Advances in Consumer Research
ISSN (Print): 0098-9258
ISSN(Online): 3079-1766

Vol. 2, Issue 6 (2025) https://acr-journal.com/

Shared Leadership, Cohesion, and Team Effectiveness: The Moderating Role of Task Interdependence

Rani Intan[1], Puji Wahono[2], Hamidah[3]

[1,2,3]Department Management, Faculty of Economics, The State University of Jakarta, Jakarta, Indonesia
Email ID : rani_9917922052@mhs.unj.ac.id, wahono@unj.ac.id, hamidah@unj.ac.id

Cite this paper as: Rani Intan, Puji Wahono, Hamidah, (2025) Shared Leadership, Cohesion, and Team Effectiveness: The Moderating Role of Task Interdependence *Advances in Consumer Research*, 2 (6), 188-199

KEYWORDS
Team Effectiveness, Shared Leadership, Team Cohesion, Task Interdependence
.
.
.

ABSTRACT
Over the past few decades, scientists have increasingly collaborated with colleagues in what is known as a research team, as scientific issues have grown more complicated and scientific knowledge and methodology have improved. This study's main objective was to assess implicit assumptions of how shared leadership and team cohesion evolve to establish the effectiveness of research teams. Individuals from various research teams in universities and research institutions in Indonesia (n=240) participated in a questionnaire study using SEM_PLS to test the hypotheses. The findings concluded that there is a strong relationship between team effectiveness and shared leadership. The implementation of shared leadership within research teams has been shown to improve team cohesion, which in turn enhances overall team effectiveness, particularly in terms of member satisfaction, commitment, and team viability. The role of task interdependence had a negative and insignificant effect as a moderator between shared leadership and team effectiveness.
..

1. INTRODUCTION

Nowadays, two or more interdisciplinary academics from various universities write almost 90% of all research publications, which reflects the increasing trend of multidisciplinary collaboration. Diverse scientific and methodological approaches are integrated by multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary research teams, allowing several people to work together to handle complicated research problems from different angles (Brown et al., 2023; Cheruvelil & Soranno, 2018; Jones, 2021). As seen by the rise in co-authored scientific publications, multidisciplinary research teams have become far more common in a variety of sectors. According to Leahey (2016) and Jones (2021), 74% of research in 2018 was done in collaboration, and the results were more beneficial and had more citations than articles authored alone.

Previous studies have shown that collaborative research positively influences academic performance (Hall et al., 2018) due to a positive relationship between members and research outcomes, particularly in terms of productivity, higher publication, the novelty of findings, and research quality (Hall & Huang, 2018; Schwarz, R., & Bennett, 2021; Seeber et al., 2020; Seok & Lee, 2021).

Therefore, in order to promote an innovative and collaborative work environment and high-quality research output that is published in reputable scientific journals and has a greater impact, team effectiveness optimization needs to be strengthened in accordance with the growing demand for Indonesian researchers to participate in collaborative research, which accounts for only 20.38 percent of the total of 296,040 lecturers in Indonesia in 2023.

A successful research team can fulfill its members' expectations of scientific recognition, collaborative research experience, abilities, and skills. Members become more dedicated and are more likely to rejoin the team in future projects. Several organizational factors (team composition, structure, communication, rewards, etc.) as well as individual factors (member abilities, trust in the team, teamwork, team leadership, etc.) have been shown to influence the research model regarding team effectiveness (Arkesteijn, 2020; Ashley M. Khawama et al., 2017; Council, 2015; Handini, 2021).

Based on the previous studies, some factors encourage the effectiveness of a research team, such as the clarity of the team's goals and directions, the authority and autonomy in making decisions, the ability to maintain member cohesiveness, trust between members, the active participation and contribution of each member in the team, and the rewards for the team's

achievements. All of these factors have an impact on the team's output, both intangible and tangible, such as publications and citations (Bennett & H.Marchand, 2018; X. Zhang, 2018).

Based on article mapping with Vos-Viewer, the analysis highlights key research themes and shows that few studies examine multidisciplinary or interdisciplinary research teams and their effectiveness, according to a Google Scholar search (2014–2024) using the term “research team”. Studies on research-team effectiveness often overlook the behavioral dynamics of new members and focus primarily on outputs such as publications.

A meta-analysis by Mathieu et al. (2019), covering 658 articles across cross-sectional, longitudinal, experimental, qualitative, and mixed-method designs in Scopus-indexed journals, identified three major themes: team tasks, member characteristics and composition, and team processes. Team processes, including trust, communication, conflict management, satisfaction, efficacy, creativity, commitment, rewards, and cohesion, play a key role in transforming inputs into outcomes. Given the numerous variables that influence team effectiveness, this study focuses specifically on the roles of shared leadership in enhancing team effectiveness, with team cohesion as a mediating variable and task interdependence as a moderating variable.

