

LEADERSHIP IN SELF-MANAGING VIRTUAL TEAMS

Kevin Crowston, Robert Heckman, Nora Misiolek and U. Yeliz Eseryel
Syracuse University School of Information Studies

Draft of 13 August 2018

ABSTRACT

Self-managing virtual teams are becoming commonplace and they embody several unique dynamics. Virtual team leadership literature tends to borrow heavily from organizational theory, which has taken into account some of these different dynamics and developed distinct and non-overlapping leadership theories for them. In this conceptual article, we integrate these different theories in a coherent whole to explain how leadership contributes to team formation, continuing change, and transformation in self-managing virtual teams. Building on the virtual teams literature, leadership theory, and structuration theory, we present a theory of leadership in self-managing virtual teams that describes leadership as a process that results in the reinforcement, creation and evolution of ongoing structures. We further distinguish between two types of leadership that empirical research suggests jointly influence team process and structures in these types of teams. We identify first-order leadership as leadership that works within and reinforces existing structures to elicit and guide group contributions. We identify second-order leadership as leadership that results in changes in the structure that guides group action. We argue that second-order leadership is enabled by first-order leadership, is action embedded, and is enabled by substantive team member contributions. We propose that effective self-managing virtual teams will exhibit a paradoxical combination of shared, distributed first-order leadership complemented by strong, concentrated, and centralized second-order leadership. We conclude by presenting a set of research questions and suggestions for future research.

Keywords: Self-managing teams, virtual teams, structuration theory, leadership

LEADERSHIP IN SELF-MANAGING VIRTUAL TEAMS

In this conceptual article, we are developing leadership theory for self-managing virtual teams. Self-managing virtual teams are becoming commonplace and they embody several uniquely different dynamics compared to organizational teams. Virtual team leadership literature tends to borrow heavily from organizational theory, which has taken into account some of these different dynamics and developed distinct leadership models. Thus, there are different theories for when the leadership is emergent, or shared, or when there were assigned leaders, but no theory that can apply directly to self-managing virtual teams, which tend to have both emergent and shared leadership, with or without external leaders. Other theories suggest that leaders may have either transactional or transformational approach, assuming that leaders may use only one approach and this approach stays static throughout the lifecycle of the team. However, it is not clear how leaders may contribute differently at different stages of a team's lifecycle from team formation, team development (minor changes), and major transformational team changes. Yet, many teams go through these stages. Finally, in much of the organizational leadership literature, the leader is positioned as the individual who developed strategies, and motivated others to do the work. Self-managing virtual teams are typically action-oriented, where contribution to the task at hand is crucial part of leadership, and where the leaders do not have the luxury of only focusing on strategy, motivation and task coordination. Therefore, we take into account all of these factors in combining distinct leadership theories as explained in detail in the following sections.

Virtual teams are a new way of organizing and working that allow organization to bridge discontinuities of time and geography and to leverage human and intellectual capital wherever it resides globally (Duarte & Snyder, 2001; Pearce & Manz, 2005). Unlike conventional co-located teams whose members work in relatively close proximity and interact regularly face-to-face, members of virtual teams are geographically and often organizationally or culturally separated (Chudoba, Wynn, Lu, & Watson-Manheim, 2005; Lu, Watson-Manheim, Chudoba, & Wynn, 2006; Watson-Manheim, Chudoba, & Crowston, 2002) and rely primarily or exclusively on technology mediation to bridge these discontinuities.

In their review of leadership theory, Avolio and colleagues (2009) suggest that leadership processes in virtual teams differ from those in co-located teams as the discontinuities in the technology-mediated environment in which virtual teams interact challenges traditional (i.e., hierarchical, top-down) forms of leadership. Virtual teamwork is characterized by "behavioral invisibility" (Bass, 2008) meaning that appointed leaders cannot easily observe team member behavior, making it difficult for them to manage team task and social dynamics. Team process is difficult to moderate because of the reduction in social interaction. Traditional forms of social control such as direct supervision, physical proximity, and shared experiences are largely absent (Pinsonneault & Caya, 2005). Finally, opportunities to give and to receive feedback are reduced, as are opportunities to assess perceived commitment to project or team goals (Konradt & Hoch, 2007).

We focus here on the nature of leadership in self-managing virtual teams since virtual teams often are self-managing. Leadership structures observed in virtual teams may include permanent leaders, rotating leaders, managing partners, structures in which facilitators or coordinators assist teams in completing their work, as well as leaderless (self-managing) structures (Beyerlein, Nemiro, & Beyerlein, 2008). However, the literature suggests that virtual teams are more likely to be self-managing regardless of whether a formal leader is appointed

(Matheiu, Maynard, Rapp, & Gilson, 2008). Self-managing teams have been the focus of some theorizing and empirical inquiry. However, this work has focused on the dynamics of self-management in co-located teams (Bell & Kozlowski, 2002; Hertel, Geister, & Kondratt, 2005; Matheiu et al., 2008), while Andres (2006) suggests that the underlying dynamics by which self-managing leadership structures emerge will differ in virtual teams because of the discontinuities present in the virtual environment that impact all forms of leadership structures and dynamics. Accordingly, we argue that when teams exhibit high levels of both virtuality and self-management, their leadership dynamics will not be explained by traditional leadership theories, theories largely designed to explain interactions between subordinates and a single individual who occupies a formal, appointed managerial or supervisory position in a hierarchical organizational setting (House & Aditya, 1997).

The purpose of this paper is to develop a theory of leadership in self-managing virtual teams. For our theorizing, we integrate several streams of non-overlapping leadership theories from the management literature and the virtual team literature from the management information systems field, using the meta-theory of structuration to hold them together. Specifically, the leadership theories and literatures that are integrated in the paper include behavioral, emergent and shared leadership theories, and the literature on self-managing and virtual teams. We also draw on work on transformational leadership, specifically on action-embedded transformational leadership.

Secondly, we identify patterns of emergent leadership in self-managing teams based on the existing empirical and theoretical literature and propose linkages from these patterns to team effectiveness. We conclude by suggesting directions for future research to test, refine, and extend our theory.

THEORETICAL & CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND

In this section, we review the three streams of leadership literature on which we base our theory: (1) the existing literature on virtual team leadership, (2) the literature on leadership in self-managing teams, and (3) shared leadership. The literature on leadership is voluminous, so we necessarily focus our review on the subset of the literature most relevant to our theorizing; a recent article by Avolio and colleagues (2009) provides more complete picture of the literature on team leadership. Structuration theory is then used as a meta-theory to integrate these streams of literature into a theoretical framework that focuses explicitly on leadership dynamics in self-managing virtual teams.

Leadership in Virtual Teams

The growing literature on virtual teams suggests that collaborating in virtual environments introduces discontinuities into the interactions of team members such that leadership in virtual settings differs from that in co-located organizational settings (Avolio et al., 2009; Bell & Kozlowski, 2002; Cascio & Shurygailo, 2003; Mathieu et al., 2008; Yoo & Alavi, 2004; Zigurs, 2003). Typically, leadership research, even investigations of leadership in virtual teams, has focused on the interaction between a single, appointed leader and other team members (Bass, 2008; Yukl, 2006).

Accordingly, research on leadership in virtual teams has most often adopted theoretical frameworks developed to investigate leadership dynamics in co-located teams. The majority of studies have been either implicitly or explicitly informed by functional behavioral leadership theories (Cogburn, Zhang, & Khothule, 2002; Kayworth & Leidner, 2002; Misiolek & Heckman, 2005; Sarker, Grewal, & Sarker, 2002; Sudweeks & Simoff, 2005; Tyran, Tyran, & Shephard, 2003; Weisband, 2002; Yoo & Alavi, 2004) that focus on the behavioral styles, orientations, or patterns that leaders manifest (Carte, Chidambaram, & Becker, 2006; Denison, Hooijberg, & Quinn, 1995; Hooijberg, Hunt, & Dodge, 1997; Lord, 1977).

In particular, the two-factor theory that underlies the functional theory of team leadership has been the predominant theoretical framework. Derived from Bales' (1950) work on small group dynamics, this theoretical perspective suggests that leaders engage in both task-oriented and relationship-oriented behaviors. Task-oriented behaviors are those that move the team forward in the accomplishment of its task, such as scheduling and planning work, initiating activity, coordinating subordinate activities, elaborating, problem-solving, proposing solutions, removing barriers or providing resources, providing feedback, and providing, elaborating, or summarizing information (Bass, 2008; Lord, 1977; Yukl, 2006). Relationship-oriented behaviors are those that allow the team to maintain a positive psycho-social dynamic, such as gate-keeping, showing trust and confidence, expressing group emotion, conflict resolution, maintaining a positive atmosphere, showing concern for others, expressing gratitude, keeping subordinates informed, and providing recognition for subordinates' accomplishment (Bass, 2008; Lord, 1977; Yukl, 2006).

