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ABSTRACT

Within this qualitative study, the researcher sought to explore the experiences of administrators engaged in shared leadership development within organizations defined as public-private partnerships. The researcher utilized a phenomenological approach comprised of data collected from one-on-one interviews with ten participants currently serving as top-level executive administrators within their respective organizations. The qualitative data gathered from the one-on-one interviews revealed how these participants experienced the phenomenon of shared leadership development, as well as the shared leadership development strategies employed. In addition, the qualitative data revealed how the shared leadership development methods unfolded within each participant’s organization. These revelations occurred following the process of data analysis in which the themes of “tenure longevity,” “climate balance,” “face-to-face synergy,” “give-and-take exchange,” “decision-making process connection,” “a stake in the vision,” and “fluid operations” emerged. It was the researcher’s intent to provide for a greater understanding of shared leadership development methods and strategies to better support the sustainability of shared leadership models within public-private partnerships. Furthermore, the researcher sought a greater knowledge regarding the “hows” and “whys” with regard to shared leadership development within collaborative organizational structures, as organizational leaders increasingly adopt various shared leadership models that contrast with traditional hierarchical, or top-down,
leadership models. This qualitative phenomenological research study is significant as it not only provides insight into shared leadership development methods, but also contributes to a growing body of scholarly work and provides a conduit for future studies concerning the central phenomenon – shared leadership.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Background

The concept of leadership is a pivotal issue that affects the success or failure of every organization and movement (Kocolowski, 2010). Participatory leadership systems have shown to be promising paths to success by increasing both organizational productivity and morale (Appelbaum, Bailey, Berg & Kalleberg, 2000). In an effort to fuel organizational success and meet tough challenges like marketing, globalization, and technological advancement, many organizations have adopted shared leadership forms of management models. Institutions of higher learning have even moved away from traditional, hierarchical leadership structures to more participatory or shared methods in the attempt to harness the wealth of expertise throughout the organization, thus increasing commitment and addressing organizational issues (Kezar, 2001).

Scholarly works grounded in shared leadership and management have been relatively broad in scope, and only recently have researchers explored the constructs of shared leadership within specific organizations (Cheng, 2008).

Statement of the Research Problem & Identification of a Gap in the Literature

Extensive research exists concerning the conceptual idea of shared leadership; however, there is a lack of shared leadership development models with regard to organizations facing difficult challenges grounded in a traditional hierarchical leadership system (Bensimon & Neumann, 2003). Previous studies
have illustrated the differences between the shared leadership concept and more
traditional forms of organizational leadership. Several studies noted that even
when shared leadership efforts prove to be successful, the approach often creates
a need for even greater systematic changes often resisted by other elements of
the organization (Argyris, 1998). Other studies found that the process of
extending the base of participation through a leadership structure that included
individuals typically excluded from the process of governance has been widely
advocated as a means to organizational improvement (Johnson & Pajares, 1996).

Shared leadership models and conventional hierarchical approaches to
organizational leadership are composed of rather different norms and dynamics,
which have often been compared (Klein, Ziegart, Knight, & Xiao, 2006). Shared
leadership implementation with regard to higher education systems has also
become quite a publicized issue (Obondoh, 2003; Kaner, 2007). Nevertheless,
minimal research and attention has been devoted to shared leadership
development methods. Organizational leaders concerned with the viability of
their respective organizations who wish to apply a shared leadership model have
very little information concerning methods of development. This research study
sought to help remedy deficiencies associated with these issues.

By understanding development methods, organizational leaders can better
understand how to establish and implement a system of shared leadership. With
this information, organizational leaders can also improve and sustain
participatory concepts and dynamics. In today’s culture of change, it remains
crucial for organizational leaders to understand development methods and strategies associated with leadership models as they continue to work toward overall organizational improvement (Fullan, 2001).

**Study Rationale**

Recently, quite a significant increase in attention to shared leadership has developed among researchers, policy-makers, and practitioners working in the field. In the United States alone, a myriad of studies have demonstrated that leadership is being shared throughout organizations, particularly when it comes to individuals within those organizations who do not work within formally designated leadership positions (Spillane, 2006). On a global spectrum, studies have revealed that leadership has increasingly been distributed across organizations and no longer centered on one particular individual (Andrews & Crowther, 2002). Within these research studies, the sharing of leadership dimensions, components, and responsibilities have signaled the potential for improving the conceptual idea of leadership when multiple individuals are involved in the process.

The concept of leadership alone is frequently researched, studied, and discussed. A shared leadership environment, whether in a school, private company, government entity, or other organization, can be a rather complex system consisting of cooperative interactions, collaborative efforts, and other dimensions of the work environment. The aforementioned studies revealed that the emergence and implementation of shared leadership and management is
perceived as not only society-centered, but people-oriented, as well. This phenomenon has led to a redefining and restructuring of roles within various organizations and entities when addressing issues and concerns.

A better understanding of the development methods and strategies within complex organizational collaborative schemes can serve as a helpful tool for organizational leaders in maintaining effective leadership structures. One such organizational collaborative scheme is the public-private partnership. Public-private partnerships have become popular institutional arrangements, as they are often perceived to remedy a lack of dynamism when it comes to delivering public services (Jamali, 2004). Development models and strategies with regard to shared leadership within public-private partnerships can also aid organizational leaders within such groups in identifying interpersonal competencies associated with collaborative efforts.

This is an important research study due to the potential it has to serve as a useful tool in aiding individuals in shared leadership development practices. This is expounded upon in the next several sub-sections of Chapter 1. For the researcher who has served in leadership positions for quite some time and looks forward to continuing to serve in such a capacity, this research study is relevant as it can potentially offer opportunities for those organizational leaders to reflect on their practices of the past and perhaps implement new ideas when it comes to shared leadership in the future.
**Definition of Terms**

Due to the broad range of explanations and definitions across academic disciplines regarding a select number of terms used throughout this research study, the researcher determined that it was important to define key terms for the purposes of this inquiry. The definitions for these terms and relative explanations follow in this sub-section of Chapter 1.

1) *Public-Private Partnership* – Public-private partnerships have evolved as popular institutional arrangements, and the term itself has become mired in a muddle of conceptual ambiguities (Jamali, 2004). Most definitions of public-private partnerships include the notion of some sort of arrangement between government and private sector organizations or entities for providing public infrastructures, facilities, or community services. Within the literature, there appears to be no underlying definition for the concept of a public-private partnership. Rather, the term seems to be applied as an umbrella notion, which covers a wide range of complexities that are constantly changing and evolving. Bovaird (2007) described public-private partnerships as working arrangements based on a mutual commitment between public sector organizations and any organizations outside of the public sector. For the purposes of this research study, public-private partnerships were defined as cooperative ventures between the public and private sectors, built on the expertise of each partner, that best meets clearly
defined public needs through the appropriate allocation of resources, risks, and rewards (National Council for Public Private Partnerships, 2011).

2) **Leadership** – No single theory or model of leadership thus far has provided an adequate explanation of leadership, thus, there is no consensus among theorists on the exact meaning of the term (Gill, 2006). It has been described as a process of influence toward the accomplishment of objectives (Bass, 1960; Yukl, 1998). Leadership has also been defined as the ability to influence or motivate an individual or group of individuals willing to work toward a given objective or goal under specific sets of circumstances (Argyris & Schon, 1974). It is a concept embedded in the social interactions and processes of any group or organization. For the purposes of this research study, the researcher considered leadership in terms of dimensions. Marshall (1991) identified three components of leadership: 1) a cognitive element – intellectual beliefs or convictions, 2) an emotional element – feelings individuals have about beliefs, 3) a volitional element – behavioral responses individuals make due to beliefs. These components underlie the process of leadership as described in this research study.
3) Shared Leadership – shared leadership models and processes can be rather complex, and ideas concerning what particular models actually entail can be quite diverse. Definitions of shared leadership models often vary from author to author and from philosophical scholar to philosophical scholar. For example, terminology such as “participatory leadership” and “shared leadership” may be used interchangeably by one researcher and mean something completely different to another. The term “distributed leadership” is another that is used interchangeably at times with shared leadership. Some researchers have attempted to distinguish between the terms by offering distinctive definitions. Jameson (2007) defined distributed leadership as going beyond shared leadership along a continuum towards fuller group engagement in leadership in specifying distribution, and does not simply imply people necessarily working together to share knowledge, power, and authority. Jameson (2007) added that the term “collaborative leadership” denotes a process of working together that requires sharing power, authority, knowledge, and responsibility, among other dimensions. Within the field of leadership studies, much has been written regarding leadership models, and several definitions for leadership models that incorporate some degree of distribution, collaboration, or sharing exist among prominent researchers. Nevertheless, nearly all definitions and descriptions of
shared leadership include the concept of broadly sharing power among members of a particular group or team as opposed to concentrating it in the hands of an individual acting in a superior position or role (Pearce, Manz, & Sims, 2009). Pearce and Sims (2000) defined shared leadership as leadership that emanates from members of teams, and not simply from the appointed leader. Carson, Tesluck, and Marrone (2007) described shared leadership as an “emergent team property” that results from the distribution of leadership influence across multiple team members. Bergman, Rentsch, Small, Davenport, and Bergman (2012) added that the process of shared leadership occurs when two or more members engage in the leadership of the team in an effort to influence and direct fellow members to maximize team effectiveness. Fletcher and Kaufer (2003) described the implications of shared leadership within four confines: 1) shared leadership provides for dynamic, multidirectional, and collective activity, 2) shared leadership focuses on interpreting social interaction as a shared phenomenon, 3) relationships and networks of influence are currency of shared leadership 4) shared leadership serves as a construct of servant leadership. For the purposes of this qualitative study, Pearce and Conger’s (2003) definition of shared leadership was applied. Pearce and Conger (2003) defined shared leadership as a dynamic, interactive process of influence among individuals in groups for which
the objective is to lead one another to the achievement of group or organizational goals or both. Pearce and Conger (2003) also added that the process of shared leadership often involves peer, or lateral, influence and at other times involves upward or downward hierarchical influence. This idea is grounded in the notion that a single leader cannot inherently possess every quality or leadership dimension necessary to meet the difficult challenges confronting today’s rather complex organizations. Another distinction of shared leadership to consider when comparing to notions that are more traditional is the autonomy exhibited by organizational members (Kennerly, 1996). Porter-O’Grady and Wilson (1995) also explained that members engaged in sharing leadership use this enhanced sense of autonomy to address issues that directly affect their specific role within a group or organization.

4) Development – This term can be used to identify different concepts within different spheres such as education, business, the social sciences, etc… Within the sphere of organizational development, Lewin (1943) pioneered early studies that would lead to modern concepts of group dynamics and action research. Lewin (1943) provided an early explanation of organizational change as a three-stage process identified within Change Theory, which included “unfreezing” old behavior, “moving” to a new level of behavior, and “refreezing”
the behavior at the new level. Later, Beckhard (1969) offered an explanation that characterized the concept of organizational development as an effort, which is planned, organization-wide, and managed from the top to increase overall organizational effectiveness by way of planned interventions. More recently, Sullivan (2005) described organizational development as a “transformative leap” to a desired vision where strategies align, in the light of local culture, with an innovative and authentic leadership style. For the purposes of this research study, organizational development with regard to a shared leadership structure was defined within McLean’s (2005) context of an organization. McLean (2005) characterized development within an organization as a planned strategy for managing change while recognizing that the dynamic and fluid environment in which we live and work necessitates the ability to respond quickly to changing circumstances. The goal of development with regard to individuals, departments, work groups, or the entire organization is overall improvement within the respective organization (McLean, 2005).

5) Administrators – In the realms of business and education, this term usually refers to individuals who have the responsibility of running the school or company. These individuals may have a wide variety of responsibilities depending on the organization by which they are employed. When administration is defined in a business process,
influence on human tasks, as well as organizational controls over processes, are often involved (Casey, 2009). When management is defined, interaction takes place between managers and individuals in subordinate positions, whereas leadership takes place between leaders and collaborators (Rost, 1993). The term “administrator” in the sense of the concept of “administration” is used in this study as a general term because participants within the study were all identified to possess various job titles. Sergiovanni (1991) defined administration as the process of working with and through others to accomplish goals efficiently. Administrative theorists often refer to the essential roles and tasks of administration as planning, organizing, and leading (Sergiovanni, 1991). The term administrator is used throughout this study to define the participants who are leaders and who are responsible for carrying out this process within their respective organizations.

Following the definition of terms, in which the conceptual ideas of leadership and shared leadership are defined for this research study, the researcher has included a table that highlights distinctions between shared leadership and “more traditional” forms of leadership. Table 1.1 on the following page is adapted from Pearce and Conger (2003).
Table 1.1

Shared Leadership & Traditional Leadership Compared

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differences between Shared Leadership and Traditional Forms of Leadership Issues Related to Leadership Style</th>
<th>Shared Leadership</th>
<th>More Traditional Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavior expressed</strong></td>
<td>Aggregated behavior (Cox, Pearce, &amp; Perry, 2003; Cox, Pearce, &amp; Sims, 2003)</td>
<td>Singular or multiple behavior (Yukl, 2001; Pearce, 1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of structure</strong></td>
<td>Lateral and decentralized (Finkelstein &amp; Hambrick, 1996; Pearce, 1997; Pearce &amp; Sims, 2000)</td>
<td>Hierarchical and centralized (Hatch, 1997; Yukl, 2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actions of member</strong></td>
<td>Autonomous and self-led (Pearce &amp; Sims, 2002; Porter-O’Grady, Hawkins, &amp; Parker, 1997)</td>
<td>Dependent and instructed (Hatch, 1997; Yukl, 2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actions of team</strong></td>
<td>Collaborative and consensus-driven (Graham &amp; Barter, 1999; Spooner, Keenan, &amp; Card, 1997)</td>
<td>Responsive to desires of leader (Hatch, 1997; Yukl, 2001)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


12
**Theoretical Framework**

Empirical investigations such as this research study can potentially result in many findings. Such findings can accumulate, and the need may arise for integration and organization in the attempt to make the findings, which can be somewhat isolated, meaningful. A theoretical framework provides structure for a research study and connects the researcher to existing knowledge (Torraco, 1997).

Theories help bind results following the collection of data, and they bring relative order to existing knowledge within a particular area of research. Furthermore, theories can stimulate advancement within a research area and promote further inquiries. The quantitative and qualitative research communities differ when it comes to the importance placed upon theory, as well the implementation or use of theory in a research study (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009). In quantitative research, a hypothesis is deduced from a theory, which is later examined and relationships tested (Creswell, 2008).

Within qualitative research studies, theoretical frameworks often remain dependent upon a particular researcher’s goals or purposes. For example, a researcher may have the desire to describe particular behaviors, understand a process, or explain a phenomenon. Creswell (2007) noted that researchers use theories to provide explanations or generalizations about how the world operates. In doing so, the theoretical framework provides a lens by which an entire research study can be viewed (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). The differences
of quantitative and qualitative research, as well as the relative “fit” of this research study are further amplified in Chapter 3.

This research study drew from the Dynamic Theory of Shared Leadership offered by Pearce and Conger (2003), one in which the traditional view of leadership creation within the hierarchical structure of an organization is challenged by the process of shared influence between and among individuals within an organization. Pearce and Conger’s (2003) Dynamic Theory of Shared Leadership helped inform this research study and provided it with a strong orienting framework (Creswell, 2008). As discussed in greater detail in Chapter 3, this research study was approached from the phenomenological tradition, so Pearce and Conger’s (2003) theory provided explanation for a real-world study and served to inform the experiences of the participants associated with this study (Creswell, 2008).

Several approaches to the use of theory in research exist. Traditional quantitative studies tend to utilize a deductive approach. The traditional quantitative model values theory preceding the process of data collection so that a hypothesis can be generated based on what is known, then proceeding through deductive reasoning to arrive at a highly formalized system (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009). By contrast, the inductive approach works in quite the opposite way, moving from specific observations to interpretations or theories. Researchers who subscribe to an inductive approach have argued that empirical
interpretations and theoretical statements should be derived from the data (Miller & Brewer, 2003).

There are also qualitative researchers who insist that a theory should not even be applied to pure qualitative research. McLeod (2001), for example, declared that phenomenological qualitative research required a withdrawal from the world and willingness to set aside existing theories and beliefs. However, within this qualitative inquiry, a functional approach was applied. Creswell (2007) noted that some qualitative researchers simply use a theory to help guide their research, and that theory becomes functional for the background of a study. Pearce and Conger’s (2003) Dynamic Theory of Shared Leadership was used to frame this qualitative research study and explain the phenomenon of shared leadership development in a broad and general sense relative only to the participants and case involved.

**Statement of Purpose and Research Questions**

The purpose of this qualitative study was to understand the leadership development strategies and methods of administrators and organizational leaders engaged in public-private partnerships in a Southern urban center.

**central research question.** The following central research question was addressed in this: How do administrators engaged in public-private partnerships experience the phenomenon of shared leadership development?

**issue sub-question.** The following issue sub-question was also addressed: What development strategies do these administrators use?
**procedural sub-question.** In addition, a procedural sub-question was addressed: How did the development strategies and methods unfold within the public-private partnership?

**Scope and Limitations**

Due to the nature of this research study, it remained incumbent upon the researcher to address weaknesses or limitations that may affect the results or implications when it comes to future research (Creswell, 2007). This inquiry focused on how administrators working within public-private partnerships experienced the phenomenon of shared leadership. One-on-one interviews were used to explore and understand these experiences.

This research study was focused on the participants’ “meaning making,” as that is the quintessential element of the human experience (Patton, 2002). The important findings reported in Chapter 4 are an understanding of the phenomenon of shared leadership development as seen through the eyes of the participants in this research study, as well as how they experienced this phenomenon. The report of the findings in the Chapter 4 sub-section entitled, Essence of Experiences served as the researcher’s interpretation of this inquiry, thus expressing the essence of the phenomenon of shared leadership development based on the experiences of the participants who experienced the phenomenon of shared leadership development (Merriam, 2009).

The data were provided from the perspectives of those who participated in the research study. As explained in detail in Chapter 3, this study was conducted
as a qualitative inquiry, and it concentrated around ten participants. Therefore, the extent that the findings can be generalized to other groups of people in other situations should be questioned, scrutinized, and discussed. Nonetheless, the limitations of this research study can certainly serve as a bridge towards suggestions for future inquiries, studies, or practices (Creswell, 2007).

**Synopsis of Chapters**

This research study was organized into five chapters. Chapter 1 provided an overview of the research study’s components to include background information and a brief summary on the current state of existing research on the topic of shared leadership. The research study’s purpose, categorical statement of the research problem, research questions, and the significance of the study were also outlined in Chapter 1.

The following chapter, Chapter 2, served as an exploration of selected literature on shared leadership within various organizations. This review was completed with the intent of providing a conceptual structure of research related to this study over the last century. In Chapter 2, the researcher began with a broad historical overview and included several seminal works relevant to the evolution of shared leadership thought and literature. The broad historical overview was adapted from the work of Pearce and Conger (2003). Following the adaptation of the historical overview, the researcher provided a detailed survey of recent studies, which cite shared, collaborative, distributed, and participatory leadership, as well as various organizational components.
In Chapter 3, the researcher presented a discussion of the particular methodology utilized in this research study. A rather detailed description of methods, as well as the researcher’s justification for employing such methods, is also included in Chapter 3. Specific attention was given to the role of the researcher, sampling procedures, data collection, and analysis procedures, as well as trustworthiness and verification procedures. The researcher concluded Chapter 3 with explanations of the study’s feasibility, advantages, and disadvantages.

A detailed explanation and a description of the findings are given in Chapter 4. This Chapter was reserved for a presentation of the qualitative data analysis and findings. Data analysis was described having utilized the interview protocol in gathering the data. Data were transcribed in the effort to learn of the participants’ experiences.

Several themes emerged from the study, and these themes are presented within Chapter 4 based upon the methodology discussed in Chapter 3. Additional procedures and a brief commentary were included in this chapter, as along with the findings. Particular attention was given to the establishment of trustworthiness in Chapter 4. The researcher concluded Chapter 4 with a subsection regarding the essence of experiences as interpreted by the researcher.

The research study was concluded with a detailed discussion in Chapter 5. A summary of the study’s purpose, procedures, methods, findings, and conclusions was included. Within this chapter, the researcher also provided a
section concerning further commentary on the major findings of the research study, as well as its respective limitations and implications for future practices. This included commentary from the researcher on what the findings meant, how the findings confirmed what other researchers within the field have found, and how the findings of this research study enhanced the literature associated with the study’s topic – shared leadership development. The researcher closed the final chapter with a detailed discussion in regards to recommendations for further research and inquiry on shared leadership and shared leadership development.
Multiple computerized databases were used in the development of this literature review. The computerized data sources included ERIC (Education Resources Information Center), JSTOR (Journal Storage), Professional Collection, and Professional Development Collection. Search criteria were limited to keywords in all fields, full-text availability, which included mostly Portable Document Format (PDF) and peer-reviewed journal publications. The publication type was limited to journal articles and the initial descriptors used within each of the computerized databases included “shared” and “leadership”.

These initial attempts resulted in limited findings. For example, the descriptors “shared” and “leadership” resulted in only a few journal articles in the first ERIC database search. Subsequent descriptors were changed to include “participatory” and “leadership” in additional searches. Within the same ERIC database, “participatory” and “leadership” resulted in several additional journal articles. In searches that followed within each computerized database, the descriptor “shared” was retained and the descriptor “leadership” was replaced with “management” as a descriptor. This alteration yielded several more journal article results in ERIC, as well as in JSTOR and Professional Collection.

Additional descriptor modifications included the replacement of “management” with the descriptor “governance.”
Collection, and Professional Development Collection searches containing “governance” as the descriptor resulted in several additional articles.

The searches within each computerized database, ERIC, JSTOR, Professional Collection, and Professional Development Collection, were not limited by date due to the nature of the topic. Several journal article results were eliminated from consideration for this literature review because they were informative articles not based on empirical studies. Though shared leadership was defined in Chapter 1 for this research study, other descriptors were used in the database searches due to the diversity of definitions regarding these descriptors among researchers across academic disciplines.

This chapter served as a review of literature relative to this research study. Related areas of research were examined to provide a backdrop, as well as to present the vast multitude of research that pertained to this study. This literature review stemmed from an historical overview of seminal works with regard to shared leadership.

The historical overview was followed with a review of more recent research regarding shared leadership systems in organizations such as government entities, private companies, and schools, as today’s leadership spectrum has been characterized by quite a shifting landscape, from hierarchical structures to more collaborative relationships (Cleveland, 2002). The following historical overview was adapted from the work of Pierce and Conger (2003).
**Historical Overview of Seminal Works**

Researchers in the early twentieth century who examined concepts associated with leadership and organizational structures often sought qualities or characteristics that defined leaders and differentiated these individuals from others within a group or organization. Follet (1924) examined management and political systems in the wake of industrialization and suggested that co-active power was a principle of democracy, which should be applicable to industries in the private sector, as well as the political arena. In fact, Follet’s (1924) demonstrations regarding the ability to establish and coordinate organizational operations through social and community activities and subsequent introduction of the concept of Law of the Situation greatly contributed to another leadership theory formally developed much later by Hersey and Blanchard (1969), which was termed, Situational Leadership Theory (Sandercock, 1991).

Nearly a decade later, Mayo’s (1933) famous “Hawthorne Studies” also offered another challenge to the predominant organizational concepts of the day. Mayo (1933) found that those in positions of management did not necessarily control productivity alone, rather, control of output was often found in the collective hands of all workers. Mayo’s (1933) examination of environmental influences within the workplace ultimately led to additional studies regarding specific aspects of group dynamics, involvement, and managerial leadership. From that point on, a new emphasis was placed upon the interpersonal dynamics between those who lead and those who are essentially being led.
The early works of Follet (1924) and Mayo (1933) helped spearhead a revolution of thought often referred to as the Human Relations Movement. The premise within this school of thought was that efficiency, as opposed to duty or morality in previous periods, was the new idiom of management according to scientific methods. By the 1950s and 1960s, studies associated with this movement were well underway. For example, Solomon, Loeffer, and Frank (1953) studied situations in which two people occupied a single position of leadership, a concept that bares a close resemblance to more recent notions of shared or collaborate leadership efforts.

The Human Relations Movement spawned additional leadership and management concepts. Hollander (1961) built upon the movement and suggested that individuals in groups emerge as leaders when others within the group perceive those individuals as having contributed to the respective task-at-hand. This particular manner of leadership does not just occur because an individual has been appointed to a formal position, but it emerges over time through positive communication behaviors (Rowe, 2001). Over the last several decades, researchers engaged in the examination of emergent leadership often built upon the work of Hollander (1961), among others.

Vroom and Yetton (1973) expanded upon earlier theories and suggested a model in which leaders, dependent upon circumstances, made conscious decisions as to whether or not they would include subordinates in the process of decision-making. Therefore, Vroom and Yetton (1973) essentially identified that
situations existed in which a shared leadership structure proved more advantageous than a more hierarchical form. They identified a normative model by which specific leadership styles called for different types of situations.

Vroom and Yetton's (1973) normative decision model was expressed in terms of a "decision-making tree" that required the leader to analyze the aspects of a particular problem or decision in order to determine the extent to which they would share decision-making power with others.

Figure 2.1

*Vroom and Yetton’s (1973) Decision Making Flowchart (Tree)*

In a general sense, the model presented by Vroom and Yetton (1973) suggested that greater involvement by others in the decision-making process was required under a select few conditions. These conditions included either a concern for a higher need of quality decision-making, subordinate knowledge trumping, augmenting decisions of the leader, subordinate acceptance, or when the potential for conflict after a decision was relatively low among subordinates (Pearce & Conger, 2003). This model has been tested many times, and it has appeared in numerous studies, articles, and textbooks. Within the business realm, top-level executives and managers have become aware of Vroom and Yetton (1973) through studies appearing in management journals, as well as through leadership workshops and decision-making seminars over the last several decades (Vroom, 1984).

During the 1960s and 1970s, the prevailing goal within leadership and organizational theory development rested in the achievement of consensus on the validity of existing theories as opposed to new theory development (McKinley, 2010). Katz and Kahn (1978) engaged in such research when they focused their attention on the roles and responsibilities that were often associated with formal leadership positions such as planning, problem solving, and development of subordinates. As organizations became more complex and responsibilities placed upon organizational leaders more demanding, Katz and Kahn (1978) suggested that leadership roles were passed on to other organizational members in the effort to address the challenges adequately. As to their commentary on the
concept of organizational leadership, Katz and Kahn (1978) considered this the “incremental increment” over and above mechanical compliance with the routine directives of an organization.

The work of Mintzberg (1983) in the decade that followed put forth notions of mutual adjustment, direct supervision, standardization of skills, work processes, results and norms, which greatly impacted the literature surrounding leadership and organizational theory (Melin & Axelsson, 2005). Mintzberg (1983) examined leadership and management with regard to the complexity of modern organizations and found that as work environments became more complex, the organizational structure became more decentralized. This type of structure allowed for a greater number of individuals to be involved in the process of decision-making, as well as other roles traditionally assigned to individuals occupying formal leadership positions. According to Mintzberg (2003), dimensions of power and influence were not held exclusively by one particular individual, namely the designated leader of a group or organization. Rather, Mintzberg (1983) considered power to be the capacity to accomplish a task or get things done, and influence was the use of, expression, or realization of that power. Thus, power was identified as something that could emanate from multiple sources within an organization. These power sources included those with formal authority, as well as those with access to decision-makers, information, problem-solving expertise, knowledge, experience, and relationships (Mintzberg, 1983).
With more complex environments and decentralized structures in modern organizations, Manz and Sims (1987) emphasized that leadership emerged from within team-oriented groups rather than from within an individual occupying a leadership role in a hierarchical structure. As previously mentioned, Katz and Kahn (1978) suggested that traditional leadership roles were often passed to other workers or subordinates due to the inability of a single person to adequately address increased demands within complex organizations. Yet, Katz and Kahn (1978) also found that organizations within which influence was distributed or shared were quite effective and emphasized the concepts of “teamwork” and “team-building,” as well.