The placement of team cohesion as a mediator is supported by previous research showing that distributing leadership roles and functions encourages closeness and cohesion within the team. In turn, this cohesion helps members remain focused on task completion, thereby improving overall team effectiveness. The moderating role of task interdependence is likewise grounded in prior findings that shared leadership exerts a stronger influence when team members’ work requires high levels of mutual reliance. Clear coordination and integration among members during the team process ultimately enhance overall team performance.

2. METHOD

Research Design

The study was conducted in order to find out how shared leadership affects team effectiveness in Indonesian research teams. The study used a quantitative survey research strategy to confirm and deduce the hypothesis to explain how a change in independent variables, shared leadership, affects the dependent variables, team effectiveness, directly or indirectly through team cohesion as the mediating variable, and task interdependence as the moderating variable. To test hypotheses about human behavior perceptions, this strategy involves collecting and evaluating numerical data. These data were collected at one time from a large sample of different variables in order to satisfy the data analysis requirements for hypothesis testing.

Measures

Measurement of team effectiveness

Team effectiveness is defined as the perceptions of research team members on the capacity of a team to complement and interact with a high level of task dependence to work together to achieve the goals and objectives of the research team, with 3 dimensions (team members' satisfaction, team members' commitment, team viability) and 8 indicators. Items were answered on a five-point Likert scale, from “fully disagree” (1) to “fully agree" (5).

Based on descriptive analysis findings, with an average score above 4 on each indication, the Team members' satisfaction dimension demonstrates a very high level of satisfaction. Team members feel supported and gain a lot from teamwork, as evidenced by indicators like "Joining the team improved my research skills" and "Teammates help me when I have difficulties". Overall, this dimension demonstrates good team member satisfaction, despite certain indicators that indicate minor unhappiness, such as "I am NOT given the opportunity to express ideas for the team's progress”, which got a relatively low score.

The average scores for the Team members' commitment dimension show a rather high level of commitment. Team members are highly committed to team goals, as evidenced by indicators like "My competencies are instrumental to the achievement of team goals" and "I mobilize all my resources for the success of the team". Even though they don't have particularly low scores, indicators like "I want to leave the team" and "I am hesitant to criticize mistakes that occur in the team process" point to a lack of openness or discomfort in the team dynamics that need more attention.

With high average scores above 4 for all parameters, the Team viability dimension demonstrated promising outcomes. Results like "I am willing to rejoin the research team in the future" and "Working with the team increased my passion for research" demonstrate how eager and prepared team members are to work together going forward. While team members are capable of handling errors, the indicators "I am responsive to changes that occur during the team process" and "I am able to bounce back quickly if something goes wrong in the team process" indicate that there is still an opportunity to increase flexibility and speed in overcoming obstacles.

Measurement of shared leadership

The social network approach is used to measure shared leadership, and each team member is asked to rate each other according to how much the team depends on them for influence and leadership positions (Mathieu et al., 2015; Nicolaides,

LaPort, & Chen, 2014). In order to determine which explicit leadership behaviors team members adopt, items were developed for this study that closely correspond with the task- and relations-oriented leadership behaviors.

With average scores above 4 for each indicator, the Task-Oriented Shared Leadership dimension has very favorable average values. This suggests that team members believe the team's leadership prioritizes effectively accomplishing tasks and objectives. Indicators like "Team members work efficiently and focus on achieving team goals" and "Team members have clear responsibilities in completing assigned tasks" demonstrate that team leaders are successful in providing clear instructions and ensuring that each team member can work with focus. The indications "Each team member has a clear role and supports each other in completing team tasks" and "Team leader provides clear guidance in completing complex tasks" further highlight how empowered team members feel in accomplishing shared objectives with clear roles and structures in the team.

The dimension of Relation-Oriented Shared Leadership shows a positive level of leadership, even though the average score is marginally lower than the preceding dimension. Even though the average score of 4.033 for the criterion "Team leader shows concern for team members' well-being" is marginally lower than the other indicators, team members still believe that their leader cares about their welfare. The signs "Team leader encourages members to share ideas and opinions" and "Team members feel valued in team communication" demonstrate that the team leader prioritizes building relationships with team members, promoting transparency and close cooperation.

Measurement of team cohesion

Cohesiveness in the team was measured by an 11-item questionnaire of two dimensions: task cohesion (7 items) and social cohesion (4 items). Respondents were prompted to rate each item on a five-point scale (1 for strongly disagree to 5 for strongly agree) based on their experiences in joining a research team.

A very high degree of team member participation in finishing the work is indicated by the average score for the task cohesion component. With the indication "I need cooperation with all team members in completing tasks" receiving the highest score (4.612), all of the indicators in this dimension received scores more than 4, suggesting that team members place a high value on collaboration when performing shared work. The indicator "I am passionate about my team responsibilities and tasks", which received a score of 4.525 and demonstrated team members' excitement in doing their work, supported this.

