive network where all the team members engage in frequent leading-following interactions and, thus, share both leader and follower identities at the same time.” (2016, p. 1707)
Theory

- Choice of antecedents based on an IPO Model of Hoch & Dulebohn (2013)
- Explaining theories: Adaptive leadership theory (DeRue & Ashford, 2010) & social exchange theory (Cropanzano, Anthony, Daniels, & Hall 2017)
  - POS: Reciprocity and felt obligation foster shared leadership (Cropanzano et al., 2017; Kurtessis et al., 2017; Wegge et al., 2010)
  - Transformational leadership: Collective goals and identification enhance engagement in leading/following interactions (Hoch, 2013)
  - Intrateam trust: Reduced risk for claiming/granting leadership influence (Drescher et al., 2014)
- Leading towards common goal increases effectiveness and foster team creativity (e.g. Hoch 2013; Wang et al., 2014)
Theory

Research Model

Transformational Leadership + Trust + POS → Shared Leadership → Team Performance + Team Creativity
Method

Design: Field study with three measurement occasions (time lag of 1 month)

Team leaders \((N = 144)\)
- Gender: 40\% female
- Age: \(M = 44.2, SD = 11.3\) years
- Education: 58\% University degree

Team members \((N = 602)\)
- Gender: 57\% female
- Age: \(M = 36.0, SD = 11.7\) years
- Education: 45\% University degree

Statistical Analysis Strategy:
- 1-1-2 Bayesian multilevel path-analytic approach (Lüdtke et al., 2008; Preacher et al., 2010)
- 500,000 MCMC-iterations, weak-informative priors (Depaoli & Clifton, 2015)
- Model/MCMC-convergence evaluation with PPC, PSR, trace plots (Depaoli & van de Schoot, 2017)
Method

Measurement

- Transformational leadership: 28 items, $\omega_{\text{within}} = .97$ and $\omega_{\text{between}} = .95$, Rowold & Poethke (2017)
- Trust: 9 items, $\omega_{\text{within}} = .92$ and $\omega_{\text{between}} = .99$, Lehmann-Willenbrock & Kauffeld (2010)
- POS: 6 items, $\omega_{\text{within}} = .89$ and $\omega_{\text{between}} = .91$, Eisenberger et al. (2001)
- Shared Leadership: 1 item, Carson, Tesluk & Marrone (2007)
- Team Performance: 26 items, $\omega_{\text{between}} = .95$, Pearce & Sims (2002)
- Team Creativity: 13 items, $\omega_{\text{between}} = .94$, George & Zhou (2001)

- Control variables: Team size, team tenure, team leader tenure (see Carson et al., 2007; Nicolaides et al. 2014)
Results

Bayesian model fit:

- Posterior Predictive $p$-Value = .41, CI = [-29.44; 37.78]
- Potential Scale Reduction = 1.001
- Trace plots show a typical pattern of MCMC-convergence

Supplementary ML-estimation:

- In general same pattern of results; point estimates are slightly higher for ML
- $\chi^2 = 28.99$, $df = 23$, $p = .18$, CFI = .99, RMSEA = .02, $\text{SRMR}_{\text{within}} = .03$, $\text{SRMR}_{\text{between}} = .10$
Results

Transformational Leadership T1
\[0.41^*\] \rightarrow \text{Trust T1} [0.41^*] \rightarrow \text{Shared Lead. T2}

\text{POS T1} \rightarrow [0.09] \rightarrow [0.41^*] \rightarrow \text{Shared Lead. T2}

\text{Transformational Leadership T1} \rightarrow [0.11^*] \rightarrow \text{Trust T1} [0.10] \rightarrow \text{Shared Lead. T2}

\text{POS T1} \rightarrow [0.19^{**}] \rightarrow \text{Shared Lead. T2}

\text{Performance T3} \rightarrow [0.31^*]

\text{Creativity T3} \rightarrow [0.43^{**}]

Team-Level

Individual-Level
Summary and Contribution

• Emergence of shared leadership depends on intrateam trust and transformational leadership: Collective identity, shared purpose, and enhanced willingness for risk-taking can foster claiming/granting leadership influence within teams (DeRue & Ashford, 2010; Kark et al., 2003; Schoorman et al., 2007)

• Testing an IPO-model: Shared Leadership as an important driver to enhance team effectiveness and creativity (Hoch & Dulebohn, 2013; Morgeson et al., 2010)

• Multilevel consideration of shared leadership highlights differentiated effects at individual vs. team level: Individual perception of every team members differs from team level construct (see Kozlowski, 2015)
Discussion & Implications

Strengths & Limitations

• Convenience sample (Marcus et al., 2017)
• Common method bias: Questionnaire-based online survey (Podsakoff et al., 2003)
• Time-lagged design & multi-source data

Implications & Further Research

• Differentiated relationships for POS, trust and shared leadership at individual vs. team level highlights the importance of multilevel research
• Interplay between the emergent states trust and shared leadership needs further attention: Drescher et al. (2014) examined reverse direction
• Possible effects of shared leadership on affect, behavior, and cognition of formal leader
• For organizations: Shared leadership proofed as complement for vertical leadership
Thank you for your attention!
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