

## TEAMWORK

# What Makes a Good Team Leader?

Denise L Reyes, Rice University

Julie Dinh, Rice University

Eduardo Salas, Rice University

### ABSTRACT

Although team leadership is important across many contexts, it is particularly influential in traditional, hierarchical organizations such as the military. In these settings, leadership can explain a major portion of variance in team performance. Failure to understand this relationship can harm the training and development at multiple levels (Zaccaro, Rittman, & Marks, 2001). We draw from the vast literature to identify and elaborate on overarching themes, or key insights, that can guide the practice of team leadership. Our insights follow the lifespan of a team – creation, inception, and sustainment of a team. We conclude with suggestions for future investigations, based on the state of the literature.

---

*“The high commander must therefore be calm, clear, and determined... His success will be measured more by his ability to lead and persuade than by his adherence to fixed notions of arbitrary command practices.”*

*Dwight D. Eisenhower (1948)*

Dwight D. Eisenhower held many impressive titles during his lifetime, including 34th President of the United States, Five Star General of the United States Army, and Supreme Allied Commander of the Allied Expeditionary Force (World War II). However, prior to ascending to such esteemed positions, “Ike” proved his mettle through exceptional command of military teams. As a young commanding officer, he strategized his units by using charismatic leadership: identifying his junior officers’ strengths, engaging with them openly, and optimizing distribution of their talent (Ambrose, 1983). Because of his deep understanding of the gravity and impact of the leadership of teams, Eisenhower stands as an exemplar of effective military direction.

Importantly, one need not be a five-star general to experience the effects of strong team leadership. In fact, the lessons from Eisenhower’s legacy and leadership are universal. Today, work continues to depend on collaboration and group-based effort, requiring strong and adaptive team leadership. Across contexts, team leadership is a key driver of affective and behavioral outcomes within organizations, enhancing team cohesion, and organizational

results (Burke, Stagl, Klein, Goodwin, Salas, & Halpin, 2006; Foels, Driskell, Mullen, & Salas, 2000; Zaccaro, Rittman, & Marks, 2001). Moreover, team leadership itself is a valuable asset, as it leads to individual professional development, team learning, and general increased leadership capacity (Day, Gronn, & Salas, 2004). This paper reviews the literature around team leadership, distilling foundational and current research findings into evidence-based insights.

We first define a team as a group of individuals who play specific roles and interact dynamically, interdependently, and adaptively toward a mutually-shared goal (Salas, Dickinson, Converse, & Tannenbaum, 1992). Within this type of group, leaders play an important role in maintenance, development,

and effectiveness (e.g., Hackman & Walton, 1986; McGrath, 1962). Indeed, team leaders can define compelling directions, develop enabling structures, ensure supportive contexts, and provide access to expert coaching (Hackman, 2002; Stagl, Salas, & Burke, 2007) – all functions which serve to bolster the team and its performance.

Leadership in teams differentiates itself from general leadership in critical ways, including through its approach, contingencies, emphases, and features (Kozlowski, Watola, Jensen, Kim, & Botero, 2008). Given the dynamism and developmental idiosyncrasies of group work, leaders of teams must focus on the process of leadership, rather than its structure. Instead of advancing universal ideals, leaders must adapt and

---

**Denise Reyes, M.A.** is a fourth-year doctoral student in Industrial/Organizational Psychology at Rice University and the 2019 Recipient of the Leslie W. Joyce and Paul W. Thayer Graduate Fellowship in Industrial/Organizational Psychology. She graduated with a Bachelor's Degree in Psychology and a minor in Leadership Studies from the University of Central Florida as Top Honor Graduate. As a Graduate Research Fellow of the Doerr Institute for New Leaders, her main research interests revolve around leadership and training. Other research interests include diversity, rejection in the workplace, and teams. Recently, she has published on the science of teamwork, team development, and training.

**Julie Dinh, M.A.** is a fourth-year doctoral student in Industrial/Organizational Psychology at Rice University and a Graduate Research Fellow of the National Science Foundation. She earned a B.A. in Psychology with highest honors from the University of California, Berkeley. Previously, she conducted behavioral science research for four years at the University of California, San Francisco and the San Francisco VA Medical Center. She currently leads interdisciplinary health research in collaboration with Baylor College of Medicine and Texas Children's Hospital. Her research interests include: the patient-provider relationship; healthcare teams and training; cross-cultural issues; stress and well-being; crisis management; humanitarian work; and attachment processes.

**Eduardo Salas, Ph.D.**, is the Allyn R. & Gladys M. Cline Professor and Chair of the Department of Psychological Sciences at Rice. As a senior research psychologist and Head of the Training Technology Development Branch of the Naval Air Warfare Center Training Systems Division for 15 years, he has served as a principal investigator for numerous research and development programs focusing on teamwork, team training, achieving patient safety, advanced training technology, decision-making under stress, and team performance assessment. Dr. Salas has a proven track record of developing and evaluating team performance and team training programs in high-stakes contexts, including oil and gas, aviation, law enforcement, and healthcare. His research interests are in uncovering what facilitates teamwork and team effectiveness; how to design, implement, and evaluate training and development systems; and generating evidence-based guidance for those in practice.

regulate team processes in order to develop skills across their members. Overall, team leadership is a more dynamic, fluid, and emergent process than that of general direction (Kozlowski et al., 2008). Thus, as encapsulated in the opening quote, effective leadership of teams is not static; it feeds off and into the energy of its constituents.