The Social Cohesion dimension showed more varied results, with several indications registering lower scores compared to Task Cohesion. The indicators “I ask how my teammates are doing even when outside of teamwork” and “Other team members and I spend time relaxing together outside of work” scored lower (3.979 and 3.788, respectively), indicating that social interactions outside of the work context were not as well developed in this team. This may signal that although there are solid ties within the team, more casual social contacts outside of the work context are less actively practiced.

Measurement of task interdependence

Task interdependences in the team were measured by a 6-item questionnaire. Respondents were prompted to rate each item on a five-point scale (1 for strongly disagree to 5 for strongly agree) based on their experiences in joining a research team.

The average task dependence score shows a very high level of dependence among team members in completing their tasks. All indicators recorded a very high average score, which shows that the success of teamwork does not only rely on individual contributions but also on collective coordination and synergy among members. The high level of dependency also reflects effective communication, clarity of roles, and a shared understanding that achieving team goals can only be realized through good cooperation among team members.

Sampling Technique

The study uses a non-probability sample, and the respondents are selected using a purposive sampling technique. The unit analysis is a member of a collaborative research team from academics or research institutions in Indonesia. Questionnaires were administered to respondents and informed that the study aimed to investigate the effectiveness of a research team.

Population and Sample Size

The study targeted participants who work as lecturers or researchers at research institutions in Indonesia, have experience joining a collaborative research team, and/or have had a research grant from the government or academic institutions. The minimum sample size that the researchers found was 240 respondents, according to the formula provided by Hair et al. (2021), which was adjusted by multiplying the number of indicators in the questionnaire by 10 or 10 times the number of the largest structural paths that lead to a construct in the model (the 10-times rule).

The data was collected in March 2025. With the highest age range of 46 to 55 years and graduated at the master's degree (50.8%) and doctoral degree (40.8%), the majority of respondents in this study are female (52.9%). The majority of those surveyed have obtained research grants and published their findings in both international and national journals (76%).

3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Reliability and validity

The validity test for second-order analysis starts with a measurement of each variable's outer loading value, which should be more than 0.7 but can still be between 0.5 and 0.7. The table of outer loading values for each concept and the accompanying dimensions show the outcomes of the testing of second-order constructs:

Tabel 1

Outer loading value on the Second Order

Variables	Dimension	Outer loading
Shared Leadership (X1)	TOSL	0.924
	ROSL	0.899
Team Cohesion (Z)	TC	0.928
	SC	0.875
	MS	0.908
Team Effectiveness (Y)	Mc	0.875
	TV	0.914

Source: SEM PLS (2025)

Each dimension's validity in reflecting the associated latent construct are displayed in the above table. Values above 0.9 imply very great construct validity, whereas values above 0.7 are generally regarded as very good outer loading values. The ROSL and TOSL indicators in the Shared Leadership (X1) construct have high outer loading values of 0.899 and 0.924, respectively. This suggests that the Shared Leadership construct is well-represented by the two dimensions. The TC dimension (0.928) is somewhat more prominent than the SC dimension (0.875) in the Team Cohesion (Z) construct, suggesting that task cohesion is a better indicator of team cohesion than social cohesion. Dimension's validity of Member's Satisfaction (MS) 0.908, Team Viability (TV) 0.914, and Member's Commitment (MC) 0.875 demonstrate outstanding and balanced contribution to the measurement of Team Effectiveness (Y) construct.

These high outer loading values indicate that all indicators and constructs in the model have good reliability and convergent validity, so the measurement model can be trusted for further analysis. The following table shows the results of the reliability and convergent validity tests on the second-order model:

Tabel 2 Convergent Validity and Reliability Test Results

Construct	Cronbach's Alpha	rho_A	Composite Reliability	AVE
Team Effectiveness (Y)	0.882	0.884	0.927	0.809
Shared Leadership (X_1	0.797	0.807	0.908	0.831
Team Cohesion (Z) Task Interdependences (M)	0.774 1.000	0.810 1.000	0.897 1.000	0.813 1.000

Source: SEM PLS (2025)

The following table indicates that all constructs have Cronbach's Alpha values over 0.7, the standard cutoff point for adequate internal dependability. Team Cohesion has the lowest score (0.774), yet it is still deemed sufficient. Strong construct reliability was indicated by the fact that all constructions had rho_A values above 0.8. All constructs have Composite Reliability (CR) above 0.8, and nearly all are above 0.9, indicating that the indicators consistently measure the latent construct and that construct reliability is quite high (Hair Jr et al., 2021).

All constructs have AVE values more than 0.5, which means that they can account for over half of the variance of their indicators. Convergent validity of the notion is supported by a high AVE. Every construct in the model satisfies the requirements for convergent validity and reliability. The results of additional research, such as examining the link between constructs, can be believed because the indicators employed are able to measure constructs consistently and representative. The outcome of discriminant validity of the three variables is shown in the following table:

Table 3.

