Temporal dynamics of shared leadership

Kai N. Klasmeier*¹

Nale Lehmann-Willenbrock²

¹ Federal Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (BAuA), Dortmund, Germany

² Chair for Industrial/Organizational Psychology, University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany

* Kai N. Klasmeier, Federal Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, Friedrich-Henkel-Weg
1-25, 44149 Dortmund, Germany, klasmeier.kai@baua.bund.de

Abstract

The high prevalence of teams in organizations highlights the need to understand antecedents of well-being and exhaustion at the team level. We draw on conservation of resources theory to build a dynamic model of shared leadership as a team resource that affects team members' well-being and emotional exhaustion. Furthermore, we investigate the interplay between dynamics of shared leadership and team workload. We applied a daily diary study over five consecutive working days with data from 265 team members nested in 77 teams. As hypothesized, an increase in shared leadership was associated with an increase in team well-being and a reduction of emotional exhaustion over time. Further, shared leadership interacted with team workload as an increase in shared leadership was more strongly associated with a decrease in shared emotional exhaustion when team workload increased. However, team member well-being was not affected by such an interaction effect. These findings address the missing link between the sharing of leadership functions and team well-being and exhaustion, establish shared leadership as an important team resource, and contribute a temporal perspective on shared leadership as a dynamic team state.

Keywords: shared leadership, well-being, temporal dynamics, diary study.

Temporal dynamics of shared leadership

Employees' mental health is highly relevant for organizational functioning (Alarcon, 2011; Bliese et al., 2017; Christian et al., 2011; Cole et al., 2011; Swider & Zimmerman, 2010). In Germany, where the sample for this study is based, mental health impairment is the number one reason for the inability to work. Additionally, the number of work hours lost due to mental health impairment has risen by 101% since 2006 (Techniker Krankenkasse, 2020).

Alongside these developments, teamwork has become increasingly important for organizations (Mathieu et al., 2017). Working in teams is impactful in shaping team members attitudes and behaviors (Humphrey & Aime, 2014; Mathieu et al., 2017), and, thus, might be highly relevant for shared mental health among team members. Theory has largely point to the social nature of mental health (e.g., Bakker & Demerouti, 2017; Hobfoll et al., 2018; Maslach et al., 2001 Ryan & Deci, 2001; Sonnentag, 2015), whereas empirical work hardly focused on the shared experience of mental health and related team-level antecedents (for exceptions see Hudson & Shen, 2018; Junker et al., 2021). Specifically, this study aims to provide insights into shared leadership as a potential antecedent of team mental health, which we define as similar patterns of mental health resulting from a collaborative team experience. This conceptual approach addresses calls for a consideration of mental health beyond the individual level (e.g., Sonnentag, 2015) and may bridge the literature about mental health and well-being with the teams literature. Following a recent meta-analysis (Montano et al., 2017), we consider positive (i.e., psychological well-being) as well as negative (i.e., emotional exhaustion) aspects of teams' mental health. Whereas emotional exhaustion as a core dimension of burnout refers to the state of physical and emotional depletion (Wright & Cropanzano, 1998), psychological well-being goes beyond the mere absence of (mental) illness and is defined as the optimal psychological

functioning (Ryan & Deci, 2001; Ryff & Keyes, 1995). The inclusion of both constructs covers a wider range of mental health states.

To understand how shared leadership may positively contribute to team-level mental health, we pursue a resource-based view and draw on conservation of resources theory (COR; Hobfoll, 1989). The central tenet of COR is that individuals and groups (i.e., teams) strive to acquire and conserve resources (Hobfoll et al., 2018, p. 106). Additionally, the threat of resource loss, actual resource loss, or a failed resource investment may result in impaired mental health (Halbesleben et al., 2014). To have a great impact on mental health, collective resources should (among other factors) refer to control and community, and should especially be autonomy-related (cf. Halbesleben et al., 2014; Maslach et al., 2001). Based on this premise, we focus on shared leadership. Shared leadership has been conceptualized as an essential team resource (Day et al., 2004) and has been defined as a “set of interactive influence processes in which team leadership functions are voluntarily shared among internal team members in the pursuit of team goals” (Nicolaidis et al., 2014, p. 924).

Shared leadership means that all team members can *voluntary* exert leadership influence on the team or participate in team leadership functions (Morgeson et al., 2010). Hence, leadership influence is not restricted to a formal leader or individual team members, but stems from the collective engagement of the team members on the same hierarchical level (Carson et al., 2007; Klasmeyer & Rowold, 2020; Zhu et al., 2018). This process of mutual influence helps team members to facilitate their collaboration and to lead each other towards team goal achievement (Day et al., 2004; Pearce & Conger, 2003). Accordingly, shared leadership can be a resource caravan from which the team as a whole can benefit. Specifically, we discuss how the day-to-day experience of collaborating and sharing leadership functions in a team environment

will contribute to a collective team experience that consists of being capable as a team (Nicolaides et al., 2014; Wu et al., 2018) or being supportive of each other (Liu et al., 2014; Sweeney et al., 2018). We further argue that autonomously sharing different leadership functions while striving towards a common goal will provide a shared purpose that helps to reduce ambiguities and to focus the team's effort (Mathieu et al., 2015). Despite this rationale, there is a pronounced lack of research regarding team mental health, which limits our understanding of shared leadership consequences (Zhu et al., 2018). As such, our study focus on team well-being and emotional exhaustion addresses previously understudied outcomes of shared leadership (Zhu et al., 2018), and allows us to expand the nomological network of this team state.

In considering how and why shared leadership can positively affect team-level well-being and exhaustion, we pursue a temporal lens (Contractor et al., 2012; Kozlowski et al., 2016). Shared leadership has been conceptualized as a dynamic team process that changes over time (e.g., Day et al., 2004; Klasmeier & Rowold, 2021; Kozlowski et al., 2016; Pearce & Conger, 2003). Accordingly, when investigating possible consequences of shared leadership, a temporal perspective is required to adequately capture dynamics in shared leadership as well as its team-level outcomes over time. Unfortunately, previous work has mostly been limited by a static point of view, typically with cross-sectional designs leaving dynamic changes over time unexplored (for notable exceptions see Drescher et al., 2014; Lorinkova & Bartol, 2021). Similarly, mental health has also been conceptualized as a dynamic state (see Bakker et al., 2014; Sonnentag, 2015). With rare exceptions (e.g., Hülshager et al., 2014), previous research has predominantly examined antecedents of well-being and exhaustion on the day-level using multilevel modeling (e.g., studying relations between various demands and resources and resulting well-being on the same or the next day), without accounting for change patterns over time. Hence, we will analyze

temporal change as linear change trajectories (i.e., continuous rate of change over time, indicating a decrease to an increase). The necessity of including temporal dynamics to understand changes in resources and related implications for changes in (team) well-being and exhaustion is also highlighted by our underlying theory. COR is a dynamic theory that proposes gain and loss cycles of resources over time (Halbesleben et al., 2014).

Additionally, resource gains become most salient in the context of resource loss (Hobfoll et al., 2018). Accordingly, situational requirements such as increasing demands or changes in the team's needs may trigger a continuous adaptation of team members' behavior (cf. Humphrey & Aime, 2014), with implications for temporal changes in shared leadership. In this respect, increasing team workload may be critical for teams and may trigger a resource outstretch and loss cycle due to a growing need to coordinate and to reflect on teamwork (Dietz et al., 2017) with likely negative implications for team-level well-being and exhaustion (Hudson & Shen, 2018; Maslach et al., 2001). However, resources gains due to increasing shared leadership may mitigate these negative consequences, as the collective fulfillment of necessary leadership functions keeps the team cohesive by focusing on a shared purpose (Mathieu et al., 2015; Morgeson et al., 2010) and enables effective teamwork (Aubé et al., 2018). Thus, an adaption (i.e., increase and resource gain) of the team's shared leadership behavior becomes most salient in the context of increasing team workload (i.e., resource loss cycle; cf. Hobfoll et al., 2018). To investigate the dynamic interplay between shared leadership, team workload, and shared mental health, we conducted a daily diary study (Gabriel et al., 2019) with teams.

In sum, this study makes several important contributions to research on the nature and outcomes of shared leadership in teams. First, we bridge the gap between the well-being literature and the literature about teams by incorporating team-level demands and resources as

well as their interaction to predict team-level well-being and exhaustion over time. This can shed light on the underdeveloped but growing research area of shared mental health in teams. Second, we expand the nomological network of shared leadership by theorizing about the effect of shared leadership as a collective team resource based on the COR theory. This may also give us a more nuanced understanding of previously unstudied outcomes of shared leadership and of the conditions (i.e., changes in team workload) where shared leadership may be particularly needed. Third, against the background of the construct definition of shared leadership, we develop a dynamic perspective on shared leadership and implement a daily diary design to investigate temporal changes in shared leadership and associated team mental health over time. This perspective helps to advance theory about shared leadership and its consequences with more temporal precision (cf. McCormick et al., 2020) and can lead to important insights on the processual nature of this team state. Additionally, this approach can also add to the dynamic view on mental health beyond a static or day-level focus in past research.