Although team leadership is important across many contexts, it is particularly influential in traditional, hierarchical organizations such as the military. In these settings, leadership can explain a major portion of variance in team performance (Burke, 1999; Marks, Zaccaro, & Mathieu, 2000). Failure to understand this relationship can harm the training and development at multiple levels (Zaccaro, Rittman, & Marks, 2001). When stakes are high, such suboptimal outcomes can be devastating – but, given the advances in leadership and team sciences, these tragedies can also be preventable. This paper thus attempts to advance a number of evidence-based best practices that can help team leaders optimize the performance of their members and the group as a whole.

### Insights from the Science on Team Leadership

Over the last couple of decades, the field has amassed a large body of work on team leadership. Researchers have demonstrated how different theories of leadership relate to a team's success: transformational leadership guiding a team (Chen, Kirkman, Kanfer, Allen, & Rosen, 2007; Eisenbeiss, van Knippenberg, & Boerner, 2008; Schaubroeck, Lam, & Cha, 2007); functional leadership addressing team needs (Zaccaro, Rittman, & Marks, 2001); and transactional leadership securing valued team rewards (Stagl, Salas, & Burke, 2007; Vroom, 1964). We draw from this vast literature to identify and elaborate on selected key insights that can guide the practice of team leadership. Although these insights are not comprehensive of the literature, they outline important themes that have been commonly found. Other papers, such as Hackman (1992; 2002)

guided the literature on team leadership, and more recently, Morgeson, DeRue, and Karam (2015) have suggested a framework using a temporal cycle of leadership processes to explain how leadership manifests within a team. Additionally, our insights follow the lifespan of a team – creation, inception, and sustainment of a team. Table 1 provides a summary of our insights, with best practices for each, adapted from Stagl, Salas, and Burke (2007). We conclude with suggestions for future investigations, based on the state of the literature.

### Insight 1: Initiate an Enabling Structure

At the onset of team formation, a team leader has to create a structure that enables team effectiveness (Hackman, 2002; Katerberg & Hom, 1981; Keller, 1992, 2006; Morgeson, DeRue, & Karam, 2015; Powell & Butterfield, 1984; Stagl, Salas, & Burke, 2007). This process involves:

- (1) optimizing team composition,
- (2) establishing norms that reinforce teamwork behaviors, and
- (3) designating roles and responsibilities while creating a sense of ownership within all team members.

To maximize the team's effectiveness, a leader should select a group of individuals with a comprehensive mixture of knowledge, skills, and abilities. Nevertheless, they should not only select those who demonstrate expert technical skills, but also the capacity to work well with the others on the team (Morgeson, DeRue, & Karam, 2015). Research suggests that there are specific individual level factors that generally contribute to team performance, such as emotional stability (Blackwell Landon et al., 2018) and team value orientation (Feitosa, Grossman, & Salazar, 2018; Rosenfield et al., 2018; Spitzmuller & Park, 2018). However, more recently, researchers argue that it is the combination of varying traits that is a stronger predictor of team performance, rather than individual

characteristics (Bell, Brown, Colaneri, & Outland, 2018). For example, research on astronaut teams found that team performance is more dependent on how the team members' personalities and other characteristics complement each other, rather than there being one universally ideal personality (Blackwell Landon et al., 2018).

Once the team members have been selected, team norms must be declared. Norms are the common expectations of behavior of team members (Hackman, 1992). In other words, they encourage desired actions and prohibit unsuitable behaviors. This is important as setting norms has been shown to be a driver in performance and team effectiveness (Hyatt & Ruddy, 1997). Hackman (2002) states that the fundamental norms are those that are outward-looking, such that they address the relationship between a team and its performance context. These norms generally advise that members should actively scan the operational environment to adjust their performance strategies accordingly; they point out the boundaries of specific behaviors that should always be done, and those that should never be acted out (Hackman, 2002).

To ensure that the team is functioning properly, the leader must define the boundaries to clarify who is responsible and accountable for outcomes (Stagl, Salas, & Burke, 2007). Under some circumstances, individuals might temporarily step in to support the team, which could cause confusion about who is held responsible for the team outputs. In such cases, the leader is responsible for clarifying any uncertainty. They can do so by holding preliminary meetings that specify the team's purpose and indicate its membership. Membership rosters are another simple tool that can distinguish the core members from individuals who play a supporting role.

Along with establishing who is responsible for the team outcomes, the leader must determine the team's functions that need to be fulfilled, inherently indicating their limited authority. The team leader should inform the team of its exact responsibilities in order to maintain control of what is done; this prevents team members from taking on more than they can handle, or inadequately completing their assigned tasks. Relatedly, the leader should instill a sense of ownership for its team members to motivate and satisfy them (Cummings, 1978; Deci, 1975; Hackman & Oldham, 1980). The work should be designed to have

*More recently, researchers argue that it is the combination of varying traits that is a stronger predictor of team performance, rather than individual characteristics.*

many core characteristics so that each team member has a small part in the big picture, and feels that their role is essential for the whole product to work out. This can help promote within-team goal setting, self-observation, and self-reward (Stagl, Salas, & Burke, 2007).

### **Insight 2: Define Team Goals and Task Interdependence at the Onset of a Team's Formation**

During preliminary stages of task performance, team leaders have a key opportunity to change and influence the trajectory of a team. By providing guidance and developing skills, leaders can shape team processes, behavior and performance henceforth. They may do so through a number of methods, including conducting prebriefings, emphasizing shared goals, and energizing and engaging team members.

