NEW WAYS OF LEADERSHIP
IN WORK TEAMS

**FRANCISCO GIL[1], CARLOS MARÍA ALCOVER[2], RAMÓN RICO[3] AND
MIRIAM SÁNCHEZ-MANZANARES[4]**
[1]*Universidad Complutense de Madrid. [2]Universidad Rey Juan Carlos. [3]Universidad Autónoma de Madrid.
[4]Universidad Carlos III de Madrid*

El liderazgo resulta fundamental para la eficacia de los equipos de trabajo y las organizaciones de las que forman parte. Los retos que afrontan estas en la actualidad requieren una revisión exhaustiva del papel estratégico del liderazgo. En este empeño, es preciso explorar nuevas modalidades de liderazgo, que permitan responder eficazmente a nuevas necesidades de trabajo, como el diseño para el cambio y la innovación, la diversidad cultural, la complejidad, el trabajo basado en el conocimiento y las organizaciones virtuales. La respuesta a estas demandas ha motivado el desarrollo de nuevos enfoques, como el 'nuevo liderazgo', el liderazgo auténtico, transcultural, complejo, compartido y remoto.
El objetivo de este artículo es revisar los principales trabajos sobre estas nuevas formas de liderazgo. Para ello, se analizarán los principales modelos teóricos y líneas de investigación y se discutirán las implicaciones prácticas orientadas a la intervención y a la dirección de equipos de trabajo.
Palabras clave: Liderazgo transformacional, Liderazgo auténtico, Liderazgo transcultural, Liderazgo complejo, Liderazgo de equipo y Liderazgo remoto

Leadership is essential to the effectiveness of work teams and the organizations of which they are a part. The challenges facing organizations in today's world require an exhaustive review of the strategic role of leadership.
In this context, it will be necessary to explore new types of leadership capable of providing an effective response to new work needs, such as the design of change, innovation, cultural diversity, complexity, knowledge-based working and virtual organizations. Responses to these needs have led to the development of new approaches, such as the 'new leadership', and authentic, transcultural, complex, shared and remote leadership.
This article reviews the main papers that discuss these new ways of leadership. For this purpose, we examine the principal theoretical models and research lines, and we discuss their practical implications in terms of intervention and the management of work teams.
Key words: Transformational leadership, Authentic leadership, Transcultural leadership, Complex leadership, Team leadership and e-leadership

Work teams play an increasingly essential role in the functioning of organizations (Cannon-Bowers & Bowers, 2010; Gil, Rico & Sánchez-Manzanares, 2008; West & Markewica, 2004) and leadership becomes a crucial factor in the effectiveness of these teams (Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Stewart, 2006; O'Reilly, Caldwell, Chatman, Lapiz & Self, 2010).

Research regarding leadership has made great advances since the thirties when its scientific study was initiated, with a trajectory characterized by a cyclic movement of moments of enthusiasm and disillusionment (Shamir, 1999). Thus, for example, in the seventies, in the face of lack of significant advances, the abandonment of

the concept of leadership itself was even proposed, while in the eighties, a phase of enthusiasm was embraced in which the so-called "new models of leadership" were developed and investigations proliferated.

Presently, because of their characteristics and diversity, organizational contexts provide a favorable environment for the development of numerous leader and leadership modalities (Gracía Sáiz, 2010). Globalization, new communication technologies and economic and social changes in particular have suggested new roles and leadership functions to organizations, and they have further heightened their investigative interest (Burke & Cooper, 2006). The settings in which leaders intervene are characterized for giving priority to continuous movement over distance and reflection; for transferring decisions to experts instead of the people authorized to

Correspondence: Francisco Gil. *Dº Psicología Social. Facultad de Psicología. Universidad Complutense de Madrid. Campus de Somosaguas. 28223. Madrid. España. E-mail: fgil@psi.ucm.es*

make them due to their positions; for greater improvisation and less routine; for updating and reasonableness being more important than prediction and precision; and for humility being more recommendable than arrogance (Weick, 2000). Consequently, the need to face new challenges demands that leaders adopt a complex role, capable of combining continuity with innovation, and that at the same time is solidly founded on ethical principles and social values. Likewise, the scenario derived from globalization requires the exercise of a global and integrative leadership sensitive to cultural differences. Moreover, the growing complexity and uncertainty of present business situations and the intensive work in knowledge make the actions of a single leader impracticable and require multi-professional teams with work autonomy and shared leadership emerging from the team itself. Finally, new ways of working, such as virtual teams or distributed teams, modify the traditional relationship of the leader with the collaborators, requiring a new type of e-leadership with function delegation.