Shared Leadership as a Dynamic Team State

Zhu et al. (2018) integrated the literature and defined shared leadership as a team phenomenon of distributing leadership roles and influence among team members, which captures three key characteristics that have been used in prior definitions: First, the *unit of analysis* when investigating shared leadership is the group or team level. Second, the *source of leadership* is the voluntary and lateral influence among peers. Third, the *distribution of leadership influence* is dispersed across all team members and is not centralized in a single person (e.g., a formal team leader; Zhu et al., 2018). To elaborate *how* shared leadership is conceptualized as a source of team leadership and *what* is actually shared within a team, we refer to the functional leadership approach (Morgeson et al., 2010). Based on this approach, shared leadership can be classified as

an internal and informal source of team leadership. In addition, the functional leadership approach proposes 15 different leadership functions, which are necessary for team need satisfaction and team effectiveness (Morgeson et al., 2010). Regarding shared leadership, the team collectively engages in the leadership functions of structuring and planning tasks, providing feedback, performing team tasks, solving problems, and supporting the social climate within the team.

Shared leadership is a team state that develops and changes over time, based on team members' day-to-day interactions (e.g., Pearce & Conger, 2003; Kozlowski et al., 2016), and therefore needs to be considered as a highly dynamic phenomenon (e.g., Carson et al., 2007; D'Innocenzo et al., 2016; Klasmeier & Rowold, 2021; Small & Rentsch, 2010). However, the extant body of research on shared leadership is mainly based on cross-sectional designs that cannot speak to dynamic shifts or changes in shared leadership in teams' day-to-day practice. As one potential avenue to address this issue, diary studies offer the opportunity to examine short-term temporal changes in focal constructs (e.g., Gabriel et al., 2019; Ohly et al., 2010) and to study team process dynamics in real working teams (Kozlowski, 2015).

In general, diary studies found that day-specific dynamics account for 40 to 70% of the variance of leadership behavior (Johnson et al., 2012; Tims et al., 2011). As the team is a typical source of leadership behavior (Morgeson et al., 2010), it is plausible that shared leadership may also display short-term dynamics across days (see Klasmeier & Rowold, 2021). Dynamics in leadership behavior can be unsystematic (i.e., day-level fluctuations) or systematic (i.e., linear trajectories as an increase or decrease) over time (McClean et al., 2019). While the former may be more spontaneous or due to day-specific events, the latter may occur as continuous adaption to longer-lasting events like different stages of project work, task cycles, teamwork and team

effectiveness episodes, or changes in the team environment (e.g., Arrow et al., 2004; Collins et al., 2016; Lorinkova & Bartol, 2021; Marks et al., 2001). We focus on systematic short-term dynamics (i.e., change trajectories or rate of change) because shared leadership can be utilized as a strategic means by the team to allocate their resources and effort while facing current demands and satisfying the team needs (Morgeson et al., 2010). Depending on the (un)successful adaption and resulting engagement in different leadership functions by the team, we assume that teams may differ in their change patterns across a work week (i.e., have variability in change over time; cf. Collins et al., 2016; Ployhart & Vandenberg, 2010). Thus, some teams might show a linear increase in shared leadership, while other teams stagnate or show a linear decrease (McClellan et al., 2019; see also Kozlowski, 2015; Kozlowski & Chao, 2018). These differences in linear change trajectories between teams can be used to predict change in focal team outcomes (Chen et al., 2011; Ployhart & Vandenberg, 2010). Hence, it is reasonable to consider a defined and continuous period of time (i.e., a work week; cf. Ancona et al., 2001; Arrow et al., 2004) to better compare how different change trajectories relate to changes in our focal outcomes. Additionally, a work week (i.e., from Monday to Friday) is also a reasonable period of time for investigating temporal dynamics of well-being and exhaustion, as recovery processes over the weekend can influence their dynamics (e.g., Fritz et al., 2010; Ragsdale & Beehr, 2016). Next, we elaborate why change trajectories in shared leadership may be linked to dynamic changes in team well-being and emotional exhaustion.

Shared Leadership as a Resource for Team Mental Health

In considering how shared leadership unfolds as a dynamic temporal phenomenon in teams, we propose that it can serve as an important team resource that impacts team members' shared experiences at work. When employees collaborate in a team, they interact on a daily

basis, and they are exposed to the same environment and shared conditions. As a result, they tend to develop similar moods, perceptions, beliefs, and behavioral patterns (e.g., Lehmann-Willenbrock et al., 2011; Myers et al., 2004; Totterdell, 2000; van Yperen & Snijders, 2000). We build our theoretical rationale regarding shared leadership as a team resource on the central tenets of COR theory, which proposes that individuals and collectives (i.e., team or organizations) strive to acquire and conserve resources (Hobfoll, 1989; Hobfoll, 2011; Hobfoll et al., 2018). Based on this basic principle, stress and impaired well-being result when resources are threatened by loss, an actual resource loss or outstretch of resources occurs, or in case of a failed resource investment (e.g., Halbesleben et al., 2014). COR explicitly focuses on the social context and incorporates a multilevel thinking of resources. This is reflected in the COR concepts of resource caravans and resource caravan passageways. Resource caravans refer to a shared pool of resources from which the members of a team can benefit (Hobfoll, 2011). The accessibility or loss of collective resources can influence the shared experience of (un)well-being among team members (Hobfoll, 2011; Junker et al., 2021; Maslach et al., 2001; Sonnentag, 2015). Accordingly, we consider well-being and emotional exhaustion as team-level outcomes, as the team members should be affected by collective resource gains or losses in a similar way (Hobfoll, 2011). Hence, based on their shared work experience, team members may develop similar patterns of mental health which can be aggregated to the team level (i.e., direct consensus model; Chan, 1998).

To enhance team well-being and to reduce emotional exhaustion, team resources should include the collective experience of control, competence, community, support, and relatedness while acting autonomous, as especially autonomy-related resources can improve well-being (Halbesleben et al., 2014; Hobfoll, 2001; Maslach et al., 2001). Based on this premise, shared

leadership can be considered as important team resource (cf. Day et al., 2004). While practicing shared leadership, teams autonomously work together for the achievement of common goals (e.g., Nicolaides et al., 2014; Pearce & Conger, 2003) which can enhance team effectiveness (e.g., Kukenberger & D'Innocenzo, 2020; Wu et al., 2018). Achieving common goals can stimulate collective mastery and growth, for example in the shape of higher collective efficacy beliefs (see Nicolaides et al., 2014; Sivasubramaniam et al., 2002). Thus, this experience of collective competence and control while acting autonomous in a strongly related unit is likely to protect team members against exhaustion and can enhance their well-being (cf. Halbesleben et al., 2014).

It should be noted that shared leadership is a voluntary behavior of all team members which exists parallel to formal leadership (e.g., Ali et al., 2020; Nicolaides et al., 2014; Pearce & Sims, 2002). Hence, not all duties, requirements, and decisions have to be shouldered solely by the team, as the formal team leader exerts in additional leadership functions to satisfy team needs (e.g., define team mission, establish expectations and goals, engage in sensemaking, manage team boundaries, solve problems, or provide resources; Morgeson et al., 2010).

Teams utilize shared leadership to create a social context that facilitates cooperation (Aubé et al., 2018; Zhu et al., 2018), enables creativity (Ali et al., 2020), reduces conflicts (Sinha et al., 2021), and builds a strong shared sense of purpose (Bergman et al., 2012; Mathieu et al., 2015), which helps to reduce ambiguities and provides clear goals and expectations. This can be critical to prevent exhaustion and to support well-being (Bakker et al., 2014). In addition, sharing different leadership functions within the team involves collectively structuring and planning tasks, providing feedback, solving problems, and supporting the social climate within the team (Morgeson et al., 2010). These behaviors cover collective resources which are related to team

member well-being (e.g., Bakker et al., 2006; Costa et al., 2015; Torrente et al., 2012), and, thus, render shared leadership as a resource caravan for the whole team. Hence, this social context and shared experience of the team members can lead to a collective increase of members' well-being and a reduction of team's emotional exhaustion over time.

Importantly, our dynamic perspective of shared leadership in teams extends to its team-level outcomes as well. Specifically, increasing shared leadership may relate to an increase in well-being and decrease in exhaustion, as an increase in autonomy-based resources (i.e., shared leadership; cf. Pearce & Conger, 2003) should have a strong impact on well-being (Halbesleben et al., 2014). In line with COR theory, resource gains over time (i.e., gain cycle) may initiate a growth in team well-being, as it reflects acquisition of resources beyond previous level of available resources (e.g., Hobfoll et al., 2018). In contrast, a continuously decreasing shared leadership over time would indicate a resource loss cycle. This may coincide with less mutual feedback and reduced efforts to collectively structure tasks that may foster negative social interactions (Bergman et al., 2012), inhibit task accomplishment (Carson et al., 2007), and impair cooperation and teamwork (Aubé et al., 2018), with likely decrease in team well-being and increase in emotional exhaustion along with these developments. Summarized, we predict the following relationships:

Hypothesis 1a: An increase in shared leadership is related to an increase in team well-being over time.

Hypothesis 1b: An increase in shared leadership is related to a decrease in team emotional exhaustion over time.