Although many are familiar with the concept of debriefing, its earlier counterpart can be just as, if not more, important in determining outcomes. Prebriefings,

conducted prior to the team performance episode, build the foundation for future team performance (Stagl et al., 2007; Tannenbaum, Smith-Jentsch, & Behson, 1998). They help create a shared mental model, or collectively-held knowledge structures that allow teams to coordinate member action and interact effectively with their environment (Mathieu, Heffner, Goodwin, Salas, & Cannon-Bowers, 2000). Across aviation and manufacturing settings, prebriefings have been shown to increase teamwork climate, compensatory behavior, team learning, and team performance (Edmondson, 1999; Smith-Jentsch, Salas, & Brannick, 1994). By establishing particulars about a mission, prebriefings can ensure that team members possess the same information and can thus collaborate effectually.

Indeed, leaders should consider prebriefings as a strategic investment of time, in that its implementation prior to a performance episode can lead to increased efficiency downstream. Prebriefings also give leaders the vital opportunity to amplify a team's collective motivation, cohesion, and commitment (Hackman, 2002). For example, team leaders can enact transformational behaviors, evoking a shared mission and mutual beliefs in specific team efficacy and general effectiveness (Stagl et al., 2007). During the prebriefing period, team leaders can also bolster psychological safety: the shared belief that the team is safe for interpersonal risk-taking, without fear of backlash (Edmondson, 1999). Indeed, leaders who elicit feedback, discussion, and informal reinforcement from members can open channels of communication and improve the cultural climate within their teams (Stagl et al., 2007). The following best practices in this section can also be incorporated into prebriefings. Altogether, team leadership behaviors during prebriefing then enhance team morale and teamwork at large, resulting in stronger cooperation and performance.

The most effective teams are motivated by a collective aspiration – whether it is defeating a common enemy or acting toward shared goals. Providing team members

with a compelling and uniting mission accomplishes several important things. First, it provides direction by aligning performance strategy with the team's purpose (Hackman, 2002). Second, it clarifies the consistencies between a team member's self-concept and the actions performed on behalf of the team (House & Shamir, 1993). Ultimately, working together toward a singular goal fosters a greater collective identity, strengthening loyalty and performance.

Through highlighting interdependencies, team leaders may then instill within their members a sense of collective or team orientation, or “the propensity to work in a collective manner in team settings” (Driskell, Salas, & Hughes, 2010, p. 317). Those who are collectively oriented value teamwork (Eby & Dobbins, 1997; Jackson, Colquitt, Wesson, & Zapata-Phelan, 2006), which can lead to productivity. In the team performance context, Driskell and colleagues (2010) found that collective orientation was associated with a number of improvements across the task space, including decision-making, negotiation, and execution. Leaders can activate collective orientations and other uniting mindsets by harnessing transformational leadership. By calling upon ideological values, team leaders can frame a mission such that team members understand that subordination of self-interest can serve the greater group objective (Stagl et al., 2007). Shared principles can then be used as rubric in decision-making, directing team members to move toward shared goals when alternate paths exist (Hackman, 2002; Stagl et al., 2007).

Importantly, it is not enough to establish shared goals, but ones that are both challenging and within reach. Indeed, leaders must provide careful guidance, such that their direction treads the line between the possible and impossible (Stagl et al., 2007; Welch & Welch, 2005). Team leaders can further inspire members through the articulation of the vision by framing a compelling team purpose. For example, they can specify goal end states but not means of

accomplishment (Hackman, 2002). Emphasizing the “destination” but not the “journey” challenges and energizes team members to apply their expertise and collaborate toward a goal.

Once these goals are set, effective leaders maximally engage team members by identifying and utilizing talent accurately (Fleishman et al., 1991). When direction is precise and meaningful, team members are more likely to apply the breadth of their experiences, expertise, and competencies during tasks (Hackman, 2002). This atmosphere also motivates senior team members to monitor, mentor, and provide back-up behavior to subordinates (Stagl et al., 2007). To this end, team leaders can engage in meaningful monitoring prior to the performance episode. For example, leaders can scan their teams during interactive prebriefings in order to strategize the distribution of skills (Kozlowski, Gully, Salas, & Cannon-Bowers, 1996). An open review of the mission inspires team members to recognize and reflect upon the ways in which they can contribute to success. Checking in with and ensuring the maximal engagement of team members enhances performance and morale.

### **Insight 3: Foster Psychological Safety**

All teams face conflict at some point, whether it be related to interpersonal or task issues. In these situations, it is particularly difficult, yet imperative, that teammates participate in open and honest communication. Transparent communication can only occur if they do not feel worried about being judged or ridiculed by the others on the team, emphasizing the importance of psychological safety (Edmondson, 1999). Team leaders play a critical role in fostering a psychologically safe environment. Expanding upon our previous discussion thereof, we elaborate on three main ways that a leader can help foster psychological safety:

- (1) admitting their own faults,
- (2) asking for input, and
- (3) providing developmental debriefing sessions.