Since the early 1990s, efforts to understand shared leadership structures, as well as leadership studies in general, have consolidated research theories and other research disciplines to include the humanities (Ciulla, 2003). House and Aditya (1997) stated that the process of leadership cannot be described simply in terms of behavior of an individual and that leadership involved collaborative relationships that lead to collective action grounded in the shared values of people who worked together to effect positive change. In addition, as mentioned in Chapter 1, the field has also witnessed a rather large addition of terminology to include such nomenclature as co-leadership, delegated leadership, peer-involved leadership, and distributed leadership, among many others. Nevertheless, the common characteristics of these additional concepts include references to shared value systems and shared approaches to the processes of
planning, establishing goals, and recognition of organizational success and failure.

The researcher provided the following visual aid as a chronological reference and overview of the seminal works in the evolution of shared leadership research discussed in this sub-section of Chapter 2. Figure 2.2 on the following page served as a visual representation of this historical overview adapted from the work of Pearce and Conger (2003).
Figure 2.2

*Historical Overview of Seminal Works in the Evolution of Shared Leadership*
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Shared Leadership Research

Following a detailed review of the recent literature regarding shared leadership, a process of coding was conducted, which revealed several themes and sub-themes. These themes and sub-themes were included on the Literature Review Map for this qualitative research study and identified as Figure 2.3 at the end of Chapter 2. Four themes were identified and described as “awareness,” “skills and competencies,” “conditions and contingencies,” and “development.” From the four themes, five sub-themes emerged. These sub-themes were also identified. “Hierarchical comparisons” emerged as a sub-theme of “awareness,” “resource management” and “capacities” emerged as sub-themes of “skills and competencies,” and “policy analysis” emerged as a sub-theme of “conditions and contingencies.” In addition, “organizational reform” emerged as a sub-theme of both “skills and competencies” and “conditions and contingencies.” The need for further study mentioned in Chapter 1 with regard to shared leadership development methods filled a gap in the literature stemming from the theme of “development,” as well as the theme of “conditions and contingencies.”

**Awareness.** Ideas concerning team-level constructs pervade recent literature regarding shared leadership. An understanding and awareness of these constructs is crucial for leaders attempting to create a culture of collaboration within an organization. Studies have demonstrated the promising success of shared leadership and participatory management systems. Johnson and Pajares (1996) extensively examined a shared leadership and decision-making program
in a large secondary school over a three-year period. Johnson and Pajares (1996) sought to trace the processes of a shared leadership program to determine how critical theories of leadership aid in the understanding of the processes, as well as to answer the following question: What are the factors that supported and constrained the shared leadership process for stakeholders in the school? The sample consisted of 92 faculty, staff, and parents at a large secondary high school in the South. The researchers collected data from in-person interviews, telephone interviews, field observations, written documents, and video recordings. The means of data analysis included interview transcription, interview, and document coding, member checking and triangulation among individual researchers involved in the research project. From the data analysis, two major findings emerged. They found that the factors that enhanced the shared leadership process included confidence in the abilities of other school community members, the availability of necessary resources and support from top-level administration. In addition, factors that contributed to constraint within the processes of shared leadership included lack of experience with democratic participatory principles and school community perceptions related to support from the school district.

Makuwira (2004) also examined shared decision-making processes; however, this was within a private organization. The purpose of the qualitative study was to explore issues surrounding shared decision-making processes within an organization devoted to literacy in Malawi. Makuwira (2004) addressed the
following question: How do individuals participate in the decision-making processes of literacy programs within an organization that claims to support them? The sample included four organization officials from a non-governmental literacy agency called the Tigali Literacy Project. Types of data collected included in-person interviews and field observations. Interviews were transcribed and coded. In addition, the researcher asked the participants to review the transcribed interviews for accuracy of the accounts. Makuwira (2004) determined that participants understood participation as consultation rather than a process of active engagement in decision-making and management processes. Makuwira (2004) also found a lack of theoretical knowledge among staff members with regard to alternatives to traditional top-down forms of management and leadership.

A central challenge confronting all organizations regardless of organizational structure is the element of leadership. Organizations function in such dynamic environments that linking learning to leadership processes becomes necessary in order for these organizations to achieve success. Guldenberg and Konrath (2002) examined shared leadership and overall organizational learning. The purpose of the qualitative study was to understand the key dimensions of intelligent shared leadership frameworks within various companies and industries in Europe. The researchers sought to answer the questions concerning the behaviors and values employed by leaders within intelligent shared leadership systems. The sample for the study included 125
business and corporate leaders from the technology industry. Data were collected from comprehensive interviews that were analyzed and coded. Themes were subsequently categorized. Goldenberg and Conrad (2002) found that the participants felt that continuous learning and professional development programs were key elements required of successful leaders operating within shared leadership structures and frameworks.

**Hierarchical comparisons.** Shared leadership models and conventional hierarchical approaches to organizational management, leadership, and decision-making are composed of rather different norms and dynamics. Klein, Ziegart, Knight, and Xiao (2006) examined different leadership styles of extreme action teams, or teams in which members cooperated to perform highly skilled and consequential tasks while coping with environmental changes. The purpose of the qualitative study was to examine the various types of leadership utilized by extreme action teams involved in medical trauma at a busy metropolitan medical trauma center in the Mid-Atlantic region. The researchers attempted to answer the following question: What experiences guide leader delegation efforts with shared and hierarchical efforts at the medical trauma center? The following sub-question was also addressed: What values and structures motivate and enable the ongoing practice of delegation? The sample consisted of 10 members of a TRU (Trauma Resuscitation Unit) ranging from attending surgeons to nurses and technicians working within the trauma center. The researchers collected data from individual in-person interviews, as well as observations from immersion
into the treatment setting. Interviews were transcribed and analyzed. Themes were then identified from the analysis. Klein et al. (2006) found that flexibility within each team allowed for swift coordination and enhanced processes. In addition, the researchers determined that reliable performance was achieved through a blending of role-based structures and flexible collaborative forms.

Fletcher and Kaufer (2003) examined what they considered a different form of leadership, compared to a traditional hierarchy that is not dependent upon individual leadership, but instead on leadership “embedded” in a system of interdependencies at different levels within an organization. The researchers used the term “shared leadership” and believed it to have the potential to transform organizational practices, structures, and working relationships within the organization. Fletcher and Kaufer (2003) identified three concepts to consider when introducing shared leadership: 1) distribution, not interdependence, 2) social interaction, 3) learning as process. Yet, the researchers maintained that for realistic, practical applications within organizations today, a shared leadership structure would most likely keep a figurehead at the top of a hierarchical structure, but such figureheads would be supported by leadership distributed throughout the organizations in which they served. Fletcher and Kaufer (2003) also reported paradoxes in shared leadership. One such paradox included the notion that leaders in formal positions have to be the ones who introduce or allow shared leadership. Another paradox was that shared leadership is often” invisible” to organizational structures, and the skills
required on the part of other organizational members for the system to work effectively may not advance individuals’ engagement in such an approach.

**skills & competencies.** The implementation of shared leadership systems requires knowledge of skills and competencies associated with collaboration and shared decision-making processes. Melser (2004) investigated shared supervisory and leadership skills within a professional development program. The purpose of this quantitative study was to examine the relationship between shared supervision and student teacher progress at a school district associated with a professional development program at Ball State University in Muncie, Indiana. It was hypothesized that shared supervisory and leadership programs associated with professional development contributed to greater student-teacher progress. The sample included 112 teachers and student teachers involved with the professional development program. Survey data were collected from self-response questionnaires hand-delivered to the participants. Data were analyzed in the questionnaire according to ten supervisory issues that served as a scale in determining levels of success. As a result, Melser (2004) found that the shared supervision of student teachers in the professional development program had positive impacts on the student teachers involved. Furthermore, it was determined that positive effects were achieved to the empowerment of all parties involved.

Griffin (1995) also examined competencies in a study involving teachers engaged in a shared decision-making program, as well as the influences of the
shared decision-making skills on the respective school and classroom. Griffin (1995) explored the shared decision-making practices of five secondary school teachers. The purpose of the qualitative study was to understand the shared decision-making activities among secondary school teachers in a public school system located in Chicago, Illinois. The following research question was addressed: What do teachers perceive as shared leadership influences toward greater participation in school leadership? The sample consisted of five teachers from five different schools within the same public school system in Chicago. Face-to-face interviews were conducted and recorded. An analysis of the data revealed themes that were categorized following a process of coding. As a result, Griffin (1995) found that the teachers who participated in shared processes were both enthusiastic and engaged. Griffin (1995) also found that the ability to re-conceptualize educational practices strengthened practices within other school frameworks including curriculum and instruction.

While there are certainly research studies that have served as examples of what shared leadership actually is, especially when it works, it was significant to mention that the a review of the literature also demonstrated that some researchers offered caution when it came to implementing shared leadership systems, specifically with regard to the theme of skills and competencies. For example, shared leadership should be pared out from a sharing of administration according to Lindahl (2008). Lindahl (2008) even went on to define administration differently from leadership. The researcher referred to
administration as dealing with scheduling, accreditation, daily operations, bureaucratic tasks, and curriculum details, or the “minutia.” Moreover, Lindahl (2008) suggested that teachers did not have the time to participate effectively, or the time to participate with satisfaction in shared administrative roles. This assertion was based on the idea that schools have not clearly differentiated between administration and leadership, and this represented the chief reason why schools have not necessarily embraced shared leadership structures in the manner in which the business world has done. In this differentiation of administration and leadership, Lindahl (2008) maintained that teachers must be involved in leadership as this involves leading people, not managing resources, or administrative systems. Finally, Lindahl (2008) suggested that shared leadership should not include multiple “heroic” leaders.

**capacities.** Shared leadership skills and competencies often vary with regard to specific organizational capacities. Xu, Borders, and Arif (2004) examined the perception of parents whose children were treated by medical doctors engaged in participatory styles of practice. The purpose of the quantitative study was to evaluate the ethnic differences of parents’ perceptions of the collaborative styles of their children’s physicians in 111 counties in West Texas. In addition, a second purpose was to examine how ethnicity affects the factors that correlate with perceived notions of collaborative styles. The researchers hypothesized that patient participation is closely related to health outcomes and overall patient satisfaction. The sample included 5941 households.
in the 111-county region of West Texas. Data were collected by telephone surveys through a list-assisted, random digit-dialing program. Data were analyzed using the 3-Item Medical Outcomes Study Instrument. Multivariate analysis was utilized to identify ethnic differences. The analysis resulted in differing perspectives of shared practices based on ethnicity. Furthermore, the researchers found that parent education and income were related to the parents’ own understanding of collaborative medical practices on the part of their children’s physicians.

Peralta-Nash (2003) explored the perception of students with respect to the shared practices of teachers. The researcher identified a lack of emphasis placed on relationships among students’ schools, communities, and homes. The purpose of the qualitative study was to examine the experiences of teachers who kept parents heavily involved in the learning process at 20 elementary schools in Seaside, California. Peralta-Nash (2003) sought to answer the following question: How do teachers engage in shared teaching efforts with parents of the school children enrolled at the respective elementary schools? The sample consisted of 20 elementary school teachers. Data were collected from interviews, field notes, journal entries, and observations. Data analysis included the categorization of themes emerging from the journal entries and notes. The researcher found that teachers effectively communicated the importance of education being a shared responsibility to the parents of students through regular home visits. Peralta-Nash (2003) also found that parents were more engaged in
the education of their children when they actually had the opportunity to witness learning processes during home visits.

Liethwood and Mascall (2008) suggested that there was a correlation between high performing schools and shared leadership within a comprehensive study of academic performance. In a sample of 90 elementary and secondary schools, the researchers found that higher-achieving schools awarded leadership influence to more school members and stakeholders as opposed to lower-achieving schools. The findings of this study suggested that either shared leadership has an effect on student achievement, or that they mutually benefit one another. Regarding the far-reaching implications of the study, Liethwood and Mascall (2008) explained that influence seemed to be an infinite resource in schools and with more informal leadership roles given away, more influence was acquired. Shared leadership aside, Liethwood and Mascall (2008) also suggested that the power of school culture had a great impact on school performance.

Wanat (2010) found that balancing collaboration and independence within the capacity of home-school relationships could prove to be a challenging experience. The researcher explored parents’ perceptions of collaborative teaching efforts and relationships. The purpose of the qualitative case study was to describe parents’ perceptions about their own personal involvement in educational activities, as well as their perspectives about participating in the policy decisions of a K-12 school district in Iowa City, Iowa. Wanat (2010) addressed the following question: How do schools encourage or discourage
shared involvement on the part of parents? The sample included seven parents of children attending various schools within the K-12 district in Iowa City. Data collection involved interviews with parents and field observations of school activities that facilitated parental involvement at the school. Interviews were transcribed and coded, and the interview data were triangulated through the observations of school-related activities, including PTA meetings, open house events, and facilities tours. Wanat (2010) found that the relationships parents had with teachers and school administrators encouraged parental involvement. Wanat (2010) also found that the parents thought that their involvement helped their children, and the desire to know what was happening in the classroom was revealed during the study.

Under the theme of capacities, research was found to exist regarding shared leadership through first-hand accounts of practitioners. McGuire (2008) provided for an example of these first-hand accounts of shared leadership. As an administrator, he examined the manner in which he was able to make improvements and advancements towards the education of his students working within teams as a model of shared leadership. McGuire (2008) found that as power was given up and authority distributed with shared responsibilities in a team, the faculty, staff, parent, and student energy soon focused on school wide improvement, and the improvement was extremely significant. Testimonials were provided to illustrate the anecdotal evidence of the credibility of the shared leadership model, and this served to foster sentiments regarding the claim that
shared leadership was a beneficial organizational structure for schools, as well as other organizations.

In a study by Wahlstrom and Louis (2008), the researchers examined schools and found that a professional community with shared leadership present had less need for the investment of trust in the principal of the school system. The researchers found that teacher self-efficacy had an effect on the proficiency of direct instruction, and the shared leadership structure was instrumental in building that teacher self-efficacy. Wahlstrom and Louis (2008) suggested a direct relationship and an emerging variation between shared leadership, climate, culture, and quality of instruction by faculty members.

**resource management.** Complexities associated with the management of tangible resources presents additional issues associated with models of shared leadership. Specifically, debates have raged in recent years regarding the shared management of natural resources. Twyman (2000) examined the intricacies of participatory management within conservation efforts by studying the process of participation in a natural resource management program. The purpose of the qualitative study was to understand the process of participation in a government-funded community development and conservation program in Botswana. Twyman (2000) addressed the following question: What are the different views of stakeholders regarding the process of participation within conservation projects? The following sub-question was also addressed: What concerns do stakeholders have about the environment and the sustainability of participatory
processes? The sample included nine conservation officials, including game wardens and deputy game wardens. Extensive in-person interviews were conducted on the part of the researcher. The interviews were recorded and transcribed. A thorough analysis revealed a number of themes that were categorized. Results demonstrated that participants felt that though conservation programs appeared to be collaborative efforts, they were in fact planner-centered, and government officials did not allow for many shared or collaborative efforts. Twyman (2008) also found that organizations involved in resource management must act to improve the ways in which stakeholders and the public work due to the sensitive nature of finite natural resources.

Improving shared decision-making in resource management is widely regarded as a growing problem. Jude, Jones, Andrews, and Bateman (2004) examined a proposed management realignment scheme that contained principals associated with shared management efforts. The purpose of the qualitative case study was to examine the techniques used by managers involved in a shared decision-making coastal management program in Norfolk Coast, England. The researchers attempted to answer the following question: How can shared management efforts associated with coastal zone management strengthen public participation in the effort to improve the process of information dissemination? The sample consisted of 30 coastal program managers. The researchers conducted in-person interviews and triangulated the data with extensive field observations. Interviews were transcribed and transcription coding revealed
emergent themes. One finding demonstrated that participants possessed mixed feelings regarding the shared management processes. An additional finding revealed that most participants felt that better communication was necessary between management groups, individual stakeholders, and public officials in order to sustain successful efforts of resource conservation within the spectrum of shared management.

With regard to resource management, food scarcities in certain parts of the world pose a number of problems associated with sustained crop diversity, malnourishment, and famine. Shared management and participatory strategies for combating food deficits have been viewed as a viable tool. Gurung and Gurung (2002) investigated the experiences of organizational leaders involved in a participatory seed management initiative. The purpose of the qualitative case study was to understand the strategies among members of the Village Development Committee (VDC) to engage in shared farming efforts in Tamku, Nepal. The sample consisted of four men and three women engaged in the collaborative farming program. Field observations were conducted as members of the program engaged in a participatory workshop. Issues were identified and coded. The researchers found that all participants identified a lack of access to necessary resources as a fundamental barrier to shared management efforts.

conditions & contingencies. The issue of labor-management cooperation continues to drive improvement efforts in the way of organizational change related to working conditions. Furthermore, identifying factors associated with
work motivation and achievement of results may prove crucial to organizational success. Kerppola (1984) examined participatory administration, as well as the preceding human resource and work issues, as well as how they relate to organizational success. The purpose of the quantitative study was to investigate how workers’ attitudes related to the primary objectives of business management in a factory in Finland. It was hypothesized that the attitudes of workers operating under an umbrella of shared administration toward management would be favorable. Survey data were collected from structured, self-response questionnaires given to 87 employees including welders, machinists, and sheet metal workers in the factory. A five-point Likert Scale measured opinions on work issues and objectives. As a result, findings revealed that the attitudes of the workers toward primary objectives of management were favorable.

Participatory systems within higher education has become quite a debated educational issue and widely publicized topic (Kaner 2007). Obondoh (2003) explored the complicated issues surrounding politics and participatory decision-making at the administrative level in higher education. The purpose of the qualitative inquiry was to understand the perceptions of school officials engaged in participatory practices at three public universities in Kenya – the University of Nairobi, Egerton University, and Kenyatta University. The sample consisted of 112 school officials to include faculty, staff, and other members involved in the tasks associated with setting goals and evaluating performance standards. Interviews were conducted and analyzed for emerging themes. The results
indicated that these school officials viewed themselves as much more than just passive consumers. In addition, most officials called for a widening of participation within the realm of campus governance to include even more members of the university community.

Oduro’s (2004) conceptualization regarding the distribution of leadership was less concerned with technical definitions, but investigated terminologies related to distributed leadership. The researcher found that an examination of the definitions of the terms “dispersed leadership,” “collaborative leadership,” “democratic leadership,” “distributive leadership,” and “shared leadership” helped shed light on the definition because all projected an element of distribution. While all pointed to elements of distribution, there were some differences in their respective meanings. The term of “shared leadership” has already been applied to this research study and defined in Chapter 1. Perhaps this can be explored further in a subsequent research studies under other conditions. Ideas regarding future inquiry are explored in the Recommendations for Future Research sub-section of Chapter 5.

Woods and Gronn (2009) examined the role of democracy in organizational work, given that the nature of employers generally does not consider democracy as a basis for their relationships with employees. The researchers maintained that most employee relationships were of a contractual nature, where an individual agreed to perform some form of labor, job, or task for compensation, and thus, fell outside the setting for a democratic process.
Nevertheless, Woods and Gronn (2009) explained that there might be advantages to employers when it comes to introducing more participatory, democratic leadership along the lines of a distributed leadership structure. The researchers also explained that the most likely success of democratic leadership is as an extension of distributed leadership, particularly in an education environment to ensure ethical outcomes are secured.

Gruenert (2005) found that collaborative school cultures, where schools in which teacher development was facilitated through mutual support, joint work, and broad agreement on educational values, created a greater environment for learning for not only students, but for teachers, faculty, and administrators, alike. Gruenert (2005) explained that school leaders, who actively engage with staff in a collaborative effort, significantly improved school culture and climate. In this study of collaborative culture’s effect on student achievement, Gruenert (2005) found that there was indeed a correlation.

Harris and Chapman (2004) identified five strategies needed for school success in terms of the distribution of leadership. Within this study, as in others, the researchers also introduced the conceptual notion of democratic leadership, which expressed the importance of values and equity in the process. Harris and Chapman (2004) suggested that the distribution of leadership was only one component in a wider model of leadership. The researchers indicated that school administrator could adopt leadership structures that allow for collaboration and democratic activity, which involved the distribution of leadership taking place
throughout the school. Harris and Chapman (2004) framed their discussion in the traditional context of leadership, where the agenda was set at the top and the individual in charge manifested the values that drove the school, and the rest of the school was expected to follow along.

Collinson and Collinson (2009) found that a blend of individual leadership and delegated leadership proved to be most effective while examining educational systems in the United Kingdom. The researchers viewed this blended leadership as being quite similar to that of Gronn’s (2009) identification of hybrid leadership. Collinson and Collinson (2009) attempted to determine how leadership was enacted, distributed, and experienced. The researchers found consistency in views among the participants in their study, as most participants acknowledged the importance of leadership and felt that key aspects of leadership included openness, engagement, and collaboration. However, with regard to the identification of distributed leadership, Collinson and Collinson (2009) reported that a majority of participants viewed it simply as “top-down delegation” rather than “bottom-up engagement.”

**Policy analysis.** Maintaining employee performance within any leadership structure can prove difficult. This view was found to be widely accepted, especially in cases that involved non-institutional settings with differing policy considerations. Thomas, Welsh, Miller, and Altus (1991) explored the manner by which members of one organization managed their own staff with limited supervision in a setting consisting of differing policy
considerations. The purpose of the qualitative study was to explore the acceptability of a participatory management system among staff members who lived and worked in a university housing cooperative at the University of Kansas. The researchers approached the following question: What behaviors are demonstrated by staff members engaged in participatory management according to university policies within the non-institutional setting of university housing? The sample included seven university housing staff members who lived and worked in the university housing cooperative. Data were collected from interviews, follow-up interviews, and observations of staff behavior. Themes emerged from the coded interviews and observations. Results indicated a desire on the part of the participants to increase performance at work when engaged in the shared management of their own activities.

**organizational reform.** Conflicts within any organization can certainly result in negative circumstances. Organizations working to diminish the role of class conflict often experiment with new organizational structures and systems in the effort to stem the conflict or eliminate it. Collins (1995) provided insight into the role of class conflict within an organization attempting to reform its structures to reflect more collaborative and participatory efforts. The purpose of the qualitative case study was to examine the traditional to participatory management transition efforts of organizational leaders at a privately owned factory in the Midwest. Collins (1994) addressed the following question: How does democratization of processes disperse class distinctions and conflict? The
sample included seven managers and seven non-management employees at the Midwestern factory. Data were collected from 14 semi-structured interviews, each totaling 45 minutes to an hour in length. Data were also collected from company meeting minutes, company newsletters, and board meeting minutes. The interviews were effectively coded and themes, or “aspects,” emerged. Findings revealed that both management and non-management members engaged in manipulative activities during the transitional process based upon self-interest, but that conflict was avoided due to the perceived notion of shared responsibilities. In addition, participants identified gain-sharing incentives associated with the participatory style as having alleviated conflict and tension.

A study by Gosling, Bolden, and Petrov (2009) found that the concept of shared leadership was highly limited in what it could achieve in terms of an overall leadership strategy. The researchers examined the usefulness of shared leadership as a descriptive, corrective, empowering, or rhetoric device in school reform. Gosling et al. (2009) maintained that sharing leadership has limited usefulness as a descriptive device, and they found little evidence to confirm that what was actually occurring could be described as distributed leadership. However, Gosling et al. (2009) do feel that shared leadership could be useful as a rhetorical tool in a manner of moving from leadership models that revolve around the personal traits and behaviors of an individual leader.

When organizations such as schools reform and adopt systems associated with shared decision-making, some individuals gain power while others
inevitably lose power, most notably principals or administrators. Shared management efforts have been found to alter the balance of power in organizations such as schools. Weiss and Cambone (1994) examined the efforts of school administrators involved in the reform of several high schools. The purpose of the qualitative study was to understand the role of principals involved in shared decision-making transitional efforts at six high schools in six different states across the country that had recently adopted a shared decision-making structure. Weiss and Cambone (1994) addressed the following question: How were decisions made among school officials during the process of reform? The following sub-question was also addressed: What topics formed the basis for the decisions made during transition? The sample consisted of 193 school officials including principals, assistant principals, teachers, counselors, and librarians. The researchers conducted interviews ranging from 30 minutes to several hours in length. Follow-up interviews were also conducted. All of the interviews were taped on audio recording devices, transcribed, and coded. Results indicated that most participants felt that the inclusion of teachers in the decision-making processes would not only move schools toward organizational reform, but toward curriculum and instruction reform, as well.

Reform efforts associated with the transition from traditional structures to shared and participatory processes have often proved difficult due to the multifaceted components involved. Jenkins and Ronk (1994) addressed the problems associated with implementing school improvement programs and
coordinating the efforts of school officials to provide instruction to students of all functioning levels. The purpose of the quantitative study was to determine the relationship between school-based participatory decision-making processes and services offered to low-performing students. Jenkins and Ronk (1994) hypothesized that training principals in organizing and providing instructional services to low-performing students would result in program modifications and improve the achievement these students, as well as other students at-risk for failure in academics. The sample consisted of 22 elementary school principals and 229 students. The research project utilized a 3-year longitudinal research design. Survey data were collected from the principals. The collected data were measured using a 5-point Likert Scale. The Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT-6) served as the instrument that measured academic achievement associated with the low-performing students. The results of Jenkins and Ronk’s (1994) study demonstrated that the involvement of school principals in programs and training facilitated change as they successfully engaged in classroom activities and effectively increased achievement test scores.

Pendlebury et al. (1998) found that individuals, as well as their psychological needs and concerns, should be the primary focus in any change process because they contended that the greatest difficulties encountered during a process of change in a school setting were those that arose inside the minds of individuals. The researchers emphasized the importance of teachers as individuals, as well as their anxieties, concerns, fears, and frustrations with
regard to reform of any kind. Pendlebury et al. (1998) maintained that a focus on these issues was essential in a change framework that encouraged teachers to take on roles as leaders for which they often had no prior experience, skills, or preparation. Along the lines of that notion, (Forsha, 1995) explained that leaders in school systems should encourage teachers to name and discuss openly, with their colleagues, their personal fears and insecurities to encourage engagement in organizational reform processes.

Bolden, Petrov, and Gosling (2009) attempted to develop ideas about how leadership could be enhanced through the encouragement of collective processes. The researchers addressed this concept through several themes – structural approaches to leadership, individual motivation, collective leadership, organizational context, and leadership development. The study focused on leaders in formal positions, but the researchers believed the findings could be generalized to individuals in informal positions, as well, as they concluded that bottom-up and horizontal leadership played an important role in higher education organizations. The researchers also affirmed that formal leaders often depended on informal leaders, and that informal leaders were often the formal leaders that one day assumed their new role.

Bolden et al. (2009) identified that a significant aspect of university leadership was found in committees, and often, decisions were made by consensus. The researchers noted that all leadership development plans, regardless of distribution, acknowledged the rapidly changing context of an
organization. Furthermore, Bolden et al. (2009) identified a need for leadership development to move from rather generic focuses to a specific focus upon the needs of higher education institutions.

Fullan (2001) reported that cultural change, which he referred to as “re-culturing,” was essential in accomplishing real change. The researcher noted that policies and structures may constantly change, but unless there is real and permanent cultural change, nothing will really have changed. Fullan (2001) explained that usually, it is the thinking on which reform programs are based that requires further examination, and not because it is wrong, but because it does not take account of the whole picture of people in the organizations, as well as the organizational culture. Collective reform in organizations, however, requires individuals to change from “the inside out” (Cashman 1998; O’Toole 1995). Bridges (1998) also found that significant reform begins with self-change and that often, leaders sometimes tend to focus too much on the change itself, which is external to the individual, and pay too little attention to the psychological transition of the “self” that individuals go through in coping with or adapting to the change.