Team Workload as a Challenge for Team Mental Health

A high level of workload represents the experience of too much work to do in relation to the time available (Sonnentag et al., 2010; Spector & Jex, 1998). Past studies revealed that the experience of workload can vary between individuals and within individuals over time (e.g., Ilies et al., 2007). Workload has mostly been investigated as an individual-level job demand, but theoretical and empirical work shift the point of view to a team-level conceptualization of workload (cf. Maslach et al., 2001). According to Funke et al. (2012), team workload is a collective property of the team that is influenced by the team's interaction patterns, team cognition, and team environment. Therefore, team workload is not solely the sum of each team members' individual workload, but the relationship of individual and team workload may be complex. This premise leads to a referent shift-consensus model (Chan, 1998; Klein & Kozlowski, 2000), whereby the referent is shifted from the individual ('I') to the team (e.g., 'we' or 'our team') to measure the shared experience of the team members. In line with Funke and colleagues (2012), the aggregation of the team members' perception of team workload is useful to compare team workload under varying degrees of task and team characteristics. Furthermore, this approach has been used in previous studies for the examination of team-level demands (Hudson & Shen, 2018). Therefore, we define team workload as the collective experience of too much work to do in relation to the time available in teams.

According to COR theory, team workload can be highly demanding and resource depleting for the team which will manifest in the shared experience of impaired well-being and higher exhaustion (cf. Halbesleben et al., 2014; Hobfoll et al., 2018; Maslach et al., 2001). From a temporal perspective, we assume that team workload follows a specific change pattern over time. Similar to dynamics in shared leadership, change patterns in team workload can differ

between teams, such that team workload may increase, decrease, or stagnate over time (cf. Arrow et al., 2004; Collins et al., 2016). When team workload increases over time, the team members may feel collectively overwhelmed by the increasing amount of work. Dealing with this overload may be associated with psychological and physiological costs (Bakker, 2014) and may involve the risk of a resource outstretch (Hobfoll et al., 2018): Ad-hoc coordination, short-term changes in the task strategy, or conflict management may be needed to cope with increasing team workload (Dietz et al., 2017). Additionally, increasing team workload can trigger a resource loss spiral. According to COR theory, resource loss and resulting exhaustion increase the vulnerability to future loss as existing resources may be outstretched (Hobfoll, 2001; Hobfoll et al., 2018). Thus, over time, a downward spiral may develop between increasing team workload and team-level well-being and exhaustion (cf. Hobfoll et al., 2018). Hence, we assume:

Hypothesis 2a: An increase in team workload is related to a decrease in team well-being over time.

Hypothesis 2b: An increase in team workload is related to an increase in team emotional exhaustion over time.

The Protective Influence of Shared Leadership: Interaction Effects

According to a central principle of the COR theory, resource gains become salient in the context of resource loss (Hobfoll, 1989; Hobfoll et al., 2018). High resources offer in general greater coping opportunities (e.g., Bakker, 2014). However, a resource loss due to increasing team workload can lead to a resource outstretch as the temporal change in team workload may disturb the stable balance between accessibility of team resources (i.e., general level of resources) and team demands. Hence, a resource loss can be counterbalanced by increasing engagement and resource gains beyond the general resource level. Thus, to overcome negative

consequences of resource loss, teams may respond to changes in their situational requirements (specifically, increasing team workload) by increasing their level of shared leadership. In this context, it is important to note that we focus on the team level. Shared leadership is a voluntary team behavior by definition (Nicolaidis et al., 2014) and, as a property of the collective, results from the engagement of the whole team and not from single individuals (Carson et al., 2007; Sivasubramaniam et al., 2002; Zhu et al., 2018) for whom taking responsibility on their own could be a burden (see Evans et al., 2021). Following this rationale, we suppose that shared leadership may be a resource caravan of which all members of a team may benefit in times of rising workload.

An increase in shared leadership is necessary to overcome the negative consequences of increasing team workload. As the collective work is more stimulating when leadership is shared (Aubé et al., 2018) and shared leadership can foster collective mastery and growth, challenging demands such as an increasing team workload may be perceived as less threatening to resources and therefore may not attenuate teams' well-being as much when teams show more shared leadership behavior (see also Hooker & Csikszentmihalyi, 2003). Additionally, an increasing engagement in shared leadership can result in more positive interactions, better social exchange relationships, and higher social support among team members (Aime et al., 2014; Drescher et al., 2014). This shared experience and social capital can be an important resource caravan for tackling the challenges associated with an increasing team workload. Conversely, if team workload increases but shared leadership stagnates or even decreases, a team may not have sufficient resources to deal with this change in team workload, as increasing resources (i.e., resource gains) are most effective in protecting against diminished well-being when demands increase (Hobfoll et al., 2018). More specifically, the lack of collective goal striving, as well as

continuously less engagement in problem solving and support for the social climate may reinforce the negative consequences of growing team workload. As a result, a team may collectively feel more and more overwhelmed by the increasing workload, which can trigger a resource loss spiral with likely negative consequences for team-level well-being and exhaustion. Taken together, we predict that shared leadership interacts with team workload dynamics as follows:

Hypothesis 3a: Dynamics in shared leadership interact with dynamics in team workload, such that an increase in shared leadership relates more strongly to an increase in well-being when team workload increases over time.

Hypothesis 3b: Dynamics in shared leadership interact with dynamics in team workload, such that an increase in shared leadership relates more strongly to a decrease in emotional exhaustion when team workload increases over time.

Method

Procedure and Participants

We used a diary design with daily measurement occasions (Gabriel et al., 2019; Ohly et al., 2010). In line with recent diary studies in the context of formal leadership (e.g., Bormann, 2017; Kuonath et al., 2017), we collected data over five consecutive working days (from Monday to Friday). Data collection started in May 2019 and ended in December 2019. With support from research assistants, we invited teams with a five-day working week from different organizations in Germany to our study, resulting in a convenience sample. Participating teams were informed about the procedure and purpose of data collection. Teams could receive a feedback report on request as an incentive for their participation.

All members of a team had to participate in the same week. At the beginning of the study, participants completed a general survey about demographics, trait measures of the constructs (i.e., ratings on the average extent of shared leadership, team workload, well-being, and emotional exhaustion), and their end of work times in the next week. Based on their individually reported end of work time for each day, daily surveys were sent by e-mail two hours before the end of work in the subsequent week. If the participants did not fill out the daily survey within 90 minutes, a second e-mail reminded them to complete the questionnaire. Access to the daily survey was only possible on that given day. To guarantee the anonymity of data, the survey tool generated an internal code for all participants that was used to match the daily surveys and the general survey. Team affiliation was coded in a similar way.

The methodological choice to collect measures once per day corresponds to our focus on the relationships of change patterns of focal constructs over time (comparable to growth curve modeling; see Ployhart & Vandenberg, 2010); in our case, over the course of one work week, respectively. This analytical approach is actually more common for longitudinal studies (Drescher et al., 2014; Vandenberghe et al., 2021; Zhang et al., 2020), but has also been applied to diary studies (e.g., Hülshager et al., 2014).

We invited 295 team members from 79 teams to the general survey. From those, 274 team members (response rate = 93%) from 79 teams completed the general survey. As a research assistant informed the first author that two teams did not provide valid data (i.e., some team members did not consider all of their team colleagues in their ratings), these two teams were excluded from the survey. The remaining 265 team members were then invited to the daily survey in the following week. On average, participants filled out 4.42 daily questionnaires (66% filled out all daily surveys). Given the high response rate compared to other diary studies

(Kelemen et al., 2020), we included all daily ratings resulting in a final sample of 1184 person-days and 377 team-days.

About half of the team members were female (49%) and on average 34 years old ($SD = 11.21$ years). Most of them held a university degree (57%) and worked about for 3.60 years in their team ($SD = 4.39$ years). Average team size was 3.49 ($SD = 1.50$). A majority of the teams was collocated (92%) and used more direct (e.g., face-to-face, 91%) than indirect (e.g., via e-mail or phone, 9%) communication modes. Team members were in direct contact with their team colleagues for approximately 13 hours per week ($SD = 11.90$ hours). The sample consisted of teams from the IT sector (20%), chemistry and science sector (11%), trading sector (10%), and public administration sector (9%).

Measures

Shared leadership. We used a shortened version of the team leadership questionnaire (Morgeson et al., 2010) that was adapted for daily measurement. In line with Morgeson et al. (2010), we assessed those leadership functions that are best suited to be fulfilled by teams themselves: Structure and plan (e.g., “Today at work, we defined and structured our own work and the work of the team”), provide feedback, perform team, solve problems, and support social climate. Each of these five leadership functions was measured with two items on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). We used this approach to measure the content of what is shared within teams (see Zhu et al., 2018). Additionally, shared leadership refers to the collective leadership influence of all team members and is thus a property of the team (Carson et al., 2007; Zhu et al., 2018) which leads to a referent-shift consensus model (Chan, 1998). This measure of the collective engagement in different leadership functions of the whole team corresponds to our conceptualization of shared leadership. Cronbach’s alpha

ranged from .87 to .91 over the five days. Intraclass correlation (ICC) was .16 for daily team level and .32 for between team level. The average degree of interrater agreement ($r_{wg(j)}$, James et al., 1993) was between .77 and .82 for the daily measures.