First, when a leader admits their own faults, he/she makes others feel at ease to communicate any errors they might make. This is a simple yet effective way to help team members feel comfortable opening up. Second, leaders should reach out to team members for their views and ideas on the task, when possible. This could be done by formally setting aside time for a forum during a meeting, or informally checking in with team members during performance episodes. When team members speak up, the leader should respond in a supportive and non-defensive manner (Edmondson, 1999). In many cases, a team member may not feel permitted to express their opinions; however, when they recognize that the leader truly values their opinion, it can help them express themselves more often (Edmondson, 1999). Finally, psychological safety can be developed and/or enhanced through effective team debriefs (Allen et al., 2018). If members are taught to take a learning approach and diagnose developmental areas, then they will be more likely to feel capable of speaking their mind. This is also an opportunity for the leader to recognize and acknowledge any shifts in engagement or changes in attitudes from the prebrief to a midpoint in a performance episode. Other team meetings can work the same way. It is the team leader’s responsibility to ensure that these exchanges take place and are developmental, which we will elaborate on when discussing Insight 5 (Support the Growth of Their Team Members).

### **Insight 4: Reinforce Teamwork With Feedback and Rewards**

Team performance can be greatly enhanced by providing specific feedback with objective indicators of performance (Bennis, 1999; Hyatt & Ruddy, 1997; Janz, Colquitt, & Noe, 1997). It is the team leader’s responsibility to serve as a boundary spanner to gain access to information systems that provide useful information for actionable change and improvement. It can be a difficult task, but the team leader should try their best to negotiate access to sensitive information; this can in turn can provide ample feedback that

facilitates planning and enhances performance techniques (Stagl, Salas, & Burke, 2007). Accessing these resources is crucial because individuals are more receptive to feedback when they are given concrete examples of what went wrong (e.g., how frequently the error was made, how severe the repercussions of the error were). Seeing the data also makes individuals more accountable for their actions. This can also lead to positive affect; objectively tracking performance can help recognize teammates' accomplishments, which can help members feel appreciated. Indeed, delivering feedback is most effective when leaders focus on both positive AND negative feedback. Only discussing positive feedback does not lead to any improvements, but solely concentrating on negative feedback can harm team morale; a balance is best. This leads us to reinforcing teamwork via rewards.

Although it is common in organizations to reward successful individuals, this singular focus on the accomplishments of one team member can undermine the value of interdependence and the collective effort. Team leaders need to strengthen team motivation and collaboration by implementing team-based performance-contingent rewards; otherwise, individuals will stray from the shared goal and neglect to integrate their tasks with those of the others on

implement varied reward structures for teamwork (Thayer, Petruzzelli, & McClurg, 2018). Rewards such as pay, promotion, management recognition, and requested time off can all be offered to the team as a whole (Druskat & Kayes, 1999).

Although this may seem contradictory, individual-level rewards should not be entirely abandoned. Individual-level rewards are essential for individual team member growth, which is still important for overall team effectiveness. Hackman (2002) suggests institutionalizing multi-tiered reward systems. With this approach, team-level rewards can remain clear and meaningful, while individuals also maintain self-growth. One method to reinforce teamwork behaviors, while still implementing individual-level rewards, is to include team performance in individual team member's performance evaluation (i.e., rating whether the individual served as a strong team player by exhibiting teamwork behaviors; Gibson & Kirkman, 1999).

### Insight 5: Support the Growth of Team Members

Lastly, rather than strictly directing the team, the team leader facilitates and promotes teamwork, serving as an expert coach (Morgeson, DeRue, & Karam, 2015). As the coach, they help the team perform taskwork and teamwork processes to improve overall performance. The leader can coach by exemplifying teamwork, delivering coaching interventions, offering novel task performance strategies, and providing learning opportunities.

Coaching interventions can occur throughout the team's lifespan and are most important at the beginning, midpoint, and end of team performance. As previously mentioned, prebriefing serves as a motivational meeting, whereas a meeting during the midpoint of task performance functions to

*Team debriefing, which was alluded to earlier, is a key to developing effective teamwork skills*

their team. As an example, Tebes and Thai (2018) note that many universities and academic medical centers apply policies and practices that work against interdisciplinary collaboration, such as tenure policies to publish in journals specific to one field. Therefore, when the individual has a choice of whether to work as a part of a team, if the benefits do not outweigh the costs, they may choose not to participate in a group effort. To minimize the likelihood of this, the leader should

review performance strategies for future tasks. Team debriefing, which was alluded to earlier, is a key to developing effective teamwork skills (Tannenbaum & Cerasoli, 2013). It is defined as a reflective team meeting that covers lessons learned and steps to improve performance. It was officially developed for military use in the 1970s (Morrison & Meliza, 1999); since then, it has been shown to be useful in many settings because it is an instrumental tool that leads directly to improved team learning and adaptation, or *team reflexivity* (West, 2000). The leader can designate team debriefing time for the individuals they oversee. The debriefing process requires leader engagement. Prior to conducting a debrief, team members and leaders need to be knowledgeable of appropriate teamwork competencies. Having this background will prepare members and leaders to focus on teamwork processes during performance episodes. It will also make the debrief more meaningful because they can reflect on the specific teamwork behaviors that are essential for team performance, allowing for a more interactive discussion. Going into the debrief, leaders need to be aware of how their team members are performing during the job. They should note serious failures or preventable errors so that the most critical areas of improvement are discussed and constructive feedback can be provided. This is also an opportunity for leaders to point out any successes and express gratitude for hard work. Positive feedback can help team members feel appreciated and recognized by upper management. Reyes, Salas, and Tannenbaum (2018) review evidence based practices and guidelines for conducting an effective debrief in detail. Overall, debriefing engages teams in a dialog of lessons learned, including how this newly-acquired knowledge can be used to address new challenges.

The midpoint is also an ideal time for the coach/team leader to offer novel task performance strategies. It is at this point that the leader can recognize what has been working and what should be adjusted. If there is

anything that should be shifted in the team's goal or objective, the leader can make suggestions on how the team should adapt to the environment (Stagl, Salas, & Burke, 2007). The leader can also set by example through their expertise, serving through functional leadership (Zaccaro, Rittman, Marks, 2001).