**development.** Additional studies such as Cheng’s (2008) examination of teachers’ job development have demonstrated that teacher participation in the decision-making process of school-based management programs comprise a key component of an effective school. The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between teacher participation, as part of a shared management
program, and the outcomes of such participation. Furthermore, a second purpose was to identify decision domains to create a participatory model and help school officials involve teachers in the decision-making process more effectively. It was hypothesized that a direct correlation existed between teacher participation in the decision-making process and affective outcomes. The sample included 335 teachers from 20 different secondary schools in Hong Kong. Survey data were collected from self-response questionnaires delivered to 335 participants. Data were analyzed in the first part of the questionnaire according to nine decision-issues that served as a scale in measuring the level of participation. A second part of the questionnaire utilized a five-point, Likert Scale to measure commitment, workload, and levels of satisfaction. As a result, two major findings emerged from the study. First, the participants perceived themselves to be deprived of participation in the decision-making process within all domains of the study. Thus, the results revealed a pattern of decision-deprivation. Second, the results revealed that the participants had a greater desire to be a part of the instructional decision-making process, as opposed to managerial and curriculum-based processes. The results did not support existing theories that a school-based management program automatically enhances and encourages teacher participation in the process of decision-making simply by its virtue of being a school-based structure.

Demonstrating competencies regarding the development of democratic processes associated with shared leadership structures can also be quite
challenging. Machell, Basom, Sorenson, and Berube (2003) recognized that school leaders are often expected to demonstrate knowledge related to creating shared management systems and collaborative learning communities. Machell et al. (2003) examined the establishment of a collaborative site-based school system. The purpose of the qualitative study was to understand the feelings of students and teachers involved in the development of shared leadership performance criteria at the graduate level at three unidentified universities in three different states. The primary research question addressed was as follows: How were students involved in the decision-making processes? The researchers also examined the perceptions of both instructors and students about the process of having students engage in collaborative performance criteria development. The study included 24 graduate students and 4 faculty members. Oral interviews were conducted with all participants. Data were organized and analyzed by the coding and identification of themes related to the questions asked in the oral interviews. Findings were mixed across three sites, but most students and faculty members found that students were most engaged in the participatory processes when they were involved in the development of performance criteria. Though they were involved at this particular phase, results also indicated limited involvement during course development and planning.

**Summary**

When shared leadership structures emerge within organizations, it is something that permeates the entire structure. Shared leadership serves as a
network of practices utilized on all levels within an organization. This is significant because it marks an era when theories are moving away from leadership traits associated with organizational members at the top of a hierarchy. The sharing of leadership traits has also marked an important shift from individual achievements and meritocracies to collective achievements, shared responsibilities, and concepts of teamwork (Fletcher & Kaufer, 2003).

As previously mentioned in this chapter, this comprehensive review of the literature revealed a number of themes, sub-themes, and ideas associated with the concept of shared leadership. The four main themes resulting from the literature review were identified as awareness, skills and competencies, conditions and contingencies, and development. Moreover, the literature review revealed that a greater understanding of shared leadership can assist organizational leaders and members alike by providing a framework through which all parties involved can better understand their respective roles as members within the organization.

The literature review also revealed somewhat of a positive picture of shared leadership structures. In light of this picture, the researcher sought to explore issues surrounding shared leadership through the perceptions of those who have experienced the phenomenon. This included probing into the participants’ understanding of the term “shared leadership,” how the phenomenon was experienced, and how the participants perceived it in terms of development within their respective organizations.
A shared leadership environment, whether in a school, private company, government entity, or other organization, can be a rather complex system consisting of cooperative interactions, collaborative efforts, and other dimensions of various work environments. As indicated in this literature review, researchers have found that the emergence and implementation of shared leadership and management is perceived more and more as not only society-centered, but people-oriented, as well. This phenomenon has led to a redefining and restructuring of roles within various organizations and entities when addressing issues and concerns.

As leaders within organizations continue to work toward overall improvement and enhanced leadership models it remains crucial for these leaders to understand development methods and strategies associated with these models. The findings of studies included in the literature review affirmed that additional examinations of shared leadership development methods are necessary. Furthermore, with respect to organizational conditions and contingencies, a research study such as this proved necessary in exploring the development methods and strategies utilized by leaders operating within organizations engaged in a public-private, collaborative effort. Under these conditions, leaders within a government, or public, organization share leadership processes with leaders from a private organization or company.

A better understanding of the development methods and strategies within such a complex organizational scheme will serve as a helpful tool for leaders in
maintaining effective organizational structures. Again, development models and strategies with regard to shared leadership will also aid organizational leaders in identifying interpersonal competencies associated with collaborative efforts within a respective organization.

A literature review map was created and it served as a conceptual, graphic representation of the topic being researched, as well as sub-topics, ideas, and their respective relationships. This allowed the researcher to group information into related modules so that connections between and among them could become even more apparent than just simple examination from a listing.

This systematic method for identifying, evaluating, and interpreting the work of researchers guided the literature review process. Other strategies could have been utilized; however, the researcher chose the mapping matrix in the attempt to develop richer knowledge structures, not only in terms of declarative knowledge, but in terms of interconnections between that knowledge, as well. The literature review map for this research study was provided in Figure 2.3.
Figure 2.3

Literature Review Map

Shared Leadership

**Awareness**
- Johnson & Pajares, 1996
- Makuwira, 2004
- Guldenberg & Konrath, 2002

**Skills & Competencies**
- Griffin, 1995
- Melser, 2004
- Lindahl, 2008

**Development**
- Cheng, 2008
- Machell et al., 2003

**Conditions & Contingencies**
- Oduro, 2004
- Obondoh, 2003
- Woods et al., 2009
- Harris & Chapman, 2002
- Collinson & Collinson, 2009
- Gruenert, 2005

**Resource Management**
- Twyman, 2000
- Jude et al., 2004
- Gurung & Gurung (2002)

**Hierarchical Comparisons**
- Klein et al., 2006
- Fletcher & Kaufer, 2003

**Organizational Reform**
- Collins, 1995
- Weiss & Cambone, 1994
- Jenkins & Ronk, 1994
- Bolden et al., 2009
- Gosling et al., 2009
- Fullan, 2001

**Capacities**
- Xu, Borders, & Arif, 2004
- Peralta-Nash, 2003
- Wanat, 2010
- McGuire, 2008
- Leithwood & Mascall, 2008
- Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008

**Policy Analysis**
- Johnson, Welsh, Miller, & Altus, 1991

---

Need for Further Study: Shared Leadership Development Methods

**Purpose Statement:** The purpose of this study will be to explore the leadership development strategies and methods of administrators engaged in a public-private partnership in Birmingham, Alabama.

**Central Research Question:** How do administrators engaged in public-private partnerships experience the phenomenon of shared leadership development?

**Issue Sub-Question:** What development strategies are used?

**Procedural Sub-Question:** How did the development strategies and methods unfold?
Chapter 3: Research Method

Overview

Within this chapter, the researcher provided a detailed description of the research methodology applied to this study. The chapter was organized into several sections, which effectively describe the research plan, as well as the nature of the research study. Within each section of this chapter, the researcher provided pertinent information that guided and informed the inquiry.

Qualitative Research Rationale

Qualitative and quantitative approaches to research consist of frameworks that vary in terms of complexity and technique, and both are grounded in philosophical frameworks that consist of rather specific methodologies. Though they are quite different, they are still related in that these respective methodologies are based upon certain criteria and accepted assumptions about the world. For example, the accepted framework of the qualitative approach establishes the subjective nature of qualitative inquiry (Strauss & Corbin, 1999). Qualitative research requires perspective, and results of qualitative inquiries are not based upon standardized tests or scales but a particular “lens” established using views of the individuals who conduct the qualitative research (Creswell & Miller, 2000).

By contrast, the quantitative approach concerns specific inferences made from test scores and instrument scales, as well as content validity of score interpretations (Creswell, 2008). Quantitative research consists of systematic
procedures and measures such as counts, medians, means, modes, correlations, and t-tests. By contrast, qualitative approaches to research employ words to answer specific questions. Nevertheless, both approaches are related in that researchers associated with either quantitative or qualitative research seek the very best data. Furthermore, both quantitative and qualitative approaches to research serve as tools or instruments to be used to facilitate some form of understanding (Richards & Morse, 2007). Regardless of the research approach, questions will be asked, and data will be collected. Patton (2002) suggested that since qualitative research has gained such widespread acceptance, the paradigm conflict of quantitative versus qualitative approaches is now over.

Qualitative research differs from the quantitative approach to the study of behavioral and social phenomena in its rejection of the argument that the goals and methods of the social and behavioral sciences are the same as the goals and methods of the natural or physical sciences. Quantitative research maintains that both the natural and social sciences aim for testable and confirmable theories that serve to explain phenomena by demonstrating how they are derived from theoretical assumptions (Creswell, 2008). Explicitly, both quantitative and qualitative research serve to achieve a form of scientific explanation to include the discovery and appeal to certain capacities – capacities governing the behavior of the physical world for quantitative research, and capacities governing human behavior for qualitative research (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).
An understanding of this qualitative study, as well as the elements associated with qualitative inquiry, is enhanced following a review of historical developments related to qualitative research. As early as the 1950s, published challenges to quantitative content analysis can be found. According to Kohlbacher (2006), Kracauer (1952) critically reacted to Berelson (1952) charging that traditional quantitative orientations inherently neglected the quality of texts, and that this was a key component of reconstructing contexts. Qualitative researchers later built upon early challenges such as this, and the strategy of triangulation soon emerged (Creswell, 2008; Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009). Patton (2002) explained that the idea of triangulation eventually encompassed more than multiple data analysis and collection methods to include multiple data sources, analysts, theories, and perspectives.

Qualitative researchers are particularly interested in the way in which the world is understood by people’s lives, behavior, and interactions (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Within this qualitative inquiry, the researcher was particularly interested in utilizing research methods that would generate data particular to the individuals who were studied. Notwithstanding, all researchers, regardless of their method affiliation, seek the very best data to support their respective arguments. For subjective researchers, good data is often the result of personal involvement in the study and close connections with the participants (Toma, 2000).
Creswell’s (2008) suggestion that qualitative researchers maintain certain degrees of visibility, as well as a viable presence from the onset of a research study, resonated with the personal philosophies of the researcher. The researcher was also drawn to the qualitative tradition because qualitative researchers cannot inherently separate themselves from their subjects, nor can they separate themselves from the circumstances surrounding the study (Creswell, 2007).

Quantitative measurements and correlations were never a consideration with regard to the goals of this research study. Instead, the goal was to generate an accurate rendering of the experiences of administrators engaged in shared leadership development within public-private partnerships. A complex, holistic picture was sought, one in which the words of the participants were analyzed and reported (Creswell, 2008). In addition, the researcher sought understanding within the context of Pearce and Conger’s (2003) Shared Leadership Theory, as well as to uncover new perspectives on what is known relative to what is unknown.

As with any practice, value and appropriateness were considered by the researcher as this research study was approached. Compared to the quantitative method, the qualitative approach served as the manner by which the research problem could be addressed and the research questions answered. The concept of depth of understanding provided a particular advantage and far exceeded that offered by detached, statistical analysis in quantitative research. Due to differences in data, the way in which data is collected, how data is analyzed, and
what the findings through investigations reveal, the process of a qualitative exploration served as the most appropriate method in enhancing understanding of shared leadership development methods (Creswell, 2007).

The following table was provided as a reference highlighting the sharp contrasts between qualitative and quantitative research in comparative form. Table 3.1 on the following page was adapted from the work of Denzin and Lincoln (2007).
### Table 3.1


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualitative Research</th>
<th>Quantitative Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uses an inductive form of reasoning:</td>
<td>Uses a deductive form of reasoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>develops concepts, insights and understanding from patterns in the data.</td>
<td>collects data to assess preconceived Models, hypotheses, and theories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses an emic perspective of inquiry:</td>
<td>Uses an etic perspective: the meaning is determined by the researcher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>derives meaning from the subject’s perspective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is idiographic: thus aims to understand the meaning that people attach to everyday</td>
<td>Is nomothetic: aims to objectively measure the social world, to test hypotheses and to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>life.</td>
<td>predict and control human behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regards reality as subjective.</td>
<td>Sees reality as objective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captures and discovers meaning once the researcher becomes immersed in the data.</td>
<td>Tests hypotheses that the researcher starts off with.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks to understand phenomena.</td>
<td>Seeks to control phenomena.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations are determined by information of richness of settings, and types of</td>
<td>Observations are systematically undertaken in a standardized manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>observations used are modified to enrich understanding.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data are presented in the form of words, quotes from documents and transcripts.</td>
<td>Data are presented by means of exact figures gained from precise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>measurement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The research design is flexible and unique and evolves throughout the research</td>
<td>The research design is standardized according to a fixed procedure and can be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research process. There are no fixed steps that Should be followed and it cannot be</td>
<td>replicated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exactly replicated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data are analyzed by extracting themes.</td>
<td>Data analysis includes statistical means</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Philosophical Assumptions

Qualitative research is a rather generic term for a variety of approaches to empirical research. As a methodology, qualitative research embraces several approaches and orientations. These qualitative disciplinary traditions are oftentimes grounded in particular philosophical assumptions. Furthermore, qualitative approaches can be differentiated in terms of different philosophical and analytical traditions. Nevertheless, qualitative approaches do share certain features that distinguish them from the quantitative approach as outlined in Table 3.1. Creswell and Plano Clark (2011) used the term “worldview” to describe philosophical assumptions in scientific research. Philosophical assumptions operate at a broad level and consist of basic sets of beliefs that guide an inquiry (Creswell 2008). The basic framework of beliefs that comprises a worldview is used to inform a particular study. Often, the term “paradigm” is used in reference to a conceptual model of a worldview, which includes the assumptions that are associated with that particular worldview (Mertens, 2007). Caracelli and Greene (2003) suggested that paradigms include social constructions and culturally embedded practices. Essentially, that a researcher’s philosophical assumptions provide for a frame of reference (Greene, 2003). Figure 3.1 on the following page served to illustrate the connection of the research approach and worldviews to the research design.
Creswell (2009) identified four worldviews that may inform research practices – post-positivistic, constructivist, participatory, and pragmatic. Though the four worldviews have some common elements, different stances are taken on those respective elements. As with other conceptual ideas associated with this research study, the researcher included a visual reference outlining the
characteristics of Creswell’s (2009) four worldviews, or paradigms. The
d worldviews identified by Creswell (2009), along with the characteristics of each,
appear in Figure 3.2. It is important to note that other worldviews exist, and the
paradigms represented in Figure 3.2 only reflect paradigms most often utilized in
educational research.

Figure 3.2

*Educational Research Paradigms*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Post-positivism</strong></th>
<th><strong>Constructivism</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Determinism</td>
<td>Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reductionism</td>
<td>Multiple participant meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empirical observation and measurement</td>
<td>Social and historical construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory verification</td>
<td>Theory generation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Participatory</strong></th>
<th><strong>Pragmatism</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>Consequences of actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment Issue-oriented</td>
<td>Problem-centered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative</td>
<td>Pluralistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change-orientated</td>
<td>Realist-world practice oriented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The philosophical assumptions of post-positivism, constructivism, participatory, and pragmatism also differ with respect to ontology, epistemology, axiology, methodology, and rhetoric (Creswell, 2007). These assumptions most distinctly reveal the underlying worldview that informs a particular research study.

With reference to ontology, the researcher did not consider any reality to be more “true” than another. In addition, the researcher felt that realities were constructed by the participants, thus, multiple perspectives also existed for the researcher. Considering the assumption of epistemology, the researcher interacted with the participants of this research study, so the findings were created through the interaction between the researcher and those being researched, which came in the form of one-on-one interviews discussed in a later sub-section of this chapter. These philosophical assumptions considered by the researcher aligned with Creswell’s (2009) notion of a pragmatist, one who utilizes a practice that considers “what works” to address the research problem and subsequent research questions.

The axiological assumption considered by the researcher aligned with the elements of pragmatism; however, there was a slight lean towards the elements associated with constructivism, too. Within the context of subjective research, the researcher disclosed biases within this chapter, and actively discussed these biases later in Chapters 4 and 5. The assumptions of methodology and rhetoric of the researcher remained true to those associated with pragmatism, but also tilted towards constructivism. The researcher did not combine quantitative data
to the qualitative data collected by way of one-on-one interviews in this research study, yet the researcher is not opposed to doing so in a future inquiry as discussed later in the Recommendations for Future Research sub-section of Chapter 5. Instead, the researcher utilized a functional, inductive approach in which the views of participants were considered and developed into patterns, or themes, in the case of this qualitative inquiry (Creswell, 2009). Ultimately, the rhetoric, or language, of this research study, was created within a rather informal style that aligned, once again, with the elements of both pragmatism and constructivism.

Though the researcher maintained some constructivist views, pragmatism remained at the core by which reality was viewed and perceived. Pragmatism is pluralistic in nature and allows for the justification of not only multiple research methods, but multiple worldviews and assumptions, as well (Creswell, 2008). Due to the researcher’s own worldviews, this qualitative study most aligned with the philosophical assumptions associated with pragmatism. Pragmatism emerged in the United States in the early half of the twentieth century due, in large part, to the work of progressive philosophers and scholars like Mead (1932) and Dewey (1934). Dewey (1934) explained that experience occurs continuously due to the interaction of living beings and environmental conditions. He further emphasized the importance and significance of “direct action” as the most important form of experience (Dewey, 1934, as cited in Hallet, 1997).
As a pragmatist, the researcher sought meaning and experiences. The researcher’s desire was to focus on the “what” and the “how” of the research problem (Creswell, 2008). Creswell and Plano Clark (2011) added that pragmatism enables researchers to utilize pluralistic perspectives when seeking to answer or address research questions. This pluralistic perspective included inductive approaches and strategies with regard to the thematic analysis of data associated with qualitative inquiry. This qualitative study reflected characteristics associated with the deconstructive pragmatic paradigm, which allowed the researcher to play an integral role in the interpretation of the study’s results. The researcher provided for this interpretation in the Essence of Experiences sub-section of Chapter 4.

Phenomenology Research Design

Qualitative research, in general, begins from an altogether different methodological assumption than quantitative research, that is to say, that the subject material of the social and behavioral sciences is essentially different from the subject material of the natural or physical sciences. Qualitative research provides that human behaviors are bound to the context in which they occur, and that they cannot be reduced to variables in the same manner as quantitative research seeking physical realities. The results from this qualitative study could not be achieved by means of statistical procedures or other means of quantification (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Understanding and conveying the meaning that is constructed by this study’s participants was preeminent in this
research study. Hence, the researcher sought illumination, understanding, and extrapolation to similar situations, whereas quantitative researchers would have sought causal determination, prediction, or generalization of the findings (Hoepfl, 1997).

Assigning notions of objectivity to quantitative research methods and notions of subjectivity to qualitative research methods intrinsically “opens the door” to debate with regard to the credibility of qualitative research. Validation of a research method or subsequent study based on these simplifications within the broad, general framework of research guidelines should also open the proverbial “door” to criticism, just as the objective-subjective debate does. As Maxwell (1992) suggested, validity is not a commodity that can be purchased by techniques. This study represented a particularly personal brand of research, one in which the researcher freely admitted and acknowledged the subjective biases and perceptions of both the participants and the researcher (Creswell, 2007). Aligning with the characteristics of qualitative inquiry, the researcher desired to understand particular behaviors from the perspective of “insiders,” namely, as they were experienced by the participants in a particular setting. In the case of this study, the insiders were administrators engaged in shared leadership development, and the setting was identified as the public-private partnership.

This qualitative study represented a phenomenological inquiry into shared leadership development methods. The purpose of this type of approach was to illuminate the specific, as well as to identify phenomena through how they were
perceived by the participants in particular situations (Lester, 1999). This qualitative inquiry was a descriptive study of how administrators experienced the phenomenon of shared leadership development within their respective organizations. A qualitative inquiry such as this is particularly effective at bringing to the fore the experiences and perceptions of participants from their own perspectives, and thus, presenting challenging structural or normative assumptions (Lester, 1999).

Phenomenology is a branch of philosophy that offers creative approaches to investigating human experiences. It is based on the assumption that one can only describe the world as experienced by the studied individual and is neither a subjective nor an objective description (Merleau-Ponty, 1962). This philosophy is considered quite suitable to many areas of empirical research (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011).

Speigelberg (1960) described the origins of phenomenology as a movement rather than a discrete period-of-time. This distinction is considerably meaningful, as it also reflects the researcher’s view that the phenomenological tradition is dynamic and ever evolving. Husserl (1952) is often considered the “father” of phenomenology (Scruton, 1995). Husserl (1952) criticized social science disciplines that had “gone wrong” by attempting to apply methods of natural sciences to issues associated with human beings.

The emphasis of phenomenology is to be placed upon the perspective lived by a person and not the world as something separate from that person
Essentially, phenomenology represents the study of lived experiences or the “life” world (van Mannen, 1997). Within this qualitative inquiry, the researcher asked “what” and “how” in the attempt to uncover meanings as they were lived or experienced by the participants.

Husserl (1952) also included another characteristic of the phenomenological approach. He felt that experiences included both the concrete particulars of a given situation in the here-and-now, as well as the categories of meaning to which anything can belong. These categories of meaning are essentially structures of consciousness, which are variant and essential. Husserl (1952) used the term “essence” to describe them. Within this qualitative phenomenological research study, the researcher analyzed data from participant interview transcriptions. The data that was extracted emerged into categories identified within this research study as “themes,” which are reported in Chapter 4 and summarized in Chapter 5. In the final sub-section of Chapter 4, the researcher interpreted the “essence” to which Husserl (1952) was referring, as well.

Sokolowski (2000) provided for a presentation of the themes and philosophical doctrines associated with phenomenology to include perception, imagination, and language. Phenomenology itself represented such an important and significant philosophical movement within the last century. The phenomenological approach allowed for researchers and social scientists to investigate and move into wider and wider contexts (Sokolowski, 2000). This
means a broadening of knowledge and leads researchers away from examinations of just concrete “things” to investigations that include knowledge, motivations, structures, and “lenses” by which we construct and view the world around us (Bolman & Deal, 2008).

Phenomenology encourages researchers to not only study or focus on what is actually being studied, but the process of the examination, as well (Sokolowski, 2000). Such was the case with this qualitative inquiry, as the researcher sought a more naturalistic approach under the umbrella of qualitative research (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Since the phenomenological approach does not represent a rigid process, the researcher was not interested in separating thoughts and objects or experiences and participants. Hence, the researcher maintained that consciousness was always directed towards something and inferred that the descriptions of the lived experiences by the participants was, consequently, the experiences of something (Sokolowski, 2000). Again, this concept aligned well with the purpose of this study outlined in Chapter 1.

Phenomenology is often considered to be central to the interpretive paradigm (Denzin & Loncoln, 2007). It is considered both a philosophical discipline, as well as a research method (Lopez & Willis, 2004). Two widely accepted types of phenomenology exist among qualitative researchers – Hermeneutic and Transcendental. The Hermeneutic School of Thought focuses on lived experiences and the interpretation of those life experiences. Conversely, the Transcendental School maintains a focus on the descriptions of
lived experiences as opposed to researcher interpretations (Creswell, 2008). Hatch (2002) suggested that the interpretive approach should only be undertaken by researchers who explore and disclose their own experiences with the phenomenon being studied, as well as their understanding of that phenomenon.

As previously mentioned, Husserl is often considered the “father,” if not the founder, of phenomenology. Heidegger (1993) then moved phenomenology into the interpretative area. Heidegger (1993) replaced the concept of knowing with that of the process of understanding and believed that understanding included awareness of being, belonging, and relating with others.

Heidegger’s analysis suggests that interpretation is the foundational mode of being. Heidegger’s work is considered hermeneutic, or an interpretable effort that illuminates what it means to be (Heidigger, 1962). The relevance of hermeneutics in this study is its concern with understanding human beings and the clarification of the conditions in which understanding takes place (Gadamer, 1976), specifically, perceptions regarding experiences with shared leadership development within public-private partnerships.

The purpose of hermeneutical description is to achieve understanding through interpretation of the phenomenon being studied, and it is the written descriptions of the phenomenon that becomes the object of interpretation (Palmer, 1969). Hermeneutics lends itself to an effective interpretative strategy for a deeper understanding of the participants in a given situation and for
preserving the meaning and the context of the experience, which represented a key component of this study.

Since the descriptive and interpretive schools are the two most common types of phenomenological approaches (Wimpenny & Gass, 2000), the researcher took an approach to the phenomenological inquiry that blended the two. This blended approach included a focus on the descriptions of what was provided by the participants during one-on-one interviews, as well as the interpretations of the individual experiences by the researcher.

The following table was included as a reference, which summarizes the characteristics of the phenomenological tradition compared to the characteristics of other qualitative research methods. Table 3.2 on the following page was adapted from the work of Merriam (2009).
Table 3.2

**Qualitative Research Approaches Compared**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic or Generic</td>
<td>Includes description, interpretation, and understanding, Identifies recurrent patterns in the form of themes or categories, May delineate a process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnographic</td>
<td>Focuses on society and culture, Uncovers and describes beliefs, value, and attitudes that structure behavior of a group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenomenology</td>
<td>Is concerned with essence or basic structure of a phenomenon, Use data that are the participant’s and the investigator’s firsthand experience of the phenomenon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grounded Theory</td>
<td>Is designed to inductively build a substantive theory regarding some aspect of practice, Is “grounded” in the real world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study</td>
<td>In intensive, holistic description and analysis of a single unit of bounded system, Can be combined with any of the above types</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Sampling, Site, and Participants**

Sampling procedures represent a key element of qualitative research investigations. Sampling can involve the selection of research sites, times,
people, and events in any research discipline (Merriam, 1998). Purposeful sampling provides for a sampling method employed by qualitative researchers. Moreover, purposeful sampling remains dominant in qualitative research, as it seeks information-rich cases for in-depth study and research (Patton, 2002). Purposeful sampling also seeks the best sources of data collection in the attempt to maximize the information and allow for the greatest insight into the research question or questions.

Creswell (2007) provided several different strategies for selecting participants based upon the scope of a study, time available to the researcher, and the approach of inquiry in qualitative research. Maximal variation sampling represents a common sampling strategy by which researchers purposefully select diverse individuals who are expected to have differing perspectives on the central phenomenon (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). The purposeful sampling strategy of maximal variation sampling was used in this qualitative phenomenological study with regard to site and participants.

Patton (2002) recommended specifying a minimum sample that would be adequate for the understanding any phenomenon. In this research study, consistent with advice given by Morse (1994), Patton (2002), and Creswell (2008), it was determined by the researcher that ten participants would be an adequate number. Organizational leaders working as administrators within public-private partnerships participated in this qualitative study, and these individuals were identified by public city records and recruited for the study
through a gatekeeper within the municipal city government – the deputy director of operations. These participants served in a role that allowed them to encourage and instigate organizational structures of their choice, and particularly, leadership structures.

Many notable researchers in the field mention organizational leaders who initiate a shared or collaborative effort. For example, Houghton, Neck, and Manz (2003) suggested the need for a “vertical leader,” one who would actively empower group members and facilitate the shared processes. In this research study, participants had served in their respective leadership capacity for a minimum of seven years, as Perry, Pearce, and Sims (1999) noted that shared leadership is a group process that requires time to develop. Finally, in the case of the ten individuals who served as participants in this qualitative inquiry, the shared leadership structure employed fit the definition of Pearce and Conger (2003) provided by the researcher under the Definition of Terms sub-section in Chapter 1.