As Avolio, Walumbwa and Weber (2009) indicate in a recent review, the description of leadership must transcend the traditional enumeration of a set of individual characteristics and focus on its didactic, shared, relational, strategic and global character, and finally, facing a complex social dynamic.

The aim of the present article is to review new leadership modalities that are the object of special attention in current research. For this purpose, we will begin by briefly defining these leadership modalities (new leadership, authentic leadership, transcultural leadership and complexity leadership) to ultimately focus on three modalities that have monopolized investigative attention in recent years (team leadership, shared leadership and remote leadership). Finally, we will discuss the implications for professional practice derived from these studies offering some orientation for the management of work teams.

NEW LEADERSHIP MODELS

In contrast to traditional leadership models in which the behavior of the leaders is based on the exchanges established with their followers (in terms of cost-benefit exchange in the *transactional leadership* model), the *new leadership models* emphasize ideological and moral values, symbolic content, visionary and inspirational messages, self-consciousness, as well as feelings and emotions.

The principal theories developed under this epigraph and that have acted as a catalyst in research since the eighties are the *charismatic* and *transformational leadership* theories. In essence, these theories posit that leaders motivate their followers to act beyond their own work expectations and help them to achieve high performance levels, inspiring high levels of group involvement through an articulated vision by the leader. With regard to charismatic leadership, certain processes have been described, such as articulating an integrated innovative vision, showing non-conventional behaviors, adopting personal risks, and taking into consideration collaborators' demands, as well as restrictions, opportunities and environmental risks (Conger, 1991). Regarding transformational leadership, four fundamental dimensions have been identified (Bass, 1985): charisma or idealized influence (leaders show their vision and serve as role models), inspirational motivation (they develop a shared vision and group spirit), intellectual stimulation (they promote problem solution and innovation) and individualized consideration (they treat members in a careful and personal manner).

Transformational leadership has generated numerous studies, these being the object of different meta-analysis reviews (see Harms & Crede, 2010; Judge & Piccolo, 2004). Overall, the results of the research reveal that transformational leadership relates positively to distinct individual variables of the leader (ethics, emotional intelligence, knowledge creation, etc.) in different types of organizations (services, military, multi-national), situations (face-to-face or virtual teams) and cultures (western, eastern and cultural assimilation or *melting pot* contexts). In subsequent sections, we will analyze how transformational leadership relates to other modalities, such as authentic, shared and remote leaderships.

Authentic Leadership

During the past few years, interest regarding the relationship between leadership and ethics has increased (Simola, Barling & Turner, 2010), propelled by the role that different organizational leaders exercise, as much in the present financial crisis as in the organizational scandals of recent years (e.g., the ENRON case). The concept of authentic leadership emerges from the distinction between *authentic transformational leadership*, which manifests a socialized charisma oriented toward serving the collaborators, and *pseudo-leadership*, which reveals a personal charisma oriented toward the leader's

personal benefit. Authentic leadership integrates concepts of positive psychology applied to organizations (self-efficacy, resilience, optimism, well-being, etc.) and the development of leadership throughout life.

Authentic leadership can be defined as *"a pattern of transparent and ethical leader behavior that encourages openness in sharing information needed to make decisions while accepting followers' inputs"* (Avolio et al, 2009, p. 423). In addition to transformational leadership, other modalities related to authentic leadership are those known as *servant leadership* and *spiritual leadership.*

The following dimensions of authentic leadership have been identified (Walumbwa, Avolio, Gardner, Wernsing & Peterson, 2008): balanced processing (objective analysis of relevant data for decision making), internalized moral perspective (be guided by internal moral standards, used to self-regulate one's own behavior), relational transparency (present his/her authentic self, sharing information openly and expressing feelings appropriate to the situation) and self-awareness (understand one's own strengths and weaknesses and how others view us). Psychometric studies have confirmed that these dimensions to a large extent define authentic leadership while differentiating it from transformational and ethical leadership. Finally, it has been found that authentic leadership predicts organizational citizenship behavior, commitment, satisfaction with supervisor, and work performance (Avolio & Luthens, 2006).

Transcultural Leadership

The need to broaden the knowledge of all cultures, derived from globalization, beyond that obtained in investigations carried out in industrialized western contexts, has increased interest in transcultural leadership research. Along these lines, the GLOBE project (*Global leadership and organizational behavior effectiveness*) is situated, being the most ambitious study carried out to date on this topic. Project Globe includes 160 researchers from 62 societies distributed worldwide and analyzes the efficacy of leadership. Through this study, different cultural dimensions have been identified (uncertainty avoidance, power distance, collectivism, gender egalitarianism, assertiveness, and orientation toward people, performance and future) and leadership attributes (charismatic value-based, team-oriented, participative, humane, autonomous and self-protective), as well as shared beliefs in different cultures about effective leaders

(House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorman & Grupta, 2004; Chocar, Brodbeck & House, 2007).