Subsequent research on leadership in co-located teams guided by this perspective has focused on identifying those task- and relationship-oriented behaviors that distinguish leaders from non-leaders in teams (Bass, 2008; Yukl, 2006). This analytic approach has also been adopted in studies of virtual team leadership based on this theoretical perspective. Empirical research investigating leadership dynamics in virtual teams suggests that these teams evolve leadership structures that differ from conventional, single-leader, hierarchical structures, and that leadership dynamics differ in virtual teams (Balthazard, Waldman, Howell, & Atwater, 2004; Carte et al., 2006; Cogburn et al., 2002; Connaughton & Daly, 2004; Hoyt & Blaskovich,

2003; Kayworth & Leidner, 2002; Misiolek & Heckman, 2005; Nicholson, Sarker, & Sarker 2002; Pauleen, 2003, 2004; Pearce, Yoo, & Alavi, 2003; Piccoli & Ives, 2000; Piccoli, Powell, & Ives, 2004; Sarker et al., 2002; Sarker, Sarker, & Schneider, 2009; Sudweeks & Simoff, 2005; Tyran et al., 2003; Weisband, 2002; Wickham & Walther, 2007; Yoo & Alavi, 2004).

Typically in these investigations, individuals are assigned to teams and required to complete a task that may range in duration from a week to several months. In some of these studies, a team member was appointed as the team leader at the outset. In others, no team member was appointed as the team leader. Once teams had completed their tasks, team members were asked to identify who the team leader(s) had been. While some teams evolved a leadership structure in which a single team member emerged who was recognized by others as the team's leader, other teams evolved less centralized leadership, interaction, influence, and participation patterns. In the latter case, no single individual or core group of individuals was identified as the team leader(s). Even in studies in which a team member was appointed as the team's leader at the outset, individuals within the team other than the appointed leader were identified by other team members as having performed leadership roles (Kayworth & Leidner, 2002; Weisband, 2002):

- Leadership in virtual teams is often *emergent*. Evidence from empirical studies of virtual team leadership suggests that, whether or not a leader is appointed, virtual teams *evolve* leadership structures based on the interactions of team members (Jarvenpaa & Leidner, 1999; Kayworth & Leidner, 2002; Misiolek & Heckman, 2005; Weisband, 2002; Wickham & Walther, 2007; Yoo & Alavi, 2004). Northouse (2004) defines emergent leadership as being a process-based phenomenon resulting from continued interaction among organizational or team members:

When an individual is perceived by others as the most influential member of a group or organization, regardless of the individual's title, the person is exhibiting emergent leadership. The individual acquires leadership through people in the organization who support and accept that individual's behavior. This type of leadership is not assigned by position, but rather emerges over a period of time through communication. (p. 5)

In the absence of a formal or appointed leader, the literature suggests that different leadership structures evolve within virtual teams (Cogburn et al., 2002; Misiolek & Heckman, 2005; Piccoli, Powell, & Ives, 2004). Some teams evolve a leadership structure in which one or two emergent leaders take the initiative to structure and guide the teams' work. Others evolve a more distributed structure in which the leadership of the team is shared by its members (e.g., Misiolek & Heckman, 2005; Yoo & Alavi, 2004). As was noted above, leaders emerge in the presence and in the absence of appointed virtual team leaders.

- Leadership attributions are *perceptual*. While status, power, or hierarchical position within an organization often are associated with leadership attributions in co-located teams, these cues are absent in virtual teams. While it is possible in co-located team environments to rely on external cues based on personal characteristics and interaction style on which to base leadership attributions, those cues are largely absent in virtual team environments. Instead, the literature suggests that leadership attributions are made on the basis of observed behaviors: the team leader (or leaders) are those individuals who are *perceived* by team members as having performed a leadership function within the team (Misiolek & Heckman, 2005; Sarker et al., 2002; Weisband, 2002; Yoo & Alavi, 2004). Three of these behaviors have been consistently associated with being identified as a virtual team leader: quantity of communication, initiation of communication, and communication content (Jarvenpaa, Knoll,

& Leidner, 1998; Jarvenpaa & Leidner, 1999; Misiolek & Heckman, 2005; Piccoli et al., 2004; Sudweeks & Simoff, 2005; Tyran et al., 2003; Yoo & Alavi, 2004).

- *Task-based contributions* to the work of the team appear to be the basis for leadership attributions on the part of team members in virtual teams. The reduction in social cues and in social interaction within virtual teams appears to shift the basis for leadership attributions to task-based competencies and contributions (Carte et al., 2006; Misiolek & Heckman, 2005; Yoo & Alavi, 2004). A study that explicitly focused on patterns of emergent leadership in virtual teams tentatively suggests that virtual teams may evolve either centralized or shared leadership structure depending on the contributions of team members to the process of completing a task as well as their contributions to the substance of the task (Misiolek & Heckman, 2005). This outcome differs from what is proposed by traditional leadership theory, which suggests that team leaders manage both social- and task-based interactions within teams (Yukl, 2002). Pescosolido (2002) and Hart and McLeod (2003) suggest that emergent leaders increase their task-oriented communication in order to reduce ambiguity, provide direction, and move the work of the team forward. This suggestion is in accord with Jarvenpaa and colleagues' (1998; 1999) observations concerning the relationship between communication content and the team lifecycle which suggest that social exchanges establish "thick" relationships among virtual team members as long as social exchange does not detract from the team's task focus.

While the studies from which these conclusions are drawn are informative, they also share three significant limitations: (1) the teams studied remained stable throughout the short duration of the studies, (2) in most studies, the tasks were relatively short-term in nature, ranging from 2 to 15 weeks, and (3) the broad distinctions between task- and relationship-oriented communication may not capture more subtle leadership dynamics suggested by the literature. With respect to the third of these limitations, in virtual teams where members make diverse knowledge contributions, Misiolek & Heckman (2005) found it useful to distinguish between two types of task roles, *task coordination* and *substantive task contribution*. Task coordination behaviors are those involved in organizing and directing the team's work (e.g., scheduling, dividing labor, creating processes) while substantive task contributions are those that actually accomplish the team's work (e.g., idea generation, evaluation, synthesis) Thus, leaders may exercise their influence by means of their substantive expertise as well as through their coordinating and directing activities.

Despite the limitations noted, this body of literature provides evidence that the basic assumptions about the nature of leaders underlying much of "traditional" leadership theory (e.g., trait and new leadership theory, contingency and situational leadership theories, social exchange and strategic contingency theories, and leader-member exchange theories) need to be reconsidered for their applicability to leadership in the virtual team setting. Leadership emergence within teams has been the subject of inquiry within primarily four streams of "traditional" leadership theory: trait and new leadership theory, contingency and situational leadership theories, the literature on leadership in self-managing teams, the literature on shared leadership, and behavioral leadership theory. Only the latter three streams of literature implicitly or explicitly acknowledge that emergent leadership can take different forms such as centralized forms in which a single member emerges who is recognized by others as the team's leader, or less-centralized forms in which leadership is shared among team members, as suggested by the evidence on virtual team leadership. These possible outcomes are consistent with the literature on self-managing teams, as well as that subset of the leadership literature focusing on shared

leadership. Further, the evidence suggests that the basis for leadership attributions lies in the observed behaviors of team members rather than in formal status within hierarchical organizational structures, reinforcing the notion that leadership is an inherently behaviorally-based phenomenon, as suggested by behavioral leadership theory as well.

Leadership in Self-Managing Teams

While emergent leadership has not itself been the focus of much of the empirical research or theorizing in the literature on self-managing teams, this literature has contributed directly to the conceptual development of the shared leadership perspective and raises issues that are central to our theorizing on leadership in self-managing teams (Pearce & Sims, 2000). Stewart and Manz (1995) define self-managing teams as “work groups that are formally organized into teams and then, as a whole, given responsibility and authority beyond that traditionally experienced by line worker” (p. 749). Self-managing teams are characterized “by a high degree of decision-making and autonomy and behavioral control at the work group level.... (such that) a much greater emphasis is placed on control from within rather than outside the group (Manz & Sims, 1987, p. 107). Although these definitions may appear to suggest that self-managing teams are “leaderless” in that formal leadership is absent, this is not necessarily the case. Self-managing teams range from teams embedded within formal organizational hierarchies in which a formal leader is appointed by upper-level management to serve as the team’s “leader” who is not a regular member of the team to loosely configured groups of individuals who come together to discuss or solve some issue or problem of interest to the group as is frequently seen in community-based organizing or in Internet-based groups such as open source software development teams. As such, self-management can be thought of as a continuum rather than as a state (Offerman & Scuderi, 2007).