Discriminant Validity (HTMT)

Construct	Shared Leadership	Task Interdependences	Team Cohesion	Team Effectiveness
Shared Leadership (X1)		0.657	0.961	0.941
Task Interdependence (M) Team Cohesion (Z)			0.806	0.659 0.911

Source: SEM PLS (2025)

All HTMT values between constructs are less than 1.0, according to the results of the Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio (HTMT) test, which is used to examine discriminant validity in SEM_PLS analysis. This suggests that the measurement model used in this study does not have a discriminant validity issue. According to Heseler et al. (2015), HTMT values on the examined constructs that are less than 0.90 or 1.0 are typically regarded as having strong discriminant validity, meaning that each construct actually measures a distinct concept and does not overlap excessively.

Structural model

The structural model examines the dependent construct's R-squared (indicator reliability) and the path coefficient's t-statistics. In hypothesis testing, the path coefficient value shows the degree of significance of the relationship between variables. R Square (R^2) indicates the percentage of the dependent variable's variance that can be accounted for by the independent variables in the study model. Therefore, the better the model explains the variation in the dependent variable data, the higher the R2 value. A higher R2 value suggests that the model is more predictive.

Table 4.

Results of the full collinearity assessment

	VIF
H1: Shared Leadership (X1) → Team Effectiveness (Y)	2.793
H4: Shared Leadership (X1) → Team Cohesion (Z)	2.264
H8: Interactions of Shared Leadership * Task Independence → Team Effectiveness (Y)	1.059
H3: Team Cohesion (Z) → Team Effectiveness (Y)	3.267

Source: SEM PLS (2025)

In PLS-SEM literature, a VIF value <3.0 is considered not to cause significant problems in multi-collinearity, while values between 3.0 and 5.0 are still considered moderate and acceptable if not accompanied by other problems (Hair et al., 2019). In the table above, the majority of VIF values are <3.0 (between 1.059 and 2.793), except for the constructs of Team Cohesion (Z) to Team Effectiveness (Y) at 3.267, which are in the moderate category, but still within relatively safe limits.

Table 5.

Analysis of Variance R-Square (R^2)

Construct	R Square (R^2)	R Square Adjusted
Team Cohesion (Z)	0.702	0.700
Team Effectiveness (Y)	0.710	0.704

Source: SEM PLS (2025)

An R^2 score of 0.702, Team cohesion indicates that the predictor factors in the model (Shared Leadership) account for 70.2% of the variance in team cohesiveness. A solid model is indicated by the Adjusted R Square value of 0.7, which shows that the proportion of variance explained is moderate after accounting for the number of predictor variables and sample size. Team Effectiveness shows an R^2 value of 0.710, meaning that 71% of the variance in team effectiveness can be explained by the predictor variables in the model (including Shared Leadership and Team Cohesion). The close Adjusted R^2 value (0.704) confirms that the model has good predictive ability and is less affected by model complexity.

Table 6.

F-Square (f^2) Values

Construct	Team Cohesion (Z)	Team Effectiveness (Y)
Shared Leadership (X1)	0.212	0.221
Team Cohesion (Z)		0.040
Task Interdependences (M)		0.007

Source: SEM PLS (2025)

The F^2 value calculates the effect size of each construct on the dependent variable, or how much the construct helps to explain the variance of the dependent variable. Shared Leadership (X1) has a moderate effect on Team Effectiveness (Y) with an f^2 of 0.221, indicating the important role shared leadership plays in improving team effectiveness. Team Cohesion (Z) made a small contribution with an f^2 of 0.040 on team effectiveness.

Model fit

Model Fit refers to various statistical indices that indicate how well a particular model represents real data. The following table summarizes the results of testing the fit model of the Saturated and Estimated models:

Table 7

Model Fit Test Results

Fit Model Indicator	Saturated Model	Estimated Model
SRMR	0.065	0.087
NFI (Normed Fit Index)	0.826	0.816

Source: SEM PLS (2025)

Adequate model fit is indicated by SMRM values of 0.065 (saturated) and 0.069 (estimated), while moderate to good model fit, albeit not optimal, is indicated by NFI values of 0.826 (saturated) and 0.816 (estimated). All things considered, the estimated and saturated models are reliable and appropriate for additional research.

Hypothesis Testing

Table 8.

Direct Effect Hypothesis Test Results

Hypothesis	Original Sample	T Statistics	t-tabel (5%)	P Values
H1: Shared Leadership (X1) -> Team Effectiveness (Y)	0.422	6.670	1.967	0.000
H2: Team Cohesion (Z) -> Team Effectiveness (Y)	0.213	2.847	1.967	0.004
H3: Shared Leadership (X1) -> Team Cohesion (Z)	0.379	5.410	1.967	0.000
H5: Task Interdependence*Shared Leadership -> Team Effectiveness (Y)	-0.018	0.563	1.967	0.574

Source: SEM PLS (2025)

According to the findings using the structural equation of the above Direct Effect hypothesis test, it is known as follows:

H1: Team effectiveness is positively impacted by shared leadership.