All of the participants in this study are involved in public-private partnerships, which can take many forms. As mentioned in Chapter 1 under the Definition of Terms sub-section, public-private partnerships were defined as cooperative ventures between the public and private sectors, built on the expertise of each partner, that best meets clearly defined public needs through the appropriate allocation of resources, risks, and rewards (National Council for Public Private Partnerships, 2011). This definition provided for a maximal
variation sampling technique that allowed for a selection of administrators from a broad range of organizations to include cultural, arts, community service, and education-oriented organizations in a Southern urban center. The administrators who served as participants in this qualitative study worked as executive and administrative directors within the organizations previously defined as public-private partnerships.

Data Collection

In this qualitative phenomenological study, data were collected through one-on-one interviewing. Interviews were recorded, saved, and transcribed. Again, part of the goal of this qualitative inquiry was to understand the meaning that participants gave to their experiences, and the interview process certainly provided a necessary and sufficient avenue of inquiry (Seidman, 1998). The transcribed interviews were saved electronically and securely stored, and the researcher was the only individual with access to the stored data.

Initial preparation of the qualitative data included the use of an electronic voice recorder in an effort to check for accuracy within the transcriptions. In addition, the researcher read and re-read the transcribed interviews to further review for accuracy. The transcriptions were then returned to the study’s respective participants for their review and clarification.

Data Analysis

The goal of this qualitative research study was to seek findings, whereas the researcher represented the primary instrument of data collection and analysis,
and through this human instrument, data were mediated (Creswell, 2008). The process of qualitative data analysis consisted of coding and categorizing patterns associated with the collected data. The researcher analyzed data collected by way of one-on-one interviews. Since methods of qualitative analysis vary, Creswell (2008) suggested that rather than a fixed linear approach, the process of qualitative analysis should conform to a contour or spiral image. This spiral image is often referred to as the “data analysis spiral,” or process by which the researcher works in analytic circles, moving around, and touching on various aspects of data analysis (Creswell, 2008).

For this qualitative research study, the spiral began with data management, as the researcher moved through the data analysis process of data organization, reading, creating analytic memos, writing, and reflecting, which were all touched upon (Creswell, 2008). The researcher continued the process of “looping,” touching on coding, categorizing, and interpreting the collected data. In the end, the researcher produced findings based on accounts reached through the data analysis spiral. This process represented quite a contrast to quantitative data analysis, which would have sought to present and interpret numerical or statistical data.

In Figure 3.3, the researcher provided a visual diagram of the data analysis spiral. Hatch (2002) and Yin (2008) also alluded to a cyclical process of data analysis within qualitative research. The data analysis spiral in Figure 3.3 was adapted from Creswell (2007).
Preliminary exploration of the qualitative material consisted of reading and re-reading through the collected data. This allowed the researcher to become more and more familiar with the data collected. A memo technique was conducted and detailed notes were placed within the margins of the transcribed interviews, which helped in formulating codes and themes. Specifically, in vivo
coding, or coding labels drawn from the exact words of the participants, was employed to guide the development of the themes (Creswell, 2008). Systematic procedures such as these, as well as the development of a codebook, helped in organizing the collected qualitative data (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). The voice recording software mentioned earlier aided in the process of qualitative data analysis, as this helped in identifying particular parts or segments of the transcribed interviews, especially with regard to those that contained multiple codes (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011).

Qualitative researchers utilize a variety of procedures and methods to enhance the credibility of collected data and to confirm their developing insights and perceptions. A number of verification procedures were used to ensure credibility and trustworthiness within this qualitative study. Trustworthiness is dependent upon ontological and epistemological assumptions, which provided the groundwork for this study. Lincoln and Guba (1985) provided four criteria in establishing trustworthiness of qualitative data. These four criteria were credibility, dependability, confirmability, and transferability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). These criteria were built into the process of this qualitative research study and as such, were part of the iterative process of this study, as well.

Credibility refers to the confidence to the truth of the data and its interpretation (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). In this study, strategies for achieving credibility were methodological coherence and researcher responsiveness. Methodological coherence is part of the process of this phenomenological study.
That is, it is iterative rather than linear, as the researcher moved back and forth between design and implementation to ensure congruence among question formulation, literature, data collection, and data analysis. Researcher responsiveness was achieved by the researcher maintaining integrity, mutual trust, and respect for the research process. In addition, the researcher remained sensitive while listening to each participant’s story to ensure the participants’ perspectives were represented and documented as accurately as possible. Use of direct quotes also allowed for validation of the data collected.

Dependability refers to the stability of data over time and over conditions (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Reasons for methodological decisions were explained throughout the study. As discussed later in this sub-section of Chapter 3, this included a reflexive journal of the researchers own pre-understanding of the phenomenon, as a hermeneutic inquiry within the phenomenological design such as this research study is affected by the researcher’s own values (Kock, 1996).

Confirmability refers to the objectivity or neutrality of the data. Consistent with the hermeneutic school of phenomenological studies, the researcher did not assume a detached, objective position. Rather, the researcher included personal interpretations as part of the data reported in Chapter 4. Therefore, although confirmability is pertinent to this study, the notion that confirmability included the researcher’s own bias and understanding of the phenomenon of shared leadership development as part of the data was
incorporated, as well. As a pragmatist, the researcher acknowledged that multiple realities were not only possible, but dynamic and changing, as well.

Transferability refers to generalizability of the data, which is the extent that the findings can be transferred to other settings or groups (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). In this qualitative research study, the sample consisted of only ten participants. It was hereby acknowledged from the outset that the intent of this study was not to generalize the findings, but rather to provide a rich and thick description of the phenomenon of shared leadership development among administrators working within organizations defined as public-private partnerships. While the findings of this research study certainly have relevance and meaning to the participants and the researcher, the researcher cannot confirm with any degree of certainty that these findings will resonate with others who have experience with shared leadership development within similar or different organizations or settings.

Creswell (2008) identified eight verification procedures or strategies often used by qualitative researchers to ensure the quality of qualitative findings – prolonged engagement, triangulation, peer review, negative case analysis, clarification of researcher bias, member-checking, rich and thick description, and external audits. First, member-checking was utilized for this qualitative research study. Member-checking involved sharing collected data with the participants so that they had the opportunity to offer criticisms and judgments based upon the accounts of the researcher (Creswell, 2007). Transcripts from the recorded
interviews conducted were forwarded to the participants for their review and clarification. Second, triangulation was incorporated. Triangulation refers to the use of multiple data sources, investigators, or verification procedures to ensure quality and authenticity (Patton, 2002). Corroborating evidence helped to “shed light” on particular themes or perspectives (Creswell, 2007). In addition, rich, thick descriptions were used to help establish trustworthiness (Creswell & Miller, 2000). Geertz (1973), explained that explanations of culture through thick descriptions, which specify many details, conceptual structures, and meanings, lie in contrast to “thin descriptions” or factual accounts without interpretations. Hence, the researcher wanted to present a thick description that was not only composed of data, but also interpretation and commentary.

The methodology that the researcher employed included the building of these rich, thick descriptions layer by layer (Geertz, 1973). The researcher desired to extract meaning throughout the processes of data collection and analysis, and believed that factual accounts alone would not suffice because this meaning had to be complexly layered so that the facts could be subjected to interpretations, which hermeneutic phenomenology should consider (Moustakas, 1994).

**Ethical Considerations**

Firm adherence to ethical guidelines and standards in planning, conducting, and reporting research was considered paramount by the researcher. The researcher considered obligations to the study’s participants, as well as the
academic disciplines involved. According to the guidelines established by the American Psychological Association (APA), those who served as participants in this study had certain rights; among these rights included the right to be briefed about the study (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009). The researcher respected integrity and took necessary measures to protect the study’s participants from harm, and to provide the participants with knowledge as to the nature and purpose of the study in writing.

Before their participation in this research study, the researcher provided participants with information in writing regarding the study’s purpose, aims, use of results and likely social consequences or impacts the study may have on their respective lives (Creswell, 2008). Participants were also informed that they had the right to refuse to participate or subsequently withdraw from the study at any point-in-time. Furthermore, no financial entitlements were offered to the participants.

The participants were notified in writing that their anonymity would be guaranteed and protected at all times. It is widely accepted throughout academia that participants voluntarily partaking in research studies have an implicit right to privacy. Collection of participants’ names and other identifiable information was not necessary, and only the researcher had access to such sensitive information. Copies of the researcher’s recruitment letter, informed consent letter, and interview protocol were included in the Appendices section.
Ethical standards regarding the respective research sites were also considered as part of this research study. The researcher gained access to the research sites only after receiving permission from site directors. In addition, the researcher informed site directors in writing that their respective sites would be disturbed as little as possible, and that the researcher viewed himself as a “guest” at the particular place of study. As Marshall and Rossman (2011) suggested, the researcher carefully considered the rationale for why specific sites and participants were appropriate for this study, and the researcher considered what characteristics were particularly unique and compelling, which could have potentially informed the study.

The qualities of an ethical researcher were considered throughout this inquiry, and every effort was made to communicate the significance of this qualitative research study to fellow researchers, scholars, and practitioners so that future inquiries would be encouraged (Creswell, 2008). The researcher fully understood the responsibility to consumers of educational research. Moreover, the researcher acknowledged the moral obligation to plan such a research study in such a way that findings resulting from data analysis would not result in the offering of misleading information.

Creswell and Plano Clark (2011) strongly suggested that qualitative researchers disclose their roles and the possible influence on interpretations within a research study. With regard to ethical considerations within this phenomenological inquiry, it remained imperative that the researcher, and human
instrument of data collection, clarify biases and experiences (Creswell, 2008). The researcher considered all prejudgments, as the researcher currently works within an organization defined as a public-private partnership. It remained crucial to disclose this information so that readers understand the researcher’s position and any assumptions that may have affected the study (Merriam, 1998). Furthermore, the researcher kept a reflexive journal to ensure trustworthiness. Lincoln and Guba (1985) described the reflexive journal as a diary in which the researcher on a regular basis, or as needed, recorded and documented study-related information about self and method.

**Feasibility and Advantages/Disadvantages**

Due to the nature of this qualitative study, data collection and analysis presented an issue. It was the goal of the researcher to complete this study within one calendar year. The planning phase served as a crucial component of this study. A fusion of factors influenced the researcher’s decision to embark upon this qualitative research study, including the research problem identified, personal experiences with shared leadership, worldviews associated with pragmatism, the intended audience of administrators, and an interest in leaders engaged in shared leadership dimensions.

An advantage to this qualitative inquiry was that it allowed the researcher to identify measures that were actually grounded in the data collected from participants (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). The researcher had the opportunity to explore the views of administrators regarding shared leadership development
who were actually working in public-private partnerships, as opposed to approaching the phenomenon with a predetermined set of variables. On the other hand, a disadvantage concerned the extensive amount of data that was collected. After all, data collection and analysis within qualitative research is often demanding and rather labor-intensive (Creswell, 2008).

It was the researcher’s intent that this qualitative study would create an advantage in itself. This advantage would stem from the core of the study’s purpose – a greater understanding of shared leadership development methods and strategies to better support the sustainability of shared leadership models. It was also the researcher’s intent that this understanding would eventually lead to greater knowledge of shared leadership and collaborative organizational structures within the comprehensive framework of the study’s central phenomenon – shared leadership development. These intentions were met with great success as the results and a discussion of the findings follow in the next two chapters.

**Summary**

In Chapter 3, the researcher presented the research study’s rationale and agenda, which comprised a qualitative methodology and a hermeneutic phenomenological design, to address the perceptions shared leadership development experiences of administrators engaged in organizations defined as public-private partnerships. The researcher also shared the philosophical assumptions associated with qualitative research, phenomenology, and
pragmatism that served in guiding the inquiry. The detailed research framework was presented, comprised of descriptions of the qualitative phenomenological characteristics that also guided the research study and produced a comprehensive research inquiry into shared leadership development methods. In addition, the sampling methods, data collection methods, data analysis methods, ethical considerations, and feasibility regarding the overall research study were explained.
Chapter 4: Findings

Overview

A qualitative phenomenological design was chosen for this research study because the researcher desired to produce a detailed description of shared leadership development by administrators engaged in public-private partnerships from the perspective of those respective administrators. In order to create this detailed description, the researcher collected data through one-on-one interviews with participants to discover methods and strategies contributing to shared leadership development within organizations defined as public-private partnerships. These one-on-one interviews were conducted within the private office spaces of each participant. True to the process of a qualitative inquiry, Chapter 4 contains a report by which the researcher built a complex, holistic picture based upon the detailed views of this research study’s participants (Creswell, 2008).

The methods of data analysis described in Chapter 3 and subsequent report of the findings in this chapter are not devoid of subjective perceptions or intentions. A quantitative approach would have relied on a deductive model of explanation beginning with the Shared Leadership Theory offered by Pearce and Conger (2003) discussed in Chapter 1. From that theory, a hypothesis or hypotheses would have been developed and tested through a multitude of predetermined procedures. Such was not the case with this qualitative research
study as generalizations were not sought, nor was Shared Leadership Theory refined, extended, or abandoned altogether.

Specifically, the phenomenological approach to qualitative research was selected because was a descriptive study of how administrators experience the phenomenon of shared leadership development. The purpose of the researcher’s approach was to illuminate the specific and to identify the phenomenon of shared leadership development through how the experiences were perceived by the study’s participants (Lester, 1999).

**Context**

The purpose of this qualitative research study was to understand the leadership development strategies and methods of administrators and organizational leaders engaged in public-private partnerships in a Southern urban center. The researcher’s interest in shared leadership had materialized over the last several years in the wake of rapidly changing work environments. Organizational leaders increasingly find themselves under significant pressure to perform, and this pressure can potentially affect organizational culture, or perhaps the climate of an organization over the long term.

Within this chapter, findings from the participant interviews were presented as they related to this purpose, as well as to the following central research question: How do administrators engaged in public-private partnerships experience the phenomenon of shared leadership development? The following issue sub-question was also addressed: What development strategies do these
administrators use? In addition, a procedural sub-question was addressed: How did the development strategies and methods unfold within the public-private partnership?

Chapter 4 was comprised of several sections including a presentation of the study’s setting and context, as well as a detailed description of the study’s participants. The themes that emerged following data analysis were also presented, including an explanation of the essence of participant experiences. The themes revealed how the participants, as administrators, experienced the phenomenon of shared leadership development within public-private partnerships.

Setting

Ten participants working as administrators within public-private partnerships participated in this qualitative inquiry into shared leadership development, and these individuals were identified by public city records and recruited for the study through a gatekeeper within the municipal city government – the deputy director of operations. All participants were selected from public-private-partnerships, and all participants had engaged in shared leadership development within their respective organizations identified as public-private partnerships. As discussed in Chapter 3, public-private partnerships can take many forms. For the purposes of this qualitative research study, public-private partnerships were defined as cooperative ventures between the public and private sectors, built on the expertise of each partner, that best
meets clearly defined public needs through the appropriate allocation of resources, risks and rewards (National Council for Public Private Partnerships, 2011). This definition provided for a maximal variation sampling technique that allowed for a selection of administrators from a broad range of organizations to include cultural, arts, community service, and education-oriented organizations in a Southern urban center. The administrators who served as participants in this qualitative study worked in executive and top-level administrative positions within the aforementioned organizations, hence, all were viewed professionally as leaders within their respective fields.

All of the participants involved in this qualitative study who worked as administrators were engaged in shared leadership and, as leaders, had contributed to the development of shared leadership. As discussed in Chapter 1, shared leadership models and processes can be rather complex, and ideas concerning what particular models actually entail can be quite diverse. Definitions of shared leadership models often vary from author to author and from philosophical scholar to philosophical scholar. For example, terminology such as “participatory leadership” and “shared leadership” may be used interchangeably by one researcher and mean something completely different to another. The term “distributed leadership” is another that is used interchangeably at times with “shared leadership.” Some researchers have attempted to distinguish between the terms by offering distinctive definitions.
Nevertheless, for the purposes of this qualitative study, Pearce and Conger’s (2003) definition of shared leadership was applied. Pearce and Conger (2003) defined shared leadership as a dynamic, interactive process of influence among individuals in groups for which the objective is to lead one another to the achievement of group or organizational goals or both. Pearce and Conger (2003) also added that the process of shared leadership often involves peer, or lateral, influence and at other times involves upward or downward hierarchical influence. This idea is grounded in the notion that a single leader cannot inherently possess every quality or leadership dimension necessary to meet the difficult challenges confronting today’s rather complex organizations.

Procedure

This qualitative research study was conducted over a period of one calendar year. Approximately four months were spent by the researcher identifying the research problem, conducting a comprehensive review of the literature, identifying a gap within the literature, creating a theoretical framework, and developing a purpose for the study. Another four months were devoted to the process of data collection, which included one-on-one interviews between the researcher and each participant. During the final four months, the researcher remained dedicated to the process of data analysis, reporting the findings, and interpreting the information.

During the process leading to that of data collection, the researcher adhered to the proper protocol outlined by Yin (2003) and Creswell (2008).
Access to the participants was gained by sending recruitment letters to the
gatekeeper identified earlier in this chapter as the deputy director of operations
within the city’s municipal government (see Appendix C). Once gatekeeper
clearance was secured, the participants were invited to participate in the study
and given informed letters of consent (see Appendix D). In addition, all
participants received copies of the IRB approval form (see Appendix E).

Adherence to proper procedural protocols continued throughout the
process of data collection, as well. Participants granted permission to the
researcher to record each one-on-one interview. Each participant was
interviewed in an office setting behind closed doors. Artificial noisemakers were
also employed to ensure privacy during the interviews. These recorded
interviews were stored electronically on a password-protected computer, and
only the researcher had access to this computer. Furthermore, the transcriptions
derived from the interviews were securely stored on the password-protected
computer, as well. As discussed in Chapter 3 regarding the anonymity of the
study’s participants, pseudonyms were used by the researcher to conceal and
protect the identity of those involved, and the confidentiality of these
participants was maintained throughout the process of data collection, as well as
the remainder of the research study’s processes.

Data analysis within this qualitative phenomenological study proceeded
as a functional, continual, and inductive process. In Chapter 3, this was
identified as the data analysis spiral (Creswell, 2008); however, the process also
ensued along a cyclical, iterative path of reading and reviewing the data for commonalities, which emerged as themes. The researcher maintained an analytic focus on the context and participants, specifically honing in on the perspectives of the participants (Gay & Airasian, 2003). Moreover, the researcher read the transcripts in their entirety several times to become immersed in the details and by doing so, captured a better sense of the interview as a whole before it was coded (Agar, 1980).

The researcher followed several steps within the phenomenological approach to data analysis in this qualitative study. This approach differs in several ways from other qualitative traditions such as case study, ethnography, and grounded theory as previously noted in Chapter 3 (Moustakas, 1994; Creswell, 2008). The first step involved full disclosure of the researcher’s own experiences and was provided in the Ethical Considerations sub-section of Chapter 3, as the researcher had experience working within a shared leadership structure in an organization identified as a public-private partnership, which is quite similar to the organizations that the research study’s participant’s worked within, as well. In the second step, the researcher provided statements from the interviews within this chapter and treated each statement with equal worth. These statements were categorically grouped, and they provided the basis for the themes that ultimately emerged (see Appendix F). In the third step, the researcher’s reflections and descriptions of the collected data were included thereby varying the frames of reference about the phenomenon of shared
leadership development. The descriptions included perspective on how the phenomenon of shared leadership was experienced by the study’s participants. Finally, in the fourth step, the researcher constructed an overall description of the meaning and essence of the experiences in the final sub-section of the chapter.

Every step within the period of the data analysis process was conducted by hand without the assistance of a myriad of data analysis software that currently exists on the market today. The researcher remained confident that the themes developed from this qualitative study accurately depicted the phenomenon of shared leadership development as each of the study’s participants uniquely experienced it.

**Participant Profiles**

Within this sub-section of Chapter 4, the researcher presented a biographical narrative of the administrators who served as participants in this qualitative phenomenological research study. Each participant was identified by the researcher to meet the definition of an administrator as defined in the Definition of Terms sub-section of Chapter 1. As mentioned by the researcher in Chapter 3, pseudonyms were used to protect the identity of the participants and maintain confidentiality throughout the research process.

As previously cited, the participants in this qualitative study included organizational leaders working as administrators within public-private partnerships. Ten administrators participated in the recorded one-on-one
interviews. A summary of the demographic data collected by way of the probing interview questions was included by the researcher in this sub-section of Chapter 4, as well as a table that highlighted demographic components identified as Table 4.1.

Table 4.1

*Participant Demographics Table*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Credentials</th>
<th>#/Years in Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theresa</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathew</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriel</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Pseudonyms used for participant names*
The sample of participants consisted of seven male and three female administrators. Every participant possessed a graduate degree, a master’s degree of some sort, and three of the participants held doctoral degrees. In addition, each participant had served in their respective leadership capacity for at least seven years, with half of the participants having done so for more than ten years.

**Participant Jennifer.** Participant Jennifer is the director of a large metropolitan cultural arts organization within a Southern urban center. She has been with the organization for just over seven years. Her education includes a Bachelor of Arts degree, as well as a graduate degree. Participant Jennifer has held numerous positions within the organization, all of which were at the supervisory level. Her work schedule is rather flexible; however, she spends much of her time on-site during normal operating hours. Of all of the participants, Participant Jennifer has been affiliated with her respective organization for the least amount of time. However, Participant Jennifer has extensive leadership experience with previous employers, as well as shared leadership experience in her background.

**Participant James.** Participant James is the executive director of another large cultural arts organization within the Southern urban center. He holds a graduate degree and serves on the executive boards of a number of cultural-oriented organizations in the community. Participant James has several decades of teaching experience in K-12 education, as well as higher education. His work schedule within the organization includes well over 40 hours per week.
Participant James has been in his position of leadership with his organization for ten years; however, he has been working for that same organization for nearly ten years, as he has worked in several different capacities including several positions of leadership.

**Participant Robert.** Participant Robert is the director of a small historical and cultural arts center. He has been with the organization in the same capacity for 15 years. Participant Robert has previously held directorships of two organizations in the past, and his education includes a Bachelor of Arts degree, as well as a Master of Arts degree. His work schedule is rarely irregular, as he is on-site within his respective organization during normal operating hours, which includes most weekends. Participant Robert has over twenty years of leadership experience, including several years of shared leadership experience.

**Participant Stephanie.** Participant Stephanie is the director of a large foundation dedicated to cultural arts education and preservation within the community identified as a Southern urban center. Participant Stephanie is also the president and chief operating officer of a large industrial corporation that is locally operated. She has been working in her current position for twenty years, and she has served as an executive board member with several other organizations within the same community for over 10 years. Participant Stephanie has been in her position of leadership the longest compared to any of the other participants in this research study. Her education includes an earned doctoral degree.
Participant Andrew. Participant Andrew is the director of a large park and recreation center located within the Southern urban center. He has served in his current capacity as director for 12 years. Participant Andrew has also served as the interim director of two other local organizations, and he has extensive experience in leadership at top, executive levels. There are nearly 20 other organizations within the community that offer similar services to the organization by which Participant Andrew is currently serving as director. His education includes two Master of Arts degrees, as well as a Ph.D. Participant Andrew works during normal operating hours during the week at his respective organization, as well as most weekends.

Participant Theresa. Participant Theresa is the administrative director of a large community service oriented organization within the Southern urban center. She has been in her current position of leadership for over 16 years, the third longest of any of the study’s participants. Participant Theresa’s education includes a graduate degree, and she has held several different positions of leadership within her organization. Her schedule allows for flexible hours, but she is on site at her organization more than 40 hours per week.

Participant Steven. Participant Steven is the executive director of a community-oriented education organization. He has been the executive director for nine years, the second shortest tenure of this study’s participants. Though he has only been in his current position of leadership for nine years, Participant Steven also served as the chief financial officer for seven years. He has
extensive leadership and shared leadership experience within his current
organization. His current position allows for some travel, but he is mostly
located on site at his organization.

Participant Michael. Participant Michael is the administrator of a large
cultural arts attraction within the Southern urban center. He has served in his
current capacity for 10 years, and he has been employed by the organization for
15 years. Participant Michael holds two graduate degrees, and he is the only
participant in this research study who serves in dual capacities within one
organization. Participant Michael is also his organization’s board chairperson.
He works a regular business-hour schedule at 40 hours per week, and he is
always on site at his respective organization.

Participant Matthew. Participant Matthew is the executive director and
chief executive officer community service and education-oriented organization
within the Southern urban center. Though his position reflects two titles, it is
only one position within the organization. Participant Matthew has held that
position for 13 years. He represents one of the three participants who possess an
earned doctoral degree. Participant Matthew is on site during the business hours
of most days; however, he has recently been working to establish a second
location within the same Southern urban center.

Participant Gabriel. Participant Gabriel is the director of a large
community-based service organization. He has served in his current position as
director for 19 years. This represents the second longest tenure of all of the
study’s participants. Participant Gabriel was the director of a similar organization for five years before assuming his current position. He holds a Bachelor of Science degree, as well as a Master of Arts degree. Participant Gabriel has significant leadership experience, as well as shared leadership experience. He works irregular hours with regard to a business week, but Participant Gabriel is usually on site at his current organization for more than 40 hours per week.

The purposeful sampling method of maximal variation sampling was used by the researcher to ensure that all of the research study’s participants had relevant experience with the phenomenon of shared leadership development under investigation in this qualitative inquiry. The criteria for selecting the administrators as participants were based on the participants’ leadership positions, their organizations, and the shared leadership structure within their organizations.

The identities of the participants, as well as their respective organizations, were presented in a manner as to ensure confidentiality. However, confidentiality of personal identity, organizational identity, and other identifiable information did not impede data collection, data analysis, or presentation of the findings. Pseudonyms were randomly assigned to protect the identity of the participants involved in this research study and were not particular to any known individual.
At the beginning of each interview, probing questions were asked to help the researcher describe the study’s participants. The participants provided information relative to their educational experience, professional work experience, leadership experience, and shared leadership experience. The intent of collecting this data was to help the researcher in describing the composition of the ten participants. The researcher made a conscious effort to ensure credibility, transferability, and dependability to indicate the quality of the data gathered in this qualitative inquiry (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

All of the participants disclosed that they had been working for each of their respective organizations for at least seven years, with some disclosing that they had been working in a leadership capacity within their organization for twenty years or more. Every participant was a high school and college graduate. All of the ten participants held graduate degrees, with three of the ten having reached the doctoral level. Gender-specific questions were not a part of this qualitative inquiry; nevertheless, seven of the ten participants were male and three were female. Again, a summary of this information was included by the researcher in Table 4.1.

Following the researcher’s transcription of each interview, the hard-copy transcript was returned to each participant for his or her review. This verification procedure, identified in Chapter 3 as member-checking, was used in this qualitative research study because it allowed the participants to verify the data and to ensure that it accurately reflected their experiences (Creswell &
Plano Clark, 2011). It was significant to mention that no changes were noted by this study’s participants due to this verification procedure.

For the purposes of this qualitative phenomenological inquiry, the experiences of the participants were presented in a narrative form. Direct quotations have been included, taken directly from the verbatim transcriptions of the one-on-one interviews, to highlight the textual and structural experiences of the participants. A number of themes emerged from the detailed process of data analysis of the interview transcriptions, and they are presented throughout the remainder of Chapter 4.