Much of the empirical research in this area has focused on the conditions under which self-managing teams with designated team leaders (or managers) embedded within organizational hierarchies become fully self-managing (Druskat & Wheeler, 2003; Stewart & Manz, 1995; Stoker, 2007; Wageman, 2001). However, Pearce and Sims (2002) note that the literature on self-managing teams does recognize that team members can and do perform leadership roles that had previously been the performed by managers. Wageman (2001) notes that self-management is a behavioral process, in which self-managing teams are given the authority to execute work and to monitor and manage work processes, for both of which they are held accountable. Specification of team goals and objectives and team structure are assumed to be outside the domain of self-managing teams. Within this context, team effectiveness is considered to have three dimensions similar to those that have been investigated in the traditional leadership literature: (1) task performance, (2) group process, and (3) individual satisfaction (Wageman, 2001, p. 560).

The degree to which specification of team goals and objectives and determination of team structure are outside the domain of team members may be a function of the type of organizational context in which the teams are embedded. As technology facilitates the development of new means of interacting and organizing, the degree to which these domains are integrated within the scope of teams’ domains may change. As represented on a continuum of self-management, self-managing virtual teams that interact primarily or exclusively via technology-mediation may take responsibility for determining goals and objectives as well as structure. External leadership may be in fact non-existent, or in the presence of the discontinuities present in the virtual environment, may be ineffective in providing this type of direction.

Other research has examined factors that contribute to the success of self-managing teams. Depending on the context in which team members interact, the literature on self-managing teams suggests that the development of shared mental models may be a critical component affecting team process and outcomes. Druskat and Pescosolido (2002) argue that it is critical that self-managing work teams develop shared mental models, which they define as “cognitive theories about how the system operates that underlie behavioral team process” (p. 285). Based on their review of the published field studies in the literature, these authors propose that some shared mental models are more appropriate than others in self-managing teams. Specifically, they identify shared mental models of psychological ownership of team outcomes and processes that support continuous learning, and that promote heedful interaction as underlying success in terms of team process and outcomes. However, the authors also note that shared mental models of task and equipment may also influence teamwork, though these have not been examined in the literature.

Cohen and colleagues (1997) suggest that degree of team member involvement is the strongest predictor of team effectiveness, and that managerial, or supervisory, behaviors performed by formal, appointed team leaders are ineffective in self-managing teams. The implication of their findings is that a focus exclusively on external leadership may not adequately capture the team’s internal and emergent leadership dynamics. Yang and Shao (1996) identify shared leadership as an outcome of effective self-management in teams. In research focusing on emergent leadership in self-managing virtual teams, Carte and colleagues (2006) suggest that the members of successful self-managing virtual teams exhibit a combination of shared individual and collective emergent leadership behaviors. Specifically, higher performing teams engaged in significantly more concentrated behaviors oriented toward performance and more shared behaviors focused on process (i.e., keeping track of the team’s work) than lower performing teams.

On the whole, the literature on self-managing teams reinforces the notion that leadership is both shared and emergent in these types of teams (Pearce & Manz, 2005). When external team leaders are appointed, their responsibilities are largely to facilitate (or mentor) rather than to direct the work of teams. The empirical finding also suggest that observed behaviors related to the process and the substance of the task are important factors related to team performance, as with virtual teams.

Shared Leadership

The final perspective we examine is shared leadership, defined by Pearce and Conger (2003b) as:

A dynamic, interactive process among individuals in groups for which the objective is to lead one another to the achievement of group or organizational goals or both... (that) often involves peer, or lateral, influence and at other times involved upward or downward hierarchical influence (p. 1).

This perspective, similar to the notion of distributed leadership (Gronn, 2002), conceptualizes leadership in terms of relational processes, shared phenomena occurring at different levels, and interdependencies among social networks or networks of influence (Fletcher & Kaufer, 2003). It differs from conventional leadership theory by conceptualizing leadership as a group-level rather than an individual-level phenomenon. Fletcher and Kaufer (2003) note that in doing so it creates an important theoretical link between leadership research and research on teams that has been largely absent in prior work.

Shared leadership research suggests that it is unlikely that a “single multirole leader” will emerge. Decades of research on small-team interactions supports the notion that different individuals perform different leadership roles as circumstances warrant. For example, Houghton and colleagues (2003) observed that when the task-oriented and social supportive-oriented leadership roles in small teams have been examined empirically, these leadership roles are often split between two or more individuals. They attribute this outcome to the tensions created when one individual attempts to fulfill both roles, noting that “the directive or task-oriented leader often creates tension within the group through the assignment of tasks... (and) may not be in the best position to fill the social supportive role of solving or soothing the problems created by the task-related tension” (Houghton, Neck, & Manz, 2003). Alternately, the split may be due to differing levels of expertise. For example, Klein and colleagues (2006) described how attending surgeons, fellows and residents dynamically shared leadership in a trauma care unit, as the surgeons routinely stepped back to allow fellows and residents to assume leadership roles.

Empirically, shared leadership is relatively unexplored area of inquiry (Pearce & Conger, 2003a; Pearce, Manz, & Sims, 2009; Wassenaar & Pearce, 2012). The few empirical investigations that have investigated shared leadership have examined it in organizational settings in which both vertical and shared leadership were present. For example, in Klein and colleagues’ (2006) study of leadership in extreme action teams in an emergency medical center, attending surgeons formally outranked fellows and residents. Nevertheless, empirical research investigating the relationship between vertical and shared leadership and team effectiveness suggest that shared leadership is a useful predictor of performance (Ensley, Hmieleski, & Pearce, 2006; Pearce & Sims, 2002). Pearce and Sims (2002) investigated the relationship between vertical and shared leadership and effectiveness in 71 change management teams. Hierarchical regression analysis of the relative influence of vertical and shared leadership behaviors indicated that although vertical leadership explained a significant amount of the variance in self-ratings of team effectiveness, shared leadership behaviors accounted for more. Ensley and colleagues (2006) investigated the influence of shared versus vertical leadership in two samples of new venture top management teams on startup performance. Again, while both vertical and shared leadership were significant predictors of performance, shared leadership variables were found to account for a significant proportion of the variance in performance beyond that accounted for by vertical leadership alone in both samples.

In summary, the literature on shared leadership suggests that leadership can be a group-level phenomenon, and that shared leadership can co-exist within teams in which there are formal or assigned leaders. However, Wassenaar and Pearce (2012) do not rule out the possibility of “serial leadership emergence” in which teams demonstrate vertical or shared leadership depending on task demands over the course of a team’s interactions. These authors note that “not all leadership roles are present or even necessary in shared leadership environments.... Some of these leadership roles can become more or less critical at certain times in the lifecycle of the team” (p. 378). While task-related leadership appears to predominate based on empirical examinations conducted to date, this possibility cannot be ruled out either theoretically or empirically.

Summary

The self-managing teams and shared leadership perspectives, and the results of empirical investigations of emergent leadership in virtual teams based on behavioral leadership theory, suggest that leadership in teams can be both shared and emergent and that shared leadership can be an important contributor to team effectiveness. Behavioral leadership theory provides

additional insights into the classes of leadership behavior that leaders in these types of teams manifest such as task-oriented and relationship-oriented behaviors, distinctions appear not to pertain to virtual team leadership based on the existing empirical literature. While behavioral leadership theory provides a framework for identifying classes of leadership behaviors, it falls short in explaining changes in leadership behaviors over time in response to changes in team composition and the environment. Existing theory and empirical research fails to explain how leadership behaviors enacted by individuals guide team interaction in self-managing virtual teams, and how structures for task performance and team interaction emerge in conjunction with ongoing interaction. Understanding these dynamics is the motivation for our theorizing.