The findings indicate a positive direction of influence with a path coefficient of 0.422. This association is significant, and the hypothesis is accepted, as indicated by the t-statistic value of 6.670 and the p-value of 0.000. Therefore, it can be said that shared leadership has a positive and significant direct impact on team effectiveness. In other words, team effectiveness tends to rise dramatically with stronger shared leadership. Accepted H1

H2: Team cohesion directly improves team effectiveness. The findings indicate that team cohesion is crucial for boosting team effectiveness, with a path coefficient of 0.213, a t-statistic of 2.847, and a p-value of 0.004. Therefore, it can be said that team cohesion has a positive and considerable direct impact on team effectiveness. This indicates that a team's sense of unity and cohesion directly promotes higher output and better teamwork outcomes. H2 confirmed.

H3: Team cohesion is positively impacted by shared leadership. With a path coefficient of 0.379, a t-statistic of 5.410, and a p-value of 0.000, it is confirmed that shared leadership significantly and favorably affects team cohesion. Thus, it can be said that shared leadership has a good and noteworthy direct impact on team cohesion. In other words, shared leadership makes the team feel more cohesive and cooperative. Accepted H3.

H5: There is a positive direct effect of shared leadership on team effectiveness moderated by task interdependence. The path coefficient is negative at -0.018, t-statistic 0.563, and p-value 0.574, indicating that the interaction between Task Interdependence and Shared Leadership does not have a significant effect on team effectiveness. Therefore, it can be concluded that the role of task interdependence in moderating shared leadership on team effectiveness is weakening and insignificant. Task interdependence do not play a role in moderating the relationship between shared leadership and team effectiveness. H5 is rejected.

Table 9.

Indirect Effect Hypothesis Test Result

Hypotheses	Original Sample	t Statistics	t-tabel (5%)	P Values
H4: Shared Leadership (X1) → Team Cohesion (Z) → Team Effectiveness (Y)	0.081	2.396	1.967	0.017

Sumber: Hasil Olah Data SEM PLS

H4: Through team cohesion, shared leadership directly improves team effectiveness.

The t-statistic value of 2.396, the p-value of 0.017, and the path coefficient of 0.081 show that shared leadership significantly influences team cohesion, which in turn affects team effectiveness. From a conceptual standpoint, this indicates that the degree of cohesiveness within the team plays a major role in mediating the impact of shared leadership on team effectiveness. H4 is approved.

Total effect analysis

When one variable has an impact on other variables, either directly or indirectly effect through one mediator variable, the total effect value is the sum of all of those influences. The overall effect results in this research model is compiled in the table below:

Table 10

Total Effect Values Summary

Path	Original Sample (O)	t-Statistic	P-Value
Shared Leadership (X1) → Team Effectiveness (Y)	0.502	8.413	0.000
Team Cohesion (Z) → Team Effectiveness (Y)	0.213	2.847	0.004
Shared Leadership (X1) → Team Cohesion (Z)	0.379	5.410	0.000
Interaction of Task Interdependence*Shared Leadership → Team Effectiveness	-0.018	0.563	0.574

Source: SEM PLS (2025)

From the preceding table, it can be concluded that: The relationship between Team Effectiveness (Y) and Shared Leadership (X1) has a p-value of 0.000, a high t-statistic of 8.413, and a total effect value of 0.502. This demonstrates that team effectiveness is strongly positively impacted by shared leadership in general. This value emphasizes the critical role that shared leadership roles in team performance by taking into account both direct and indirect consequences (via Team Cohesion).

The effect of Shared Leadership on team cohesion has a p-value of 0.000, a t-statistic of 5.040, and a total effect value of 0.379. This suggests that team cohesion is a key component of improved team effectiveness, is greatly enhanced by shared leadership. The effect of Team Cohesion on Team Effectiveness has a total of 0.213. It concluded that team cohesion contributes significantly and positively to improving team effectiveness. This reinforces the mediator role previously analyzed. Additionally, this partial mediation demonstrates that although team success is significantly impacted directly by shared leadership, cohesiveness continues to play a critical role as a conduit that reinforces this effect. The intricacy of the interactions between variables in team and organizational contexts is amply demonstrated by this model.

These findings also indicate that while task interdependence can reflect good collaboration, boundaries are necessary to maintain a balanced coordination burden. One recommended approach is to divide the work in parallel (especially in certain types of research), allowing each member to complete their part independently without having to wait for results from other members. This strategy is expected to reduce bottlenecks in the workflow, accelerate task completion, and minimize potential conflicts caused by delays.