**Identification of Themes**

In the following sub-sections of Chapter 4, the researcher included information regarding the data that emerged into themes following data analysis of the participant interview sessions. Direct quotes were used, and these direct quotations provided the basis by which the researcher identified the study’s themes. Data were extracted directly from each of the participants’ interview transcripts, as they were relevant to each of this qualitative study’s research questions. Only excerpts of the participant interviews that were relevant to the inquiry were included. Participant responses to questions during the one-on-one interview process that were not pertinent to leadership development methods in response to this study’s research questions were not considered applicable to this inquiry.
The fourteen interview questions focused on the perceptions and experiences of the study’s participants. These questions were carefully considered in regards to this qualitative research study’s design, as well as the study’s topic and research questions (see Appendix C). The interviews lasted between fifty minutes and one hour in duration. The themes that emerged were identified from the responses to the interview questions and emerged through the researcher’s use of the process of “horizontalization.” The researcher employed the method of horizontalization by which the interview transcriptions were reviewed and combed for significant or meaningful statements relevant to the phenomenon of shared leadership development, as well as the research questions (Moustakas, 1994). These meaningful statements, or “horizons,” were clustered into groups according to similarities of the experiences described by the participants. The themes were then selected by the researcher for their relevance to the central research question and sub-questions of this qualitative research study.

The development of horizon statements represented a transformative process. The process of horizontalization included such components as point-of-view and understanding, as well as the “fusion” of these components (Gadamer, 1990). Therefore, fusion of horizon suggested a formation of different vantage points through such dialogue as the conversations during the one-on-one interviews and the researcher’s interpretations (Moustakas, 1994). In the case of
this research study, the fusion occurred when one horizon was understood in order to explain another.

Multiple thoughts and perspectives from the study’s participants, as well as the researcher, intersected in this inquiry, as so often is the case with qualitative research (Turner, 2003). At the point of merger with regard to understanding on the part of the study’s participants and the researcher, fusion of horizon occurred. In this chapter, fusion of horizon was demonstrated through description of the researcher’s understanding of the phenomena of shared leadership development, combined with each participant’s responses and statements resulting from the one-on-one interviews. The data resulting from the interviews served to help create the texts for interpretation. For the researcher, who subscribed to the hermeneutic school of phenomenological thought, this represented the path to interpretative understanding and allowed for a method to reveal authenticity (Sokolowski, 2000).

As the researcher stated in Chapter 1, the following central research question was addressed: How do administrators engaged in public-private partnerships experience the phenomenon of shared leadership development? The following issue sub-question was also addressed: What development strategies do these administrators use? In addition, a procedural sub-question was addressed: How did the development strategies and methods unfold within the public-private partnership? After a thorough review of the interview transcripts, seven themes emerged from the process of data analysis regarding the research
questions. These themes were identified as “tenure longevity,” “climate balance,” “face-to-face synergy,” “give-and-take exchange,” “decision-making process connection,” “a stake in the vision,” and “fluid operations.” For each of these themes, relevant statements were clustered. Though common themes emerged, the particular experience for each participant was rather unique relative to the lived experience with the phenomenon of shared leadership development. The one-on-one interviews yielded rich data and the following sub-sections of Chapter 4 served as a report of the findings following the data coding process and process of data analysis. Themes and codes were also summarized within a theme and data-coding codebook (see Appendix G).

As the researcher discovered, the identified themes of tenure longevity, climate balance, face-to-face synergy, give-and-take exchange, decision-making process connection, a stake in the vision, and fluid operations emerged only after thorough and repeated reviews and personal reflections on the part of the researcher upon the collected data. Through this comprehensive process, the researcher discovered the voice of each participating administrator materializing to describe the individual perceptions about shared leadership, as well as perspectives on how shared leadership was developed.

Each of the identified themes that emerged through the process of data analysis received its own constructed narrative from the researcher to depict how it contributed to a detailed understanding of shared leadership development within public-private partnerships and how practitioners who served as
participants understood this phenomenon. Successive reflections contributed to
the researcher’s assurance that the following report of the data accurately
reflected and addressed the research questions that guided this qualitative
research study. The seven themes that emerged from the interviews with
administrators working within public-private partnerships, coupled with the
resulting analysis of the data, served as the manner in which shared leadership
development was experienced.

**Data Analysis Example**

As previously described in Chapter 4, the researcher applied the process
of horizontalization by which the transcriptions of interviews with the study’s
participants were divided into statements. These statements were transformed
into meanings expressed within the phenomenological concept of shared
leadership development. This process of de-contextualization of the data into
invariant structures of data allowed for the statements to be clustered into
categories, or themes, which supported a related theme. For example, a majority
of administrators who served as participants in this research study referred to
their respective experience with shared leadership development in terms of their
“longevity” as administrators within their organizations. These participants
believed that shared leadership development was even possible because the
shared leadership structure took significant time to develop during a significant
period-of-time in which they filled their respective positions of leadership.
Horizon statements were then clustered into groups of similar meaning. Statements referring to “longevity,” “adaptation over time,” “long process,” “time,” and “tenure” emerged to form the theme of “tenure longevity.” This theme served to answer the central research question of how administrators engaged in public-private partnerships experience the phenomenon of shared leadership development, as well as the procedural sub-question of how the development strategies unfurled. The research data was then scrutinized even more closely to ensure accuracy. The procedure for data analysis observed by the researcher, a utilization of phenomenological methods, was provided in Figure 4.1
Figure 4.1

Data Analysis Procedures

Begin:
- Set aside judgment, prejudice, and view the phenomenon with a fresh eye (view of a transcendental ego)
- Verbatim transcript

Transcendental-phenomenological reduction:
- Consider the phenomenon with an open mind, and consider it from different perspectives
- Identify units of meaning/segment (invariant horizons)
- Horonalization: each segment has equal value.
- The outcome is textual (the what) description of the phenomenon

Imaginative variation:
- From the textual description, construct the structural (the how) epitome of the experience
- This procedure requires imagination and intuition to reflect the relationship (themes) pertinent to the experience

Synthesize:
- Combine textual and structural descriptions to form a textual structural essence of the experience, emphasizing on the space and time when the phenomenon is observed

- Repeat the process for each participant until saturation

- Combine the textual-structural description into a composite description representing the essence of experience of the whole group

Introduction of Themes

Of the seven themes that emerged from the interview transcriptions, tenure longevity, climate balance, and fluid operations served to answer the central research question. The themes of face-to-face synergy, give-and-take exchange, and fluid operations provided for answers to the issue sub-question. The themes of a stake in the vision, decision-making process connection, tenure longevity and fluid operations all materialized to answer the procedural sub-question.

As the participants shared their experiences with shared leadership development, the researcher discovered that many of these experiences were also manners by which the participants overcame challenges and barriers. In addition, two of the themes that emerged, tenure longevity and fluid operations, emerged to answer two of the research questions, or in the case of fluid operations, all three of the research questions. The primary focus of this qualitative research study was to explore the shared leadership development strategies and methods of administrators engaged in public-private partnerships. Had these particular individuals not received the opportunity to serve in such long-term capacities as administrators, perhaps the subsequent themes may not have emerged as they did.

Throughout the remainder of Chapter 4, the researcher provided for a detailed description of each of the seven themes of tenure longevity, climate balance, give-and-take exchange, face-to-face synergy, decision-making process
connection, a stake in the vision, and fluid operations that emerged following data analysis. Each of the themes are presented and supported layer by layer with rich, thick descriptive statements gathered from the transcriptions of interviews, all of which were verified and checked by the participants involved in the study (Geertz, 1973).

**tenure longevity.** The experiences of the administrators in this study shared a rather broad narrative in explaining how they experienced the phenomenon of shared leadership development. Explanations varied but primarily focused on the concept that they had been practitioners within their field and organization for a significant period-of-time. An integral part in explaining how they experienced shared leadership development was tied to the time they had spent in a position of leadership so that they could see the process of leadership development through.

A common experience for all ten participants was longevity with regard to their respective tenure as administrators within the organizations they served. Viewing shared leadership development as a process contributed to this notion. The participants viewed leadership as a shared process between members of their organizations, but this process took significant time to develop. Participant James remarked, “Now, this is not something that just happened over night…it took time, a long time. You see, I’ve been here for than twenty years, and I can tell you, it’s still a work in progress.”
The administrative positions held by the participants of this study allowed for the implementation of shared leadership structures and strengthened the leadership within their organizations in decentralized styles. The fact that all had endured years of service within top levels of organizational administration facilitated a climate, over time, which helped to ensure organization-wide acknowledgement, support, and commitment in changing the culture. When referring to how he experienced shared leadership in his current organization, Participant Robert stated, “I never viewed sharing leadership as a quick fix to any problem, and I never used it like that.” Participant Robert added, “I’m all about planning. That’s how I work…and just like with any plan, it takes time. Involving others in leading is the same way….that’s how I approached it from the beginning.”

The emphasis placed upon time was weaved into the manner by which all participants experienced the phenomenon of shared leadership. Participant Andrew explained, “Accomplishing goals is important…but we have to remember that as leaders, we are also here to grow others, and what does that take? Well, it takes work, and a lot of time goes into that.” Along with this concept, Participant Andrew mentioned the idea of delegation. Participant Andrew stated, “Why do we delegate to members of a work team? Well, we don’t do it to pass along the buck or lighten the workload…we do it to grow others within the group or within the organization as a whole. I guess I would
kind of liken it to planting a seed and growing it...that seed just doesn’t bloom as soon as you plant it.”

Several participants referred to “visions” they had for their organization, which also fused into another theme discussed later in this chapter identified as “a stake in the vision.” With regard to tenure longevity, Participant Stephanie described what she meant by this term when she explained, “Part of my job when I came onboard as director here was to create a vision, and then get folks onboard with this vision. I knew I couldn’t implement a vision unless I had people who shared that vision. I knew that if I wanted to be here for the long haul, that I had to surround myself with those who shared the same vision...and sometimes, people didn’t share in my vision. Whenever anyone left, I made sure that new hires did.” Along the same lines of a vision for their organization, Participant Matthew stated, “When it came to creating a vision, I wanted to include everyone from the beginning. It wasn’t a matter of me, me, me. It was us, us, us, from the beginning...and that meant, well, that was important to me. That might not be the best thing for some people in a position like this, but I wanted that vision to endure...and I thought that was the best way.”

Within the theme of tenure longevity, one of the study’s participants experienced shared leadership as an extension of the power from his position. Participant Steven explained, “My experience with this system has been overwhelmingly good...it’s like I have a bunch of me running around here...I always thought and joked about wanting to clone myself, and this kind of a
system allows me to do just that…but it takes the right kind of people, and sometime you have to develop those people in the long run. As a leader, that’s your job.” Regarding this idea of developing people, Participant Steven added, “As I’m getting older now, I find myself spending more and more time doing that…but in the end, it definitely makes things easier for me.”

Participant Gabriel experienced shared leadership in terms of a commitment to a more lateral approach to organizational administration. Participant Gabriel mentioned, “I really care about what we do here, and I believe in what we do. You know, good leaders often have to come up with unique ways of doing things…and they have to inspire and empathize and recognize. I’m committed to those things, but I want that commitment to be collective.” Participant Gabriel also mentioned, “You can’t just do those things every now and then. I realized that if it was gonna work and we were gonna be successful, than everyone had to be committed, just like a team.” In expressing the experience of shared leadership as a commitment, the researcher interpreted this to be a process, just as the participants of the study experienced shared leadership as a process. In terms of the theme of tenure longevity, the interpreted process of commitment, or binding to a course of action, emerged into the identified theme.

The data provided by the participants included unique perspectives on shared leadership development within public-private partnerships as an alternative to the typical hierarchical structures within many organizations and
entities. The participants experienced the development of shared leadership within the theme of tenure longevity, and the process of data analysis revealed this significance. This emergent theme served as one particular explanation for the central research question of this qualitative study: How do the administrators engaged in public-private partnerships experience the phenomenon of shared leadership development?

In addition to the significance of tenure longevity in answering the central research question, this emergent theme served as an explanation for the following procedural sub-question: How did the shared leadership development strategies and methods within the public-private partnership unfold? Specific methods and strategies emerged following the process of data analysis, and these are explained in this chapter serving as the report on the study’s findings. Yet, it was important to note that the strategies and methods reported unfolded over time. The methods and strategies that emerged as themes in response to the issue sub-question also emerged within tenure longevity in response to the procedural sub-question.

It was important for the researcher to disclose that through the process of coding the collected data and classifying the text within the participant interview transcriptions, the theme of tenure longevity emerged as a result from seven of the ten participants. The experiences of Participants James, Robert, Andrew, Stephanie, Matthew, Steven and Gabriel contributed to the identified theme of tenure longevity. Though the remaining three, Participants Theresa, Michael and
Jennifer did not provide data that materialized into this identified theme, the researcher felt that it was equally important to consider the fact that these participants had been in their positions of leadership within their respective organizations for at least seven years.

**climate balance.** Achieving balance and having the ability to change leadership styles instinctively according to events, timing, and those working with each participant proved to be a crucial component of the shared leadership development experience for study participants. The attempt to maintain some balance with regard to organizational climate, let alone to achieve it, served as another explanation of the central research questions: How do administrators engaged in public-private partnerships experience the phenomenon of shared leadership development?

Within the context of the shared leadership development experience in regards to the theme of climate balance, Participant Theresa explained, “I find my leadership style constantly changing...no particular leadership style fully replaces the other, and one can’t stand alone when you deal with the complexities that I deal with on a day-to-day basis.”

The theme of climate balance appeared to be emphasized when participants discussed challenges or barriers within the organization and workplace. “When challenges are presented to me, the ability to balance human resources, capitol, and my personal preferences in support of my goals becomes increasingly more difficult, and my responsibilities even greater,” explained
Participant Robert. Participant Jennifer remarked, “There’s a great deal of symmetry here, and I think everyone feels it. When problems arise, we all deal with em’.” When it came to organizational challenges, the theme of climate balance also appeared as a medium by which solutions were found. Participant Robert went on to explain, “My role is to help facilitate connections….and this might mean putting the right people in a position where they can best meet a challenge.”

Climate balance also emerged as a theme when participants expressed their shared leadership development experience in terms of the types of people working within the shared leadership structure of the organization. Participant James remarked, “The people I work with don’t always agree with me…and that’s not always a bad thing. I learned from former bosses not to surround myself, at any level now, with “yes” people...that’s not always a good thing.” Participant Steven expressed climate balance by using the term “balance” several times. He stated, “My job is to balance our needs based on who I’ve got on my team…and I truly feel that this is what sharing is…it’s balance.” Participant Stephanie expressed the theme of climate balance when discussing the various skill sets and expertise of the employees within her organization. “We are all professionals here, and we all have something significant to offer…different skills and skill sets…why not take advantage of that, I thought.”

Other participants expressed the theme of climate balance in terms of managing resources. This was the case with two participants in particular,
Participant Michael and Participant Gabriel. These two participants had the largest number of people working within each of their organizations. Due to the size of their organizations with regard to people, Participant Michael and Participant Gabriel took strategic approaches to organizational leadership and the identified theme of climate balance. Participant Michael stated, “I constantly have to redefine and reevaluate the lines of power I give to others….we’ve got a lot of responsibilities, but then again, we’ve got a lot of people to meet these head-on.” Participant Gabriel explained climate balance in similar terms and stated, “From the time I started, I gathered everyone’s input on which areas would fall where, and who oversee these areas.” Participant Gabriel also added, “Too much centralization can be a pitfall when it comes to making a system like this work.”

One participant described the theme of climate balance in terms of organizational structure. This concerned moving between traditional hierarchical structures and shared forms. The experience was based on the types of issues that would arise. These issues were not necessarily problems. Rather, the climate balance was experienced when the participant moved between structures to address these issues. Participant Stephanie explained, “Now, my experience with sharing the leadership role is not one that I would consider a hundred percent. Sometimes, I feel like I work within a hybrid position…sometimes team player, sometimes manager.”
Eight participants, Participants Michael, Gabriel, Steven, Jennifer, James, Robert, Theresa, and Stephanie expressed their experiences with shared leadership development in terms that emerged to form the theme of climate balance. The conceptual ideas that surround this theme were understood by the study’s participants in terms of the complexity of their organizations. In the case of this research study, the organizations were public-private partnerships. The multitude of roles, responsibilities, abilities, challenges, and issues could potentially serve to upset or improve organizational structure, as well as the climate that permeates an organization. Through experiencing shared leadership development in terms of the emergent theme of climate balance, the participants shared a propensity to embrace that concept.

**face-to-face synergy.** As with any kind of organizational structure, developing one grounded in shared leadership involves particular methods in the establishment of characteristics associated with any organization such as the establishment of goals, reciprocity, and joint efforts. This research study’s issue sub-question sought to answer the following question: What shared leadership development strategies are used by administrators engaged in public-private partnerships? The theme of face-to-face synergy emerged during data analysis as an answer to this research question.

Communication is often identified as a crucial dimension of leadership, whether the leadership roles are shared or not, within any organization or group. All of the participants in this qualitative research study working as
administrators within public-private partnerships stressed the importance of communication in the workplace in many ways; however, particular emphasis was placed upon the idea of face-to-face communications by a majority of the participants, which emerged to form the theme of face-to-face synergy in response to the research study’s issue sub-question. In addition, the participants recognized that their impact as leaders within their respective organizations flowed from when, where, and how they did or did not communicate in a face-to-face manner with other organizational members.

The theme of face-to-face synergy emerged in the wake of a virtual revolution. The world has witnessed significant advancements in electronic communications methods utilized in all sorts of workplaces today. While the immense volume and sheer speed of communication has increased exponentially over the last decade with more and more people having easy access to email, texting, and other means of communication such as social media via computers, tablets, and “smart” devices, face-to-face discussions have typically fallen by the wayside.

In terms of a shared leadership development method, Participant Andrew stated, “I make a conscious effort to talk to people in-person… constantly.” He added, “I think that as leaders, we should be self-aware so as to manage this type [in-person] of communication well and constantly learn and develop…and I don’t mean this only as leaders, but as communicators. It’s a fundamental thing.”
Participant Jennifer added another perspective to the concept of interacting face-to-face with other members of the organization and contributed to the identification of the emergent theme of face-to-face synergy. She remarked, “An important idea to remember is that communication doesn’t include talking, emailing, or texting to others exclusively...I always try to listen to what others are saying, pay close attention, and ask for clarification whenever necessary….and I show it, I demonstrate it.” Participant Gabriel echoed these very same sentiments. He affirmed, “You have to be responsive when you’re in a position of shared leadership. This involves sitting down with your counterparts and listening to what they have to say.” Participant Gabriel added, “Often, I try to summarize what someone just told me as I’m having a conversation with them just to demonstrate the fact that I had been paying attention to what they were saying...this shows them that I think what they’re saying is important, and that’s important to me.”

While the participants discussed the identified theme of face-to-face synergy as a positive method of shared leadership development, it was significant for the researcher to note that two participants referred to “barriers” specifically associated with face-to-face interactions. For example, Participant Stephanie discussed barriers that may be presented as a challenge to effective face-to-face communication within an organization. Participant Stephanie explained, “You never want to pass judgment on those you’re working with... what we do here is not personal, and I always try to set aside my personal
Participant Matthew mentioned “distractions,” which can be perceived as barriers to the identified theme of face-to-face synergy, as well. Distractions can take many forms; yet, these were generally described by Participant Matthew as “anything that could compromise the flow of information or communication between organizational members.” Furthermore, Participant Matthew added, “Take sending an email for example, you can’t see how that person reacts…facial features and what not…and an email or a text can’t tell you something in jest.”

Participant James expressed the emergent theme of face-to-face synergy within the context of organizational production. He disclosed, “You know, too often, too many people try to take the easy way out…they don’t talk to one another anymore. In most cases, I think, they end up wasting more time emailing or texting and waiting for a response.” Participant James further explained, “Sometimes, I think I get more from someone else when I look them in the eyes and ask them a question…probably way more than I would in a text message.”

Within the context of the theme identified as face-to-face-synergy, Participant Robert took somewhat of a philosophical approach. He remarked, “Interpersonal discussion are like the foundation for good communication…and once this groundwork is laid, you can build on other forms of communication.” Along these lines, Participant Steven also mentioned, “Sure, sending emails and
texts can be effective in certain situations, but it might delay a decision on something. Plus, having a conversation with someone in-person builds trust.”

A majority of participants within this qualitative inquiry provided data on shared leadership development methods that lead to the identified theme of face-to-face synergy. Though they seemingly understood the importance of other forms of communication in the rapidly changing work environments of their respective organizations today, they also understood that there were certainly particular methods for particular times. Face-to-face synergy emerged as a theme within this study, and not only as a development method regarding shared leadership in response to the research study’s issue sub-question, but it emerged as a preference for the study’s participants, as well. In addition, within the shared structures of the study’s participants in this qualitative inquiry, face-to-face synergy materialized as a process. More so than any other form, this process was one that assured, largely, that communication was clear and understood for the long-term.

**give-and-take exchange.** As transcriptions from the participants’ interviews were coded and categorized, and as themes unfolded, the concept of give-and-take exchange emerged as a prevailing theme during the data analysis process. Participants commented on the importance of this theme with regard to shared leadership development methods, thus, providing another response to the research study’s issue sub question: What shared leadership development methods are used by administrators engaged in public-private partnerships?
Participants described the identified theme of give-and-take exchange not only as a concept of interaction with others, but as a manner by which others viewed themselves within the organization, as well. Participant Theresa explained, “In a similar sense, compromise could lead to re-evaluations of many aspects of the organization itself…including an individual’s role as a leader.” Participant Gabriel also remarked, “For others to be engaged, you gotta create a resonant workplace…you may have to give in at times…but this can help create better work relationships.”

Give-and-take exchange was expressed by participants as a measure that can better serve the organization as a whole, as well as the leadership therein, when it is utilized throughout the respective organization. However, Participant Michael warned, “Mismanagement of this [compromise] or irresponsible practices can prove detrimental to your credibility.” While discussing information that emerged into the theme of give-and-take exchange, some participants stressed the importance of timing. Participant Jennifer stated, “If you don’t give in or compromise at the right time…on the right issues, then the impact can be misunderstood or even diluted a good bit.”

One participant mentioned that the process associated with the identified theme of give-and-take exchange was not always something that leaders found easy to put into practice, and that it could prove rather difficult at times, as well. Participant Andrew stated, “As the executive director, I have to say that my part in adjusting my stance on something like some important issue can’t be
overstated.” Participant Andrew added, “Overall, our success is dependent upon it [give-and-take]...I have to be willing at times...and this has to be stressed because all too often, managers and supervisors don’t always get that. This includes everyone, whether they are in position of management or supervision, or not.”

Among the study’s participants, the identified theme of give-and-take exchange served as a response to the research study’s issue sub-question. The theme also emerged as much more than just some conceptual idea of the lively exchange of ideas within conversation. Instead, it included an in-depth process that can potentially expose organizational or shared leadership challenges. When developing shared leadership structures within the context of the identified theme of give-and-take exchange, the participants of this study in positions of leadership as administrators stressed that this concept can be a helpful method in developing shared leadership structures, and a powerful tool in assessing shared leadership development progress, as well.

**decision-making process connection.** Decision-making alone is usually intertwined with the concept of leadership, or management and supervision for that matter. The approaches taken by the participants involved in this qualitative research study relied heavily on the input of others within the organization. By definition, the public-private partnerships under study as part of this qualitative inquiry were complex organizations. Within these complex environments, complex issues were sure to arise. The participants in this study emphasized the
gravity to which others participating within the shared leadership structure felt a connection to the process of decision-making. Keeping others connected to decision-making processes served yet as another answer to the research study’s procedural sub-question: How did the shared leadership development methods unfold within the public-private partnership?

Six of the study’s ten participants, Participants Michael, Matthew, Steven, James, Andrew, and Jennifer remarked about the manner in which shared leadership development unfolded within their respective organization within the context of the identified theme of decision-making process connection. Among these six participants, the quality of this identified theme was also indicated.

Participant Michael phrased his sentiment regarding the theme of decision-making process connection in the form of a question when he stated, “If you really needed to get something done…who are you going to turn to make it happen…someone who believes in it and feels connected to it?” Participant Matthew placed particular value on the decision-making process connection when he remarked, “Let me tell you, it’s like intellectual capital…you want that investment from others…and it surely helps.” Participant Matthew made another point related to the emergent theme of decision-making process connection when he asked another rhetorical question, “What’s decision making all about…connecting others…connecting others to you and everyone as a whole, as an organization.”
Participant Steven expressed his feelings regarding the value of the identified theme of decision-making process connection as “buy-in.” This term was used by Participant James, as well. Participant James explained his position by saying, “You gotta understand, I worked in sales…as I rose through the ranks in my professional career, everything is a sell…everything is a buy-in. You hear this stuff all the time in marketing…they preach this stuff to you, this kind of rhetoric….but it’s not just talk, it’s real.”

Participant Andrew described regular staff meetings held at least on a bi-weekly basis. He stated, “I try to bring everyone together on a regular basis…it’s good to make sure that we’re always on the same page.” Along the same approach, Participant Jennifer mentioned a process by which the leadership within her organization came together not regularly, but upon major decisions that needed to be made regarding various issues. Participant Jennifer emphasized the concept of “unity” in terms of the identified theme of decision-making process connection. Participant Jennifer explained, “When it comes to major issues…and big decisions have to be made, then we want to be unified…we don’t want feelings of disconnect. That’s the point.”

**a stake in the vision.** Participants mentioned the establishment of a vision when referring to their experiences with shared leadership development within their organizations defined as public-private partnerships, as well as the importance of a connection between the established vision and members of the organization. This was discussed earlier within the context of the identified
theme of tenure longevity and in response to this qualitative research study’s central research question: How do administrators engaged in public-private partnerships experience the phenomenon of shared leadership development. In addition, the theme of a stake in the vision also emerged as another theme in response to the research study’s procedural sub-question: How did the shared leadership development strategies unfold within the public-private partnership?

Participants in this research study emphasized the concept of a stake in the vision as one in which the ends are concerned, as well as the means. Participant Theresa stated, “People believing in what you’re trying to do as an organization, as a team, is absolutely paramount. If you want to be effective and successful in sharing leadership…in sharing responsibility…you have to constantly assess and reassess the climate. You have to step back and ask yourself, do people believe in this? Do they feel a part of this?” Similarly, Participant Matthew mentioned, “I make decisions with members of my staff everyday but overall, I have to consider what’s in it for them, too.” Participant Matthew added a bit of humor when he remarked quite poignantly, “My mother used to tell me, it’s not all about you, son.”

Participant Gabriel highlighted the significance of the emergent theme of a stake in the vision when he discussed his organizational staff meetings. Participant Gabriel remarked, “I want to be sure to always convey the importance I give to team efforts across the board… I begin every one of my staff meetings with a team-building exercise…and not just any exercise, but one that hits-home
a message about our vision...something to tie it all in...everything I do in that regard means something.”

Participant Stephanie expressed the concept of a stake in the vision in terms of communication. In the form of a question, she asked, “As a leader, I have to formulate or approve of a vision for this organization, but if I don’t express that vision or communicate it clearly, how can I expect those around me to invest in it? Along those same lines regarding communication of a vision to create an “investment” or stake in that vision, Participant Andrew stated, “I try to emphasize my own core values when I bring others into the fold about what I see for the future…and I think about what others will gravitate towards.”

Within the accounts of the administrators who served as participants in this qualitative study, the identified theme of a stake in the vision represented a non-linear process, as the manner in which the shared leadership development methods were not fixed. This concept was built upon in the following theme identified as fluid operations, which also served to answer the procedural sub-question: How did the shared leadership development strategies and methods unfold within the public-private partnership? In addition, the theme that emerged as fluid operations also served to answer the central research question: How do administrators engaged in public-private partnerships experience the phenomenon of shared leadership development? Fluid operations also offered a response to the issue sub-question: What shared leadership development strategies are used by administrators engaged in public-private partnerships?
**fluid operations.** It was significant to mention that fluid operations emerged as a theme to serve as an appropriate answer to all three of this qualitative study’s research questions. The participants experienced shared leadership development within their organizations as fluid operations, which stood in striking contrast to rigid procedures. The adoption of this identified theme was also utilized as a development method. Furthermore, the other identified methods that served as emergent themes in this report also unfolded under the proverbial umbrella of fluid operations as an overarching theme. The varying responses of the participants of this research study that are provided in the following sub-section of this chapter contributed to the emergence of the theme of fluid operations.