Altogether, the results of the GLOBE project reveal different cultural conglomerates in which people share similar perceptions about leaders' behaviors (see data relative to Europe and Spain in Gil & Martí, in press). Nevertheless, the results also reveal a series of universally accepted attributes in all the cultures analyzed, such as charismatic and team-oriented leadership.

Some research has attempted to determine how global leadership would be, capable of efficiently leading groups of people in different cultural contexts (MacCall & Hellenbeck, 2002; Heames & Harvey, 2006). Other research, on the contrary, has analyzed how leaders in different cultures behave, as in the case of expatriate executives, identifying the key resources and competencies in such contexts, such as global vision, experience and cultural intelligence (Elenkov & Manev, 2009). Finally, the relative efficiency of different strategies (selection and training of leaders) developed in a certain context on being applied to other cultures has been investigated (Smith et al., 2001).

Complexity Leadership

The concept of complexity leadership emerges when considering that traditional models do not reflect the dynamic, multi-level, distributed and contextual character in the true practice of leadership. It means applying the *theory of complexity* to the study of leadership. Instead of addressing limited characteristics or relationships (leader attributes, leader relationships with subordinates or the group), leadership is conceived as an adaptive and complex system of dynamic and unpredictable agents that interact in complex mutually reinforcing networks (Uhl-Bien & Marion, 2008). It is not the acts of one or various individuals that are interesting to investigate in order to understand leadership, but the interaction of numerous forces that act in a particular context.

This focus applied to leadership identifies three complexity axes: cognitive, social and behavioral, so that the leader must be capable of addressing events from distinct perspectives, perform distinct roles and execute distinct behaviors in function of the demands of the situation (Hoojberg, Hunt & Dodge, 1997). Moreover, the following behaviors that promote learning, creativity and adaptability in work teams have been identified: a) administrative leadership (connected to hierarchical notions, alignment and control), b) enabling leadership

(structure and make possible conditions to enhance the potential of subordinates), and c) adaptive leadership (conduct activities for an emergent change, involving others to face the challenges). Based on this paradigm, new themes of research such as strategic leadership or feminine leadership have been developed (see, for example, Marion & Uhl-Bien, 2007), as well as reviews of true cases of real companies (Pascale, Milleman & Gioja, 2002).

Team Leadership

In the same measure as the presence of teams has increased in organizations, research has centered on the impact of leadership on team performance. Traditionally, research has analyzed the influence that the individual leader (generally external to the team) exerts over his/her collaborators through interpersonal relationships, obviating other forms of team-oriented leadership provided by his/her own members (Wageman & Hackman, 2010).

Present-day situations, characterized by their complexity and ambiguity, make it difficult for an external leader to be able to successfully perform all leadership functions. Likewise, knowledge based work requires providing professional groups with sufficient autonomy to, as a result, go on to perform leadership functions.

Although broad knowledge regarding leadership and teams are available separately, team leadership has scarcely been researched. There is good knowledge about how a leader directs subordinate groups, but less knowledge about how the leader promotes team processes (such as managing to integrate team activities, creating a positive climate, developing group learning, etc.). For a more exhaustive review of these processes, see Gil et al. (2009) and Rico, Alcover and Tabernero (2010).

Team leadership can be understood in two different ways (Day, Gron & Salas, 2004): 1) as those attributes (skills, behaviors) that the members bring to the team (e.g., charisma, integrity, proactivity) and that operate as components that influence processes and team performance; and 2) as a result of team processes (e.g., group learning), facilitating team adaptation and performance throughout the different stages of its development. Both focuses are essential to understanding team leadership, wherefore we will address the former next and the latter (shared leadership) in the following section.

The first focus underlines the importance of functional leadership in teams, bringing to light the individual contribution by the leader on joint processes and results. There is no doubt that many teams possess the knowledge and skills necessary to perform the work well; however, the leader, through his/her acts (defining goals, organizing the team, motivating, giving support, etc.) can help to achieve the team's goals. In this respect, some functional leadership models have been proposed, five of which we will highlight.

In the first place, the model by Hackman and Wageman (2005) on *team coaching*, which indicates how leaders can influence team learning and development performing motivating functions (becoming familiarized) in the beginning, consulting functions (task strategies) at midpoint, and educational functions (oriented toward reflection) on finishing a significant work episode.