Theoretical Implications

These results support theories of team effectiveness that highlight the significance of distributed leadership, psychological safety, and team member trust. The viewpoints of social exchange and self-determination theories, which hold that trust and autonomy increase member commitment and happiness, are supported by the early alignment of individual and team goals. Assigning task-oriented leadership responsibilities among team members is crucial for preserving coordination and minimizing work overlap.

Practical Implications

Start by aligning goals through team discussions so every researcher knows their work matters. Build trust and psychological safety with open communication, praise for success, and quick conflict resolution. Share leadership by giving members freedom to plan, organize, supervise, and help make decisions. Strengthen social bonds by encouraging respect and recognizing each person's achievements to boost motivation. Finally, set clear roles and responsibilities so coordination is smooth and everyone understands their tasks.

Limitations and Suggestion for Future Research

The team members subjectively evaluated the effectiveness of the team, which implies that various biases could affect the evaluation. Second, this study used a cross-sectional design, meaning that variables were not manipulated and data were gathered during a single assessment. The study was carried out via an online survey, meaning that participants answered questions about their unique experiences working there. Though the participants were not from the same organization, it was challenging to systematically account for disruptive elements due to the work environment, even though this gave the intended insights into the influence of shared leadership at the individual level. In order to exclude related disruptive influences, future research on the effects of shared leadership at the person level might choose a sample of individuals from the same workplace. As a result, there is no concrete proof in this study that shared leadership, team cohesion, and team effectiveness criteria are causally related. To get more conclusive findings regarding the definition of causality, experimental and longitudinal research should now be carried out in light of the study's encouraging findings.

4. CONCLUSION

In leadership concepts, it is essential for members to guide and influencing one another and their activities to guarantee that team goals and objectives are fulfilled while improving team cohesion. Leadership is now seen as explicitly organized rather than merely hierarchical due to the complexity it generates. One suitable approach to leading research teams is the concept of shared leadership, in which leadership responsibilities are distributed among multiple team members.

Prior research has demonstrated the positive impact of shared leadership on team productivity and various team outcome variables (Han et al., 2021; Nordbäck & Espinosa, 2019; Siangchokyoo & Klinger, 2022; Wu et al., 2020). Task and relations-oriented shared leadership behaviors among team members have a significant impact on member's satisfaction, member's commitment and team viability, with shared task-oriented leadership behaviors more impact-full to improve these outcomes.

Shared leadership fosters a greater sense of belonging, collaboration, and integration among team members (team cohesiveness), which in turn boosts output and overall team success (team effectiveness). This mediating mechanism implies that good leadership enhances the social atmosphere and internal cohesiveness, which boosts team synergy, in addition to having a direct effect. In terms of management practice, this highlights the necessity of leadership approaches that promote unity and cohesiveness within teams in addition to individual leadership.

Other significant conclusions is how team cohesion affects team effectiveness and how it acts as a mediator between shared leadership and team effectiveness. The function of team cohesion as a mediator variable in this research is based on the earlier studies that the closeness and cohesiveness among team members can be facilitated by the divided of leadership roles and responsibilities. In order to boost team success and productivity, cohesiveness within the team might eventually motivate team members to maintain concentrate on finishing duties.

Task Interdependence among team members regarding resources, information, and tasks is a characteristic that, according to previous research findings, generally strengthens teamwork processes. However, the results of the hypothesis test in this study indicate that task interdependence actually weakens the relationship between shared leadership and team effectiveness. This finding indicates that excessive levels of task interdependence can actually hinder the decision-making process and increase the potential for conflict. This condition ultimately has negative implications for overall team performance...

REFERENCES

[1] Ahsan Ali, Hongwei Wang, & Russell E. Johnson. (2020). Empirical analysis of shared leadership promotion and team creativity: An adaptive leadership perspective. Journal of Organizational Behavior.

[2] Ashley M. Khawama, Toni Didonab, & Brenda S. Hernandezc. (2017). Effectiveness Of Teamwork In The Workplace. International Journal Of Sciences Basic And Applied Research, Vol. 32 No. https://www.gssrr.org/index.php/JournalOfBasicAndApplied/article/view/7134

[3] Bennett, L. M. , G., & H.Marchand, C. (2018). Collaboration team science (US Department of Health & Human Services, Ed.). National Institutes of Health,National Cancer Institute.