Team workload. Team workload was measured using a four-item version from the Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire (COPSOQ, Kristensen, Hannerz, et al., 2005; German version by Nübling et al., 2006). Items were adapted to capture day-specific workload on the team level using a referent shift. Additionally, the instructions for this scale asked team members to rate these items with respect to the day-specific experience of the entire team. Team members rated the items (e.g., “To what extent did your team have to work very quickly today?”) on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*always*). Cronbach’s alpha ranged from .82 to .86 over the five days. ICC was .25 for daily team level and .32 for between team level. Mean $r_{wg(j)}$ was between .74 and .79 for the daily measures.

Well-being. We used an adapted five-item version of the World Health Organization Well-Being Index (Topp et al., 2015) to measure subjective psychological well-being. In line with previous research on well-being outcomes for teams, we did not shift the referent to the team but rather asked all team members about their individual well-being (e.g., Chiang et al., 2020; Consiglio et al., 2013; Hudson & Shen, 2018; Junker et al., 2021). This decision builds on the rationale that the experience of states like well-being (and also emotional exhaustion) may be most accurately measured by self-ratings of the focal individuals about their own experience which indicates that a reference-shift could be problematic (Gabriel et al., 2019). Team members rated the items (e.g., “Today I have felt active and vigorous”) on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*always*). Cronbach’s alpha ranged from .80 to .87 over the five days. ICC

was .12 for daily team-level and .19 for between team level. Mean $r_{wg(j)}$ was between .74 and .85 for the daily measures.

Emotional exhaustion. We measured emotional exhaustion with four items from the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (CBI, Kristensen, Borritz, et al., 2005; German version by Nübling et al., 2006) that have been adapted for daily measurement. For the same reasons as mentioned above, we did not change the referent to the team. An illustrative example was: “How often have you been emotionally exhausted at work today?”. The items were rated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*always*). Cronbach’s alpha ranged from .85 to .89 over the five days. ICC was .13 for daily team-level and .22 for between team level. Mean $r_{wg(j)}$ was between .74 and .83 for the daily measures.

Construct validity. To test for discriminant validity, we calculated multiple confirmatory factor analyses (CFAs). As the measurement of shared leadership covered five different leadership functions with two items each, we modeled shared leadership as a second-order construct. The five leadership functions were used as latent indicators for the overall latent factor. Accordingly, we tested a CFA with eight first-order factors and one second-order factor. The model yielded an acceptable fit to the data ($\chi^2 = 1264.64$, $df = 219$, $p < .001$, CFI = .93, RMSEA = .06, SRMR = .06) that was better compared to an alternative model with seven first-order factors (items of emotional exhaustion and team workload loaded together on one factor; $\Delta\chi^2 = 1538.15$, $\Delta df = 3$, $p < .001$) and an alternative model, in which the items of emotional exhaustion loaded together with the items of well-being ($\Delta\chi^2 = 1639.80$, $\Delta df = 3$, $p < .001$). In sum, the results from different CFA models confirmed the discriminant validity of our constructs.

Analytical Strategy

Our data is hierarchical in nature and has a three-level structure: The lowest level represented daily measures of the team members (Level 1 – daily individual level), which were nested in daily measures on the team level (Level 2 – daily team level). These team-day data were nested in teams (Level 3 – between team level). For our hypotheses, Level 2 is of primary interest, as this level captures day-specific values at the team level.

We used an analytical approach developed by Chen et al. (2011) to test our proposed model. In contrast to multilevel modeling, which is suitable to study within-team relationships (e.g., the relation between day-level shared leadership and day-level collective well-being; Kelemen et al., 2020; Wang & Maxwell, 2015), this approach aims to examine the relationships between team-specific change trajectories in the focal constructs over time. To enable this analysis, we conducted the following steps to prepare our data: First, we aggregated the daily measures to the team level (i.e., aggregated all measures of the members of one team for each day). Aggregation can be justified as all variables had a notable amount of shared variance on the daily team level (Level 2) and sufficient interrater agreement. Second, we specified growth curve models to capture change trajectories in our focal constructs using random coefficient modeling (Bliese & Ployhart, 2002). In particular, we estimated within-team effects of time for all constructs by modeling a random slope of time as linear change over the five working days (specified by values of 0, 1, 2, 3, 4 for the five days) using the lme4 package in R (Version 4.0.0;

R Core Team, 2020)¹. Formalized, we estimated the following random-slope model of time for each construct:

$$\text{Daily team level: } \bar{x}_{jk} = \beta_{0k} + \beta_{1k} \times \text{Time} + e_{jk}$$

$$\text{Between team level: } \beta_{0k} = \gamma_{00} + u_{0k}$$

$$\beta_{1k} = \gamma_{01} + u_{1k}$$

In this equation, $\bar{x}_{jk}$ is the observed and aggregated score of X of team k at time j , β_{1k} is the linear change of time which can vary between teams (specified by u_{1k}). Additionally, we tested for between-team differences in the linear change of time. Likelihood-ratio tests indicated that the teams in all constructs differed significantly in their change patterns over time.

Third, we extracted the team-specific random slopes of time (i.e., the changes trajectories over time) for all constructs. Using structural equation modeling with the lavaan package, we modeled our proposed relationships between change in the independent variables and change in the dependent variables as well as the interaction effects, while controlling for initial values of the dependent variables (i.e., values on Monday). Prior to this final analytical step, we standardized the change scores and initial values.

Results

Table 1 contains means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations. Due to the hierarchical data structure, we calculated intercorrelations for daily individual level, daily team level, and between team level, respectively. The results of hypotheses testing are presented in Table 2. Our

---

¹ Following the suggestion of an anonymous reviewer, we also tested for non-linear (i.e., quadratic and cubic) change patterns over time. These exploratory analyses revealed that non-linear time slopes did not provided a superior fit to the data compared to linear time slopes.

proposed model had an excellent fit to the data ($\chi^2 = 0.11$, $df = 2$, $p = .95$, CFI = 1.00, RMSEA = .00, SRMR = .01).

Insert Table 1 & 2 about here

For Hypotheses 1a and 1b, the results indicated that an increase in shared leadership was significantly associated with an increase in team well-being ($\beta = .52$, $p < .001$) and additionally lowered emotional exhaustion over time ($\beta = -.37$, $p < .001$), when all other constructs are considered. In support for Hypothesis 2a and 2b, team workload dynamics were related to a decreased well-being over time ($\beta = -.21$, $p = .039$) and an increase in emotional exhaustion ($\beta = .18$, $p = .047$).

Insert Figure 1 about here

Contrary to our expectation, the interaction between dynamics in team workload and shared leadership on well-being was not significant ($\beta = -.08$, $p = .447$). Therefore, Hypothesis 3a received no support. Regarding Hypothesis 3b, results showed a significant interaction between dynamics in team workload and shared leadership on emotional exhaustion change ($\beta = -.19$, $p = .042$). Thus, shared leadership dynamics over time were more strongly related with a decrease in collective emotional exhaustion, when team workload increased ($\beta_{\text{conditional}} = -.55$, $p < .001$) vs. decreased over time ($\beta_{\text{conditional}} = -.18$, $p = .141$, see Figure 1). Thus, Hypothesis 3b was supported.

Supplementary Analyses

To further investigate the prediction of team well-being and emotional exhaustion, we analyzed the influence of dynamics in shared leadership and team workload on end of week values of our outcomes (i.e., values on Friday) while controlling for initial values ($\chi^2 = 0.34$, $df =$

2, $p = .85$, CFI = 1.00, RMSEA = .00, SRMR = .02). These results (see Table 3) provided additional support for the assumption that an increase in shared leadership was associated with higher team well-being ($\beta = .42, p < .001$) and reduced emotional exhaustion ($\beta = -.35, p < .001$) at the end of the week. However, dynamics in team workload were only slightly related to team-level well-being ($\beta = -.19, p = .050$) and exhaustion ($\beta = .17, p = .095$). Concerning the interaction between shared leadership and team workload dynamics, we could replicate our results regarding end of week emotional exhaustion ($\beta = -.21, p = .039$), as shared leadership dynamics were more strongly related to end of week emotional exhaustion, when team workload increased ($\beta_{\text{conditional}} = -.55, p < .001$) vs. decreased over time ($\beta_{\text{conditional}} = -.14, p = .29$, see Figure 2).

 Insert Table 3 about here

 Insert Figure 2 about here

To address concerns about reverse causality, we also checked for the reverse effects of dynamics in well-being and emotional exhaustion on end of week shared leadership as well as team workload while controlling for initial values of these. Friday-values of shared leadership were only positively influenced by increasing well-being ($\beta = .31, p = .002$). However, this relation was smaller than the relation of shared leadership dynamics influencing end of week well-being. Regarding team workload, this analysis only revealed a significant relation with an increase in team emotional exhaustion ($\beta = .24, p = .046$). Besides this, we found that end of week shared leadership was predicted by increasing team workload ($\beta = .19, p = .019$), whereas end of week team workload was independent from increasing shared leadership ($\beta = .11, p = .318$).

For a more detailed view, we reanalyzed our model using the five facets of shared leadership in separate models. All facets of shared leadership were negatively related to dynamics in emotional exhaustion ($ps < .05$) and positively related to dynamics in well-being ($ps < .05$), except for the facet ‘provide feedback’ which was unrelated to emotional exhaustion. In general, the relationships were a bit smaller in comparison to overall shared leadership. Only the facet ‘perform team task’ revealed relationships with dynamics in emotional exhaustion ($\beta = -.36, p < .001$) and well-being ($\beta = .52, p < .001$) in similar magnitude. Moreover, the interaction with workload dynamics could only be found for the facet ‘perform team task’ with respect to short-term dynamics in emotional exhaustion ($\beta = -.18, p = .049$), whereas all remaining interaction effects were not significant.