On their part, Zaccaro, Rittman and Marks (2001) posit that different leadership competencies influence work performance through their effects in four types of group processes (cognitive, motivational, affective and coordination). The authors propose the following leadership competencies for each type of process: a) for *cognitive processes* (shared mental models, collective information processing and meta-cognition in teams): sense making, identifying task needs and requirements, planning, meta-cognitive prompting, developing and motivating team members; b) for *motivational processes* (collective efficacy and cohesion): planning, setting goals, coordinating, developing and motivating team members and providing feedback; c) for *affective processes* (conflict control, team emotion control norms, emotional contagion and team emotional composition): giving feedback, selecting and developing personnel, utilizing personnel resources; and d) for *coordination processes*: matching member capabilities to roles, offering clear strategies, monitoring environmental changes, giving feedback and reorganizing.

Furthermore, Zaccaro, Heinen and Shuffler (2009) propose that the impact of team leadership is based on providing greater interconnectivity, integration and coherence among members. In addition to establishing orientation and managing team operations, the fundamental role of the leader is to develop leadership capacities and skills in team members (basically through coaching activities).

Recently, Morgueson, Scott and Karam (2010) proposed a model that distinguishes two general

dimensions: leadership sources (internal vs. external) and formality (formal vs. informal), from which different sources of leadership can be identified, such as *coach leadership* (formal and external) and shared leadership (informal and internal). In addition, these authors identify different leadership functions related to two team development phases: a) in the *transition* phase: compose the team, define the mission, establish expectations and goals, organize and plan, train and develop team, sense making, and provide feedback; and b) in the *action* phase: monitor the team, manage team boundaries, challenge the team, perform team tasks, solve problems, provide resources, encourage team self-management and support social climate.

Finally, Kozlowski, Watola, Jensen, Kim and Botero (2009) have elaborated a model of adaptive, contingent, fluid and flexible leadership that adapts to the task's contingencies, work demands, members competencies and the relationships among them. The leader role can be transferred to members and rotated among them in function of the circumstances, thus creating a distributed leadership, as we will see in the following section.

All these theoretical proposals regarding team leadership are promising; the taxonomies on leadership functions, especially, can be very useful in the design of training programs. However, it is pertinent to remember the theoretical character of such proposals and the need for subsequent empirical studies to corroborate the validity of such proposals.

Shared Leadership

Shared leadership, also called distributed, collective or peer leadership, acquires greater relevance the more work hierarchy is diluted, being the work members those who perform leadership activities contemporaneously or sequentially. Hence, shared leadership contrasts with more conventional, hierarchical or vertical paradigms of power that attribute the leader with a hierarchical position of power, an external designation to the team and formal authority. Although shared leadership is not an entirely new concept, it is related to other existing concepts in the literature, such as self-directed work teams, team empowerment or leadership substitutes; interest in its study has increased recently given the key role of work teams in contemporary organizations.

Shared leadership is defined as "*a dynamic, interactive influence process among individuals in groups for which the objective is to lead one another to the achievement of group or organizational goals or both*" (Pearce & Conger, 2003; p.1). It can be well conceived as an emergent team property (Day et al., 2004), or as something formally prescribed. In any case, it always emerges from the distribution of leadership actions among team members, in such a way that members all lead one another according to the circumstances (Wageman, Fisher & Hackman, 2009). The resulting structure can be considered as a network of mutual influence based on knowledge and skills (Friedrich, Vessey, Schuelke, Ruark & Mumford, 2009) that affects activities and results in both individuals and groups and strengthens relationships among team members. In this regard, on being considered as a property of the system and not of a single member, it can be said that "*the effectiveness of leadership becomes more a product of those connections or relationships among the parts than the result of any one part of that system (such as the leader)*", (O'Connor & Quinn; p. 423) and, thus, shared leadership is related to the concept of complexity leadership.

Shared leadership can adopt multiple forms: the leader role passes from one person to another as the team performs different activities and advances in successive stages; the leadership role is divided into distinct functions and responsibilities exercised by different people at the same time; lateral influence is produced among group members; or there is a leadership role with little differentiation. In any case, team members always share leadership responsibilities, without denying that this leadership coexists with a certain degree of vertical leadership in functions such as task design or managing team boundaries. It means taking advantage of and optimizing the *asymmetries* – natural or prescribed – among team members so that instead of obstacles, they become an added value.

Different studies have been carried out in which shared leadership has been related to distinct behaviors, such as transactional, transformational, directive, empowering and supportive behaviors (Perry, Pearce & Sims, 1999), with competencies, such as how to negotiate integrative solutions through group learning, problem solving within a systems framework (Lambert, 2002) and roles (Carson, Tesluk & Marrone, 2007), such as *navigator* (who provides team direction and sets clear goals), *engineer* (who structures roles, functions and responsibilities), *integrator* (who develops and maintains cohesion) and *liaison* (who establishes relationships with external groups of interest).