[4] Braun, M. T., Kozlowski, S. W. J., Brown, T. A., & ... (2020). Exploring the dynamic team cohesion–performance and coordination–performance relationships of newly formed teams. Small Group …. https://doi.org/10.1177/1046496420907157

[5] Brown, S.-A., Sparapani, R., Osinski, K., Zhang, J & Olson, J. (2023). Team principles for successful interdisciplinary research teams. American Heart Journal Plus: Cardiology Research and Practice, 32. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ahjo.2023.100306

[6] Cheng, X., Pan, W., & Zhang, Q. (2019). Antecedents of knowledge interaction in the sustainable interdisciplinary research team: A mixed research method. Sustainability. https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/11/13/3624

[7] Cheruvelil, K. S., & Soranno, P. A. (2018). Data-Intensive Ecological Research Is Catalyzed by Open Science and Team Science. BioScience, 68(10), 813–822. https://www.jstor.org/stable/90025676

[8] Christina Mayer, Sivatheerthan Thushayanthini, & Mütze-Niewöhner. (2023). Sharing leadership behaviors in virtual teams: effects of shared leadership behaviors on team member satisfaction and productivity. Team Performance Management, 29(1–2), 90–11.

[9] Cooke, N., & Hilton, M. (2015). Enhancing the Effectiveness of Team Science (N. J. C. and M. L. Hilton, Ed.). National Academic Press. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK310384

[10] DeOrtentiis, P. S., & Summers, J. K. (2013). Cohesion and satisfaction as mediators of the team trust – team effectiveness relationship: An interdependence theory perspective. Career Development International, 8(5). https://www.emerald.com/insight

[11] Dipboye, R. L. (2018). Groups and Teams in Organizations. In The Emerald Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology (pp. 369–439). Emerald Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-78743-785-220181011

[12] Döös, M., & Wilhelmson, L. (2021). Fifty-five years of managerial shared leadership research: A review of an empirical field. Leadership, 17(6), 715–746.

[13] Eduardo Salas, Rebecca Grossman, & Chris W. Coultas. (2015). Measuring Team Cohesion: Observations from the Science. The Journal of Human Factors and Ergonomics Society, 57(3). https://doi.org/10.1177/0018720815578267

[14] Feng, Y., Hao, B., Iles, P., & Bown, N. (2017). Rethinking distributed leadership: dimensions, antecedents and team effectiveness. Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 38(2), 284–302. https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-07-2015-0147

[15] Gropp, R. E. (2017). Advancing Team Research for Science and Society. AIBS Bulletin. https://academic.oup.com/bioscience/article-abstract/67/2/103/2965790

[16] Hall, K. L., & Huang, G. C. (2018). The science of team science: A review of the empirical evidence and research gaps on collaboration in science. American …. https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2018-23205-018

[17] Han, J., Yoon, J., Choi, W., & Hong, G. (2021). The effects of shared leadership on team performance. Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 42(4), 593–605. https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-01-2020-0023

[18] Hoch, J. E., & Kozlowski, S. W. J. (2014). Leading virtual teams: Hierarchical leadership, structural supports, and shared team leadership. Journal of Applied Psychology. https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2012-32455-001

[19] Holloway, K., & Sturridge, C. (2022). Understanding social cohesion. In Social cohesion in displacement (The State of Play). ODI. http://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep51381.7

[20] Imam, H., & Zaheer, M. K. (2021). Shared leadership and project success: The roles of knowledge sharing, cohesion and trust in the team. International Journal of Project Management. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0263786321000132

[21] Jones, B. F. (2021). The Rise of Research Teams: Benefits and Costs in Economics. The Journal of Economic Perspectives, 35(2), 191–216. https://www.jstor.org/stable/27008035

[22] Josh Daspit, C. Justice Tillman, Nancy G. Boyd, V. M. (2013). Cross-functional team effectiveness: An examination of internal team environment, shared leadership, and cohesion influences. Team Performance Management. https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/13527591311312088

[23] Kozlowski, S. W. J. (2018). Enhancing the effectiveness of work groups and teams: A reflection. Perspectives on Psychological Science, 13(2), 205–212.

[24] Leahey, E. (2016). From sole investigator to team scientist: Trends in the practice and study of research collaboration. Annual Review of Sociology, 42, 81–100.

[25] Lee, M. H., & Ko, K. M. (2019). The Influence of Supervisors' Leadership Skills and Team Cohesion on Team Performance in Environmental Service Industry. Ekoloji Dergisi. https://search.ebscohost.com/login.

[26] Mathieu, J. E. (2019). Embracing Complexity: Reviewing the Past Decade of Team Effectiveness Research. Vol. 6:17-. https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/full/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012218-015106#_i2

[27] Mathieu, J. E., Kukenberger, M. R., & D'Innocenzo, L. (2015). Modeling reciprocal team cohesion–

performance relationships, as impacted by shared leadership and members' competence. Journal of Applied Psychology, 100(3), 713–734.

[28] Meuser, J. D. (2016). Journal of Management Vol. XX No. X, Month XXXX 1–30 DOI: 1 A Network Analysis of Leadership Theory: The Infancy of Integration. Journal of Management, XX(X). doi: 10.1177/0149206316647099

[29] Mu ¨ller, E. , P. S., & Wegge, J. (2018). Shared leadership effectiveness: perceived task complexity as moderator. Team Performance Management: An International Journal, 24(5), 298–315.