Discussion

In this study, we linked shared leadership dynamics to temporal changes in team well-being and emotional exhaustion, based on central assumptions of the COR theory. Adopting a functional leadership perspective of shared leadership, we could show that increasing shared leadership was related to increased team member well-being as well as decreased team-level emotional exhaustion over time. Additionally, we assumed that shared leadership—as a team-level resource—may interact with team workload, as resource gains should be most important in the context of resource loss. Results supported this assumption only partially, as an increase in shared leadership was more strongly associated with dynamics in team-level emotional exhaustion when team workload increased. However, this interaction effect could not be found with regard to team-level well-being dynamics.

Theoretical Implications

First, this study provides a novel perspective on shared leadership by showcasing the temporal dynamics of this team phenomenon. Considering temporal dynamics in shared leadership is necessary to understand how shared leadership as a team state evolves over time (Kozlowski & Chao, 2012; Kozlowski et al., 2016). Indeed, temporal dynamics are inherent in the definition and conceptualization of shared leadership (see D’Innocenzo et al., 2016; Pearce & Conger, 2003). Specifically, our results show that changes in shared leadership occur not only as teams mature or develop over longer time spans (e.g., lifecycle models of team development; Drescher et al., 2014), or due to different stages of project work (Lorinkova & Bartol, 2021), but rather more quickly and dynamically. Even over short periods of time (i.e., one week), teams show significant differences in their temporal development of shared leadership behavior. As such, our results also add to the discussion about dynamics in teams at large and underscore the notion that teams should be considered as volatile and agile collectives rather than stable compositional units (cf. Arrow et al., 2004; Collins et al., 2016; Klonek et al., 2019; Mortensen & Haas, 2018).

Second, our research underlines the value of shared leadership for teams by theoretically and empirically linking it to team-level well-being and emotional exhaustion. As these are two previously unstudied outcomes of shared leadership (Zhu et al., 2018), we are also able to expand the nomological network of the shared leadership construct towards mental health outcomes. This expansion seems particularly relevant given the long existing theorizing about the social nature of mental health (e.g., Hobfoll, 2001; Maslach et al., 2001), the growing prevalence of teamwork (Mathieu et al., 2017), and the importance of such outcomes for organizational functioning at large (e.g., Alarcon, 2011; Christian et al., 2011; Cole et al., 2011).

Our empirical insights lend support to our argument that a continuous engagement in sharing different leadership functions among the team (e.g., collectively structuring and planning tasks, or performing team tasks) creates a social context and shared experience that is beneficial for the development of shared mental health among the team members. As we used a multidimensional measure for shared leadership, it is interesting to note that we found stronger relationships with dynamics in team-level well-being and emotional exhaustion for the overall measure of shared leadership than for the different facets in a supplementary analysis. This finding underscores that shared leadership unfolds its consequences not necessarily by performing different leadership functions (i.e., facets of shared leadership) in isolation, but rather through the combined engagement in multiple leadership functions.

Our findings also contribute to the literature on work-related well-being and help to bridge the gap between this stream of literature and the literature on teams. Previous research on work-related well-being mostly considered job characteristics, resources, and demands on the individual level, but rarely took a collective or team-level perspective into account (Sonnentag, 2015). As teams are widely used as organizing principle, this view can generate meaningful insights and adds to the scarce but growing research on team-level antecedents of shared mental health (Chiang et al., 2020; Junker et al., 2021; Tiede et al., 2021). Moreover, our results offer opportunities for theory-building and future studies to include team-level constructs to predict mental health from a multilevel perspective. In this regard, COR theory offers a suitable background to understand higher-level resource gains and loss (Hobfoll, 2011; Hobfoll et al., 2018). Besides this, our study contributes to the understanding of work-related well-being as a dynamic state (e.g., Sonnentag, 2015). Previous diary studies have mostly focused on day-specific fluctuations of individual-level well-being (Bakker, 2014; Sonnentag, 2015) but seldom

examined change trajectories over time (for a notable exception, see Hülshager et al., 2014). This perspective implies that shared well-being and emotional exhaustion do not only alter from day-to-day but also exhibit systematic (i.e., linear) change trajectories over a continuous period of time. These findings add to the assumption of resource gain and loss cycles of COR theory (e.g., Hobfoll et al., 2018).

Third, the interaction between shared leadership and team workload regarding team emotional exhaustion emphasizes the conceptualization of shared leadership as a collective resource for teams. A growing engagement in shared leadership can help to mitigate negative outcomes for teamwork and task work due to increasing team workload (Funke et al., 2012). Additionally, this implication contradicts the speculation of Zhu and colleagues (2018) that shared leadership may not be appropriate in times of high pressure, as our results indicate that shared leadership can unfold its potential especially under conditions of increasing team workload, which meets expectation of COR theory about the importance of resource gains in the context of resource loss (Halbesleben et al., 2014). As team workload rises, the team members need to rely on their peers, as they provide support, keep the team focused on a shared purpose, solve problems, and jointly engage in leadership functions to satisfy team needs (Ensley et al., 2006; Morgeson et al., 2010). Therefore, shared leadership can be seen as dynamic means for teams to adapt their behavior and to counterbalance resource loss. It is important to note that shared leadership was uncorrelated with team workload at all levels and that increasing shared leadership did not lead to higher team workload at the end of the week. This is an interesting finding as an increasing engagement in shared leadership is not experienced as a burden for the team (for example due to higher responsibility). We interpret this result in terms of our focus on the team level. This means that an increase in shared leadership stems from the collective

engagement of the whole team (see DeRue & Ashford, 2010). In contrast, the engagement of a single individual can be stressful for this team member, if the team as a whole is disengaged (see Evans et al., 2021).

Finally, the lack of a significant interaction between team workload and shared leadership in the context of team well-being might be interpreted under the premise that well-being is defined as the optimal psychological functioning and experience and not just the absence of mental illness (e.g., depletion, exhaustion, or strain; Ryan & Deci, 2001). Thus, our finding that shared leadership buffers against negative consequences of increasing team workload in the case of team-level exhaustion but does not interact with team workload dynamics to predict team well-being could be due to the complexity of the well-being construct and the fact that a reduction of the challenges associated with team workload may not suffice for creating positive effects for team-level well-being.

Practical Implications

Our findings provide several practical implications for teams, leaders, and organizations aiming to reap the benefits of shared leadership and improve employee well-being in team settings. Organizations need to recognize and promote shared leadership parallel to formal or hierarchical leadership. The increase of agile team collaboration in organizations points to the value of shared leadership in teams (e.g., Annosi et al., 2017; Solansky, 2008). Such developments toward more shared leadership in teams can be actively supported by formal leaders in an organization. Especially expressions of leader humility, empowering leadership, and transformational leadership have been identified as antecedents of shared leadership (Chiu et al., 2016; Hoch, 2013; Klasmeier & Rowold, 2020): Humble leader behaviors such as praising followers or allowing them to learn can foster team members' confidence to assume leadership

influence themselves. Likewise, formal leaders can foster collective goals and a shared purpose in order to encourage shared leadership in teams. Additionally, organizations can actively communicate that shared leadership is recognized as a desirable behavior and encourage team members to actively engage in informal leadership processes.

Moreover, team development can help teams to build capabilities to lead themselves in order to support task- and teamwork. For example, the team environment should facilitate social interactions to increase social support and cooperation (Driskell et al., 2015). Regular team meetings can foster the exchange of processes and tasks and can provide a possibility for direct interactions between team members. These meetings may also be helpful in dealing with high demands (e.g., team workload), as they help to clarify role and task ambiguities within the team or facilitate the coordination between team members.

Limitations and Future Directions

This study has several limitations that point to opportunities for future research. First, the reliance on self-report measures to capture our focal study variables may raise concerns for common method bias. However, there are some reasons that justify the use of self-reported data and we took steps to reduce potential bias. We considered temporal change patterns at the team level over time for hypothesis testing. This means that the variables at this level reflect the change in the day-specific shared consensus of all team members across days, and thus may be less biased than individual-level ratings. Moreover, multi-source data in the context of diary studies may not always be useful. Especially for affective data, self-reports are more valid than other-ratings (Gabriel et al., 2019). Nevertheless, we encourage future research efforts to consider a wider range of possible well-being indicators.

Second, future research can investigate to what extent the positive relation between shared leadership and collective member well-being hinges on additional contextual variables. Among those, we did not include formal leader behavior in this study, given our study focus on shared leadership rather than formal leadership influence in teams. Previous research has already shown that formal leader behavior can influence follower well-being (Montano et al., 2017) and follower reactions to high demanding work conditions (Breevaart et al., 2016). However, meta-analytical evidence supports the incremental validity of shared leadership over formal leadership for attitudinal outcomes (Wang et al., 2014). Nevertheless, future research should consider different sources of team leadership simultaneously. Additionally, formal leader's behavior might influence the emergence of shared leadership (e.g., Chiu et al., 2016; Klasmeier & Rowold, 2020), and Zhu et al. (2018) suggested that shared and hierarchical leadership may also interact with each other. For example, specific formal leader behaviors (e.g., empowering, humble) may be particularly suitable for coinciding shared leadership. However, especially theoretically incongruent formal leader behaviors (e.g., directive, abusive) may interact with shared leadership behaviors of the team. It is possible that shared leadership can mitigate negative consequences of abusive leadership or, in case of a rather directive leadership style, promote conflicts with the formal leader. The inclusion of formal leader behavior in addition to shared leadership can test these ideas and provides a fruitful avenue for future research.