MODEL DEVELOPMENT

To conceptualize the dynamic process by which individuals' actions can provide leadership in self-managing teams, we adopt a structurational perspective (Giddens, 1984). Numerous authors have used a structurational perspective to frame empirical analyses of team activities (e.g., Barley, 1986; DeSanctis & Jackson, 1994; Majchrzak, Rice, Malhotra, & King, 2000; Newman & Robey, 1992; Orlikowski, 1992; Perlow, Gittel, & Katz, 2004; Walsham, 1993) and in particular, the development of virtual teams (e.g., Sarker & Sahay, 2003; Suprateek Sarker, Lau, & Sahay, 2001). We chose this framework because it provides a way to conceptualize how the leadership behaviors of one team member might shape the actions of others, even in the absence of traditional modes of authority, a key issue in our theorizing about leadership in self-managing virtual teams.

Structuration theory posits a recursive relation between team structure (defined as the rules and resources that influence, guide or justify individual action) and the actions of those that live within, and that help to create and sustain, this structure. It is perhaps best described as a meta-theory; that is, rather than specifically describing particular factors of leadership or their relations, it describes the form that such a theory might take. Specifically, structuration theory suggests that a theory of leadership in self-managing virtual teams should consider structure and action in these teams and how the two are interrelated in different approaches to leadership (Bass, 2008).

In our work, we consider structure as comprising three kinds of rules and resources identified in prior work (Barley & Tolbert, 1997; Stein & Vandenbosch, 1996): (1) interpretive schema that create structures of signification, (2) authoritative and allocative resources that create structures of domination, and (3) norms and rules that create structures of legitimation. (It should be noted that this division into three kinds of structure is an analytic convenience: in practice, they are overlapping and mutually reinforcing.) For example, an individual team member may follow a set process for a task (an individual action) because that process is the accepted norm within the team (*i.e.*, because of a structure of legitimation).

Structure matters because the development of shared structure improves team performance if it enables more effective contributions by team members. In this way, effective structure may serve as a substitute for conventional leadership in the way that it guides individuals' actions towards desired group outcomes. It is not a question of the presence or absence of structure, but rather its nature and the degree of agreement concerning existing structures among team members.

For example, without common interpretive schema (a shared structure of signification), individuals from different teams or backgrounds may interpret tasks differently based on their backgrounds, making collaboration and communication difficult (Dougherty, 1992). In the absence of developed team norms (structures of legitimation), team members will draw on norms

they have acquired in other settings to guide their actions, but these diverse norms may conflict. The tendency for individuals to interpret tasks according to their own perspectives is exacerbated when working in a virtual environment, with its more varied individual settings and less opportunity for informal discussion and mutual observation.

We turn now to the question of how structure is developed and the role of leaders and leadership in this development. The key notion here is the “duality of structure”, meaning that the structural properties of a social system are seen as both the means and the ends of the practices that constitute the social system. As Sarason (1995) explains, in structuration theory:

The central idea is that human actors or agents are both enabled and constrained by structures, yet these structures are the result of previous actions by agents. Structural properties of a social system consist of the rules and resources that human agents use in their everyday interaction. These rules and resources mediate human action, while at the same time they are reaffirmed through being used by human actors or agents. (p. 48).

Simply put, by doing things, we create the way to do things. According to the structuration perspective, repeatedly “doing things” reinforces scripts – “observable, recurrent activities and patterns of interaction” (Barley & Tolbert, 1997, p. 99). Because these scripts are enacted by all team members, they are more likely to become internalized and reinforce the developing structures. For example, the norm of using a particular process for a task is not a given, but rather is itself the outcome of prior actions by team members. By following the norm, members reinforce its legitimacy (“we always do it this way”); by taking different actions (*e.g.*, skipping a step because it is seen to be too time-consuming or using a different approach because the accepted approach seems unable to deal with important problems), they undermine its legitimacy, perhaps eventually changing the norm. Indeed, as we argue, behaviors may be deliberately chosen for their effects on structure.

Figure 1, adapted from Barley and Tolbert (1997), graphically summarizes the relationship between institution (which the authors use synonymously with structure) and action, and how both evolve over time. In this figure, the two bold horizontal lines represent “the temporal extensions of Giddens’ two realms of social structure: institutions and action,” while the “vertical arrows represent institutional constraints on action” and the diagonal arrows, “maintenance or modification of the institution through action” (p.100). For example, the influence of a team norm on a member to use a particular work process is represented by a downwards vertical arrow, while reinforcement or changes to the norm due to actions is represented by an upwards diagonal arrow. We use this model of action and structure as the basis for our theorizing about the nature of leadership in self-managing virtual teams.

Insert Figure 1 About Here.

Leadership in Self-Managing Virtual Teams

In this section, we develop an argument that leadership in self-managing virtual teams consists of behaviors that generate or reinforce structure (*i.e.*, the upwards diagonal arrows in Figure 1). While it might first appear that a consideration of leadership would be relevant primarily to an understanding of structures of domination, we propose that leadership in self-managing virtual teams is expressed through all three systems of structure: signification, domination and legitimation. We argue that self-managing virtual teams develop the full range of structure that then guides the actions of team members enabling them to overcome the challenges created by discontinuities. While all leaders likely help create structure that guides the actions of

team members, we suggest that leaders in self-managing virtual teams exert influence through all three modalities of structure. Thus we define leadership in this context as follows:

Leadership in self-managing virtual teams is a process that results in the creation, reinforcement, and ongoing evolution of team structures of signification, domination, and legitimation that guide the actions of team members.

If leadership in self-managing teams is a process that results in the reinforcement, creation and ongoing evolution of structures, how does this process operate? The structural perspective suggests that some actions serve to reinforce existing structures, while others have the effect of creating and modifying structures. Although we acknowledge that the creation of structures may be influenced by the prior experiences, expectation, and beliefs of team members, our focus here is limited to the emergence of structures based on team member interaction. Based on our review of the empirical and theoretical literature, we suggest that task-based coordination contributions to the team will be more influential in developing these structures than other types of contributions as self-managing teams negotiate their virtual collaborative environments. We therefore propose:

Proposition 1: The structures of signification, domination, and legitimation that are created through interaction in self-managing virtual teams will be generated from the individual actions of team members, and specifically their task-based contributions.

Proposition 1a: Substantive contributions of individual team members advance the development of structures of signification in self-managing virtual teams.

Proposition 1b: Process contributions (i.e., those related to the coordination of the team's work) advance the development of structures of legitimation in self-managing virtual teams.

Proposition 1c: Structures of domination emerge with continued team interaction, and are subordinate to the development of structures of signification and legitimation in initial team interactions in self-managing virtual teams.

Relative to structures of signification, domination, and legitimation, these propositions suggest that self-managing virtual teams develop shared mental models early in their interactions concerning interpretive schemas and communication (signification), and norms and sanctions (legitimation). We propose that it is more important for self-managing virtual teams to develop structures of signification and legitimation early in their interaction because the literature suggests that task-focused behaviors are related to both perceived team effectiveness and performance (Burke, Stagl, Klein, Goodwin, Salas, & Halpin, 2006; Carte et al., 2006; Druskat & Pescosolido, 2002; Ensley & Pearce, 2001; Johnson & Lee, 2008; Misiolek & Heckman, 2005; Wageman, 1997). Structures of signification enable self-managing virtual teams to more quickly develop shared mental models concerning the substance (i.e., the "what") of the team's work. Structures of legitimation enable self-managing virtual teams to more quickly develop shared mental models concerning the process (i.e., the "how") of the team's work.).

As discussed above, leaders may lack formal control over authoritative and allocative resources that produce structures of domination. Discontinuities in the virtual environment lessen the ability to influence via traditional sources of hierarchical power, and that attempts to exert influence via these means may be detrimental to team dynamics and performance (Bligh, Pearce, & Kohls, 2006; Erex, Lepine, & Helms, 2002; Hiller, Day, & Vance, 2006; Mathieu et al., 2008; Van der Vegt, de Jong, Bunderson, & Mollman, 2010; White & Smith, 2010). Further, as Barley and Tolbert (1997) point out, structures of domination do not necessarily equate to formal power to reward and sanction. Knowledge-based power, in the form of specialized knowledge or

expertise, can contribute to the development of structures of domination such as when the team is dependent on the specialized knowledge of a team member to assist in problem-solving. The need to leverage specialized knowledge may not be apparent at the outset of a team's interactions, but may become apparent later on.