[30] Mukua-Maru, J., Linge, T., & Ouma, C. (2023). Influence of Collaboration of Team Leadership on Team Effectiveness of Collaborative Partnerships in International Research Organizations in Kenya. The University Journal. http://journals.daea.or.ke/index.php/tuj/article/view/250

[31] Mukundi Gichuhi, J. (2021). Shared Leadership and Organizational Resilience: A Systematic Literature Review. International Journal of Organizational Leadership, 10(Special Issue 2021), 67–88. https://doi.org/10.33844/ijol.2021.60536

[32] Nicolaides, V. C., LaPort, K. A., & Chen, T. R. (2014). The shared leadership of teams: A meta-analysis of proximal, distal, and moderating relationships☆. The Leadership Quaterly, 23, 923–942.

[33] Nordbäck, E. S., & Espinosa, J. A. (2019). Effective coordination of shared leadership in global virtual teams. Journal of Management Information Systems, 36(1), 321–350.

[34] Prabhu, N., & Modem, R. (2023). Shared transformational leadership and emergent team processes: determinants of team viability and team satisfaction. Journal of Asia Business Studies, 17(2), 225–255. https://doi.org/10.1108/JABS-04-2021-0141

[35] Salma Sajid, Dr. Muhammad Farhan Tabassum, & Dr. Sana Ullah Khan. (2020). Impact Of Group Cohesion And Team Efficacy On The performance Of School Volleyball Players. Elementary Education Online, 19(3), 3355–3364.

[36] Sangeetha, P., & Kumaran, S. (2018). Impact of shared leadership on cross functional team effectiveness and performance with respect to manufacturing companies. Journal of Management Research, 18(1), 44–55. https://search.proquest.com/openview

[37] Schwarz, R., & Bennett, L. (2021). Team effectiveness model for science (TEMS): Using a mutual learning shared mindset to design, develop, and sustain science teams. Journal of Clinical and Translational Science, 5(1), 157. https://doi.org/10.1017/cts.2021.824

[38] Scott-Young, C. M., Georgy, M., & Grisinger, A. (2019). Shared leadership in project teams: an integrative multi-level conceptual model and research agenda. International Journal of Project Management, 37(4), 565–581.

[39] Seeber, I., Bittner, E., Briggs, R. O., de Vreede, T., de Vreede, G. J., Elkins, A., Maier, R., Merz, A. B., Oeste-Reiß, S., Randrup, N., Schwabe, G., & Söllner, M. (2020). Machines as teammates: A research agenda on AI in team collaboration. Information and Management, 57(2). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2019.103174

[40] Seok, S. W., & Lee, M. A. (2021). Shared and vertical leadership: Relationship among team satisfaction, team commitment, and team performance in hospital nurses. Journal of Korean Academy of Nursing Administration, 27(2). https://doi.org/10.11111/jkana.2021.27.2.84

[41] Siangchokyoo, N., & Klinger, R. L. (2022). Shared leadership and team performance: The joint effect of team dispositional composition and collective identification. Group & Organization Management, 47(1), 109–140.

[42] Skitmore, M., & Xiong, B. (2020). Relationship between contractor satisfaction and project management performance . Construction Economics and Building, 4, 1–24.

[43] Stephen P. Robbins, T. A. J. (2019). Organizational Behavior 18th edition (18th ed.). Pearson Education Limited.

[44] Sweeney, A. (2022). Looking within: a longitudinal qualitative analysis of shared leadership behaviours in organisational teams. Team Performance Management: An International Journal, 28(7).

[45] Wang, D., Waldman, D. A., & Zhang, Z. (2014). A meta-analysis of shared leadership and team effectiveness. Journal of Applied Psychology. https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2013-38206-001

[46] Wu, Q., Cormican, K., & Chen, G. (2020). A Meta-Analysis of Shared Leadership: Antecedents, Consequences, and Moderators. Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 27(1), 49–64.

[47] Xiao, D., Tian, W., & Zhu, F. (2018). A Study on the Team Effectiveness Construction of the Research Team--the Moderating Effect of Share Mental Model. 2nd International Forum on Management …. https://www.atlantis-press.com/proceedings/ifmeita-17/25891145

[48] Youtie, J., & Bozeman, B. (2014). Social dynamics of research collaboration: norms, practices, and ethical issues in determining co-authorship rights. Scientometrics, 101(2), 953–962. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-014-1391-7

[49] Zhang, Q., & Hao, S. (2022). Construction Project Manager's Emotional Intelligence and Team Effectiveness: The Mediating Role of Team Cohesion and the Moderating Effect of Time. Frontiers in Psychology, 13. https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/psychology/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.845791

[50] Zhang, X. (2018). Team Roles and Interactions in Academic Research Project Teams and Their Potential Influence on Team Effectiveness. ruor.uottawa.ca. https://ruor.uottawa.ca/handle/10393/38601

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