Furthermore, shared leadership has been related to distinct group processes (e.g., cohesion, shared vision) and context variables (e.g., time, ambiguity, resource limitations) that act as mediating variables. Likewise, various conditions that facilitate the emergence of shared leadership have been identified, acting in a positive way (e.g., skills heterogeneity) or a negative way (e.g., geographic dispersion or large number of members; Pearce, Perry & Sims, 2001).

The empirical research has been focused on analyzing the relationships of shared leadership with antecedent conditions (internal or external), team processes and performance (Carson et al., 2007). With respect to internal antecedents, three factors relevant to internal team environment that are interrelated and mutually reinforced have been identified: shared purpose (team members have similar understandings of their team objectives and take steps to ensure a focus of collective goals); social support (team members' efforts to provide emotional and psychological strength to one another); and voice (the degree to which a team's members have input into how the team carries out its purpose and the capacity to talk and involve people). Regarding the external context, *coaching* for support by external team leaders is important, for which these executives can develop shared leadership in different ways, such as by giving encouragement, strengthening group commitment with a view to reducing social loafing or making recommendations about the most appropriate task strategies. This external *coaching* is even more important when the group lacks strong teamwork orientation (non-shared objectives, low involvement, etc.).

Moreover, it has been observed that shared leadership is more effective when the team develops complex tasks related to knowledge creation (e.g., research and development, consultancy, decision making). It has also been found that shared leadership improves group processes such as collaboration, coordination and cooperation (Yeatts & Hyten, 1998).

Regarding the impact of team effectiveness, recent research has found positive relationships between shared leadership and team efficacy (Carson, et al., 2007), in a variety of contexts and samples (high executives, virtual teams, non-profit making organizations, etc.), these relationships being stronger than in the case of traditional vertical leadership. Finally, although theoretically shared leadership can improve the group's satisfaction and well-being (Peiró & Rodriguez, 2008), it is a subject that has

scarcely been explored empirically, and, therefore, very thought-provoking for future research.

Remote Leadership

Globalization and the development of information technologies and communication have made new ways of work possible, such as the so-called virtual work teams whose members interact in different ways through technology and are frequently geographically dispersed. Compared with the traditional work team context, where the greater part of interaction is produced face-to-face, the virtual work team context presents important peculiarities: the absence of previous relationships that permit the development of cohesion and trust among group members; lack of shared work norms and processes; weak group identity due to geographic dispersion; confusion derived from communication restrictions; and the leader's organizational boundaries due to scarce direct contact with the team (Huang, Kahai & Jestice, 2010).

In this new scenario, leading involves accepting new responsibilities for team development and structuring its processes. Thus, traditional leadership models based on face-to-face leader-member relationships are insufficient to efficiently manage virtual teams. This has led to a review of the traditional leadership role, giving way to the concept of remote leadership.

Remote leadership, also called distance or *e-leadership*, is the leadership that takes place in virtual teams. Although virtuality was initially considered to be a dichotomy (contrasting face-to-face teams with virtual teams), it is currently considered to be a continuum that can adopt different levels depending on the geographic distribution, the communication tools used, the immediacy of the communication, etc. (Bell & Kozlowski, 2002; Rico, Bachrach, Sánchez-Manzanares & Collins, *in press*). Therefore, leadership should be contingent on virtual team levels at all times.

Most research regarding remote leadership has analyzed and compared how leaders work in high-level virtual teams (greater technological dependence and lower capacity to transmit technological information) compared to leaders of more traditional work teams (preponderance of face-to-face interactions). For example, Kayworth and Leidner (2003) have observed that under remote work conditions, leaders capable of performing multiple roles simultaneously are more efficient, demonstrating their capacity to face complex situations.

Moreover, empirical evidence indicates that shared leadership better predicts virtual team performance than vertical leadership (Pearce, Yoo & Alavi, 2004). This suggests that the distribution of leadership functions and responsibilities among the members of such teams contribute to overcome the difficulties posed by virtuality (coordination and communication problems, low cohesion, etc.). Likewise, the impact of transformational leadership on virtual work teams has been analyzed, demonstrating that transformational leadership relates in a more significant way to work team performance than transactional leadership (Purvanova & Bono, 2009), and to distinct team processes such as group potency (Sosik, Avolio & Kahai, 1997), cohesion and cooperation (when the richness of the media is low, fewer social and non-verbal cues are transmitted), (Huang et al, 2010). It has also been observed that inspirational motivation increases trust in teams with high levels of virtuality (Joshi, Lazarova & Liao, 2009.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE

The new contexts and challenges faced by organizations require the reexamination and broadening of traditional leadership models based on authority and centered on the establishment of contracts or transactions with subordinates, related to a local context, focused on one single person and oriented toward individual or interpersonal relationships with subordinates. Through research, new lines of work are being developed with a view to facilitating organizations with the adaptation of their traditional leadership models and practices. Thus, as expressed in the preceding review, papers on transformational leadership, authentic leadership, complexity leadership, team and shared leadership, and remote leadership are thought provoking.