We distinguish between two orders of leadership that emerge with team interaction in self-managing virtual teams: one that influences behavior while maintaining or reinforcing existing structures (first-order leadership) and one that works by modifying team structures (second-order leadership). First-order leadership is predominantly functional and operates within and reinforces existing structures of signification and legitimation. Second-order leadership is predominantly transformational, and operates to modify or transform structures of signification and legitimation. The distinction we draw between first-order and second-order leadership is intended to parallel the distinction between single-loop and double-loop learning as proposed by Argyris and Schön (1978), and the distinction between first-order and second-order change as described by Watzlawick and colleagues (1974). We next discuss how we define first- and second-order leadership, the patterns that are likely to emerge in self-managing virtual teams, and which patterns are more likely to be associated with successful task performance.

First-order leadership

We define first-order leadership behavior that influences other team members to make effective contributions to the team task, while working within and reinforcing existing structures of signification, domination and legitimation that emerge during initial team interactions. Behavioral theories of leadership have identified four classes of leadership behaviors that we view as associated with first-order leadership: (1) task coordination/process; (2) substantive task contribution; (3) group maintenance; and (4) boundary-spanning. Stewart and Manz (1995) identify similar leadership behaviors as those associated the most significant long-term improvements in self-managing teams. These behaviors are especially important in self-managing virtual teams in which members decide for themselves what they will do (and not do), based on discussion with other members and observation of what they are doing (and not doing). In order to be able to contribute effectively in self-managing virtual teams, team members must share ideas about what is important to the team, the kinds of actions that are appropriate or necessary, and what resources will be available and to whom. In other words, team members must draw on shared structures of signification, domination and legitimation. As team members work in ways that also draw on these structures, they make them visible, reinforce them and by increasing their effect on the behavior of other members, improve the functioning of the team. We argue that these leadership behaviors provide first-order leadership when they work in the context of existing structures, drawing on them as resources to guide, legitimize, enable, and give meaning to these behaviors.

How might first-order leadership be exhibited in a self-managing virtual team? Research has documented that different teams faced with similar contextual and task demands often evolve very different role and leadership structures, and work practices (Abdul Karim & Heckman, 2005; Brown & Eisenhardt, 1997; Misiolek & Heckman, 2005). For example, in one study, self-managing teams working on identical tasks within a controlled context developed very different leadership structures, some highly centralized with one or two strong leaders performing leadership behaviors, and others highly decentralized with leadership behaviors widely distributed, or shared, among team members (Misiolek & Heckman, 2005).

We propose that effective self-managing virtual teams develop shared first-order leadership during the creation and reinforcement of shared structures. Our rationale for doing so is three-fold. First, research on face-to-face teams (e.g., Bales, 1950; Yukl, 2006) suggests that the same individual is unlikely to perform all four functional leadership roles equally well. Second, teams that attempt to integrate diverse, specialized knowledge workers may require many different kinds of first-order leadership in the form of substantive task contribution (Grant, 1996). Finally, we suggest that the presence of a leadership structure that incorporates both vertical and shared leadership implies the presence of distributed first-order leadership. Consistent with this view, in an empirical study, Taggar and colleagues (1999) found higher performance in groups where leaders and members both exhibit high levels of leadership. In short, the nature of work in self-managing virtual teams creates a pressure for shared first-order leadership. We thus offer the following propositions:

Proposition 2: First-order leadership is more likely to be fluid, shared, and emergent in effective self-managing virtual teams.

Proposition 2a: Shared, emergent, and fluid first order leadership will be more effective than centralized first-order leadership in reinforcing structures of signification, legitimation, and domination.

Note that this proposition does not preclude the emergence of centralized first-order leadership. The emphasis is on the linkage between the type of first-order leadership that emerges from team interaction and its linkage with team effectiveness. We suggest that distributed first-order leadership serves to reinforce scripts that characterize work in virtual team environments (Barley & Tolbert, 1997). Because these scripts are enacted by all team members, they are more likely to become internalized and reinforce the developing structures.

Second-order Leadership

We define second-order leadership as behavior that result in modifications to the structures of signification, domination and legitimation and, thus the way that team members work. While first-order leadership influences team member behavior through the reinforcement of these structures, second-order leadership effects change in the structures. Second-order leaders help other team members make sense of the world in different ways and to develop new norms of behavior and new processes to match changing needs over time. The literature on leadership dynamics in self-managing co-located teams suggests that the development or modification of structures that guide team members' interactions facilitates the work of these teams (Johnson & Lee, 2008), although this has not been investigated in self-managing virtual teams. For example, Foldy and colleagues (2008) discussed how a leader was able to help members of an organization understand an important element of the organization's work, and Taggar and Ellis (2007) described how a leader was able to increase the norm of collaborative problem solving in a group, both examples of the development or modification of structures that guide group members' actions.

As with first-order leadership, we propose that self-managing virtual teams will evolve a variety of second-order leadership structures, but in the case of second-order leadership, we propose that a more centralized or concentrated form of leadership will be associated with effectiveness in the long run. That is, we propose that the most effective self-managing virtual teams will be characterized by a leadership structure that includes widely distributed and shared first-order leadership within the team, complemented by strong, centralized second-order leadership. We argue that centralized second-order leadership will be more effective because of the need for clarity and agreement among team members about making changes to the structures that govern and constrain their behavior. As self-managing virtual teams progress in their work, to be effective, they must have a high degree of shared consensus about structures of signification, domination and legitimation. This is more likely to occur in teams in which centralized second-order leader or leaders able to clearly articulate a vision of these structures that is broadly embraced by team members. Studies by Kayworth and Leidner (2002) and Piccoli and colleagues (2004) suggest that the most effective self-managing teams virtual teams were those in which one or two team members took the initiative to clarify team members' responsibilities and work process structures. Carte and colleagues (2006) found that self-managing virtual teams initially developed both centralized and decentralized leadership structures, but that over time, centralized leadership structures were associated with higher performance. We thus offer the following proposition:

Proposition 3: Second-order leadership is more likely to be centralized in effective self-managing virtual teams.

Proposition 3a: Centralized second-order leadership will be more effective than shared, fluent, and distributed second-order leadership in modifying and changing existing structures of signification, legitimation, and domination.

The Relationship between First- and Second-Order Leadership

A fundamental question remains: How do those who are able to influence change in underlying team structures gain the power to do so (*i.e.*, why are some actions structure changing and others not)? We propose that the answer to this question lies in the nature of the interrelationship between first-order and second-order leadership. We suggest that second-order leadership is action embedded, by which we mean that second-order leadership derives its authority from substantive, action-oriented contributions that provide evidence to other team members of an individual's abilities and thus ability to lead, and makes their attempts to alter structure credible and effective. However, the literature on leadership in virtual teams is mixed concerning what type of first-order leadership is likely to confer the credibility on team members that facilitates their emergence as second order leaders, and somewhat contradicts that on leadership emergence in self-managing co-located teams. We thus propose the following relationship between first- and second-order leadership:

Proposition 4: First-order leadership is a prerequisite for second-order leadership. Team members acquire "permission" to be second-order leaders as a result of their having demonstrated first-order leadership in self-managing virtual teams.

Proposition 4a: Those individuals who emerge as centralized second-order leaders will have exhibited more substantive task-oriented first-order leadership than other team members in self-managing virtual teams.

Proposition 4b: Those individuals who emerge as centralized second-order leaders will have exhibited more coordination/process task-oriented first order leadership than other team members in self-managing virtual teams.

Given our definition of second-order leadership and its relation to first-order leadership, we might ask whether change in structures is incremental or discontinuous. Advocates of double-loop learning (Argyris & Schön, 1978) believe that change in underlying structures is only possible when teams have consciously reflected on conditions eliciting a need for change, have surfaced the team's deep assumptions and beliefs, and engaged team consensus for change. In effect, double loop learning theory requires that team members be consciously aware of team structures before they are able to change them. Before changes in theory-in-use (*i.e.*, the tacit structures that govern behavior) are possible, members "...require external references. There must be public representations of organizational theory-in-use to which individuals can refer.... These are the shared descriptions of the organization which individuals jointly construct and used to guide their own inquiry" (Argyris & Schön, 1978).

In contrast to this highly rational, discontinuous change model, we propose that the structural change influenced by second-order leadership may sometimes also result from a more incremental, subconscious process. For example, a team's role structure may gradually evolve as the overall task is divided into pieces suitable for different kinds of participants. The job of coordinating task assignment is an example of first-order leadership on a day-to-day basis, and much of this coordination will be distributed self-assignment (*i.e.*, individuals voluntarily taking on tasks for which they have particular skills or interest). However, as structure evolves, second-order leadership will call attention to and clarify the newly emergent structure, and influence the team to embrace it. The process of consciously surfacing and describing underlying structures may not be necessary in virtual teams using information and communication technology to collaborate, because the transparent dialogues themselves, archived for subsequent viewing, become the external reference called for by Argyris and Schön (1978), the public representation of organizational theory- in-use to which individual members can refer.