Finally, the leader should seek out developmental opportunities for their team members. However, according to Lieutenant General Walter F. Ullmer, Jr. (2010), "best practices" in this area have not been fully implemented in the Army and other important settings. To this end, team leaders should consider other avenues that can build team skills, prior to the performance episode. Talent can be optimally engaged through myriad ways: provision of conceptual training, developmental feedback, environmental support for continuous learning, responsive performance appraisal systems, holistic promotion systems, and formal mentoring (Ulmer, 2010). Of these, team leaders should consider either conducting training or arranging for formal training. Exhaustive research, including meta-analyses (Hughes et al., 2016; Salas, Nichols, & Driskell, 2007), have demonstrated the effectiveness of team interventions to improve teamwork competencies, and subsequently team performance across domains, particularly in the military (Goodwin, Blacksmith, & Coats, 2018) and healthcare (Fiscella & McDaniel, 2018; Power, 2018). Teams are rarely prepared for all of the challenges that they will face, so team training and other preemptive developmental activities are valuable tools for maximizing individual and collective performance.

### Future Directions on Team Leadership Research

Decades of research have helped us reveal these insights on team leadership. However, there are still avenues for more research. New structures have evolved over time, which reveal novel challenges for team leaders (Mathieu, Hollenbeck, Van Knippenberg, & Ilgen,



2017). We briefly discuss two areas that would be well-served by further research: multiteam systems and teams using shared leadership as opposed to having a single team leader.

### **Multiteam Systems**

The shift from individual to team work has also extended to a shift from single to multi-team systems (MTSs), which are teams of teams (Mathieu, Marks, & Zaccaro, 2001). MTSs are necessary to address more complicated and multifaceted problems that a single team cannot adequately solve (Shuffler & Carter, 2018). Today, more than ever, we are able to make rapid advancements across fields with the use of MTSs; however, collaborations across multiple fields and expertise can come with difficulties. Of course, MTSs are larger than single teams, in which case the team members tend to be more geographically and functionally diverse from one another. This inevitably leads to a hindrance of communication, whether it be due to time-related issues or difficulty understanding others' backgrounds. This could potentially add more burden on team leaders to aid communication. Another challenge for MTSs is that teamwork must also occur across teams, involving multiple team leaders. The research on MTSs is still in its nascent stage. Future research should uncover the challenges that team leaders face when engaging in a MTS, as well as the practices that can help facilitate teamwork across teams. Although very little is known about leadership in MTSs, effective team leadership may be crucial to ensure that MTS coordinate suitably in support of superordinate goals (Shuffler & Carter, 2018). The marked shift in workforces from single to multi-team systems calls for more research on the topic.

### **Teams Without a Single Leader**

In more recent years, there has been a trend away from traditional hierarchical leadership and toward leaderless teams or shared leadership. In this group structure, an individual is not always a leader or a follower. Instead,

roles can change based on the circumstances. When a team alternates the leadership position amongst the team members, this is known as shared leadership. Shared leadership is defined as “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” (Pearce & Conger, 2003, p. 1). More specifically, shared leadership acknowledges that all members of a team can serve as leaders given their unique perspectives and expertise. For example, within NASA, the crew office team is expected to adapt to changing environments by adjusting the team hierarchy to best fit the situation. According to crew resource management literature, responsibilities of a crewmember include non-technical skills that encompass both leadership and teamwork (Flin, O'Connor, & Mearns, 2002; Holt, Boehm-Davis, & Beaubien, 2001). Leadership responsibilities include: adjusting style to the situation, assigning tasks, with clearly defined goals, according to capabilities and individual preferences, responding to information, suggestions, and concerns of team members, and enhancing the team's motivation to perform. Team member responsibilities include: proactively supporting the leader, taking necessary steps to implement leader direction, communicating concerns for team interactions that are not apparent to the leader, and supporting or planning options to reduce the burden for the leader. Thus, members of a crew may be expected to take on varying roles and power-based relationships, depending on what is most appropriate given the context.

The proliferation of research on shared leadership has emerged over a short time span in the past two decades, however, the findings have demonstrated a positive relationship between shared leadership and team morale, team performance, and team satisfaction (Jung, Avolio, Murry, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996; Pearce & Sims, 2002; Serban & Roberts, 2016).

The literature on shared leadership emphasizes that team members have mutual influence and shared responsibility (Lindsay, Day, & Halpin, 2011). However, there is little explanation on when and what conditions the team members emerge as team leaders. There are a few recent meta-analyses on shared leadership that indicate an overall positive effect of shared leadership on team outcomes (D’Innocenzo, Mathieu, & Kukenberger, 2016; Nicolaidis, LaPort, Chen, Tomassetti, Weis, Zaccaro, & Cortina, 2014; Wang, Waldman, & Zhang, 2014). However, moderators of this relationship are less clear. Nicolaidis and colleagues (2014) found a positive correlation between shared leadership and team performance; this relationship was moderated by task interdependence and team tenure, so that shared leadership was needed more under conditions of high task interdependence (versus low task interdependence) and the relationship was weaker as team tenure increased. On the other hand, more recently, D’Innocenzo, Mathieu, and Kukenberger (2016) found that task complexity moderated the relationship between shared leadership and team performance, such that it resulted in lower effect sizes with more complex tasks and they did not find a significant influence of team task interdependence. Wood (1986) conceptualizes task complexity as the extent to which tasks create demands on the knowledge, skills, and resources of team members. Although these findings may be contradictory, theoretically, it is thought that the more complex the task, the less likely it is that a single person can hold the expertise to fully lead a task, demonstrating the need for shared leadership (Pearce, 2004). Presumably, team composition and situational factors influence when a member emerges as a leader, but more research is needed to identify exactly *who* should emerge and when this emergence should occur during the team’s cycle.