The review of these new leadership modalities in the present paper permits us to offer various recommendations to orient professional practice, although some are derived directly from the theoretical models and research results analyzed here. Thus, for example, *authentic leadership* warns executives about possible abuses of power and undesirable effects (the "dark side" of leadership represented by self-interested exploitation on the part of the leader), proposing the defense of ethical codes and values related to socialized charisma. *Transcultural leadership* addresses the need of knowing different cultures and employing competencies

such as cultural empathy to efficiently manage multicultural teams in a global context. On its part, *complexity leadership* reminds us that leadership is an emergent, adaptive and complex process, so that it should not be only individual factors that are analyzed isolatedly, but also the interactions among them over time. *Team leadership* either exercised by an external leader or all team members (*shared leadership*) reveals the importance of the team in self-directed team functions, contributing knowledge and experience through different ways of empowerment. Finally, *remote leadership* suggests that leaders should use styles that permit sharing their functions through shared leadership, develop group identity through transformational leadership, and build trust by facilitating knowledge among group members (e.g., through face-to-face meetings at project commencement).

All these suggestions are especially useful as they are guides for the design of training programs and for the elaboration of leadership competency taxonomies (for a recent and exhaustive review, see García Sáiz, 2010). There are numerous programs and training methods that have confirmed their efficacy in different professional groups, such as airline crews, military units and health care teams. Among the most widespread and contrasted techniques, the following stand out: cross-training (members obtain information about the roles of the others), meta-cognition (skills that regulate processes such as inductive and deductive reasoning and problem solving are developed), team coordination (oriented toward team members knowing and managing the processes that determine effective team work), self-correction (members learn skills to analyze their own work, review events, exchange feedback and plan future actions), exposure to stressful situations (members learn about the principal stressors that can harm team work and efficient coping strategies) and team development or teambuilding (oriented toward improvement of overall team functioning focusing on role clarification, goal setting, problem solving and the improvement of interpersonal relationships) (see Day et al., 2004; Gil et al., 2009). These techniques are oriented toward the development of work team competencies and thus are related to *team, shared and remote leadership*.

Finally, as general recommendations applicable to all types of leadership, we repeat those made by Conger and Riggio (2007) in their book "*The practice of leadership:*

developing the next generation of leaders". Today's leaders must: 1) engage and involve their followers; 2) model the way (vision, mission, values); 3) be proactive; 4) avoid short-cuts, because effective leadership development is a long term investment; and from those suggested by Kouzes and Posner (2000) regarding future leadership: 1) value uncertainty, and 2) lead with an orientation characterized by *vitality, improvisation, lightness, authenticity and the ability to learn.*

REFERENCES

Avolio, B.J. and Luthans, F. (2006). *The high impact leader: Moments matter in accelerating authentic Leadership.* Nueva York: McGraw-Hill.

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

Bell, B.S. and Kozlowski, S.W.J. (2002). A typology of virtual teams. Implications for effective leadership. *Group and Organizational Management, 27*(1), 14-49.

Bass, B.M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations.* Nueva York: Free Press.

Burke, R. J. and Cooper, C. (2006) (Eds.). *Leading in turbulent times.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Cannon-Bowers, J.A. and Bowers, C. (2010). Team development and functioning. En S. Zedeck (ed.), *APA Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Volume 1. Building the Organization* (pp. 597-650). Washington, DC: APA.

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

Chocar, J.S., Brodbeck F. and House, R.J. (2007) (Eds.), *Culture and leadership across the world. The GLOBE book of in-depth studies of 25 societies.* Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrance Erlabaum Ass., Pub.

Conger, J.A. (1991). *El líder carismático: un modelo para desarrollar cambios organizacionales exitosos.* Bogotá: McGraw-Hill (Orig. 1989).

Conger, J.A. and Riggio, R.E. (2007). *The practice of leadership. Developing the next generation of leaders.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Day, D.V., Gron, P. and Salas, E. (2004). Leadership capacity in teams. *The Leadership Quarterly, 15,* 857-880.

Elenkov, D. S. and Manev, I. M. (2009). Senior expatriate leadership's effects on innovation and the role of cultural intelligence. *Journal of World Business, 44*(4): 357-369.