Within the shared leadership structures of their organizations, the participants who served as administrators within public-private partnerships demonstrated shared leadership fluidity without compromising fundamental principles in their overall organizational administration. Participant Michael commented, “There’s no one-size-fits-all style when it comes to sharing responsibility, or sharing in decisions.” Participant Steven remarked, “I think timing and temperament can always impact your response.”

In contrast to the concept of rigidity as previously mentioned, Participant Robert stated, “I try not to always take a hard line on things…now that doesn’t mean I’ll compromise what I feel is right, but I tend to think more about the grey areas when others are involved.” Participant James explained his position on this
identified theme, “I used to be a Marine...improvise, adapt, overcome was my mantra. I’m not hard to the core, or should I say the Corps with a capital ‘C’ and a ‘p’ as in ‘Marine Corps,’ but I use that experience to stay flexible.”

In terms of fluid operations, Participant Jennifer expressed her views as “opportunities.” She explained, “From the moment I arrived here, I made sure that the business-as-usual approach would be left by the wayside...I wanted everyone around me to start thinking along the lines of new opportunities for themselves...getting out of their normal routines, and I thought that was very important when it came to sharing ideas.” In a similar sense, Participant Matthew stated, “I try not to get caught up in old habits...developing those around me, it wasn’t always easy, but you’ve got to be ready to adapt.”

The participants in this qualitative research study have been leading their respective organizations in rapidly changing environments. They are changing and adapting with regard to demographics, economics, and technology, among so many other factors. Building on this idea, Participant Gabriel recalled, “A plan itself is often changed or altered because of changing circumstances.” Indeed, for the study’s participants, the notion of fluid processes or fluid operations helped to facilitate the shared leadership development process.

Essence of Experiences

As described in Chapter 3, the researcher subscribed to the hermeneutic school of thought regarding phenomenological research. This approach excluded the concept of bracketing, which when applied to a research study claims that the
The researcher must maintain a neutral stance and remove the “self” and biases from the position of inquiry (Creswell, 2008). In the manner of hermeneutic thought within phenomenological inquiry, the researcher brought background, fore-projections, pre-understandings, and biases to bear in the reciprocal act of understanding (Turner, 2003).

The researcher’s understanding was both a process and a mode of being. Therefore, understanding was dependent on a number of inter-subjective factors, including traditions of shared language, history, and culture between the researcher and the participants (Gadamer, 1989). The process of understanding in this study was an epistemological issue (Turner, 2003). In Chapter 3, the researcher disclosed a personal philosophical assumption that aligned with pragmatism. Considering the epistemology of this paradigm, the researcher interacted with the participants of this research study, so the findings were created through the interaction between the researcher and the participants. As a pragmatist, the researcher fundamentally believed that epistemological issues such as this, as well as questions concerning subjectivity and objectivity, could only exist on a continuum rather than on antagonistic sides (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009).

The researcher considered interpretation to be a way to grasp and create meaning through pre-understanding so that a better understanding may be clarified and hidden meanings possibly revealed (Allen, 1995). In addition, the researcher’s interpretation emphasized the manner in which particular
understanding came into being. For these reasons, the hermeneutic phenomenological method utilized by the researcher acknowledges that the phenomenon of shared leadership development experienced by administrators working within public-private partnerships could best be understood in the context of the participants and the researcher actually being in that reality (Geanello, 1998).

The concepts used for interpretation of the data, consistent with the hermeneutic philosophical method, include the concepts of openness to meaning, pre-understanding, prejudices, and fusion of horizon (Moustakas, 1994). Remaining open to meaning facilitates the exploration of the ways in which particular pre-understandings and prejudices come about (Kvale, 1979). For this phenomenological study, the concept of openness to meaning relates to the researcher’s frame of reference, knowledge, and personal experiences, as well as the socio-political and cultural contexts in which the researcher lives.

According to interpretation within the hermeneutic school of thought, understanding may only be possible through dialogue, with one individual being open to the opinion of another (Moustakas, 1994). For the researcher, the notion of dialogue included the conversations with the study’s participants in the form of one-on-one interviews, as well as the dialogue between the reader and the actual text of this study. This required awareness, on the part of both parties involved, of one’s own bias or prejudice in order to be open to the other’s point of view. The concept of openness to meaning was important in this study as it
facilitated exploration into hidden meaning and unexamined prejudices through acceptance of the researcher’s own biases and prejudices, as well as acceptance of the participants’ perceptions of their own experiences with shared leadership development. During the processes of open dialogue, conversation, and interpretation of the texts, consideration of other values and prejudices included the potential for increased or different understanding (Moustakas, 1994).

Phenomenology represents a qualitative research approach with a focus on the essence of lived experience (Rossman & Rallis 1998). Researchers engaged in phenomenological studies focus in-depth on the meaning of a particular aspect of an experience. Through verbal dialogue between the researcher and the participant, as well as reflection on the part of both, the quintessential meaning of the experience can be revealed. According to Holstein and Gubrium (1994), language is viewed as the mechanism by which meaning is both constructed and conveyed. The purpose of a phenomenological inquiry such as this included description, interpretation, and critical self-reflection into the "world as world" (van Mannen, 1990). Thus, this sub-section of Chapter 4 was presented as the researcher’s commentary on the “essence” of the lived experiences.

Shared, collaborative, participatory, democratic, and distributed leadership were concepts quite familiar to this study’s participants and thus, were familiar concepts within each of their respective work environments. The essence of an organizational structure, which incorporates a shared leadership philosophy, is that the formal designations of “leader” and “follower” are made
indistinct. In turn, what emerges is a structure of relationships based upon mutual influences between and among all. For the participants of this study serving in positions of leadership within public-private partnerships, a shared leadership model was viewed as one such organizational structure that provided a viable alternative to a classic, hierarchical, or vertical leadership model. The shared model developed by this study’s participants provided for an organizational structure where engaged members of each organization had some degree of influence upon organizational success.

Within the organization of each participant, the shared leadership models that were developed were coupled with workplaces consisting of a majority of professional organizational members. Opportunities existed to promote both individual and overall organizational success, and members were afforded additional opportunities to provide input and contribute to the processes of decision-making. In doing so, the members working for and among each of the study’s participants played a significant role in shaping their organizations.

The purpose of this qualitative study was to explore the leadership development strategies and methods of administrators and organizational leaders engaged in public-private partnerships in a Southern urban center. The researcher was able to uncover the manners in which top-level administrators and directors of public-private partnerships developed shared leadership within their respective organizations. The findings demonstrated that participants often encountered challenges with regard to shared leadership development; however,
this was understood by participants to be a part of the shared leadership and shared leadership development processes.

At the core of the essence of participant experiences within this study was recognition of shared leadership development as a process. All of the participants did not simply create a shared leadership structure and quit. Rather, the participants recognized that shared leadership development was a process that would continue through their tenures and perhaps beyond.

Shared leadership development not only represented an ongoing and fluid process, but also one that required continuous assessment and recurrent evaluations to remain flexible and responsive to the rapidly changing work environment. The context of complex organizations, such as public-private partnerships, is ever changing. Public-private partnerships are constantly challenged by increasing complexities. To meet these challenges successfully, the participants of this study engaged in shared leadership development methods to foster knowledge and skill sets among highly skilled and capable organizational team members.

As mentioned in Chapter 1, Pearce and Conger (2003) identified shared leadership as a dynamic process. If it is also ongoing, as it was identified among the participants of this study, then it is indeed developmental and continual, as well. This notion stemmed from the work of Hosking (1988) in which the concept of leadership itself was conceived as an ongoing activity grounded in the processes of social influences.
If at the core of the essence of experience within this qualitative study was recognition of shared leadership development as a process, then that process could be characterized as being rather informal. Perhaps the participants personified this characterization by being informal themselves. The themes that were revealed following the process of coding served as a testament to this characterization.

The identified theme of fluid operations was one such example, which served as a confirmation to the informal characterization. Each participant felt that he or she could not be rigid in his or her ways when developing a shared leadership structure. This translated into their organizational operations.

Rigidity, when it came to shared leadership development within public-private partnerships, did not lend itself well to such a complex organizational structure. Furthermore, rigidity would possibly create a structure incapable of coping or keeping pace with the rapidly changing work environment. The participants of this study have provided the impetus for change within their respective organizations and may very well be contributing to a movement that shifts organizational structures, processes, and the organization itself away from the center, where it is assumed that leaders and organizational members have to adapt to them at some point. Instead, the participants of this study serving in leadership roles shifted the focus on organizational members, empowering them to find their creativity and maximum potential within the organization.
The identified theme of climate balance served as an additional confirmation to the informal characterization of shared leadership development among this study’s participants. Changing leadership styles to fit certain times or situations and having the ability to do so instinctively according to events, timing, and those working for the organization helped maintain climate balance within the organizations. Shared leadership development itself can fundamentally alter the balance of power within an organization, highlighting the corps of the essence of experience when it comes to shared leadership development as previously mentioned, that shared leadership development represented a process or continuum.

The identified theme of face-to-face synergy characterized yet another testament to the notion that shared leadership development among the participants in this qualitative study was an informal process. The theme of face-to-face synergy was not something that had to be created by study participants within formal staff meetings, conferences, or scheduled appointments. Rather, the participants felt that it was important, especially in these times of rapidly changing methods of communication, to maintain relations face-to-face, as opposed to maintaining relations and communication via conference calls, email, text messaging, or other manners that would not allow for such contact.

**essence within the context of “framing.”** The essence of experiences of the participants involved in this study coincided with the dispositions of Bolman
and Deal (2008), a work cited by the researcher previously in Chapter 3. The participants contended that what they have done to this point in their positions of leadership in the way of shared leadership development has been quite successful. Bolman and Deal (2008) suggested that effective leadership requires a broad understanding of theories, organizations, and human relationships and offer four “frames,” or “lenses” that provide for rather effective tools, which leaders can utilize to gain this broad understanding. The findings of this study revealed the essence of this concept. Table 4.2 was provided on the following page to highlight the concept of Bolman and Deal’s (2008) Four-Frame Model.
Table 4.2

*Overview of Bolman and Deal’s (2008) Four-Frame Model*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FRAME</th>
<th>STRUCTURAL</th>
<th>HUMAN RESOURCE</th>
<th>POLITICAL</th>
<th>SYMBOLIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metaphor for organization</td>
<td>Factory or machine</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Jungle</td>
<td>Carnival, temple, theater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Concepts</td>
<td>Rules, roles, goals, policies, technology, environment</td>
<td>Needs, skills, relationships</td>
<td>Power, conflict, competition, organizational politics</td>
<td>Culture, meaning, metaphor, ritual, ceremony, stories, heroes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image of Leadership</td>
<td>Social architecture</td>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>Advocacy and political savvy</td>
<td>Inspiration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic leadership challenge</td>
<td>Attune structure to task, technology, environment</td>
<td>Align organizational and human needs</td>
<td>Develop agenda and power base</td>
<td>Create faith, beauty, meaning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Political frame.** Bolman and Deal (2008) explained that leaders cannot eliminate politics in organizations, but they can gain an understanding of how to manage and approach political processes. The essence of the participants’ approach to shared leadership development paralleled this notion from Bolman and Deal (2008). Public-private partnerships by name, and as defined in Chapter
1, include the public element. In the case of this research study, the participants were selected from organizations in which the public component consisted of the local municipal, or city government. Politicians leave office and administrations have turnover. This is the nature of the political “beast” and can potentially create conflict, and it represents a natural and inevitable part of the political landscape.

Within the political frame or through their political “lenses,” the participants of this study disclosed several ways in which they manage political processes. The identified themes of tenure longevity, climate balance, and give-and-take exchange fall within this frame. Political dynamics can be sordid and destructive, but effective leaders understand that politics can be the vehicle by which organizations achieve a noble purpose (Bolman & Deal, 2008). In this regard, the participants of this study were no different.

Tenure longevity emerged as a theme that symbolized the participants’ time in their respective leadership positions as a constant through political changes within the organization and local government. As local political offices bore witness to turnover in administration, policy changes, and discontinuity, the participants of this study in fact provided for a degree of continuity that allowed for the development of shared leadership.

The ability to sustain balance and change leadership styles depending upon who the organizational leader was working with, or according to what event was occurring, emerged as the theme of climate balance, and like tenure
longevity, fit well within the political frame of Bolman and Deal (2008). This concept emerged frequently during the one-on-one interviews when participants referred to meeting challenges or overcoming barriers. Bolman and Deal (2008) also stated, “A single leader focuses responsibility and clarifies accountability, but the same individual may not be equally effective in all situations” (Bolman and Deal, 2008, p. 179). Achieving balance within an organizational structure by which leadership is shared among organizational members proved to be a great equalizer in this regard.

The theme of give-and-take exchange was once again another concept that fell within Bolman and Deal’s (2008) political frame. Politics is often defined as who gets what, when, and how (Lasswell, 1936). Organizations as entities may have a stake in fostering a culture of givers among members of the organization, but as leaders engaged in shared leadership development, the participants of this studied revealed that they did the same as leaders of their organizations. The participants in this study made genuine connections with other members of their organization and utilized a “give-and-take exchange” approach in that relationship, thus contributing to shared leadership development. The give-and-take exchange created harmony among organizational members and once established, the participants understood that it was something that required nurturing. This was rather symbolic of what rested at the corps of the essence of experience for these participants – shared leadership development was an ongoing and fluid process.
structural frame. Bolman and Deal (2008) suggested that appropriate structural design within an organization was dependent upon circumstances and that the design should always consider goals, strategies, technology, and the working environment. Within the structural frame, the participants understood the limitations of their current work environments as public-private partnerships. As is the case with many organizational issues, answers to problems concerning structural designs were not always clear-cut. Bolman and Deal (2008) suggested that leaders rarely face well-defined problems with clearly defined answers. Rather, they encounter enduring issues related to structural designs, including trade-offs sometimes without simple answers (Bolman & Deal, 2008).

The identified theme of fluid operations falls within Bolman and Deal’s (2008) structural frame. The organizational structures within each organization headed by the participants of this study were in no way rigid and firm. In addition, there was a willingness on the part of this study’s participants to restructure organizational operations. In today’s complex time, organizational structures and design are most certainly ongoing concerns for individuals engaged in shared leadership. Considering fluidity and restructuring based on a multitude of issues within the work environment, the participants of this study adhered to Bolman and Deal’s (2008) suggestion that it is much easier to restructure an organization than to reconstruct the personalities of organizational members. The participants of this study were inclined to implement policies that made sense for their respective organizations based upon their understanding of
structural designs. This understanding may have helped create and maintain structural designs that worked for the organizations, as well as for those working within them.

**symbolic frame.** Organizational symbols can help leaders respond to basic human needs by providing hope, faith, trust, and meaning (Bolman & Deal, 2008). Within the symbolic frame, this study’s participants recognized that the identified theme of “a stake in the vision” could provide for a rather powerful symbolic message and tool within the process of shared leadership development. Though establishing long-term goals and plans as part of a vision can provide members of an organization with a sense of direction, it is was deemed important in this study that those organizational members should have an investment, or “stake,” in that vision, as well. This notion helped guide the organizational efforts and assisted members working for the study’s participants in reaching important outcomes. Through an established and communicated vision in which all essentially have a stake, organizational members can potentially learn more about their organization, their role, and what exactly their organization is trying to accomplish.

The importance of a conveyed vision in which organizational members have a stake could not be overstated when it came to shared leadership development, as the participants of this study emphasized a constant assessment and reassessment of their responses to challenges and issues within and related to their organizations. Through the process of establishing and presenting a vision
in which everyone shared a vested interest, the leaders serving as participants in this study not only defined the organization’s objectives or goals, but also established the strategy by which the goals would be achieved. When other members were participating in this process and contributing to these definitions, then shared leadership was being developed and implemented.

**human resource frame.** Throughout the work of Bolman and Deal (2008), the ever-changing relationships between individuals and the organizations for which they work are discussed. Rapid change in today’s workforce and economy, including changes in technology, competition, and globalization, can create pressures and dilemmas for organizations, as well as organizational leaders. When the needs of individuals and organizations are not aligned respectively, one or both usually suffer (Bolman & Deal, 2008).

Emerging research demonstrates that downsizing in response to workforce dilemmas often produces bleak results, whereas organizations that move in a different direction and continue to invest in people often gain a competitive advantage (Bolman & Deal). The identified themes of decision-making process connection and face-to-face synergy highlighted such investments as shared leadership was developed within public-private partnerships, and they surely resonated with Bolman and Deal’s (2008) notion of the human resource frame.

All organizations can improve by employing strategies that invest in people and human resources, and Bolman and Deal (2008) suggested that key strategies leaders can implement include the empowerment of individuals and the
investment in their respective development. The identified theme of decision-making process connection tied into this suggestion. The concepts of a decision-making process connection and the strategy of empowerment include much more than just having information available to organizational members. These are concepts that include the encouragement of autonomy, the redesign of work, teambuilding, and the promotion of egalitarianism. A single leader focuses responsibility and clarifies accountability, but the same individual may not be equally effective in all situations (Bolman and Deal, 2008). For the participants of this study engaged in shared leadership development within public-private partnerships, the theme of decision-making process connection certainly echoed this notion from Bolman and Deal (2008).

Along with decision-making process connection, the identified theme of face-face synergy fell well-within the spectrum of Bolman and Deal’s (2008) human resource frame. The essence of the human resource frame involves meeting the needs of members within the organization. The human resource frame, based upon ideas from the field of psychology, maintains that organizations are much like an extended family, which includes individuals with needs, feelings, prejudices, skills, and limitations (Bolman and Deal, 2008). Communication of all mediums, including face-to-face communication, which falls in line with the finding of face-to-face synergy, can certainly play an important role in developing or implementing any organizational structure or leadership style.
Technology is transforming the aspects of communication within and among organizations. As the participants of this study suggested, when it comes to shared leadership development within public-private partnerships, sharing ideas, planning strategies, discussing progress, and evaluating programs can be accomplished using email, teleconference technology, social networks, and text messaging. However, developing shared leadership utilizing face-to-face communication proved especially necessary for the participants involved in this research study.

Though improvements in the way we communicate with regard to social networking, emailing, or texting can be somewhat effective, they are not without their deficiencies. Today’s 21st Century technology can certainly connect people faster than ever before and in new and exciting ways, yet, it can also isolate individuals when it comes to their respective role within an organization, as it is often difficult to know an individual or develop a personal connection electronically. With face-to-face synergy developed along Bolman and Deal’s (2008) human resource frame, the flow of information for this study’s participants became more continuous, allowing these leaders engaged in shared leadership development to dissolve existing barriers much easier, and to foster an energized and dynamic organizational culture at the same time.

The findings of this qualitative research study further demonstrated that understanding, grasping, and adhering to concepts associated with the seven identified themes of tenure longevity, climate balance, face-to-face synergy,
give-and-take exchange, decision-making process connection, a stake in the vision, and fluid operations proved crucial to understanding the participants’ collective experiences with shared leadership development. The findings also suggested that if the participants failed to either employ or recognize these concepts in the rapidly changing landscape of their organizations with increasingly complex work environments, potentially negative results may have been yielded. Furthermore, the findings of this qualitative study highlighted the concepts that a select group of administrators engaged in public-private partnerships utilized to develop, sustain, and improve shared leadership structures.

Summary

The data for this qualitative research study came from semi-structured, one-on-one interviews with 10 participants who served as administrators engaged in shared leadership development within public-private partnerships. The interviews were audio-recorded and printed transcriptions were produced so that the participants could check their input and so that the researcher could perform the rigorous task of data analysis in the qualitative tradition of phenomenology.

Detailed data analysis was conducted using phenomenological methods in which participant statements from the one-on-one interviews about how the individuals were experiencing shared leadership development were horizontalized, or listed out with equal worth. The researcher identified the seven themes of tenure longevity, climate balance, face-to-face synergy, give-and-take
exchange, decision-making process connection, a stake in the vision, and fluid operations in addressing the research study’s central research question, issue sub-question, and procedural sub-question.

To answer the central research question, the researcher focused the analysis of data on discovering the primary manners in which administrators engaged in public-private partnerships experienced the phenomenon of shared leadership development. The analysis of the data demonstrated that without significant tenure and fluidity with regard to how these administrators experienced shared leadership development, this study’s sub-questions would have most likely gone unanswered. The themes that emerged following data analysis will contribute to the current body of knowledge and research that considers shared leadership development. In the following chapter, the researcher included a discussion regarding the findings reported within this chapter, as well as implications for practice and recommendations for further research.
Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Overview

In this final chapter, the researcher summarized the findings of this study, presented conclusions, identified implications for practitioners in the field, made recommendations for administrators engaged in shared leadership development within organizations identified as public-private partnerships, and offered recommendations for future research. The central research question guided this qualitative research study, and it was supported by the issue sub-question and procedural sub-question, which framed seven themes that emerged from the collected data. These themes provided for answers to all three research questions.

The purpose of this qualitative research study was to explore the shared leadership development strategies and methods of administrators and organizational leaders engaged in public-private partnerships in a Southern urban center. A better understanding of the development methods and strategies within complex organizational and collaborative schemes such as public-private partnerships can serve as a helpful tool for organizational leaders in maintaining effective leadership structures.

A more complete understanding of shared leadership development certainly holds great promise for future examinations and studies. The complexities associated with shared leadership, as well as the nature of developing such structures, are certainly worthy of further review. The
following sub-sections of this chapter were provided by the researcher as a summary of the major findings and a summary of how the research questions were addressed. In addition, sub-sections addressing implications for practice and commentary from the researcher regarding recommendations for future research was also included.

**Major Findings**

Key aspects of significance regarding the findings of this qualitative study rested in the conceptual ideas and identified themes of tenure longevity, climate balance, face-to-face synergy, give-and-take exchange, decision-making process connection, a stake in the vision, and fluid operations with regard to shared leadership development. Development models and strategies concerning shared leadership within public-private partnerships can potentially aid organizational leaders in identifying interpersonal competencies associated with collaborative efforts such as these. The findings of this qualitative study represent components of an ongoing process in which organizational leaders can engage and establish a framework in developing a shared leadership structure.

*tenure longevity.* The identified theme of tenure longevity as an experience of shared leadership development highlighted the concept as an emergent process over a significant period among a group or network of interacting individuals. This finding contrasted with traditional leadership as a phenomenon that filters down from an individual. Gronn’s (2008) work confirmed and elaborated on this. Due to the ever-changing work environments
of each participant, the process of shared leadership development had to be constantly re-evaluated in order to continue to assess the needs of the organization, as well as the members working within the organization. Shared leadership could not be implemented as a quick fix to organizational issues or leadership problems (Porter-O’Grady, 2001). As the participants of this study mentioned, a shared leadership structure could not be implemented quickly, as it takes time, planning, and commitment to develop (Scott & Caress, 2005).

Data gathered from the one-on-one interviews revealed that if shared leadership develops within an organization, it would emerge over a significant period. This confirmed the findings of Carson et al. (2007) as through organizational members’ interactions, mutual influence, and negotiation over time, shared leadership can properly develop (Carson et al., 2007). Members of an organization require time to develop an understanding of one another’s abilities, skills, and knowledge. As such, a more seasoned group of individuals will likely have a greater ability and willingness to engage in shared leadership than those who have not been afforded that kind of time and opportunity (Avolio, Bass, & Young, 1995).

The participants of this study pointed to the period-of-time with which they held their positions as leaders while developing shared leadership as a manner in which they experienced the study’s central phenomenon. Lack of turnover in the positions of administration held by the study’s participants enabled these leaders to effectively carry out the process of shared leadership
development. This added to the concept identified as “maturity” by Gersick (1988) and Barry (1991). The term maturity is used as a summary evaluation identifier of team-member functioning and interpersonal dynamics (Pearce & Conger, 2003). Included in an evaluation concerning maturity is the level of familiarization among those involved in a particular organization or team.

Tenure longevity underscores maturity in the case of the participants involved in this study as each had the opportunity to maintain their roles as leaders for significant periods. Their respective tenures of the study’s participants allowed time to ensure that shared leadership was being developed. In a sense, the participants’ tenures as leaders within their organizations allowed for shared leadership development to “mature.” Pearce and Conger (2003) proposed that maturity in organizational teams is positively associated with both the development and display of shared leadership in the organization.

As developing a shared leadership structure takes significant time and effort, attention can be drawn away from other organizational responsibilities and could potentially cause other challenges or issues. For example, the time that the study’s participants put into implementation and development of shared structures of leadership may have reduced the efficiency of the organization as a whole, or it may have created periods of inefficiency. After all, shared leadership development involves change. This change includes the frequency and duration of contact among staff, also identified as another theme within this study – “face-to-face synergy,” shifting the nature and quality of these
interactions, and developing the systems and structures of shared leadership that will effectively sustain these changes. When faced with such complex challenges in today’s rapidly changing work environment and in one as complex as a public-private partnership, the time spent up-front to develop a shared leadership structure can potentially help such complex organizations respond more effectively and efficiently in the long term.

**climate balance.** A balance in organizational climate was revealed as a platform for shared leadership development. Shared leadership is a partnership, as organizational members view each other as equal partners in the stakes of the organization (Pearce & Conger, 2003). The study’s participants concurred that the achievement of this balance was one of the more difficult aspects of shared leadership development. Effective organizational leaders, such as the participants of this study, certainly understand this as they identify clear parameters empowering all members of the organization, thus ensuring that what is developed, decided upon, or created is effectively carried out. They model a balanced organizational climate in their words, actions, values, and belief systems, beginning with the organizational culture they create and maintain among themselves and other members of the organization.

The identified theme of climate balance aligned with Pearce and Conger’s (2003) proposition that the climate that exists within an organization will be a key determinant of the effectiveness of implementing a shared leadership structure. Balance, within the climate of an organization whose leaders engage
in shared leadership development, is created and shaped by the leaders’ overriding commitment to developing those around them.

Climate balance emerged as a dominant theme in this qualitative study and served to substantiate the claims of Wahlstrom and Louis (2008) in which it was suggested that a direct relationship exists between shared leadership and organizational culture and climate. Climate balance also builds upon the work of Gruenert (2005) who found that school leaders, who actively engage with staff in shared and collaborative efforts, significantly improved school culture and climate.

Healthy organizations such as the ones headed by the participants of this study share in the idea that balance within the organizational culture helps maintain and promote healthy, shared values. Yukl (2003) found that employees who distinguish their leader as caring for the interests of each individual worker are likely to exhibit increased allegiance and confidence, as well as to have a stronger sense of emotional well-being. In order to achieve a climate that binds members of the organization together, the leaders serving as participants in this study went well beyond the routine work within their organizations. These participants shared a commitment to values beyond their own, and they recognized that a single set of values, ideas, or points-of-view would not emphasize the process of shared leadership development.

**face-to-face synergy.** As discussed in Chapter 4, “Face time” in communication can be underestimated at times, especially with the rapid
changing technology associated with today’s communication devices such as smart phones, tablets, laptops, and other portable technologies. That being stated, technology can be a wonderful resource to reach as many people as possible in a fast manner. Not only does this technology make communication timely, it can be done and completed with relatively little effort and energy in the fast-paced world of today. Understandably, organizational leaders want to reach out to their members in the most efficient manner possible. However, in moving away from face-to-face connections, these same organizational leaders can find themselves losing organizational harmony in the process.

The identified theme of face-to-face synergy certainly affirmed the findings of several researchers who built upon the studies of those engaged in the Human Relations Movement and the concept of emergent leadership as mentioned in Chapter 2. Rowe (2001) noted that this particular manner of leadership does not just occur because an individual has been appointed to a formal position, but it emerges over time through positive communication behaviors (Rowe, 2001). In the case of this phenomenological study, face-to-face synergy was representative of such a positive communication behavior.