## Conclusion

Team leaders play an essential role in facilitating team effectiveness, particularly in high-stake settings

confronting novel elements and environments, such as military teams. The literature has thoroughly demonstrated how leadership is successfully exhibited in a team. Moreover, the research has evinced several practices that can enhance team effectiveness: (1) initiating an enabling structure, (2) defining team goals and task interdependence at the onset of a team’s formation, (3) fostering psychological safety, (4) reinforcing teamwork with feedback and rewards, and (5) supporting the growth of team members. Even so, there remain many potential streams of team leadership research, particularly in the areas of MTSs and shared leadership that can help expand our understanding of team leadership even further.

• • •

## References

- Allen, J. A., Reiter-Palmon, R., Crowe, J., & Scott, C. (2018). Debriefs: Team learning from doing in context. *American Psychologist*, 73, 504-516.
- Ambrose, Stephen (1983). *Eisenhower: Soldier, General of the Army, President-Elect (1893-1952)*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Bell, S. T., Brown, S. G., Colaneri, A., & Outland, N. (2018). Team composition and the ABCs of teamwork. *American Psychologist*, 73, 349-362.
- Bennis, W. (1999). *The leadership advantage: Leader to leader*. Hoboken, N.J.: Jossey-Bass.
- Blackwell Landon, L., Slack, K. J., & Barrett, J. D. (2018). Teamwork and collaboration in long-duration space missions: Going to extremes. *American Psychologist*, 73, 563-575.
- Burke, C. S. (1999). *Examination of the cognitive mechanisms through which team leaders promote effective team processes and adaptive performance*. George Mason University: Unpublished dissertation.
- Burke, C. S., Stagl, K. C., Klein, C., Goodwin, G. E., Salas, E., & Halpin, S. (2006). What types of leader behaviors are functional in teams?: A meta-analysis. *Leadership Quarterly*, 288-307.
- Chen, G., Kirkman, B. L., Kanfer, R., Allen, D., & Rosen, B. 2007. A multilevel study of leadership, empowerment, and performance in teams. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 331-346.
- Cummings, T. G. (1978). Self-regulating work groups: A socio-technical synthesis. *Academy of Management Review*, 3, 625-634.

- Day, D. V., Gronn, P., & Salas, E. (2004). Leadership capacity in teams. *Leadership Quarterly*, 15, 857-880.
- Deci, E. L. (1975). *Intrinsic Motivation*. New York: Plenum.
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206314525205>
- Driskell, J. E., Salas, E., & Hughes, S. (2010). Collective orientation and team performance: Development of an individual differences measure. *Human Factors: The Journal of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society*. Retrieved from <http://hfs.sagepub.com/content/early/2010/04/02/0018720809359522.abstract>
- Druskat, V. U., & Kayes, D. C. (1999). The antecedents of team competence: Toward a fine-grained model of self-managing team effectiveness. *Research on Managing Groups and Teams*, 2(2), 201-231.
- Eby, L. T., & Dobbins, G. H. (1997). Collectivistic orientation in teams: An individual and group-level analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 18, 275–295.
- Edmondson, A. C. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44, 350-383.
- Eisenbeiss, S. A., van Knippenberg, D., & Boerner, S. 2008. Transformational leadership and team innovation: Integrating team climate principles. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93, 1438-1446.
- Eisenhower, D. E. (1948). *Crusade in Europe*. Baltimore, MD: Doubleday & Company, Inc.
- Feitosa, J., Grossman, R., & Salazar, M. (2018). Debunking key assumptions about teams: The role of culture. *American Psychologist*, 73, 376–389.
- Fiscella, K., & McDaniel, S. H. (2018). The complexity, diversity, and science of primary care teams. *American Psychologist*, 73, 451–467.
- Fleishman, E. A., Mumford, M. D., Zaccaro, S. J., Levin, K. Y., Krotokin, A. L., & Hein, M. B. (1991). Taxonomic efforts in the description of leader behavior: A synthesis and functional interpretation. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 2(4), 245-287.
- Flin, R., O'Connor, P., & Mearns, K. (2002). Crew resource management: improving team work in high reliability industries. *Team performance management: an international journal*, 8(3/4), 68-78.
- Foels, R., Driskell, J. E., Mullen, B., & Salas, E. (2000). The effects of demographic leadership on group member satisfaction: An integration. *Small Group Research*, 31, 676-701.
- Gibson, C. B., & Kirkman, B. L. (1999). Our past, present, and future in teams: The role of human resource professionals in managing team performance. In A.I. Kraut and A.K. Korman (Eds.) *Changing Concepts and Practices for Human Resources Management: Contributions from Industrial-Organizational Psychology* (pp. 90-117). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Goodwin, G. F., Blacksmith, N., & Coats, M. R. (2018). The science of teams in the military: Contributions from over 60 years of research. *American Psychologist*, 73, 322–333.
- Hackman, J. R. (1992). Group influences on individuals in organizations. In M. D. Dunnette and L. M. Hough (eds.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 3 (pp. 143-193). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Hackman, J. R. (2002). *Leading teams: Setting the stage for great performances*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Hackman, J. R. and Oldham, G. R. (1980). *Work Redesign*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Hackman, J. R. & Walton, R. E. (1986). Leading groups in organizations. In P. S. Goodman & Associates (Eds.), *Designing effective work groups*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Holt, R. W., Boehm-Davis, D. A., & Beaubien, J. M. (2001). Evaluating resource management training. *Improving teamwork in organizations: Applications of resource management training*, 165-188.
- House, R. J., & Shamir, B. (1993). Toward the integration of transformational, charismatic, and visionary theories. In M. M. Chemers and R. Ayman (eds.), *Leadership Theory and Research: Perspective and Directions*, p. 245-270. Academic Press: New York, NY.
- Hughes, A. M., Gregory, M. E., Joseph, D. L., Sonesh, S. C., Marlow, S. L., Lacerenza, C. N.,...Salas, E. (2016). Saving lives: A meta-analysis of team training in healthcare. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 101, 1266–1304.
- Hyatt, D. E., & Ruddy, T. M. (1997). An examination of the relationship between work group characteristics and performance: Once more into the breach. *Personnel Psychology*, 50(3), 553-585.
- Jackson, C. L., Colquitt, J. A., Wesson, M. J., & Zapata-Phelan, C. P. (2006). Psychological collectivism: a measurement validation and linkage to group member performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(4), 884.
- Janz, B. D., Colquitt, J. A., & Noe, R. A. (1997). Knowledge worker team effectiveness: The role of autonomy, interdependence, team development, and contextual support variables. *Personnel Psychology*, 50(4), 877-904.