Friedrich, T.L., Vessey, W.B., Schuelke, M.J., Ruark, G.A. and Mumford, M.D. (2009). A framework for understanding collective leadership: The selective utilization of leader and team expertise within networks. *The Leadership Quarterly, 20*(6), 933-958.

García Sáiz, M. (2010). *Aprender a liderar.* [*Learning to lead*].Barcelona: Paidós.

Gil, F. and Martí, M. (en prensa). Cultura y liderazgo. El proyecto Globe [Culture and leadership. Project Globe]. In F. Molero and J. F. Morales (Dirs.) *El líder y su grupo. Desarrollos actuales en el proceso de liderazgo. [The leader and the group. Current developments in the leadership process.]* Madrid: Alianza.

Gil, F., Rico, R. and Sánchez-Manzanares, M. (2008). Eficacia de equipos de trabajo.[Work teams efficacy]. *Papeles del Psicólogo, 29,* 25-31.

Hackman, J.R. and Wagerman, R. (2005). A theory of team coaching. *Academy of Management Review, 30,* 269-287.

Harms, P.D. and Crede, M. (2010). Emotional intelligence and transformational and transactional leadership: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 17*(1), 5-17.

Heames, J.T. and Harvey, M. (2006). The evolution of the concept of the "executive" from the 20th century manager to the 21st century global leader. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 13*(2), 29-42.

Hiller, N. J., Day, D. V. and Vance. R. J. (2006). Collective enactment of leadership roles and team effectiveness: A field study, *Leadership Quarterly, 17* (4), 387-397.

Hoojberg, R., Hunt, J.G. and Dodge, G.E. (1997). Leadership complexity and development of the Leaderplex Model. *Journal of Management, 23,* 375-408.

Huang, R., Kahai, S. and Jestice, R. (2010). The contingent effects of leadership on team collaboration in virtual teams. *Computers in Human Behavior, 26,* 1098-1110.

House, R.J., Hanges, P.J., Javidan, M., Dorman P.W. and Gupta, V. (2004). *Culture, leadership and organizations.* Londres: Sage.

Joshi, A., Lazarova, M.B. and Liao, H. (2009). Getting

everyone on board: The role of inspirational leadership in geographically dispersed teams. *Organization Science, 20* (1), 240-252.

Judge, T. A. and Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(5), 755- 768.

Kayworth, T. and Leidner, D. (2002). Leadership Effectiveness in Global Virtual Teams. *Journal of Management Information Systems, 18,* 7-41

Kouzes, J.M. and Posner, B.Z. (2000). Las lecciones del pasado y del futuro. [Lessons from the past and the future.] In W. Bennis, G. M. Spreitzer y T. G. Cummimgs (Eds.), *El futuro del iderazgo [The future of leadership.]* (pp. 93-103). Bilbao: Deusto, 2002.

Kozlowski, S.W.J., Watola, D.J., Jensen, J.M., Kim, B.H. and Botero, I.C. (2009). Developing adaptative teams: A theory of dynamic team leadership. In E. Salas, G.F Goodwin and C.S. Burke (Eds.) *Team effectiveness in complex organization: cross-disciplinary perspectives and approaches,* 113-155. New York: Psychology Press.

Lambert, L. (2002). A Framework for Shared Leadership. *Educational Leadership, 59*(8), 37-40.

Marion, R. and Uhl-Bien, M. (2007) Introduction to the special issue on leadership and complexity. *The Leadership Quarterly, 18,* 293-296.

McCall, M. and Hollenbeck, G. (2002*). Developing global executives: The lesson of international experience.* Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Morgeson, F.P., Scott, D. and Karam, E.P. (2010). Leadership in teams: a functional approach to understanding leadership structures and processes. *Journal of Management, 36*(1), 5-39.

Neufeld, D.J., Wan, Z. and Fang, Y. (2010). Remote leadership, communication effectiveness and leader performance. *Group Decis. Negot., 19,* 227-246.

O'Connor, P.M.G. and Quinn, L. (2004). Organizational capacity for leadership. En C.D. McMCauley y E. Van Velsor (Eds.) *The Center for Creative Leadership Handbook of Leadership Development* (pp. 417-437). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

O'Reilly, C., Caldwell, D., Chatman, J., Lapiz, M. and Self, W. (2010). How Leadership Matters: The effects of leaders' alignment on strategy implementation. *The Leadership Quarterly, 21*(1), 104-113.

Pascale, R. T., Milleman, M. and Gioja, L. (2002). *El líder en tiempos de caos. Las leyes de la naturaleza y las nuevas leyes de los negocios. [Surfing the edge of chaos: The laws of nature and the new laws of business.]* Barcelona: Paidós (Orig.: 2000).