Kouzes and Posner (1995) asserted that leaders must provide frequent and lasting opportunities for organizational members to associate and mingle and though technological tools are convenient ways to stay in touch, they are simply no substitute for positive, face-to-face interactions. The identified theme of face-to-face synergy built upon the work of Johnson and Johnson (1989) in
which they noted that group goals and reciprocity have a powerful impact on collaborative success, but meeting face-to-face is the most powerful of influences. The notion that this all occurs within a complex organizational structure such as the public-private-partnerships lead by the participants of this study also supported the findings of Van de Ven, Delbecq, and Koenig (1976) in which they suggested that the needs for face-to-face communication increase with the complexity of organizational issues.

**give-and-take exchange.** The identified theme of give-and-take exchange underscored the significance of compromise among the participants involved in this study. Conflict can be defined as having occurred when there are incompatible goals, thoughts, beliefs, or emotions between or among individuals that lead to opposition or differences of opinion (Wilmot & Hocker, 2011). Therefore, it is almost certain to be ever-present. As such, the participants of this study used the theme of give-and-take exchange to mitigate conflict within their organizations.

The theme of give-and-take exchange, as identified in this research study, added to the growing literature regarding collective trust. Trust represents a cornerstone of successful relationships, leadership, teams, and organizations (Forsyth, Adams, & Hoy, 2011). As opposed to interpersonal trust, collective trust is often conceptualized as a generalized trust rendered among organizational members (Kramer, 2010). Forsyth, Adams and Hoy (2011) add
that collective trust is not only distinct from interpersonal trust, but complementary, as well.

Through the identified theme of give-and-take exchange within organizations serving as settings for this study, collective trust emerged over time. This aligned, once again, with the corps of the essence of shared leadership development as discussed in Chapter 4, and this concept is grounded in the shared perceptions of organizational members regarding leaders and others within the group (Forsyth, Adams, & Hoy, 2011).

A deep, rooted trust within a respective organization fosters cooperation, and such was the case with this qualitative study (Lu & Hao, 2012. Leaders of organizations developing structures of shared leadership facilitate the process of building greater trust, increase the likelihood of cooperation, and effectively breed further cooperation (Putnam, 1996). The identified theme of give-and-take exchange, as it was perceived by the participants of this study and their respective organization’s members, symbolized such cooperation.

Within the realm of finance, ‘valuation’ often refers to the process of measuring worth or organizational capital. The give-and-take exchange implemented by the leaders involved as participants in this study contributed to overall organizational effectiveness, as these individuals placed a high value upon the ideas of others within the organization, as well as other organizational constructs. This represents a key component of “servant leadership,” which is discussed later in the Recommendations for Further Research sub-section of
Chapter 5, as servant leaders promote the valuing and development of others within the group or organization (Sokoll, 2011).

Organizational constructs that reflect a more participatory, or shared process, are also grounded in the idea of placing value upon the ideas of others. Participatory structures contribute to shared values and shared responsibility for organizational members (Kaner, 1996). Effective leadership often rests in understanding concepts associated with valuation in efforts to sustain meaningful organizational change and continuous improvement such as the continuous process of shared leadership development identified in this qualitative study (Fullan, 2002).

**decision-making process connection.** The identified theme of decision-making process connection contributed to a wealth of literature on the topic of participatory decision-making, which often overlaps with the topic of shared leadership. When it comes to the process of identifying and selecting a course of action to solve a particular problem or to meet a particular goal, the decision should be rational and systematic (Kaner, 1996). Within a shared leadership structure and as identified by the participants of this study, the ability to develop several alternative ways to approach a problem can prove to be a valuable tool. As such, for the participants of this study, having other organizational members feel connected to that process proved just as important.

The identified theme of decision-making process connection confirmed the work of Vroom and Yetton (1973), who suggested a model in which leaders,
dependent upon circumstances, made conscious decisions as to whether or not they would include subordinates in the process of decision-making. Vroom and Yetton (1973) claimed that situations existed in which a shared leadership structure proved more advantageous than a more hierarchical form. As mentioned in Chapter 2, they identified a normative model by which specific leadership styles appealed to different types of situations. Vroom and Yetton (1973) suggested that greater involvement by others in the decision-making process was required under a select few conditions. The situation in which the participants of this study found themselves represented such a condition. These participants were concerned about the need of quality decision-making, and the connection to the process on the part of other organizational members further emphasized the participants’ desire.

The continuum of leadership styles suggests that leaders can perform their respective functions in a number of different ways, though leaders involved in shared leadership structures, as a matter of shared leadership principles, desire to maximize the involvement of others within the organization in the decision-making process (Pearce & Conger, 2003). The participants involved in this study were so inclined to involve others in the decision-making process because they were relying on the input of highly skilled and trained members in their organizations, all of whom possessed high levels of expertise. This aligns with the findings of DeNisi, Hitt, and Jackson (2003).
Individuals engaged in shared leadership, such as the participants of this study, shared the process of decision-making to foster cooperation. This notion linked the identified themes of decision-making process connection, give-and-take exchange, and climate balance. When conflict occurs, as it most certainly will, resolutions are more easily reached through a process such as decision-making (Kaner, 1996). In addition, group decisions take place within the broader context of the organization and society as a whole, especially within a democratic society such as ours today. The idea of a decision-making process connection is most certainly compatible with the process of shared decision-making among those who believe they are actually connected to the process.

**a stake in the vision.** Senge (1990) described the shared vision as a sense of common identity and practices. Kouzes and Posner (1995) suggested that it is not enough for a leader to have a vision, and members of an organization must understand, accept, and commit to the vision. In the literature concerning shared leadership, the term “vision” is found to have a multitude of definitions (Locke, 2000). Many of these definitions include such components as a mental picture, future organizational orientations, and aspects of goal setting. Leaders should provide a vision that serves as guidance for an organization and articulates organizational goals. Nanus (1992) noted that visions serve as a “signpost” for providing direction for those within an organization who must understand the organization, as well as where it needs to move forward. Seeley (1992) added
that vision is a “goal-oriented mental construct” that guides the behavior of organizational members.

Vision can certainly be a powerful force. Manasse (1986) described it as the force that “molds meaning” among the members of an organization. For the participants of this study, having the other members of the organization join and share in the vision was crucial. This included some sort of bond or investment from other organizational members, thus contributing to the theme of a stake in the vision.

Establishing long-term goals and plans with regard to a respective vision can provide members of an organization with a sense of direction, as this helps guide organizational efforts and assists members in reaching important outcomes. Through an established and communicated vision, leaders and other organizational members learn more about the organization, as well as what exactly that organization is trying to accomplish (Daft, 2007). According to Robbins and DeCenzo (2007), planning is concerned with the ends (what is to be done) as well as the means (how it is to be done), and this was confirmed through analysis of the collected data in this research study.

The importance of a conveyed vision by which those involved have a stake cannot be overemphasized, as effective and successful leaders must constantly assess and reassess their responses to challenges and issues within and related to the organization. Through the process of establishing and presenting a vision, a leader not only defines an organization’s objectives or goals, but also
establishes the strategy by which the goals will be achieved (Robbins & DeCenzo, 2007). The identified theme of stake in the vision built upon this notion.

**fluid operations.** In the dynamic work environments of the study’s participants, having the ability to adapt and maintain fluid operations contributed to the successes and longevity of shared leadership development. The identified theme of fluid operations confirmed the findings of Scott and Caress (2005), by which the researchers found that due to the ever-changing environment, shared governance needs to be flexible and constantly re-evaluated, in order to continue to assess the needs of the organization.

The maintenance of fluid operations on the part of this study’s participants aligned with the Flexible Leadership Model offered by Yukl (1998). This model of flexible, adaptive leadership incorporates practitioner insights, as well as previously identified leadership theories. Yukl (1998) proposed that effective leaders should adapt their behavior to changing situations and find appropriate balance for trade-offs and competing demands. Thus, a linkage also existed between the identified themes of climate balance, give-and-take exchange, and fluid operations. The participants involved in this study maintained fluid operations within the structure of shared leadership being developed.

As they engaged and worked through shared leadership development, the participants of this study were committed to flexibility, experimentation, and
adaptability with regard to organizational operations. Whether or not organizational goals were to be attained through formal courses or practical experience, the study’s participants engaged in activities that helped foster new ideas and create designs that worked for their organizations, as well as for those working within the organizations. This identified theme of fluid operations is once again grounded in the essence of shared leadership development – that this phenomenon represents a continual, ever-changing, and fluid process.

**Addressing Research Questions**

The central research question addressed in this study proceeds: How do administrators engaged in public-private partnerships experience the phenomenon of shared leadership development? The following issue sub-question was also addressed: What development strategies did these administrators use? In addition, the following procedural sub-question was also addressed: How did the strategies and methods unfold within the public-private partnership? Instead of viewing a shared leadership structure within a public-private partnership as an alternative to the typical hierarchical structure within many organizations and entities, the participants of this study viewed the development of shared leadership as an ongoing process – one in which each identified theme or conceptual idea represented an integral part of that particular process.

This qualitative study pointed to leaders involved in organizations with shared structures that experienced shared leadership development as the
identified themes of tenure longevity, climate balance, face-to-face synergy, give-and-take exchange, decision-making process connection, a stake in the vision, and fluid operations. The process of shared leadership development within a conceptual framework that embraces these identified themes allows for an understanding of the methods employed by leaders involved in shared leadership development, as well. This concept shed light on answers in response to the issue sub-question addressed in this qualitative study, as well as the procedural sub-question. The findings demonstrated that shared leadership development did not just happen “over night,” thus highlighting, once again, the essence of experiences shared by the study’s participants. Developing shared leadership structures meant developing manners by which practices of organizational team members occurred together on key organizational and leadership issues.

In this qualitative study, shared leadership development was not simply a commodity or set of formal tasks for one particular member of any of the organizations for which the participants worked. All seven of the themes that emerged from this study, tenure longevity, climate balance, face-to-face synergy, give-and-take exchange, decision-making process connection, a stake in the vision, and fluid operations, served to answer the study’s central research question regarding how administrators engaged in public-private partnerships experience the phenomenon of shared leadership development. That being
stated, several of the themes also served to answer the study’s issue sub-question, as well as the procedural sub-question, but not all.

Regarding the issue sub-question of what development strategies the participants working as administrators used, the identified themes of face-to-face synergy, decision-making process connection, and fluid operations served as explanations. The theme of fluid operations overlapped to help in the explanation for the procedural sub-question regarding how the development strategies and methods unfolded within the public-private partnership. In addition, the identified themes of climate balance and stake in the vision served as pertinent accounts as to the manners by which the shared leadership development strategies unfolded. Table 5.1 was provided to illustrate the alignment of identified themes to research questions within this qualitative study.
Table 5.1

Research Questions and Identified Themes Alignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Identified Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What development strategies do these administrators use?</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did the development strategies and methods unfold within the public-private partnership unfold?</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*“X” denotes alignment with the respective research question*
Limitations

As with any qualitative research study, the findings reported as part of this qualitative study were inherently grounded in the experiences of the participants. Therefore, the interpretations of the participants, as well as the researcher, were personal. Eisner (1991) suggested that when we conceptualize objectivity, we ineluctably imply its opposite, subjectivity, and between the two, there is no doubt about which one comes out on top. In addition, the researcher receives a label of being either objective or subjective based upon the broad generalizations indicative of the methodology. For example, a qualitative researcher acquires the title “subjective” due to the accepted framework of broad generalizations associated with qualitative research methods. That association has such negative connotations in the public mind that to admit being subjective may undermine one’s credibility (Patton, 2002).

As discussed in Chapter 1, the researcher involved in this qualitative study identified himself as a pragmatist. Accordingly, the epistemological concerns of the researcher challenged the “objectivity versus subjectivity” debate. As a pragmatist, the researcher fundamentally believed that epistemological issues such as the relationship between the researcher and the participants, as well as questions concerning subjectivity and objectivity, existed on a continuum (Teddle & Tashakkori, 2009). Some research studies, such as this qualitative inquiry, lend themselves to personal involvement with participants. Others, such as a quantitative investigation seeking to prove, disprove, or test a hypothesis,
may require little to no interaction with participants as surveys, questionnaires, or previously collected data are examined.

The notions of personal involvement and close relationships established in this qualitative study lend themselves to possible biases that may have ultimately altered the research inquiry or subsequent results. The researcher involved in this inquiry maintained a degree of visibility and a viable presence from the onset of the qualitative study. Therefore, the researcher could not separate himself from the subject or participants, nor could the participants separate themselves from the qualitative circumstances surrounding this study. Whereas quantitative research derives from statistical measures to keep data free from researcher bias, the lack of separation and bias on the part of the researcher in a qualitative study such as this simply does not afford itself to the foundations of quantitative methods (Morgan & Drury, 2003).

The researcher engaged in this phenomenology sought to understand participant experiences from the “insiders” perspective, that is, as it was lived by the participants in their particular situations. The research was intensely personal, and the researcher freely admitted to the subjective perception and biases of both the study’s participants and the researcher as part of the methodological approach.

The great advantage of a phenomenological approach such as this is the depth created, as the researcher attempted to understand participant views of particular phenomena within their environments. In addition, the researcher
can probe into the participants’ thoughts, feelings, and emotions in the attempt to understand the “hows,” “whats,” and “whys” of a phenomenon, rather than simply recording or documenting actions and behaviors. This phenomenological inquiry provided the researcher with an opportunity to develop insight into the understandings of the study’s participants regarding the phenomenon of shared leadership development.

**contextual limitations.** A qualitative study such as this phenomenological inquiry is conducted with several assumptions. One such assumption concerns this study’s central phenomenon of shared leadership development and the idea that the experiences of the participants involved in the study are context-bound. The researcher feels that participant experiences take meaning and are inseparable from social, cultural, and historical influences. Therefore, this phenomenological inquiry into the experiences of administrators engaged in shared leadership development is bounded by that context. The researcher involved in this study did not isolate the experiences of the participants from the study’s context. This qualitative phenomenology is in no way devoid of the subjective perceptions of those involved, nor are the findings divorced from the study’s context.

**setting limitations.** The researcher felt that the settings in which participant experiences were studied had to be naturally occurring. The settings, in the case of this study, were the organizations defined in Chapter 1 as public-private partnerships. These settings could not be contrived or artificial, such as a
laboratory experiment from a quantitative investigation. As such, this study took place in the field and in the settings as they were found.

This phenomenological exploration placed no constraints on what was to be studied, and the researcher did not identify, define, or test the relationship between a set of independent and dependent variables. Rather, the researcher explored the study’s participants holistically and took into account any and all factors and influences within the setting. By its very nature, the extent to which this study can produce valid generalizations is exceptionally limited. Nevertheless, it can prove to be a useful tool in the development of a hypothesis to be tested through rigorous investigations as part of future inquiries. This is discussed further in the Recommendations for Future Research sub-section of this chapter.

**Human instrument limitations.** Within this phenomenological study, the researcher represented the data-gathering instrument. Through the semi-structured, one-on-one interviews, the researcher spoke to participants, interacted with them, and recorded the responses to the interview questions. Qualitative methods of data collection and data analysis were relied upon, as opposed to survey instruments, tests, questionnaires, and highly structured observational protocols. The researcher involved with this inquiry dealt with data in the form of words rather than statistics and statistical measurements. Large volumes of data were gathered from interviews, and a process of inductive analysis ensued shortly thereafter.
The inductive process of data analysis took place through both the process of data collection and data analysis. The researcher did not wait until all of the interviews were conducted and all of the data were “in” before interpreting and analyzing the interview transcriptions. As Creswell’s (2008) data analysis spiral indicated in Chapter 3, data analysis and data collection often took place simultaneously. From the outset of this phenomenological inquiry, the researcher often reflected on the meaning from participant responses. As data from the one-on-one interviews was reduced and reconstructed through the process of data coding and categorizing, the researcher developed themes and interpreted the essence of participant experiences as explained in Chapter 4.

**design limitations.** In a quantitative investigation, a researcher carefully designs all aspects of the study before data is collected. Variables are also specified, as well as measures for those particular variables and the statistics to be used when analyzing the data. This is possible because quantitative researchers know what they are seeking well in advance. A hypothesis or multiple hypotheses are developed that guide the study. In contrast, the phenomenological nature of this qualitative study allowed the design to unfold. This was necessary because the researcher involved in this study was not sure of what was to unfold as the exploration into the central phenomenon progressed.

Creswell (2008) stated, “Limitations are possible weaknesses or problems with the study identified by the researcher” (Creswell, 2008, p. 207). During the course of this qualitative inquiry, limitations were experienced. In this study,
the researcher did not decide in advance, what exactly was to be sought. It was understood from the onset of this study that what was to be found remained dependent upon interactions between the researcher and the participants. Furthermore, those interactions were not fully predictable and important features of this inquiry were not known until they were actually witnessed by the researcher.

This qualitative study could only be characterized beforehand in a very general way. In Chapter 1, a problem was identified and questions were developed in the attempt to address the problem. The researcher then sought to gain access to research sites and participants so that the research problem and topic could be further explored. The findings of this inquiry were based solely on the experiences of the participants and the fieldwork interpretations of the researcher. The goal of such an inquiry was to portray a complex pattern of shared leadership development methods in sufficient depth to provide a detailed description of what was experienced by those involved in the research study.

**Implications for Practice**

The importance of understanding conceptual frameworks with regard to shared leadership is crucial to understanding the very nature of shared leadership (Pearce & Conger, 2003). This understanding on the part of organizational leaders helps bring the respective frameworks into focus and eventually, into practice. Furthermore, an understanding of these leadership concepts provides a backdrop by which organizational leaders can acquire, relate, and apply
leadership strategies within the constructs of today’s complex and changing organizations.

Shared leadership development requires deep contemplation on the part of organizational leaders about the subject at hand. Personal assumptions about leaders and followers must be probed, and self-awareness is essential for effective interaction with others. In the case of this phenomenological study, the leaders engaged in shared leadership development within public-private partnerships provided direction by way of the seven themes that emerged.

Establishing long-term goals and plans with regard to a respective vision can provide team members involved in an organization such as a public-private partnership with a sense of direction, as this helps guide organizational efforts and assists members in reaching important outcomes. Through an established and communicated vision within the context of the identified theme of “a stake in the vision,” those engaged in shared leadership and other organizational members learn more about the organization, as well as what exactly that organization is trying to accomplish.

Organizational constructs that reflect a shared process are also grounded in the idea of placing value upon the ideas of others. Participatory structures contribute to shared values and shared responsibility for organizational members. Effective leadership often rests in understanding concepts associated with valuation in the effort to sustain meaningful organizational change and continuous improvement. Furthermore, achieving the identified theme of
“climate balance” according to the organizational structures, along with timing within the organization proves essential to individual and organizational success in a shared leadership environment. This appears to be especially the case within complex organizations today in a time of rapidly changing organizational environments.

Pressures for change can and often do exist in any organization, and leaders must not be trapped by denying, resisting, or avoiding these pressures. One of the most important tasks bestowed upon the leader of an organization today is to encourage the ongoing rejuvenation of that organization. The results of this kind of encouragement can only be achieved if the leader understands the relationship between organizational continuity and organizational change. Organizational leaders must grasp a sense of their respective organization’s present and future, as well as its past. This is particularly important in times such as this, where organizations find themselves in the wake of rapid change.

A crucial point here is that the cultural traditions of an organization have inherent value. They can represent the heart of an organization’s collective wisdom. These cultural traditions grow out of the past and are adapted to the present without any breaks in continuity. Leaders who do not effectively recognize the importance of these cultural traditions can very easily wreck, but not so easily reconstruct, them. As the findings of this study indicated, and as the essence of participant experiences revealed, any effort to engage in such activity as shared leadership development should be done so practically and
relatively slowly over time, as shared leadership development represents a continual process. This, too, was highlighted by the identified theme of “fluid operations.”

Making such changes as developing shared leadership structures requires more than merely an understanding of the development concepts. It also requires the leader of an organization to become an agent of change and development – the one who guides the process within the organization. To assume this role and responsibility effectively implies an understanding of the idea that the change may not be so easy, hence the hard work that goes into such an endeavor.

The themes that emerged as part of this research study were keys to understanding the phenomenon of shared leadership development methods within public-private partnerships. In addition, they may represent keys for leaders engaged in such organizational structures to being as effective as they can be. These leaders may gain further insight into promoting the overall effectiveness of their own leadership styles, as well as the overall effectiveness of their organizations.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

Certainly, the idea of shared leadership development can stand to be further explored within the context of differing organizational structures. In addition, shared leadership development within a framework of leadership styles could compliment the contributions of this particular study. The following report was provided as a guide for future research regarding the phenomenon of
shared leadership development within additional contexts and lexicons, as well as from other methodological approaches. Each of the following subsections of Chapter 5 concerned viable topics for future inquiries and investigations regarding shared leadership development and current theories and methods in the field of leadership studies. In the final sub-section, the researcher suggested building upon this research study with a follow-up “mixed methods” approach that incorporates an exploratory design, one in which a qualitative strand is followed by a quantitative strand so as to lend further validity to the qualitative findings (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009).

**transformational leadership and shared leadership development.** An exploration of transformational leadership styles and additional analyses of shared leadership development is needed. Recent scholarship and research is flooded with information regarding the virtues, pros, and cons of both transformational and transactional leadership styles. This could certainly be considered when it comes to developing shared leadership structures, how they relate, or how they are experienced.

According to Bass (1998), transformational leaders motivate others to do more than they originally intended and often, even more than they thought possible. Furthermore, by definition, transformational leaders concern themselves with the concept of change as it relates to the organization. This resonates well with Fullan’s (2001) notion that leaders today must constantly adjust within a culture of change. Thus, transformational leadership concerns the
implementation of new ideas, and transformational leaders must constantly change and continually work to improve organizational systems and processes.

The transformational leader is not concerned with the status quo, rather with effecting revolutionary change in organizations and fields of human services (Trott & Windsor, 1999). Burns (1978) depicted the transformational leader as a morally responsible manager who focuses on developing the moral maturity, values, and standards of his or her subordinates and strengthening their devotion to serve the well-being of others, their organization, and society beyond self-interest. Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramaniam (1996) described the transformational leader as being pioneering and less likely to support the current situation, seeking opportunities in the face of risk, and attempting to mold and create rather than react to environmental conditions (as cited in van Eeden et al., 2008). Van Eeden et al. (2008) added that a transformational leader is one who conveys a vision to inspire others, sets long-term goals, and emphasizes social and interpersonal skills. Furthermore, the transforming leader looks for potential motives in employees, seeks to satisfy their needs, and engages the full person of the follower.

Jogulu & Wood (2007) insinuated that transformational leadership involves establishing oneself as a role model by gaining the trust and confidence of employees and sanctioning and guiding them to excel beyond the organizational day-to-day obligations. A transformational leader could be categorized as a visionary, a futurist or a mechanism for change that assumes a

In order for a leader to have idealized influence, an employee must be able to see that the leader is unfailing in word or deed and they actually stand for something they aspire to do and inspire their employees toward the same goal (Murphy & Drodge, 2004). Leaders with these attributes are highly admired, respected, trusted, and have a high level of self-confidence, self-esteem, and self-determination. Such leaders are usually regarded as role models, and they demonstrate high standards of ethical and moral conduct (Chan & Chan, 2005).

Chan & Chan (2005) described inspirational motivation as the ability of leaders to stimulate and inspire employees and colleagues by building self-assurance, filling and arousing enthusiasm and determination in the group. In general, this is the method of inspiring their vision and encouraging employees to implement it for the future growth of the organization. This type of leader provides symbols, metaphors, and simplified emotional appeals to increase
awareness and understanding of mutually desired goals (Bass and Avolio, 1997). Murphy & Drodge (2004) pointed out that communicating the vision to everyone and reiterating it often was the key ingredient of inspirational motivation.

Bass et al. (1987) described intellectual stimulation as encouraging employees to think of creative ways to solve old problems, examining their own values and beliefs, and when suitable, those of their leader (as cited in Deluga, 1990). As a result, the employees can extend themselves with capabilities of discovering, examining, and resolving problems with a more liberated thought in order to survive rapidly changing organizational environments (Deluga, 1990). Curtin (1995) confirmed this by suggesting that employees welcome new experiences as long as they are not intimidated, and explained that employees want to be included in the decision-making process and know that their views are valued and desired.

Transformational leaders work along a non-linear path. Moreover, transformational leaders are not only concerned with meeting organizational goals, but they also want to see individuals succeed so that all organizational units, departments, supervisors and subordinates meet and exceed expectations. Limited empirical research exists as to understanding leadership styles such as transformational leadership and shared leadership development, and these could serve as worthy topics for future investigations.

**servant leadership and shared leadership development.** Servant leadership is yet another style of leadership that has gained significant popularity
in today’s literature, and it is viewed as a promising manner by which leaders of organizations today can be more effective and efficient. The concept itself examines the role of a leader from the understanding that by virtue of the leadership position, the leader is in fact a servant. According to Servant Leadership Theory, the role of an effective leader is not merely to lead others, but to serve others by seeking to uplift them, thereby creating a better organization or culture (Greanleaf, 1996). Greanleaf (1996) added that servant leadership goes beyond organizational boundaries and seeks to create a better society through service to those inside and outside of the organization.

Greenleaf’s (1996) servant leadership model places service to others, including employees, customers, and the community, as the top priority in an organization. Servant leadership emphasizes the need for individuals to provide increased service to those who work around them, bringing a more holistic approach to the workplace, a sense of well being and belonging to a community, and increased opportunities for others regarding decision-making powers.

As discussed in Chapter 1, the hierarchical or traditional top-down models of leadership, often described as pyramids, place the majority of lower-level members of an organization at the base with a minority of top-level members near the top. Greenleaf’s (1996) model of servant leadership seeks to invert that pyramid, thus “flipping” the pyramid and placing the majority of lower-level individuals in an organization near or at the top. Figure 5.1 was provided as a visual reference of this concept.
Perhaps servant leadership can incorporate elements of shared leadership, or vice-versa. Co-existence with regard to these leadership models may serve as a viable topic for further research inquiries. Tenets of servant leadership, as well as dimensions of shared leadership, should be investigated further within the
contexts of organizational sustainment, evolution, or improvement. These are all concepts and ideas that would require further exploration and investigation.

**relational leadership and shared leadership development.** Leadership paradigms shifting away from single or heroic leaders are by no means a new phenomenon. Over the last several decades, researchers have explored how leadership is practiced as some kind of joint endeavor (Rust, 1991). As mentioned in Chapter 2, along with the wealth of recent studies that have emerged regarding this work, so too, have a number of terminologies regarding the phenomenon. Relational leadership represents one such term and theory.

The model of relational leadership focuses on the nature of the relationships that exist between a leader and a follower, or those who are being led (Regan & Brooks, 1995). This view of leadership states that the relationships between leaders and followers have certain characteristics that can potentially improve organizational climate (Regan & Brooks, 1995). In stark contrast to leadership found in strict bureaucratic forms, the relational form is found to be role-based and reciprocal.

Ancona and Bresman (2007) suggested that leadership being distributed and carried out by both formal and informal leaders throughout an organization could help in organizational planning and in achieving organizational goals. Future studies regarding Relational Leadership Theory framed within a structure of shared leadership development may serve to advance scholarship within both models. After all, as Pearce and Conger (2003) suggest, leadership is a concept
of relationships, and it assumes the existence of some people who follow one or more leaders.

management by objectives and shared leadership development. There are indeed differences between leaders, managers, and supervisors. This may provide impetus for future research regarding shared leadership development, as well. The shaping of team members and subordinates with regard to perception, responses to organizational changes, and acceptance of organizational practices may relate to all three.