We therefore offer the following proposition about the nature of structural change in self-managing virtual teams:

Proposition 5: Changes in structures of signification, domination, and legitimation in self-managing virtual teams will be incremental rather than continuous and disruptive.

Proposition 5a: Self-managing virtual teams will recursively exhibit first- and second-order leadership as structural changes are introduced within the team.

This proposition suggests that self-managing virtual teams demonstrate exhibit both first- and second-order leadership in order to create, reinforce, and modify structures over time. In response to changes in task demands, or perhaps in proactive anticipation of the next steps toward task completion, self-managing virtual teams manifest first- and second-order leadership as necessary in order to allow the team to adapt and move forward in the completion of their task.

DISCUSSION

We have presented a theory of leadership in self-managing virtual teams. Because traditional leadership theory does not fully explain leadership dynamics in self-managing virtual teams, we have expanded it to include the notion of second-order leadership, forms of leadership that influence changes in the structure that guides team behavior. We have proposed that effective self-managing virtual teams will exhibit a paradoxical combination of widely shared, distributed first-order leadership complemented by strong, concentrated, and centralized second-order leadership. Finally, we have proposed that there is a recursive relationship between first- and second-order leadership that evolves with continued team interaction.

Based on existing theory and empirical evidence, we have developed five propositions deductively from prior theory rather than inductively from systematic empirical observations. To support these propositions requires that they be systematically tested in future research. As well, the theory (like all theories) is only partial. Future research should extend the framework presented here by inductively exploring the antecedents, patterns and consequences of leadership in self-managing virtual teams.

Methodological Issues

A variety of research approaches could be applied to study the processes of leadership in self-managing virtual teams (Walsh, 1995). The use of interview data would enable exploration of the team members' perceptions of the leadership process and allow direct comparison between different members' perceptions of structures, thus explicitly examining how these are developed. On the other hand, content analysis of the interactions between members of self-managing virtual teams would enable detailed analysis of the influence process as it unfolds. Such analysis infers the deep structures and processes from informed examinations of the artifacts that these surface level dialogues provide. This approach has the advantage of avoiding reliance on the recollections of team members, which may degrade over time or be unreliable in other ways. Such research may be feasible in some cases. For example, many Internet-based collaborations maintain archives of their interactions that are publicly available and corporate virtual teams may have similar data that could be accessed. However, two guidelines for such research should be kept in mind. First, observations should be longitudinal and dynamic, carefully observing changes that occur over time. The phenomenon of leadership is inherently rooted in the passage of time and cannot be observed in a snapshot. Rather, it is a structural process that can only be seen through a longitudinal lens. Second, the unit of coding and analysis in such research should be the episode. Leadership is fundamentally an interaction process among team members, and such interactions are best observed episodically.

Topics for Future Research

To further develop and test our theory of leadership in self-managing virtual teams, additional research is needed to address the following questions:

1. *How do prior the experiences, expectations, and beliefs of individual team members influence the development of structures?* We have proposed a dynamic process by which structures of signification, domination, and legitimation are created, reinforced, and modified. We have also suggested that task-based contributions are especially important in the initial formation of these structures. However, future research is needed to understand how initial structure formation might be influenced by the prior experience, expectations, and beliefs of team members.

2. *What aspects of structure are most important to observe in order to understand second-order leadership, and what is the nature of this structure?* We have described structures of signification, domination, and legitimation that exist in self-managing virtual teams. Again, the observation of various types of self-managing virtual teams will allow us to inductively infer and classify these structures, better understand their nature, and their instantiation in actions.

3. *What are the dimensions of first-order leadership?* Building on the relevant leadership theory and the virtual teams literature, we have proposed that first-order, functional leadership consists of four classes of behavior: (1) coordination/process, (2) substantive task contribution, (3) group maintenance and (4) boundary-spanning. Future research should assess whether these four dimensions provide a relatively comprehensive description of first-order leadership, specifically investigating the behaviors and/or roles in which leaders engage in self-managing virtual teams.

4. *What patterns of first-order leadership emerge in self-managing virtual teams?* In previous research on leadership in virtual teams (Misiulek & Heckman, 2005), we observed that very different patterns of first-order leadership can exist in different teams. While we have discussed centralized versus decentralized leadership patterns, such a distinction may prove to be too simple to fully describe the leadership patterns that emerge in various types of self-managing virtual teams. Future research should classify the first-order leadership patterns that emerge in order to develop valid and reliable operational definitions of centralized and decentralized patterns.

5. *How do patterns of first-order leadership evolve over time?* Leadership is not a static phenomenon. As teams grow and attract new members, lose existing members or face new environmental constraints, leadership patterns may change. For example, in a current study of open source development teams, which are extreme examples of self-managing virtual teams, Heckman and colleagues (2006) observed growing levels of participation in decision-making in one project and declining levels of participation in another. A recent study of student project teams (Misiulek & Heckman, 2005) documented the fluid emergence and distribution of first order leadership behaviors as outside activities constrained the ability of individuals to participate at different times. A longitudinal research design will be necessary to systematically observe and understand such dynamic changes in leadership patterns.

6. *How does second-order leadership influence change in team structures?* Some scholars (e.g., Argyris & Schön, 1978) suggest that deep structures are best modified by a rational, discontinuous change process that includes discovery of hidden beliefs and assumptions (structures), followed by a consensus-based examination of and experimentation with potential new structures. We suggest that the change process might, under certain conditions, be less

discontinuous and more incremental, and action-embedded rather than communication-driven. Schein (1987) noted that some of the most powerful mechanisms for embedding and reinforcing culture are based on leaders' actions—what they pay attention to, reward, sanction, and their reaction to critical incidents and crises.

7. *How do second-order leaders gain influence?* We have proposed that second-order leaders gain influence by virtue of their action-embedded first-order leadership contributions. These assertions require systematic testing that will best be accomplished through detailed longitudinal observations of numerous self-managing teams.

8. *How do different patterns of leadership (both first-order and second-order) relate to team effectiveness?* We have proposed that the effective self-managing virtual teams will exhibit decentralized first-order leadership and centralized second-order leadership. In order to investigate this further, future research will need to determine what constitutes “effectiveness” in self-managing virtual teams and to develop valid and reliable operational definitions of first- and second-order leadership patterns.

9. *To which contexts does the dynamic process that we propose apply?* While we believe that the theory developed above applies to self-managing virtual teams in general, the literature on leadership in virtual teams suggests that factors such as different task demands in particular may require different leadership structures and patterns. Future empirical work should investigate how factors such as task demands affect the emergence of structures and the dynamics proposed, and limits to the applicability of our theory.

The theory and propositions we have developed represent an attempt to integrate and consolidate several previously developed theoretical perspectives on leadership and team dynamics in self-managing teams. We hope that these questions will provide a starting point for future research and thereby make a contribution to the study of self-managing virtual teams.

Managerial Implications

The primary contribution of this paper has been to develop a set of theoretical propositions about the nature of leadership in self-managing virtual teams. However, even in its nascent state, our theory has some implications for the practice of leading virtual teams. The theory suggests specific actions that members of self-managing virtual teams can take to facilitate team functioning and to improve effectiveness. These include ensuring that all first-order leadership functions are performed well, and preferably by many team members, in a decentralized and shared mode. It also suggests that there is value in centralizing second-order leadership functions. Self-managing virtual teams might more explicitly recruit or select members who are particularly skilled at these functions and pay more attention to the on-going process of developing shared interpretive schema, role structures and rules and norms. Since virtual work is increasingly common, educational programs for all kinds of workers might incorporate these ideas. For example, distance education classes that use technology support for instruction should provide instruction for students on the nature of leadership in self-managing virtual teams and thus set expectations for how the work can best be accomplished, as well as requiring team projects to provide an opportunity to practice these skills.

Whether these propositions are confirmed or disconfirmed by future research, understanding how teams of independent knowledge workers can more effectively work in self-managed virtual teams and virtual environments will improve both the traditional and non-traditional organizations within which they exist. The results of the research we hope to stimulate will then serve as a road map to improve organizational performance and foster innovation.