A third limitation is related to our referent-shift consensus model for measuring shared leadership and team workload. In the case of team workload, Funke and colleagues (2012) discussed several other methodological strategies to measure team workload (e.g., physiological and behavioral data or strategy shift measures). Likewise, a common approach to measure shared leadership is the use of social network analysis (e.g., D'Innocenzo et al., 2016). Using social

network analysis, however, seldom captures the content of shared leadership (e.g., specific behaviors or functions; Carson et al., 2007; Zhu et al., 2018). Additionally, using a social network approach to measure different team leadership functions would have been difficult to implement in a daily diary study design (Gabriel et al., 2019) due to the increased length of the questionnaire. Thus, further research is needed to compare different measures for shared leadership and team workload to provide evidence-based guidelines for the operationalization of these team constructs.

Finally, to the best of our knowledge, this study is among the very first empirical investigations of the dynamics of shared leadership studies as an antecedent of team members' well-being and exhaustion using a daily diary design. Future studies may try to replicate these findings to demonstrate their robustness. Additionally, in terms of a temporal consideration of shared leadership change patterns, it is important to extend the time frame of data collection (e.g., two weeks) to examine how the observed change patterns develop across longer periods of time. Whereas a team may exhibit a linear increase of shared leadership in one week, the same team may show a decrease in the next week (i.e., the team may have a cyclical change pattern; McClean et al., 2019). Investigations of shared leadership across longer time frames (i.e., using a weekly or monthly data collection) may also identify longer-term temporal patterns of shared leadership and associated outcomes. Additionally, they have the potential to show whether a high engagement in shared leadership may have negative consequences for a team when this behavior is shown over a longer period (i.e., too-much-of-a-good-thing effect; Pierce & Aguinis, 2013).

Conclusion

The present study developed a dynamic temporal model to examine the relationship between changes in shared leadership and dynamics in well-being and exhaustion in teams. We

draw on COR theory to argue how the sharing of leadership functions can serve as a team resource. We hypothesized and found that as members have similar experiences given their daily exposure to a shared team context, dynamic changes in shared leadership predict changes in team-level well-being and emotional exhaustion. These findings emphasize the importance of shared leadership for team functioning, establish shared leadership as a team resource, and advance our understanding of the temporal dynamics of team leadership and its benefits for shared mental health.

References

- Aime, F., Humphrey, S. E., DeRue, D. S., & Paul, J. B. (2014). The riddle of heterarchy: Power transitions in cross-functional teams. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57(2), 327–352. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2011.0756>
- Alarcon, G. M. (2011). A meta-analysis of burnout with job demands, resources, and attitudes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 79(2), 549–562. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2011.03.007>
- Ali, A., Wang, H., & Johnson, R. E. (2020). Empirical analysis of shared leadership promotion and team creativity: An adaptive leadership perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 41(5), 405–423. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2437>
- Ancona, D. G., Okhuysen, G. A., & Perlow, L. A. (2001). Taking time to integrate temporal research. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(4), 512–529. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2001.5393887>
- Annosi, M. C., Foss, N., Brunetta, F., & Magnusson, M. (2017). The interaction of control systems and stakeholder networks in shaping the identities of self-managed teams. *Organization Studies*, 38(5), 619–645. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840616679454>
- Arrow, H., Poole, M. S., Henry, K. B., Wheelan, S., & Moreland, R. (2004). Time, change, and development: The temporal perspective on groups. *Small Group Research*, 35(1), 73–105. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1046496403259757>
- Aubé, C., Rousseau, V., & Brunelle, E. (2018). Flow experience in teams: The role of shared leadership. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 23(2), 198–206. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000071>

- Bakker, A. B. (2014). Daily fluctuations in work engagement: An overview and current directions. *European Psychologist*, 19(4), 227–236. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1016-9040/a000160>
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands-resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22(3), 273–285. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000056>
- Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Sanz-Vergel, A. I. (2014). Burnout and work engagement: The JD-R approach. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1(1), 389–411. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091235>
- Bakker, A. B., van Emmerik, H., & Euwema, M. C. (2006). Crossover of burnout and engagement in work teams. *Work and Occupations*, 33(4), 464–489. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0730888406291310>
- Bergman, J. Z., Rentsch, J. R., Small, E. E., Davenport, S. W., & Bergman, S. M. (2012). The shared leadership process in decision-making teams. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 152(1), 17–42. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.2010.538763>
- Bliese, P. D., Edwards, J. R., & Sonnentag, S. (2017). Stress and well-being at work: A century of empirical trends reflecting theoretical and societal influences. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(3), 389–402. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000109>
- Bliese, P. D., & Ployhart, R. E. (2002). Growth Modeling Using Random Coefficient Models: Model Building, Testing, and Illustrations. *Organizational Research Methods*, 5(4), 362–387. <https://doi.org/10.1177/109442802237116>
- Bormann, K. C. (2017). Linking daily ethical leadership to followers' daily behaviour: The roles of daily work engagement and previous abusive supervision. *European Journal of Work*

- and Organizational Psychology*, 26(4), 590–600.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432x.2017.1331217>
- Breevaart, K., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Derks, D. (2016). Who takes the lead? A multi-source diary study on leadership, work engagement, and job performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 37(3), 309–325. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2041>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2007.20159921>
- Chan, D. (1998). Functional relations among constructs in the same content domain at different levels of analysis: A typology of composition models. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(2), 234–246. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.83.2.234>
- Chen, G., Ployhart, R. E., Thomas, H. C., Anderson, N., & Bliese, P. D. (2011). The power of momentum: A new model of dynamic relationships between job satisfaction change and turnover intentions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(1), 159–181.
<https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2011.59215089>
- Chiang, J. T.-J., Chen, X.-P., Liu, H., Akutsu, S., & Wang, Z. (2020). We have emotions but can't show them! Authoritarian leadership, emotion suppression climate, and team performance. *Human Relations*, 74(7), 1082–1111.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726720908649>
- Chiu, C.-Y. C., Owens, B. P., & Tesluk, P. E. (2016). Initiating and utilizing shared leadership in teams: The role of leader humility, team proactive personality, and team performance capability. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 101(12), 1705–1720.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000159>

- Christian, M. S., Garza, A. S., & Slaughter, J. E. (2011). Work engagement: A quantitative review and test of its relations with task and contextual performance. *Personnel Psychology, 64*(1), 89–136. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01203.x>
- Cole, M. S., Walter, F., Bedeian, A. G., & O’Boyle, E. H. (2011). Job Burnout and Employee Engagement. *Journal of Management, 38*(5), 1550-1581. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206311415252>
- Collins, C. G., Gibson, C. B., Quigley, N. R., & Parker, S. K. (2016). Unpacking team dynamics with growth modeling: An approach to test, refine, and integrate theory. *Organizational Psychology Review, 6*(1), 63–91. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2041386614561249>
- Consiglio, C., Borgogni, L., Alessandri, G., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2013). Does self-efficacy matter for burnout and sickness absenteeism? The mediating role of demands and resources at the individual and team levels. *Work & Stress, 27*(1), 22–42. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2013.769325>
- Contractor, N. S., DeChurch, L. A., Carson, J. B., Carter, D. R., & Keegan, B. (2012). The topology of collective leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly, 23*(6), 994–1011. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2012.10.010>
- Costa, P. L., Passos, A. M., & Bakker, A. B. (2015). Direct and contextual influence of team conflict on team resources, team work engagement, and team performance. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research, 8*(4), 211–227. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ncmr.12061>
- 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>

- Day, D. V., Gronn, P., & Salas, E. (2004). Leadership capacity in teams. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15(6), 857–880. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2004.09.001>
- DeRue, D. S., & Ashford, S. J. (2010). Who will lead and who will follow?: A social process of leadership identity construction in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 35(4), 627–647. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.35.4.zok627>
- Dietz, A. S., Driskell, J. E., Sierra, M. J., Weaver, S. J., Driskell, T., & Salas, E. (2017). Teamwork under stress. In E. Salas, R. Rico, & J. Passmore (Eds.), *The Wiley Blackwell handbook of the psychology of team working and collaborative processes* (pp. 297–316). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Drescher, M. A., Korsgaard, M. A., Welpe, I. M., Picot, A., & Wigand, R. T. (2014). The dynamics of shared leadership: building trust and enhancing performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 99(5), 771–783. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0036474>
- Driskell, T., Driskell, J. E., & Salas, E. (2015). Mitigating stress effects on team cohesion. In A. X. Estrada, E. Salas, & W. B. Vessey (Eds.), *Team cohesion* (First edition ed., Vol. 17, pp. 247–270). Emerald Group Publishing Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1108/s1534-085620150000017010>
- Ensley, M. D., Hmieleski, K. M., & Pearce, C. L. (2006). The importance of vertical and shared leadership within new venture top management teams: Implications for the performance of startups. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17(3), 217–231. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.02.002>
- Evans, K., Sanner, B., & Chiu, C.-Y. (2021). Shared Leadership, Unshared Burdens: How Shared Leadership Structure Schema Lowers Individual Enjoyment Without Increasing

Performance. *Group & Organization Management*.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601121997225>

Fritz, C., Sonnentag, S., Spector, P. E., & McInroe, J. A. (2010). The weekend matters:

Relationships between stress recovery and affective experiences. *Journal of*

Organizational Behavior, 31(8), 1137–1162. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.672>

Funke, G. J., Knott, B. A., Salas, E., Pavlas, D., & Strang, A. J. (2012). Conceptualization and measurement of team workload: a critical need. *Human Factors*, 54(1), 36–51.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0018720811427901>

Gabriel, A. S., Podsakoff, N. P., Beal, D. J., Scott, B. A., Sonnentag, S., Trougakos, J. P., & Butts, M. M. (2019). Experience sampling methods: A discussion of critical trends and

considerations for scholarly advancement. *Organizational Research Methods*, 22(4), 969-

1006. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428118802626>

Halbesleben, J. R. B., Neveu, J.-P., Paustian-Underdahl, S. C., & Westman, M. (2014). Getting to the “COR”: Understanding the role of resources in conservation of resources theory.