Management by Objectives, or MBO, is a well-defined and integrated management system with planning representing the dominant function. Drucker (1954) first coined the term “management by objectives” in his work entitled, The Practice of Management (Robbins & DeCenzo, 2007). Often described as “performance management,” management by objectives emphasizes departmental and individual performance objectives at all management, supervisory, and leadership levels.

Often, management by objectives is associated with management fads, or systems that come along and appear to be embraced for a brief period with great enthusiasm, but eventually fade away. However, when employed properly, management by objectives may prove quite effective in meeting performance and organizational objectives. Developed in the 1950s, management by objectives is by no means a new concept, yet it continues to contribute to overall...
organizational effectiveness (DuBrin, 2008). Drucker’s original concept for management by objectives was provided in Figure 5.2

Figure 5.2

*The Management by Objectives Process*

Quite simply, management by objectives represents a system of organized planning and implementation in an orderly, effective manner. Robbins and DeCenzo (2007) stated, “Management by objectives is a system in which specific performance objectives are determined by both supervisors and subordinates, progress is periodically reviewed, and rewards are given on the basis of that progress” (Robbins & DeCenzo, 2007, p. 115).

A key element of management by objectives is the focus of operational efforts on organizationally important goals (Robbins & DeCenzo, 2007). Unlike traditional systems, a system based on management by objectives seeks to motivate members of an organization rather than control the members. Fueling this motivation is the concept of mutual participation, that is, the employee or member, as well as the supervisor, participates in establishing specific goals.

Goal specificity also represents a key element of management by objectives. Specific goals, tasks, time lines, and rewards linked to accomplishments serve as tools in directing actions toward organizational objectives, and more importantly, toward results. DuBrin (2008) described management by objectives as a specific managerial program that involves a series of the following sequential steps: 1) Establishing organizational goals, 2) Establishing unit, or departmental, objectives, 3) Reviewing member performances, 4) Negotiating or agreeing, 5) Creating action plans to achieve objectives, 6) Reviewing performance (DuBrin, 2008, p. 137).
A third element that proves crucial in an organizational system based on management by objectives is participation (Robbins & DeCenzo, 2007). Though levels of participation can vary from one organization to another, effective supervisors within this type of system place an emphasis on subordinates participating in the process of planning and establishing goals. Furthermore, subordinates not only assist in the planning and decision-making processes, but also in the process of reviewing and appraising their performance in executing the plans. Clearly, improved communication results as a distinct advantage to an organizational system based upon the elements of participation as it relates to management by objectives (Kroon, 1995).

Robbins and DeCenzo (2007) identified organizational systems based on traditional objective setting and the process of planning and establishing goals at the top-level of management. The proverbial “two-way street” of participation, feedback, and appraisal on the part of the subordinate and the supervisor does not exist in a system rooted in traditional objective setting. Whereas management by objectives represents a non-linear approach to organizational management, traditional objective setting represents quite a linear approach. In addition, Robbins and DeCenzo stated, “Traditional objective setting is a top-down approach with the top-level management imposing its standards on members below” (Robbins & DeCenzo, 2007, p. 116).

Organizational models based on systems of traditional objective setting do not allow for participation and choices regarding courses of action, not to
mention the entire decision-making process, on the part of subordinates. Contrarily, the quintessence of management by objectives is the element of participation. According to Robbins and Coulter (2005), the traditional perspective of objective setting assumes that top-level managers know what is best because they see the “big picture,” thus the goals passed down to subordinates are the instruments that serve to direct, guide, and in some ways, restrain individual employees’ work behaviors.

Plans that are passed down from top-level managers to low-level supervisors and subordinates as part of a traditional objective setting model flow through a series of individuals before they are finally executed at the operational level. Strategic planning concerns broad, overall goals for an entire organization. Therefore, within a system based on traditional objective setting, managers and supervisors must constantly define the goals, apply interpretation at their respective level of management, and add biases as they work to tailor the goals and make them more specific (Robbins & Coulter, 2005). Management by objectives provides for a more specific management system, one that seeks to eliminate these interpretations and biases through participation and goal specificity, all of which could serve as catalysts for further inquiries. Due to these elements, further investigation should be considered regarding such a style within the context of shared leadership development.

**shared leadership processes and organizational planning.** The identified theme of “decision-making process connection” can be expanded upon
through future inquiries regarding specific processes such as organizational planning. The importance of organizational planning cannot be overstated, as effective and successful leaders must constantly assess and reassess their responses to challenges and issues within and related to the organization. Through the process of planning, a leader not only defines the organization’s objectives or goals, but also establishes the strategy by which the goals will be achieved (Robbins & DeCenzo, 2007).

The concept of planning is often identified as a process that precedes decision-making. Within the context of effective management, Gamage and Pang (2003) suggest that planning has “primacy” from the standpoint of its position in the sequence of management functions and “pervasiveness” as an activity that affects the entire organization. In addition, because planning represents a non-linear process, successful leaders engage in the development of a comprehensive hierarchy of plans to integrate and coordinate organizational activities (Robbins & DeCenzo, 2007).

Within the context of organizational planning, there are three interconnected models, or types, of planning: strategic planning, tactical planning, and operational planning. Strategic planning refers to organizational planning concerned with the establishment of overall goals, as well as the positioning of an organization’s offerings against any form of competition (Robbins & DeCenzo, 2007). Strategic planning is a task that is often performed by organizational members at the highest levels of executive management.
Tactical planning, on the other hand, refers to organizational planning that provides more specific information about how the overall goals are to be attained (Robbins & DeCenzo, 2007). Tactical planning is a task often performed by organizational members at the mid-management level. Supervisory development at the lowest level within an organization concerns operational planning. Operational plans are rather specific, and these plans relate to the day-to-day operations of an organization.

The process of strategic planning can include conceptual ideas such as an organization’s vision and mission, as well as overall goals and situational analysis. These are plans that are rather broad, and they can be applied to an entire organization. Robbins and DeCenzo (2007) explained, “Strategic plans seek to position an organization in terms of its environment, provide direction to drive an organizations efforts over an extended period of time, and are less specific in their details as they serve as the basis for tactical plans” (Robbins & DeCenzo, 2007).

As Fullan (2001) appropriately alluded to in the title of his work, organizational leaders today find themselves *Leading in a Culture of Change*. Building on this idea, Weindling (1997) noted that strategic planning stresses evolutionary, or rolling planning, whereas “the plan itself is altered to adapt to changing circumstances” (Weindling, 1997, as cited in Gamage & Pang, 2003, p. 162). The idea behind strategic planning is to establish and employ less complex goals and organizational structures.
Several guides, models, and outlines exist regarding strategic planning and the implementation of strategic plans. However, it is important to understand that like all organizational theories, these should be used as a map or blueprint, as they are dependent upon the organization’s design structures. Implementing plans and policies that make sense for a particular organization based on an understanding of theories provides for effective supervisory, management, and leadership efforts. This understanding helps create strategic plans that work for an organization, as well as those working within the organization.

Whereas strategic planning concerns a rather broad process applied to an entire organization, tactical planning is applied to various units, departments, or elements of a particular organization. Often, tactical plans are developed from strategic plans, but cover shorter periods and must be updated more frequently to meet the demands of the current environment (Robbins & DeCenzo, 2007). Strategic plans provide for large-picture goals, yet they do not include specifics regarding the daily operations of getting the plan implemented – therein lies the tactical planning phase. Tactical plans are designed to help members of an organization execute the overall strategic plan, as well as accomplish specific tasks related to the organization’s greater strategy (Daft, 2007).

Stone and Villachica (2003) identified tactical planning as “planning that specifies solutions and approaches to realize the business case”, and they added that tactical planning should “address risks and provide a scope of work” (Stone
& Villachica, 2003, p. 12). As opposed to strategic planning, which is characterized as proactive, tactical planning is more reactive by nature. Thereby, tactical plans often address what is happening in the moment.

Due to the reactive nature of tactical planning and the proactive nature of strategic planning, effective supervisors find a balance between the two. Too much focus, or attention, to one or the other may prove detrimental to the organization. Conversely, neglecting one particular model may allow the other to breakdown. The two types of planning, strategic and tactical, work collectively, and organizational success will remain dependent upon supervisors finding balance between both models. Sycara-Cyranski (1990) emphasized a dynamic balance between strategic and tactical planning and added that such a balance is important for achieving coherent goal directed behaviors.

Operational planning is the process concerned with the lower levels of supervision within an organization. DuBrin (2008) built upon the previous models of strategic and operational planning and noted, “Planning is a complex and comprehensive process involving a series of overlapping and interrelated elements or stages, including strategic, tactical, and operational planning (DuBrin, 2008, p. 114). Of the three models, the process of operational planning usually involves steps that are rather specific in nature. These are steps taken by supervisors at the lower-levels within an organization.

The purpose of establishing goals and planning for organizational leaders at all levels is to assist the respective organization in reaching its peak
performance. Leaders engaged in shared leadership development are certainly interested in achieving such performance. Further inquiries regarding organizational planning and shared leadership development may shed further light into the details regarding these phenomena.

**shared leadership and the inter-generational divide.** Zemke, Raines, and Filipczak (2000) examined organizations where leadership and management teams have been successful in managing multiple generations. They identified what they termed the ACORN imperatives, or approaches, which contribute to intergenerational “comfort.” The approaches identified included the accommodation of employee differences by learning about unique needs and then serving them accordingly and the creation of workplace choices such as allowances for the workplace to shape itself around the work being done, thereby decreasing bureaucracy. Another approach identified concerned operations stemming from a sophisticated management style that involves adapting leadership styles to contexts, or by balancing concerns for tasks, as well as concerns for members working for the organization.

Leadership studies over the last several years have concentrated on the inter-generational gap and management practices. Yang and Guy (2006) found that continuity in management and supervisory practices were important factors related to organizational success when supporting multiple generations. Deal (2007) added that different generations have different preferred learning styles, as well as preferred means of communication.
Unique situations can occur in today’s work environment, such as five
generations being represented within a particular organization. From those born
before 1945, and those born after 1995 and just beginning to enter the workforce,
organizational leaders find themselves in a unique period regarding the needs for
intergenerational communication among members of the workforce today.

**A mixed methods approach.** A compliment to this qualitative
phenomenological study may also include a mixed methods exploration. Teddlie
and Tashakkori (2009) suggested that researchers mixing research methods
should consider more than just combining methods, such as the logic of
methodologies. Philosophical assumptions of ontology, epistemology, axiology,
generalizations, causal linkages, and deductive and inductive logic should be
applied (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011).

If a pure quantitative process concerns a deductive approach by which a
test theory, then a pure qualitative process concerns an inductive approach
by which a theory can be generated. Creswell (2009) explained that timing,
weighting, and mixing represent factors that should be taken into consideration
before determining the most appropriate mixed methods design for a particular
study. This process of consideration is complex and includes assumptions and
actions, and the researcher must certainly be aware of the mixed methods
research typologies that exist (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009). Timing is crucial
because researchers must consider when data will be collected and analyzed.
Creswell and Plano Clark’s (2011) Typology of Mixed Methods Designs and
Variants included four types of designs, which include different timing with regard to data collection. For example, the researcher must consider whether data are to be collected sequentially, such as in the explanatory and exploratory designs, or perhaps concurrently.

Creswell (2008) noted that the intended emphasis placed upon the quantitative and qualitative data to be collected in a mixed methods research study should also be considered. Creswell and Plano Clark (2011) referred to this emphasis as “weighting.” Creswell and Plano Clark (2011) also explained that the process of merging, or “mixing,” the data is just as important as the previous factors of timing and weighting when considering a mixed methods research design. This process should be considered in all steps of the research study’s "determination process," including feasibility, rationale, data collection, data analysis, and the final report of the project (Creswell, 2008).

Specifically, an exploratory mixed methods design in which a qualitative phase is followed by a quantitative phase may prove rather beneficial when it comes to further exploration of shared leadership development (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009). An exploratory design built upon an initial qualitative strand, such as this particular research study, followed by a second quantitative phase may lend validity to the qualitative results. The identified themes from this research study could essentially be used to develop and administer a test instrument to generate data to be analyzed statistically in a quantitative phase.
Though the conceptual ideas of transferability and meta-transferability lean heavily toward the quantitative realm of research, the mixed methods approach would certainly allow for more qualitative orientations within a conceptual framework in the attempt to provide better methods for answering additional research questions (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). Traditional ideas concerning the concepts of reliability and validity stem from the positivist tradition and in a future-mixed methods study regarding shared leadership development, qualitative methods can be used to explore themes regarding shared leadership. Those particular themes could be used to develop and administer a test instrument that can generate data to be analyzed statistically in a quantitative phase. The use of simple statistical measures of association could be utilized to allow for the discovery of shared leadership development methods within this iterative combination of qualitative and quantitative data. A mixed methods approach such as this may very well serve best in addressing the issues of shared leadership development, experiences of administrators engaged in shared leadership development, and the relationship between shared leadership development and overall organizational sustainability.

Summary

Chapter 5 served to provide a discussion of the findings of this study, a presentation of conclusions, an identification of implications for practitioners in the field, and recommendations for administrators engaged in shared leadership development within organizations identified as public-private partnerships.
Furthermore, the researcher offered recommendations for future research regarding shared leadership development within the contexts of transformational leadership, servant leadership, relational leadership, Management by Objectives (MBO), organizational planning, and the inter-generational divide. The researcher also recommended that a follow-up study be conducted within a mixed methods design, specifically a sequential exploratory design in which a qualitative phase would be followed by a quantitative phase.

The purpose of this qualitative research study was to explore the shared leadership development strategies and methods of administrators and organizational leaders engaged in public-private partnerships in a Southern urban center. A better understanding of the development methods and strategies within complex organizational and collaborative schemes such as public-private partnerships can serve as a helpful tool for organizational leaders in maintaining effective leadership structures. The central research question guided this qualitative research study, and it was supported by the issue sub-question and procedural sub-question, which framed seven themes that emerged from the collected data. These themes of tenure longevity, climate balance, face-to-face synergy, give-and-take exchange, decision-making process connection, a stake in the vision, and fluid operations provided for answers to all three of the research questions.
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Appendix A: Recruitment Letter

January 1, 2013

Dear Participant,

My name is Brian Barsanti, and I am a graduate student at the University of Alabama at Birmingham in pursuit of the Ph.D. in Educational Leadership. I am currently working on my dissertation. I am interested in shared leadership development among administrators and leaders engaged in public-private partnerships. I feel that you can provide valuable information regarding the topic of shared leadership and more specifically, shared leadership development. You are invited to participate in a one-on-one interview lasting no more than one hour.

Prior to the interview, you will receive an outline of questions that I plan to ask in order to give you plenty of time to think about your responses. During the actual interview, I may ask some clarifying questions in order to yield additional details from your responses. Your name will not be used in the dissertation and your participation in this research study is completely voluntary. In addition, there are no penalties should you decide not to participate. Furthermore, you can withdraw from the research study at any time. Your interview will be audio recorded, and the data generated in the form of your responses will be available for your review.

The results of this dissertation will be presented to my dissertation committee consisting of five faculty members at the University of Alabama at Birmingham. Results could potentially serve as the impetus for future research projects. These studies may have the potential to influence organizational policies and leadership practices in the future.

If you have any questions, I can be reached at 205-833-8226 or via email at barsanti@uab.edu.

Sincerely,

Brian J. Barsanti
Appendix B: Informed Consent Letter

Prospective Research Participant:

Read this consent form carefully and ask as many questions as you like before you decide whether you want to participate in this research study. You are free to ask questions at any time before, during, or after your participation in this research.

Dissertation Information:

TITLE
Concerning Shared Leadership Development: A Phenomenological Study of Administrator Experiences within Public-Private Partnerships

ORGANIZATION
University of Alabama at Birmingham

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR
Brian J. Barsanti

CONTACT INFORMATION
205-833-8226; barsanti@uab.edu

PURPOSE OF THIS RESEARCH STUDY
The purpose of this qualitative study is to explore the leadership development strategies and methods of administrators and organizational leaders engaged in public-private partnerships in a Southern urban center.

PROCEDURES
You will be asked to participate in a one-on-one interview that should last no longer than one hour in length.
POSSIBLE RISKS OR DISCOMFORT

There are no identified risks at this time; however, any new information developed during this research study that may affect your willingness to continue will be communicated to you.

POSSIBLE BENEFITS

It is my intent that this qualitative study will create an advantage in itself. This advantage will stem from the core of the study’s purpose – a greater understanding of shared leadership development methods and strategies to better support the sustainability of shared leadership models. It is also my intent that this understanding will eventually lead to greater knowledge of shared leadership and collaborative organizational structures under the umbrella of the study’s central phenomenon – shared leadership development.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

There is no financial compensation for your participation in this research study.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Your identity in this research study will be treated as confidential. The results of the study will not give your name or include any identifiable references to you.

TERMINATION OF RESEARCH STUDY

You are free to choose whether or not to participate in this research study. There will be no penalty should you choose not to participate. In addition, your participation in the study may be terminated by the principal investigator due to unforeseen circumstances.

AUTHORIZATION

I have read and understand this consent form, and I volunteer to participate in this research study. I understand that I will receive a copy of this form. I voluntarily choose to participate and I further understand that nothing in this consent form is intended to replace any applicable federal, state, or local laws.

Participant Name (Printed): ________________________________

Participant Signature: ________________________________
Appendix C: Interview Protocol

Concerning Shared Leadership Development: A Phenomenological Exploration of Administrator Experiences within Public-Private Partnerships

**Interview Protocol**

Name_________________________ Date____________________

Organization___________________ Title____________________

**Introduction**

On behalf of my dissertation committee and the University of Alabama at Birmingham, I want to thank you for taking the time to talk to me today. I will be recording and transcribing what is said today. I will be asking you to review the transcription with some of the notes I make regarding what you say. It is important that I reflect in my writing what you mean. Therefore, I want you to review it to make sure that I am representing your views. The transcription will be a verbatim, so be prepared to see any “uhhs” or “ahhs” that you say. Direct quotes used in the final written paper will not contain those phrases. It is important that the transcription be verbatim so that I do not paraphrase something you have stated with an incorrect interpretation.

I am interested in the shared leadership development strategies and methods of administrators and organizational leaders engaged in public-private partnerships.
You have had the opportunity to review the questions I am going to ask you today and give them some thought. I want your perspective so please feel free to share your views and opinions. I may ask some additional questions if I require clarity regarding a statement that you have made. Do I have your permission to audio record this interview? Are you ready to begin the interview?

**Probe Question 1:** Can you describe your educational experience?

**Probe Question 2:** Can you describe your professional work experience?
**Probe Question 3:** Can you tell me about your leadership experience?

**Probe Question 4:** Can you tell me about your shared leadership experience?
Organization / Role

5. Describe the organization you are currently working for.

6. Describe your role within the shared leadership structure of your organization.
7. Can you share the experiences that have prepared you for a shared leadership structure?

Development / Methods

8. What do you think is meant by “shared leadership?”
9. How do you, as a leader, contribute to shared leadership development within your organization?

10. What are the barriers or difficulties you face in shared leadership development?
11. What are the values and/or practices that inform your shared leadership development strategies?

12. Do you find shared leadership development is necessary?
13. How would you describe the extent to which you have successfully developed shared leadership structures within your organization?

14. Is there anything else that you would like to clarify or otherwise discuss with me today regarding shared leadership development methods?
**Participant Quotations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Now, this is not something that just happened over night…it took time, a long time. You see,”</td>
<td>Long time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’ve been here for than twenty years, and I can tell you, it’s still a work in progress.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I never viewed sharing leadership as a quick fix to any problem, and I never used it like that.”</td>
<td>Never a quick fix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I’m all about planning. That’s how I work…and just like with any plan, it takes time. Involving others in leading is the same way….that’s how I approached it from the beginning.”</td>
<td>It takes time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Accomplishing goals is important…but we have to remember that as leaders, we are also here to grow others, and what does that take? Well, it takes work, and a lot of time goes into that.”</td>
<td>A lot of time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Why do we delegate to members of a work team? Well, we don’t do it to pass along the buck or lighten the workload…we do it to grow others within the group or within the organization as a whole. I guess I would kind of liken it to planting a seed and growing it…that seed just doesn’t bloom as soon as you plant it.”</td>
<td>Tenure, Longevity, Just doesn't bloom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Part of my job when I came onboard as director here was to create a vision, and then get folks onboard with this vision. I knew I couldn’t implement a vision unless I had people who shared that vision. I knew that if I wanted to be here for the long haul, that I had to surround myself with those who shared the same vision…and sometimes, people didn’t share in my vision. Whenever anyone</td>
<td>Long haul</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
left, I made sure that new hires did."

“When it came to creating a vision, I wanted to include everyone from the beginning. It wasn’t a matter of me, me, me. It was us, us, us, from the beginning…and that meant, well, that was important to me. That might not be the best thing for some people in a position like this, but I wanted that vision to endure…and I thought that was the best way.”

"My experience with this system has been overwhelmingly good…it’s like I have a bunch of me running around here…I always thought and joked about wanting to clone myself, and this kind of a system allows me to do just that…but it takes the right kind of people, and sometime you have to develop those people in the long run. As a leader, that’s your job.”

"As I’m getting older now, I find myself spending more and more time doing that…but in the end, it definitely makes things easier for me.”

“I really care about what we do here, and I believe in what we do. You know, good leaders often have to come up with unique ways of doing things…and they have to inspire and empathize and recognize. I’m committed to those things, but I want that commitment to be collective.”

“You can’t just do those things every now and then. I realized that if it was gonna work and we were gonna be successful, than everyone had to be committed, just like a team.”

“I find my leadership style constantly changing…no
particular leadership style fully replaces the other, and one can’t stand alone when you deal with the complexities that I deal with on a day-to-day basis.”

“When challenges are presented to me, the ability to balance human resources, capital, and my personal preferences in support of my goals becomes increasingly more difficult, and my responsibilities even greater.”

“There’s a great deal of symmetry here, and I think everyone feels it. When problems arise, we all deal with ‘em.”

“My role is to help facilitate connections….and this might mean putting the right people in a position where they can best meet a challenge.”

“The people I work with don’t always agree with me…and that’s not always a bad thing. I learned from former bosses not to surround myself, at any level now, with “yes” people…that’s not always a good thing.”

“My job is to balance our needs based on who I’ve got on my team…and I truly feel that this is what sharing is…it’s balance.”

“We are all professionals here, and we all have something significant to offer…different skills and skill sets…why not take advantage of that, I thought.”

“I constantly have to redefine and reevaluate the lines of power I give to others….we’ve got a lot of responsibilities, but then again, we’ve got a lot of...
people to meet these head-on.”

“From the time I started, I gathered everyone’s input on which areas would fall where, and who oversee these areas.”

Everyone’s input

“Too much centralization can be a pitfall when it comes to making a system like this work.”

Too much centralization/Pitfall

“Now, my experience with sharing the leadership role is not one that I would consider a hundred percent. Sometimes, I feel like I work within a hybrid position…sometimes team player, sometimes manager.”

Hybrid

“I make a conscious effort to talk to people in-person…constantly.” He added, “I think that as leaders, we should be self-aware so as to manage this type [in-person] of communication well and constantly learn and develop…and I don’t mean this only as leaders, but as communicators. It’s a fundamental thing.”

Talk to people in-person/Communication

Face-to-Face Synergy

“An important idea to remember is that communication doesn’t include talking, emailing, or texting to others exclusively…I always try to listen to what others are saying, pay close attention, and ask for clarification whenever necessary…and I show it, I demonstrate it.”

Listen/Pay close attention

“Be responsive when you’re in a position of shared leadership. This involves sitting down with your counterparts and listening to what they have to say.”

Be responsive/Listening

“Often, I try to summarize what someone just told
me as I’m having a conversation with them just to demonstrate the fact that I had been paying attention to what they were saying...this shows them that I think what they’re saying is important, and that’s important to me.”

“You never want to pass judgment on those you’re working with... what we do here is not personal, and I always try to set aside my personal beliefs about the manner in which others conduct their personal lives.”

“Take sending an email for example, you can’t see how that person reacts...facial features and what not...and an email or a text can’t tell you something in jest.”

“You know, too often, too many people try to take the easy way out...they don’t talk to one another anymore. In most cases, I think, they end up wasting more time emailing or texting and waiting for a response.”

“Sometimes, I think I get more from someone else when I look them in the eyes and ask them a question...probably way more than I would in a text message.”

“Interpersonal discussion are like the foundation for good communication...and once this groundwork is laid, you can build on other forms of communication.”

“Sure, sending emails and texts can be effective in certain situations, but it might delay a decision on something. Plus, having a conversation with someone in-person builds trust.”
“In a similar sense, compromise could lead to re-
evaluations of many aspects of the organization
itself...including an individual’s role as a leader.”

“For others to be engaged, you gotta create a
resonant workplace...you may have to give in at
times...but this can help create better work
relationships.”

“Mismanagement of this [compromise] or
irresponsible practices can prove detrimental to
your credibility.”

“If you don’t give in or compromise at the right
time...on the right issues, then the impact can be
misunderstood or even diluted a good bit.”

“As the executive director, I have to say that my
part in adjusting my stance on something like some
important issue can’t be overstated.”

“Overall, our success is dependent upon it
[give-and-take]...I have to be willing at times...and
this has to be stressed because all too often,
managers and supervisors don’t always get that.
This includes everyone, whether they are in position
of management or supervision, or not.”

“If you really needed to get something done...who
are you going to turn to make it happen...someone
who believes in it and feels connected to it?”

“Let me tell you, it’s like intellectual capital...you
want that investment from others...and it surely
helps.”
“What’s decision making all about…connecting others…connecting others to you and everyone as a whole, as an organization.”

“You gotta understand, I worked in sales…as I rose through the ranks in my professional career, everything is a sell…everything is a buy-in. You here this stuff all the time in marketing…they preach this stuff to you, this kind of rhetoric…but it’s not just talk, it’s real.”

“I try to bring everyone together on a regular basis…it’s good to make sure that we’re always on the same page.”

“When it comes to major issues…and big decisions have to be made, then we want to be unified…we don’t want feelings of disconnect. That’s the point.”

“People believing in what you’re trying to do as an organization, as a team, is absolutely paramount. If you want to be effective and successful in sharing leadership…in sharing responsibility…you have to constantly assess and reassess the climate. You have to step back and ask yourself, do people believe in this? Do they feel a part of this?”

“I make decisions with members of my staff everyday but overall, I have to consider what’s in it for them, too.”

“My mother used to tell me, it’s not all about you, son.”
“I want to be sure to always convey the importance I give to team efforts across the board… I begin every one of my staff meetings with a team-building exercise…and not just any exercise, but one that hits-home a message about our vision…something to tie it all in…everything I do in that regard means something.”

“As a leader, I have to formulate or approve of a vision for this organization, but if I don’t express that vision or communicate it clearly, how can I expect those around me to invest in it?

“I try to emphasize my own core values when I bring others into the fold about what I see for the future…and I think about what others will gravitate towards.”

“There’s no one-size-fits-all style when it comes to sharing responsibility, or sharing in decisions.”

“I think timing and temperament can always impact your response.”

“I try not to always take a hard line on things…now that doesn’t mean I’ll compromise what I feel is right, but I tend to think more about the grey areas when others are involved.”

“I used to be a Marine…improvise, adapt, overcome was my mantra. I’m not hard to the core, or should I say the Corps with a capital ‘C’ and a ‘p’ as in ‘Marine Corps,’ but I use that experience to stay flexible.”
“From the moment I arrived here, I made sure that the business-as-usual approach would be left by the wayside...I wanted everyone around me to start thinking along the lines of new opportunities for themselves...getting out of their normal routines, and I thought that was very important when it came to sharing ideas.”

“I try not to get caught up in old habits...developing those around me, it wasn’t always easy, but you’ve got to be ready to adapt.”

“A plan itself is often changed or altered because of changing circumstances.”
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