REFERENCES

- Abdul Karim, N., & Heckman, R. 2005. Group communication media choice and the use of information and communication technology to support learning: A case study. *Campus-Wide Information Systems*, 22: 1.
- Andres, H.P. 2006. The impact of communication medium on virtual team group process. *Information Resources Management Journal*, 1: 1-17.
- Argyris, C., & Schön, D. A. 1978. *Organizational learning*. London: Addison-Wesley.
- Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Weber, T. J. 2009. Leadership: Current Theories, Research, and Future Directions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60: 421–449.
- Bales, R. F. 1950. A set of categories for the analysis of small group interaction. *American Sociological Review*, 15: 257–263.
- Balthazard, P., Waldman, D., Howell, J., & Atwater, L. 2004. Shared leadership and group interaction styles in problem-solving virtual teams. In **Proceedings of the 37th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences – 2004**. Available at: <http://hicss.hawaii.edu>.
- Barley, S. R. 1986. Technology as an occasion for structuring: Evidence from the observation of CT scanners and the social order of radiology departments. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 31: 78–109.
- Barley, S. R., & Tolbert, P. S. 1997. Institutionalization and structuration: Studying the links between action and institution. *Organization Studies*, 18: 93–117.
- Bass, B. M. 2008. *The Bass Handbook of Leadership* (4th ed.). New York: Free Press.
- Bell, B. S., & Kozlowski, S. W. J. 2002. A typology of virtual teams: Implications for effective leadership. *Group and Organization Management*, 27: 14–49.
- Beyerlein, M., Nemiro, J., & Beyerlein, S. 2008. A framework for working across boundaries. In: J. Nemiro, M. Beyerlein, L. Bradley, & S. Beyerlein (Eds.), *The handbook of high performing virtual teams*: 31-58. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bligh, M., Pearce, C., & Kohles, J. 2006. The importance of self- and shared leadership in team based knowledge work. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21: 296-318.
- Burke, C.W., Stagl, K.C., Klein, C., Goodwin, G.F., Salas, E., & Halpin, S.M. 2006. What types of leadership behaviors are functional in teams? A meta-analysis. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17: 288-307.
- Carte, T. A., Chidambaram, L., & Becker, A. 2006. Emergent leadership in self-managed virtual teams: A longitudinal study of concentrated and shared leadership behaviors. *Group Decision and Negotiation*, 15: 323–343.

- Cascio, W. F., & Shurygailo, S. 2003. E-leadership and virtual teams. *Organizational Dynamics*, 31: 363–376.
- Chudoba, K. M., Wynn, E., Lu, M., & Watson-Manheim, M. B. 2005. How virtual are we? Measuring virtuality in a global organization. *Information Systems Journal*, 15: 279–306.
- Cogburn, D. L., Zhang, L., & Khothule, M. 2002. Going global, locally: The socio-technical influences on performance in distributed collaborative learning teams, *Annual Research Conference of the South African Institute of Computer Scientists and Information Technologists on Enablement through Technology*: 52–64. Port Elizabeth, South Africa: ACM.
- Cohen, S.G., Chang, L., & Ledford, G.E., Jr. 2007. A hierarchical construct of self-management and its relationship to quality of work life and perceived work effectiveness. *Personnel Psychology*, 50: 275-308.
- Connaughton, S.L., & Daly, J.A. 2004. Leading from afar: Strategies for effectively leading virtual teams. In S.H. Godar & S.P. Ferris (Eds.), *Virtual and collaborative teams: Process, technologies, and practice*: 49-75). Hershey, PA: Idea Group Publishing.
- Denison, D. R., Hooijberg, R., & Quinn, R. E. 1995. Paradox and performance: Toward a theory of behavioral complexity in managerial leadership. *Organization Science*, 6: 524–540.
- DeSanctis, G., & Jackson, B. M. 1994. Coordination of information technology management: Team-based structures and computer-based communication systems. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 10: 85.
- Dougherty, D. 1992. Interpretive barriers to successful product innovation in large firms. *Organization Science*, 3: 179–202.
- Druskat, V.U., & Pescosolido, A.T. 2002. The content of effective teamwork mental models in self-managing teams: Ownership, learning and heedful interrelating. *Human Relations*, 55: 283-314.
- Druskat, V.U., & Wheeler, J.V. 2004. How to lead a self-managing team. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 45: 65-71.
- Duarte, D. L., & Snyder, N. T. (2001). *Mastering virtual teams* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ensley, M. D., Hmieleski, K. M., & Pearce, C. L. (2006). The importance of vertical and shared leadership within top venture management teams: Implications for performance of startups. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17: 217-231.

- Ensley, M. D., & Pearce, C. L. 2001. **Shared** cognition in top management **teams**: Implications for new venture performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 22: 145-160.
- Erex, A., Lepine, J., & Elms, H. 2002. Effects of rotated leadership and peer evaluations on the functioning and effectiveness of self-managed teams: A quasi-experiment. *Personnel Psychology*, 55: 929-948.
- Flecher, J. K., & Kaufer, K. 2003. Shared leadership: Paradox and possibility. In C.L. Pearce & J.A. Conger (Eds.), *Shared leadership: Reframing the hows and whys of leadership*: 21-47. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Foldy, E. G., Goldman, L., & Ospina, S. 2008. Sensegiving and the role of cognitive shifts in the work of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19: 514-529.
- Giddens, A. 1984. *The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration*. Berkeley: University of California.
- Grant, R. M. 1996. Toward a knowledge-based theory of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 17: 109-122.
- Gronn, P. 2002. Distributed leadership as a unit of analysis. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13: 423-451.
- Hart, R. K., & McLeod, P. L. 2003. Rethinking team building in geographically dispersed teams: One message at a time. *Organizational Dynamics*, 31: 352-361.
- Heckman, R., Crowston, K., Li, Q., Allen, E., Eseryel, Y., Howison, J., & Wei, K. 2006. *Emergent decision-making practices in technology-supported self-organizing distributed teams*. Paper presented at the International Conference on Information Systems (ICIS), Milwaukee, WI.
- Hertel, G., Geister, S., & Konradt, U. 2005. **Managing virtual teams**: A review of current empirical research. *Human Resource Management Review*, 15: 69-95.
- Hiller, N., Day, D., & Vance, R. 2006. Collective enactment of leadership roles and team effectiveness: A field study. *Leadership Quarterly*, 17: 387-397.
- Hooijberg, R., Hunt, J. G., & Dodge, G. E. 1997. Leadership complexity and the development of the Leaderplex model. *Journal of Management*, 23: 375-408.
- Houghton, J. D., Neck, C. P., & Manz, C. C. 2003. Self-leadership and superleadership. In C.L. Pearce, & J.A. Conger (Eds.), *Shared leadership: Reframing the hows and whys of leadership*: 123-140. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- House, R. J., & Aditya, R. N. 1997. The social scientific study of leadership: Quo vadis? *Journal of Management*, 23: 409-473.

- Hoyt, C.L., & Blascovich, J. 2003. Transformational and transactional leadership in virtual and physical environments. *Small Group Research*, 34: 678-715.
- Jarvenpaa, S. L., Knoll, K., & Leidner, D. E. 1998. Is anybody out there? Antecedents of trust in global virtual teams. *Journal of Information Systems*, 14:, 29–64.
- Jarvenpaa, S. L., & Leidner, D. E. 1999. Communication and trust in global virtual teams. *Organization Science*, 10: 791–815.
- Johnson, T.E., & Lee, Y. 2008. The relationship between shared mental models and task performance in an online learning environment. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 21: 97-112.
- Kayworth, T. R., & Leidner, D. E. 2002. Leadership effectiveness in global virtual teams. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 18: 7–40.
- Klein, K. J., Ziegert, J. C., Knight, A. P., & Xiao, Y. 2006. Dynamic delegation: Shared, hierarchical, and deindividualized leadership in extreme action teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 51: 590–621.
- Konradt, U., & Hoch, J. E. 2007. A work roles and leadership functions of managers in virtual teams. *International Journal of E-Collaboration*, 3: 16.
- Lord, R. G. 1977. Functional leadership behavior: Measurement and relation to social power and leadership perceptions. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 22: 114–133.
- Lu, M., Watson-Manheim, M. B., Chudoba, K. M., & Wynn, E. 2006. How does virtuality affect team performance in a global organization? Understanding the impact of variety of practices. *Journal of Global Information Technology Management*, 9: 4–23.
- Majchrzak, A., Rice, R., Malhotra, E., & King, N. 2000. Technology adaptation: The case of a computer-supported interorganizational virtual team. *MIS Quarterly*, 24: 569-600.
- Manz, C.C., & Sims, H.P., Jr. 1987. Leading workers to lead themselves: The external leadership of self-managing work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 32: 106-128.
- Mathieu, J., Maynard, M.T., Rapp, T., & Gilson, R. 2008. Team effectiveness 1997-2007: A review of recent advancements and a glimpse into the future. *Journal of Management*, 34: 410-476.
- Misiolek, N., & Heckman, R. (2005). *Patterns of emergent leadership in virtual teams*. Paper presented at the 38th Hawai'i International Conference on System Science (HICSS-38), Big Island, HI.
- Newman, M., & Robey, D. 1992. A social process model of user-analyst relationships. *MIS Quarterly*, 16: 249–266.