Journal of Management, 40(5), 1334-1364. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206314527130>

Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources. A new attempt at conceptualizing stress.

American Psychologist, 44(3), 513-524. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0003-066x.44.3.513>

Hobfoll, S. E. (2001). The Influence of Culture, Community, and the Nested - Self in the Stress

Process: Advancing Conservation of Resources Theory. *Applied Psychology*, 50(3), 337-

421. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1464-0597.00062>

Hobfoll, S. E. (2011). Conservation of resource caravans and engaged settings. *Journal of*

Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 84(1), 116-122.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.2010.02016.x>

- Hobfoll, S. E., Halbesleben, J., Neveu, J.-P., & Westman, M. (2018). Conservation of Resources in the Organizational Context: The Reality of Resources and Their Consequences. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 5(1), 103-128. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032117-104640>
- Hoch, J. E. (2013). Shared leadership and innovation: The role of vertical leadership and employee integrity. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 28(2), 159–174. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-012-9273-6>
- Hooker, C., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2003). Flow, creativity, and shared leadership. In C. L. Pearce & J. A. Conger (Eds.), *Shared leadership* (pp. 217–234). Sage.
- Hudson, C. K., & Shen, W. (2018). Consequences of work group manpower and expertise understaffing: A multilevel approach. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 23(1), 85–98. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000052>
- Hülshager, U. R., Lang, J. W. B., Depenbrock, F., Fehrman, C., Zijlstra, F. R. H., & Alberts, H. J. E. M. (2014). The power of presence: The role of mindfulness at work for daily levels and change trajectories of psychological detachment and sleep quality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 99(6), 1113–1128. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037702>
- Humphrey, S. E., & Aime, F. (2014). Team microdynamics: Toward an organizing approach to teamwork. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 8(1), 443–503. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19416520.2014.904140>
- Ilies, R., Schwind, K. M., Wagner, D. T., Johnson, M. D., DeRue, D. S., & Ilgen, D. R. (2007). When can employees have a family life? The effects of daily workload and affect on work-family conflict and social behaviors at home. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(5), 1368–1379. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.5.1368>

- James, L. R., Demaree, R. G., & Wolf, G. (1993). r -sub(wg): An assessment of within-group interrater agreement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(2), 306–309.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.78.2.306>
- Johnson, R. E., Venus, M., Lanaj, K., Mao, C., & Chang, C.-H. (2012). Leader identity as an antecedent of the frequency and consistency of transformational, consideration, and abusive leadership behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(6), 1262–1272.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029043>
- Junker, N. M., van Dick, R., Häusser, J. A., Ellwart, T., & Zyphur, M. J. (2021). The I and We of Team Identification: A Multilevel Study of Exhaustion and (In)congruence Among Individuals and Teams in Team Identification. *Group & Organization Management*.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/10596011211004789>
- Kelemen, T. K., Matthews, S. H., & Breevaart, K. (2020). Leading day-to-day: A review of the daily causes and consequences of leadership behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 31(1), 101344. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2019.101344>
- Klasmeier, K. N., & Rowold, J. (2020). A multilevel investigation of predictors and outcomes of shared leadership. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 41(9), 915–930.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2477>
- Klasmeier, K. N., & Rowold, J. (2021). A diary study on shared leadership, team work engagement, and goal attainment. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12371>
- Klein, K. J., & Kozlowski, S. W. J. (2000). From micro to meso: Critical steps in conceptualizing and conducting multilevel research. *Organizational Research Methods*, 3(3), 211–236.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/109442810033001>

- Klonek, F., Gerpott, F. H., Lehmann-Willenbrock, N., & Parker, S. K. (2019). Time to go wild: How to conceptualize and measure process dynamics in real teams with high-resolution. *Organizational Psychology Review*, 9(4), 245–275.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/2041386619886674>
- Kozlowski, S. W. J. (2015). Advancing research on team process dynamics: Theoretical, methodological, and measurement considerations. *Organizational Psychology Review*, 5(4), 270–299. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2041386614533586>
- Kozlowski, S. W. J., & Chao, G. T. (2012). The dynamics of emergence: Cognition and cohesion in work teams. *Managerial and Decision Economics*, 33(5-6), 335–354.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/mde.2552>
- Kozlowski, S. W. J., & Chao, G. T. (2018). Unpacking team process dynamics and emergent phenomena: Challenges, conceptual advances, and innovative methods. *American Psychologist*, 73(4), 576–592. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000245>
- Kozlowski, S. W. J., Mak, S., & Chao, G. T. (2016). Team-centric leadership: An integrative review. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 3(1), 21–54. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-041015-062429>
- Kristensen, T. S., Borritz, M., Villadsen, E., & Christensen, K. B. (2005). The Copenhagen Burnout Inventory: A new tool for the assessment of burnout. *Work & Stress*, 19(3), 192–207. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678370500297720>
- Kristensen, T. S., Hannerz, H., Høgh, A., & Borg, V. (2005). The Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire: A tool for the assessment and improvement of the psychosocial work environment. *Scand J Work Environ Health*, 31(6), 438–449.
<https://doi.org/10.5271/sjweh.948>

- Kukenberger, M. R., & D'Innocenzo, L. (2020). The building blocks of shared leadership: The interactive effects of diversity types, team climate, and time. *Personnel Psychology*, 73(1), 125-150. <https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12318>
- Kuonath, A., Specht, J., Kühnel, J., Pachler, D., & Frey, D. (2017). Keeping up day-specific effects of transformational leadership: The role of followers' emotion regulation. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 26(6), 828–843. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432x.2017.1379993>
- Lehmann-Willenbrock, N., Meyers, R. A., Kauffeld, S., Neininger, A., & Henschel, A. (2011). Verbal interaction sequences and group mood: Exploring the role of planning communication. *Small Group Research*, 42(6), 639–668. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1046496411398397>
- Liu, S., Hu, J., Li, Y., Wang, Z., & Lin, X. (2014). Examining the cross-level relationship between shared leadership and learning in teams: Evidence from China. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25(2), 282–295. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.08.006>
- Lorinkova, N. M., & Bartol, K. M. (2021). Shared leadership development and team performance: A new look at the dynamics of shared leadership. *Personnel Psychology*, 74(1), 77-107. <https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12409>
- Marks, M. A., Mathieu, J. E., & Zaccaro, S. J. (2001). A temporally based framework and taxonomy of team processes. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(3), 356–376. <https://doi.org/10.2307/259182>
- Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 397-422. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.397>

- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000128>
- Mathieu, J. E., Kukenberger, M. R., D'Innocenzo, L., & Reilly, G. (2015). Modeling reciprocal team cohesion-performance relationships, as impacted by shared leadership and members' competence. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100(3), 713–734. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038898>
- McClean, S. T., Barnes, C. M., Courtright, S. H., & Johnson, R. E. (2019). Resetting the clock on dynamic leader behaviors: A conceptual integration and agenda for future research. *Academy of Management Annals*, 13(2), 479–508. <https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2017.0081>
- McCormick, B. W., Reeves, C. J., Downes, P. E., Li, N., & Ilies, R. (2020). Scientific Contributions of Within-Person Research in Management: Making the Juice Worth the Squeeze. *Journal of Management*, 46(2), 321–350. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206318788435>
- Montano, D., Reeske, A., Franke, F., & Hüffmeier, J. (2017). Leadership, followers' mental health and job performance in organizations: A comprehensive meta-analysis from an occupational health perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 38(3), 327–350. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2124>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206309347376>