- Jung, D. I., Avolio, B. J., Murry, B. D., Sivasubramaniam, N., & Sosik, J. J. (1996). Leadership in work groups: An empirical investigation of leadership style, collective efficacy, collective identity, and group performance. In *56th annual meeting of the Academy of Management, Cincinnati, OH*.
- Katerberg, R., & Hom, P. W. 1981. Effects of within-group and between-groups variation in leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 66, 218-223.
- Keller, R. T. 1992. Transformational leadership and the performance of research-and-development project groups. *Journal of Management*, 18, 489-501.
- Keller, R. T. 2006. Transformational leadership, initiating structure, and substitutes for leadership: A longitudinal study of research and development project team performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 202-210.
- Kozlowski, S. W., Gully, S. M., Salas, E., & Cannon-Bowers, J. A. (1996). Team leadership and development: Theory, principles, and guidelines for training leaders and teams. In M. Beyerlein, S. Beyerlein, and D. Johnson (Eds.), *Advances in Interdisciplinary Studies of Work Teams: Team Leadership*, Vol. 3 (p. 263-292). Greenwich, Conn: JAI Press.
- Kozlowski, S. W., Watola, D. J., Jensen, J. M., Kim, B. H., & Botero, I. C. (2008). Developing adaptive teams: A theory of dynamic team leadership. In E. Salas, G. F. Goodwin, & C. S. Burke (Eds.), *Team effectiveness in complex organizations: Cross-disciplinary perspectives* (pp. 113-155). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Lindsay, D., Day, D., & Halpin, S. (2011). Shared leadership in the military: Reality, possibility, or pipedream?. *Military Psychology*, 23, 528-549.
- Marks, M. A., Zaccaro, S. J., & Mathieu, J. E. (2000). Performance implications of leader briefings and team-interaction training for team adaptation to novel environments. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(6), 971-986.
- Mathieu, J. E., Hollenbeck, J. R., van Knippenberg, D., & Ilgen, D. R. (2017). A century of work teams in the Journal of Applied Psychology. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(3), 452-467.
- Mathieu, J. E., Marks, M. A., & Zaccaro, S. J. (2001). Multiteam systems. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. K. Sinangil, & C. Viswesvaran (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial, work, and organizational psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 289-313). London, UK: Sage.
- McGrath, J. E. (1962). *Leadership behavior: Some requirements for leadership training*. Washington, DC: U.S. Civil Service Commission, Office of Career Development.
- Morgeson, F. P., DeRue, D. S., & Karam, E. P. (2010). Leadership in teams: A functional approach to understanding leadership structures and processes. *Journal of management*, 36(1), 5-39.
- Morrison, J. E., & Meliza, L. L. (1999). *Foundations of the after-action review process* (Special Report 42). Alexandria, VA: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences
- Nicolaidis, V. C., LaPort, K. A., Chen, T. R., Tomassetti, A. J., Weis, E. J., Zaccaro, S. J., & Cortina, J. M. (2014). The shared leadership of teams: A meta-analysis of proximal, distal, and moderating relationships. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25(5), 923-942.
- Pearce, C. L. (2004). The future of leadership: Combining vertical and shared leadership to transform knowledge work. *The Academy of Management Executive*, 18(1), 47-57.
- Pearce, C. L., & Conger, J. A. (2003). All those years ago. Shared leadership: *Reframing the hows and whys of leadership*, 1-18.
- 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 behaviors. *Group dynamics: Theory, research, and practice*, 6(2), 172-197.
- Powell, G. N., & Butterfield, D. A. 1984. The "high-high" leader rides again! *Group & Organization Studies*, 9, 437-450.
- Power, N. (2018). Extreme teams: Towards a greater understanding of multi-agency teamwork during major emergencies and disasters. *American Psychologist*, 73, 478-490.
- Reyes, D. L., Tannenbaum, S. I., & Salas, E. (2018). Team Development: The Power of Debriefing. *People & Strategy*, 41(2), 46-52.
- Rosenfield, S., Newell, M., Zwolski, S., & Benishek, L. E. (2018). Evaluating problem-solving teams in K-12 schools: Do they work? *American Psychologist*, 73, 407-419.
- Salas, E., Dickinson, T. L., Converse, S. A., & Tannenbaum, 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., Nichols, D. R., & Driskell, J. E. (2007). Testing three team training strategies in intact teams: A meta-analysis. *Small Group Research*, 38(4), 471-488.
- Schaubroeck, J., Lam, S. S. K., & Cha, S. E. 2007. Embracing transformational leadership: Team values and the impact of leader behavior on team performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 1020-1030.
- Serban, A., & Roberts, A. J. (2016). Exploring antecedents and outcomes of shared leadership in a creative context: A mixed-methods approach. *The leadership quarterly*, 27(2), 181-199.
- Shuffler, M. L., & Carter, D. R. (2018). Teamwork situated in multiteam systems: Key lessons learned and future opportunities. *American Psychologist*, 73(4), 390-406.