Pearce, C.L. and Conger, J.A. (2003). *Shared leadership: Reframing the hows and whys of leadership.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Pearce, C. L., Perry, M. L. and Sims, H. P., Jr. (2001). Shared leadership: Relationship management to improve NPO effectiveness. En T. D. Connors (Ed.), *The nonprofit handbook: Management* (pp. 624-641). Nueva York: Wiley.

Pearce, C.L., Yoo, Y. and Alavi, M. (2004). Leadership, social work and virtual teams: The relative influence of vertical versus shared leadership in the nonprofit sector. In R.E. Riggio and S.S. Orr (Eds.) *Improving leadership in nonprofit organizations* (pp. 180-203). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Peiró, J.Mª. and Rodríguez, I. (2008). Estrés laboral, liderazgo y salud organizacional. [Work stress, leadership and organizational health.] *Papeles del Psicólogo, 29*(1), 68-82.

Perry, M., Pearce, C. and Sims, H. (1999). Empowered selling teams: How shared leadership can contribute to selling team outcomes. *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management, 99,* 35-51.

Purvanova, R.K. and Bono, J.E. (2009). Tranformational leadership in context: face-to-face and virtual teams. *The Leadership Quarterly, 2*0, 343-357.

Rico, R., Alcover, C.Mª. and Tabernero, C. (2010). Efectividad de los equipos de trabajo, una revisión de la última década de investigación (1999-2009). [Work team effectivity, a review of research in the last decade (1999-2009).]*Revista de Psicología del Trabajo y de las Organizaciones, 26*(1), 47-71.

Rico, R., Bachrach, D., Sánchez-Manzanares, M. and Collins, B. (*en prensa*). The interactive effects of person-focused citizenship behaviour, task interdependence, and virtuality. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology.*

Shamir, B. (1999). Leadership in boundaryless organizations: disposable or indipensable? *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 8*(1), 49-71.

Simola, S.K., Barling, J., and Turner, N. (2010). Transformational leadership and leader moral orientation: Contrasting an ethic of justice and an ethic of care. *Leadership Quarterly, 21,* 179-188.

Shuffler, M.L., Wiese, C.W., Salas, E. and Burke, C.S.

(2010). Leading one another across time and space: exploring shared leadership functions in virtual teams. *Revista de Psicología del Trabajo y de las Organizaciones, 26*(1), 3-17.

Smith, P.B., Peterson, M.F., Schwartz, S.H., et al. (2002) Cultural values, sources of guidance, and their relevance to managerial behavior: A 47-nation study. *Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology, 33* 2: 188-208.

Stewart, G.L. (2009). A Meta-Analytic review of relationships between team design features and team performance. *Journal of Management, 32*(1), 29-55.

Sosik, J.J., Avolio, B.J. and Kahai, S.S. (1997). Effects of Leadership style and anonymity on Group potency and effectiveness in a group decision support system environment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*, 89-103.

Uhl-Bien, M. and Marion, R. (2008). *Complexity leadership.* Charlotte, NC: Information Age.

Wageman, R., Fisher, C. and Hackman, J.R. (2009). Leading teams when the time is right: Finding the best moments to act. *Organizational Dynamics, 38*(3), 192-203.

Wageman, R. and Hackman, J.R. (2010). What makes teams of leaders leadable? En N. Nohria & R. Khurana (Eds.), *Handbook of leadership theory and practice* (pp. 475-506). Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.

Walumbwa, F. O., Avolio, B.J., Gardner, W.L., Wernsing, T.S. and Peterson, S.J. (2008). Authentic leadership: Development and validation of a theory-based measure. *Journal of Management, 34*(1), 89-126.

Weick, K. E. (2000). El liderazgo como legitimación de la duda. [Leadership as the legitimization of doubt.] In W. Bennis, G. M. Spreitzer and T. G. Cummings (Eds.), *El futuro del iderazgo* [*The future of leadership*] (pp. 104-115). Bilbao: Deusto, 2002.

West, M. A. and Markiewicz, L. (2004). *Building team-based working. A practical guide to organizational transformation.* Oxford: BPS / Blackwell.

Yeatts, D. E. and Hyten, C. (1998). *High-Performing Self-Managed Work Teams: A Comparison of Theory and Practice.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Zaccaro, S., Heinen, B and Shuffler, M. (2009). Team Leadership and team effectiveness. En E. Salas, G.F. Goodwin y C.S. Burke (Eds.) *Team effectiveness in complex organization: cross-disciplinary perspectives and approaches* (pp. 83-111). Nueva York: Psychology Press.

Zaccaro, S., Rittman, A. and Marks, M.A. (2001). Team Leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly, 12*, 451-483.