- Mortensen, M., & Haas, M. R. (2018). Perspective—Rethinking Teams: From Bounded Membership to Dynamic Participation. *Organization science*, 29(2), 341-355.
<https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2017.1198>
- Myers, N. D., Feltz, D. L., & Short, S. E. (2004). Collective efficacy and team performance: A longitudinal study of collegiate football teams. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 8(2), 126–138. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2699.8.2.126>
- Nicolaides, 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.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2014.06.006>
- Nübling, M., Stöbel, U., Hasselhorn, H.-M., Michaelis, M., & Hofmann, F. (2006). Measuring psychological stress and strain at work: Evaluation of the COPSQ questionnaire in Germany. 3, 1–14.
- Ohly, S., Sonnentag, S., Niessen, C., & Zapf, D. (2010). Diary studies in organizational research. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, 9(2), 79–93. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1866-5888/a000009>
- Pearce, C. L., & Conger, J. A. (Eds.). (2003). *Shared leadership: Reframing the hows and whys of leadership*. Sage.
- Pearce, C. L., & Sims, 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. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2699.6.2.172>

- Pierce, J. R., & Aguinis, H. (2013). The Too-Much-of-a-Good-Thing Effect in Management. *Journal of Management*, 39(2), 313-338. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206311410060>
- Ployhart, R. E., & Vandenberg, R. J. (2010). Longitudinal research: The theory, design, and analysis of change. *Journal of Management*, 36(1), 94–120. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206309352110>
- R Core Team. (2020). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing.
- Ragsdale, J. M., & Beehr, T. A. (2016). A rigorous test of a model of employees' resource recovery mechanisms during a weekend. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 37(6), 911–932. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2086>
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2001). On happiness and human potentials: A review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 141–166. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.141>
- Ryff, C. D., & Keyes, C. L. (1995). The structure of psychological well-being revisited. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69(4), 719-727. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.69.4.719>
- Sinha, R., Chiu, C. Y., & Srinivas, S. B. (2021). Shared leadership and relationship conflict in teams: The moderating role of team power base diversity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 42(5), 649-667. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2515>
- Sivasubramaniam, N., Murry, W. D., Avolio, B. J., & Jung, D. I. (2002). A longitudinal model of the effects of team leadership and group potency on group performance. *Group & Organization Management*, 27(1), 66–96. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601102027001005>

Small, E. E., & Rentsch, J. R. (2010). Shared leadership in teams: A matter of distribution.

Journal of Personnel Psychology, 9(4), 203–211. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1866-5888/a000017>

Solansky, S. T. (2008). Leadership style and team processes in self-managed teams. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 14(4), 332–341.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051808315549>

Sonnentag, S. (2015). Dynamics of well-being. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 2(1), 261–293. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032414-111347>

Sonnentag, S., Kuttler, I., & Fritz, C. (2010). Job stressors, emotional exhaustion, and need for recovery: A multi-source study on the benefits of psychological detachment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 76(3), 355–365. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2009.06.005>

Spector, P. E., & Jex, S. M. (1998). Development of four self-report measures of job stressors and strain: Interpersonal Conflict at Work Scale, Organizational Constraints Scale, Quantitative Workload Inventory, and Physical Symptoms Inventory. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 3(4), 356–367. <https://doi.org/10.1037//1076-8998.3.4.356>

Sweeney, A., Clarke, N., & Higgs, M. (2018). Shared leadership in commercial organizations: A systematic review of definitions, theoretical frameworks and organizational outcomes.

International Journal of Management Reviews, 21(1), 1733.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12181>

- Swider, B. W., & Zimmerman, R. D. (2010). Born to burnout: A meta-analytic path model of personality, job burnout, and work outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 76(3), 487–506. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2010.01.003>
- Techniker Krankenkasse. (2020). *Gesundheitsreport 2020: Arbeitsunfähigkeiten [Health Report 2020: Incapacities to work]*.
- Tiede, K. E., Schultheis, S. K., & Meyer, B. (2021). Subgroup Splits in Diverse Work Teams: Subgroup Perceptions but Not Demographic Faultlines Affect Team Identification and Emotional Exhaustion. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 595720. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.595720>
- Tims, M., Bakker, A. B., & Xanthopoulou, D. (2011). Do transformational leaders enhance their followers' daily work engagement? *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22(1), 121–131. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2010.12.011>
- Topp, C. W., Østergaard, S. D., Søndergaard, S., & Bech, P. (2015). The WHO-5 Well-Being Index: a systematic review of the literature. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics*, 84(3), 167–176. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000376585>
- Torrente, P., Salanova, M., Llorens, S., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2012). Teams make it work: How team work engagement mediates between social resources and performance in teams. 24, 106–112.
- Totterdell, P. (2000). Catching moods and hitting runs: Mood linkage and subjective performance in professional sport teams. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(6), 848–859. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.85.6.848>
- van Yperen, N. W., & Snijders, T. A. B. (2000). A multilevel analysis of the demands-control model: Is stress at work determined by factors at the group level or the individual level?

- Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5(1), 182–190.
<https://doi.org/10.1037//1076-8998.5.1.182>
- Vandenberghe, C., Landry, G., Bentein, K., Anseel, F., Mignonac, K., & Roussel, P. (2021). A Dynamic Model of the Effects of Feedback-Seeking Behavior and Organizational Commitment on Newcomer Turnover. *Journal of Management*, 47(2), 519-544.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206319850621>
- Wang, D., Waldman, D. A., & Zhang, Z. (2014). A meta-analysis of shared leadership and team effectiveness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 99(2), 181–198.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0034531>
- Wang, L. P., & Maxwell, S. E. (2015). On disaggregating between-person and within-person effects with longitudinal data using multilevel models. *Psychological Methods*, 20(1), 63–83. <https://doi.org/10.1037/met0000030>
- Wright, T. A., & Cropanzano, R. (1998). Emotional exhaustion as a predictor of job performance and voluntary turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(3), 486-493.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.83.3.486>
- Wu, Q., Cormican, K., & Chen, G. (2018). A meta-analysis of shared leadership: Antecedents, consequences, and moderators. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 52(1), 154805181882086. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051818820862>
- Zhang, C., Nahrgang, J. D., Ashford, S. J., & DeRue, D. S. (2020). The Risky Side of Leadership: Conceptualizing Risk Perceptions in Informal Leadership and Investigating the Effects of Their Over-Time Changes in Teams. *Organization science*, 31(5), 1138-1158. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2019.1350>

Zhu, J., Liao, Z., Yam, K. C., & Johnson, R. E. (2018). Shared leadership: A state-of-the-art review and future research agenda. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 39(7), 834–852.

<https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2296>

Preprint

Table 1*Descriptive statistics and intercorrelations*

	1.	2.	3.	4.
<i>Daily Person-Level (N = 1174 to N= 1179)</i>				
1. Shared leadership				
2. Team workload	-.01			
3. Emotional exhaustion	-.14**	.33**		
4. Well-being	.38**	-.09**	-.48**	
<i>Daily Team-Level (N = 377)</i>				
1. Shared leadership				
2. Team workload	-.02			
3. Emotional exhaustion	-.18**	.25**		
4. Well-being	.32**	-.19**	-.59**	
<i>Between Team-Level (N = 77)</i>				
1. Shared leadership				
2. Team workload	.10			
3. Emotional exhaustion	-.08	.62**		
4. Well-being	.34**	-.17	-.38**	
<i>M^a</i>	3.52	2.53	2.04	3.42
<i>SD^a</i>	0.78	0.87	0.84	0.75

Note. ^a Means and standard deviations have been calculated based on the data at daily person-level.

** $p < .01$.

Table 2

Results from structural equation modeling of dynamic changes in shared leadership, team workload, and collective member exhaustion and well-being in the team

Variable	β	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>
Predicting change in team well-being			
Shared leadership change	.52	.08	<.001
Team workload change	-.21	.10	.039
Interaction	-.08	.10	.447
Initial team well-being	-.11	.08	.171
Predicting change in team emotional exhaustion			
Shared leadership change	-.37	.08	<.001
Team workload change	.18	.09	.047
Interaction	-.19	.09	.042
Initial team emotional exhaustion	-.40	.07	<.001

Note. $N = 77$ teams. Results are standardized coefficients.

Table 3

Results of structural equation modeling for end of week well-being and emotional exhaustion in teams

Variable	β	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>
Predicting end of week team well-being			
Shared leadership change	.42	.08	<.001
Team workload change	-.19	.10	.050
Interaction	-.16	.10	.102
Initial team well-being	.43	.08	<.001
Predicting end of week team emotional exhaustion			
Shared leadership change	-.35	.09	<.001
Team workload change	.17	.10	.095
Interaction	-.21	.10	.039
Initial team emotional exhaustion	.48	.07	<.001

Note. $N = 77$ teams. Results are standardized coefficients.

Figure 1

Interaction effect of dynamics in shared leadership and team workload on emotional exhaustion

Note. The change variables are measured as team-specific standardized change trajectories and the simple slopes are plotted for ± 1 standard deviation around the change trajectory of the moderator. Hence, ‘Team Workload Increase’ refers to an above average (i.e., positive) change trajectory of team workload, whereas ‘Team Workload Decrease’ refers to a below average (i.e., negative) change trajectory of team workload.

Figure 2

Interaction effect of dynamics in shared leadership and team workload on end of week emotional exhaustion

Note. The change variables are measured as team-specific standardized change trajectories and the simple slopes are plotted for ± 1 standard deviation around the change trajectory of the moderator. Hence, 'Team Workload Increase' refers to an above average (i.e., positive) change trajectory of team workload, whereas 'Team Workload Decrease' refers to a below average (i.e., negative) change trajectory of team workload.