- Smith-Jentsch, K. A., Salas, E., & Brannick, M. T. (1994). Leadership style as a predictor of teamwork behavior: Setting the stage by managing team climate. In K. Nilan (Chair), *Understanding Teams and the Nature of Teamwork*. Symposium presented at the 9th annual conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Nashville, TN.
- Spitzmuller, M., & Park, G. (2018). Terrorist teams as loosely coupled systems. *American Psychologist*, 73, 491–503.
- Stagl, K. C., Salas, E., & Burke, C. S. (2007). Best practices in team leadership: What team leaders do to facilitate team effectiveness. In J. A. Conger and R. E. Riggio (Eds.), *The practice of leadership: Developing the next generation of leaders*, (pp. 172-198). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Tannenbaum, S. I., & Cerasoli, C. P. (2013). Do team and individual debriefs enhance performance? A meta-analysis. *Human Factors*, 55, 231–245.
- Tannenbaum, S. I., Smith-Jentsch, K. A., & Behson, S. J. (1998). Training team leaders to facilitate team learning and performance. In J. A. Cannon-Bowers & E. Salas (Eds.), *Making decisions under stress: Implications for individual and team training* (pp. 247-270). Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association.
- Tebes, J. K., & Thai, N. D. (2018). Interdisciplinary team science and the public: Steps towards a participatory team science. *American Psychologist*, 73, 549–562.
- Thayer, A. L., Petruzzelli, A., & McClurg, C. E. (2018). Addressing the paradox of the team innovation process: A review and practical considerations. *American Psychologist*, 73, 363–375.
- Ullmer Jr, W. F. (2010). Military leadership into the 21st century: Another "bridge too far?". *Parameters*, 40(4), 135-156.
- Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and Motivation*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Wang, D., Waldman, D. A., & Zhen Zhang. (2014). A Meta-Analysis of Shared Leadership and Team Effectiveness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 99(2), 181–198. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0034531>
- Welch, J. & Welch, S. (2005). *Winning*. HarperCollins: New York, NY.
- West, M. A. (2000). Reflexivity, revolution and innovation in work teams. In M. M. Beyerlein, D. A. Johnson, & S. T. Beyerlein (Eds.), *Product development teams* (Vol. 5, pp. 1-29). Stamford, CT: JAI Press.
- Wood, R. E. (1986). Task complexity: Definition of the construct. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 37(1), 60-82.
- Zaccaro, S. J., Rittman, A. L., & Marks, M. A. (2001). Team leadership. *The leadership quarterly*, 12(4), 451-483.

Table 1

*Insights on Team Leadership*

Insight	Practices
<b>I. Initiate An Enabling Structure</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Compose the optimal mixture of team members</li> <li>b. Establish norms of conduct to reinforce desired behaviors and sanction inappropriate actions</li> <li>c. Identify who is responsible and accountable for outcomes</li> <li>d. Designate the team's decision making authority</li> <li>e. Create a sense of ownership to promote self-goal setting, self-observation, and self-reward</li> </ul>
<b>II. Define Team Goals and Task Interdependence at the Onset of a Team's Formation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Use prebriefings to instill shared affect, cognition, and behavior</li> <li>b. Instill collective aspirations via a common mission/congruent goals</li> <li>c. Stimulate and inspire by challenging the status quo</li> <li>d. Exercise authority to establish a compelling direction</li> <li>e. Provide consequential direction to fully engage talent</li> </ul>
<b>III. Foster Psychological Safety</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Admit own faults</li> <li>b. Ask team members for input</li> <li>c. Respond in a supportive and non-defensive manner</li> </ul>
<b>IV. Reinforce Teamwork with Feedback and Rewards</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Ensure information system provide performance targeted data</li> <li>b. Negotiate access to sensitive information if it facilitates planning and selection of performance strategies</li> <li>c. Implement team-based performance-contingent rewards</li> <li>d. Use multitiered reward systems so individual efforts are not ignored</li> </ul>
<b>V. Support the Growth of Team Members</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Act as a coach</li> <li>b. Provide team leader coaching interventions delivered at the midpoint of task performance to review performance strategies</li> <li>c. Offer novel task performance strategies</li> <li>d. Conduct debriefs</li> <li>e. Provide and secure developmental opportunities</li> </ul>

*Note. This table is an adapted version of best practices described in Stagl, Salas, and Burke (2007).*