- Nicholson, D., Sarker, S., & Sarker, S. 2002. Ingredients of effective leadership in information systems development project teams: An exploratory study. In **Proceedings of the eighth Americas Conference on Information Systems**. Available at: <http://aisel.isworld.org/pdf.asp?Vpath=/amcis/2002/&PDFPath=022206.pdf>.
- Northouse, P.G. 2004. **Leadership. Theory and practice**. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Offerman, L.R., & Scuderi, L.F. 2007. Sharing leadership: Who, what, when, and why. In B. Shamir, R. Pillai, M. Bligh, & M. Uhl-Bein (Eds.), **Follower-centered perspectives on leadership: A tribute to the memory of James R. Meindl**: 71-91. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Orlikowski, W. J. 1992. The duality of technology: Rethinking the concept of technology in organizations. **Organization Science**, 3: 398–427.
- Pauleen, D.J. 2003. Leadership in a global virtual teams: an action learning approach. **Leadership & Organization Development Journal**, 24: 153-162.
- Pauleen, D.J. 2004. An inductively derived model of leader-initiated relationship building with virtual team members. **Journal of Management Information Systems**, 20: 227-256.
- Pearce, C. L., & Conger, J. A. 2003a. All those years ago: The historical underpinnings of shared leadership. In C.L. Pearce, C. L. & J.A. Conger, (Eds.), **Shared leadership: Reframing the hows and whys of leadership**: 1–18. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Pearce, C. L., & Conger, J. A. (Eds.). 2003b. **Shared leadership: Reframing the hows and whys of leadership**. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Pearce, C. L., & Manz, C. C. 2005. The importance of self- and shared leadership in knowledge work. **Organizational Dynamics**, 34: 130–140.
- Pearce, C., Manz, C.C., & Sims, H.P. Jr. 2009. Where do we go from here?: Is shared leadership the key to team success? **Organizational Dynamics**, 38: 234-238.
- Pearce, C. L., & Sims, H. P., Jr. 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: 172–197.
- Pearce, C.L., Yoo, Y., & Alavi, M. 2003. Leadership, social work, and virtual teams. In R.E. Riggio & S.S. Orr (Eds.), **Improving leadership in nonprofit organizations**: 180-203. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Perlow, L.A., Gittell, J.H., & Katz, N. 2004. Contextualizing patterns of work group interaction: Toward a nested theory of structuration. **Organization Science**, 15: 520-536.

- Pescosolido, A. T. 2002. Emergent leaders as managers of group emotion. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13: 583–599.
- Piccoli, G., & Ives, B. 2000. Virtual teams: Managerial behavior control's impact on team effectiveness. In *Proceedings of the twenty first International Conference on Information Systems*: 575-580. Atlanta: Association for Information Systems.
- Piccoli, G., Powell, A., & Ives, B. 2004. Virtual teams: Team control structure, work processes, and team effectiveness. *Information, Technology & People*, 17: 359–379.
- Pinsonneault, A., & Caya, O. 2002. Virtual teams: What we know, what we don't know. *International Journal of E-Collaboration*, 1: 1–16.
- Sarason, Y. 1995. A model of organizational transformation: The incorporation of organizational identity into a structuration theory framework. *Academy of Management Journal*(Best papers proceedings): 47–51.
- Sarker, S., Grewal, S., & Sarker, S. 2002. *Emergence of leaders in virtual teams*. Paper presented at the 35th Hawai'i International Conference on System Sciences (HICSS-35).
- Sarker, S., Lau, F., & Sahay, S. 2001. Using an adapted grounded theory approach for inductive theory building about virtual team development. *DATA BASE for Advances in Information Systems*, 32: 38–56.
- Sarker, S., Sarker, S., & Schneider, C. 2009. Seeing Remote Team Members as Leaders: A Study of US-Scandinavian Teams. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication*, 52: 75–94.
- Sarker, S., & Sahay, S. 2003. Understanding virtual team development: An interpretive study. *Journal of the Association of Information Systems*, 4: 1-38.
- Schein, E. H. 1987. *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco: Josey-Bass.
- Stein, E. W., & Vandenbosch, B. 1996. Organizational learning during advanced system development: Opportunities and obstacles. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 13: 115–136.
- Stewart, G. L., & Manz, C. C. 1995. Leadership for self-managing work teams: A typology and integrative model. *Human Relations*, 48: 747–770.
- Stoker, J.I. 2007. Effects of team tenure and leadership in self-managing teams. *Personnel Review*, 37: 564-582.

- Sudweeks, F., & Simoff, S. J. 2005. *Leading conversations: Communication behaviors of emergent leaders in virtual teams*. Paper presented at the 38th Hawai'i International Conference on System Science (HICSS-38), Big Island, HI.
- Taggar, S., & Ellis, R. 2007. The role of leaders in shaping formal team norms. *The Leadership Quarterly, 18*: 105–120.
- Taggar, S., Hackett, R., & Saha, S. 1999. Leadership emergence in autonomous work teams: Antecedents and outcomes. *Personnel Psychology, 52*: 899–926.
- Tyran, K. L., Tyran, C. K., & Shepherd, M. 2003. Exploring emergent leadership in virtual teams. In Gibbon, C. B. & Cohen, S. G. (Eds.), *Virtual Teams That Work: Creating Conditions for Virtual Team Effectiveness*: 183–195. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Van der Vegt, G.S., de Jong, S.B., Bunderson, J.S., & Mollman, E. 2010. Power asymmetry and learning in teams: The moderating role of performance feedback. *Organization Science, 21*: 347-361, 587-590.
- Wageman, R. 2001. How leaders foster self-managing team effectiveness: Design choices versus hands on coaching. *Organization Science, 12*: 559-577.
- Wageman, R. 1997. Critical success factors for creating superb self-managing teams. *Organization Science, 26*: 49-61.
- Walsh, J. P. 1995. Managerial and organizational cognition: Notes from a trip down memory lane. *Organization Science, 6*: 280–321.
- Walsham, G. 1993. *Interpreting information systems in organizations*. Chichester: John-Wiley.
- Wassenaar, C.L., & Pearce, C.L. 2012. The nature of shared leadership. In D.V. Day & J. Antonakis (Eds), *The nature of leadership* (2nd ed): 362-389. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Watson-Manheim, M. B., Chudoba, K. M., & Crowston, K. 2002. Discontinuities and continuities: A new way to understand virtual work. *Information, Technology and People, 15*: 191–209.
- Watzlawick, P., Weakland, J., & Fisch, R. 1974. **Change: Principles, problem formulation and problem resolution**. New York: Norton.
- Weisband, S. 2002. Maintaining awareness in distributed team collaboration: Implications for leadership and performance. In Hinds, P. & Kiesler, S. (Eds.), *Distributed Work*: 311–333). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- White, G.L., & Smith, K.H. 2010. Leadership characteristics and team outcomes in the development of a marketing web page. *Journal of International Technology and Information Management, 19*: 99-116.

- Wickham, K.R., and Walther, J.B. 2007. Perceived behaviors of emergent and assigned leaders in virtual groups. *International Journal of e-- Collaboration*, 3: 1-17.
- Yang, O., & Shao, Y. 1996. Shared leadership in self-managed teams: a competing values approach. *Total Quality Management*, 7: 521-534.
- Yoo, Y., & Alavi, M. 2004. Emergent leadership in virtual teams: What do emergent leaders do? *Information and Organization*: 27-58.
- Yukl, G. 2006. *Leadership in organizations* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Zigurs, I. 2003. Leadership in virtual teams: Oxymoron or opportunity? *Organizational Dynamics*, 31:, 339-351.

FIGURE 1

**A Sequential Model of the Relation between Structure and Action
(from Barley & Tolbert, 1997).**

