Research Article

Discovering the Components of Shared Leadership Using a Qualitative Approach in Educational Organizations in Mashhad

Elias Karbasforoshan[a], Dr. Yaghoob Maharati[b], Dr. Golamreza Malekzadeh[c], Dr. Fariborz Rahimnia[d]

[a] PhD Student in Organizational Behavior Management, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad.
[b] Associate Professor Department of Management Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Mashhad, Iran.
Email: maharati@um.ac.ir
[c] Associate Professor Department of Management Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Mashhad, Iran.
[d] Professor Department of Management Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Mashhad, Iran.

Abstract

Shared leadership is a growing category in organizational behavior. This leadership focuses on a team of people who simultaneously lead the organization instead of focusing solely on vertical leadership or other types of leadership. This study is conducted to investigate the views of leadership team members on the components, benefits, and challenges of shared leadership. For this purpose, semi-structured interviews were conducted with members of the leadership team of private organizations in the field of education based on the phenomenological approach. In this team, shared leadership is implemented and analyzed by the content analysis method. In this study, 11 sub-themes and 24 sub-components were identified that include participatory leadership, participatory decision making, rotational management, supportive management, participatory attitude, positive personality trait, collectivism, high organizational capacity building, organizational learning, organizational integration, and corporate responsibility. The dimensions of shared leadership in private organizations in Mashhad can be identified by reflecting on the results. We can identify the dimensions of shared leadership in private organizations in Mashhad and gain a better understanding of the issues mentioned about shared leadership by reflecting on the results.

Keywords: Shared Leadership, Content Analysis, Leadership, Leadership Styles, Participatory Management, Educational Organizations.

Introduction

Due to the changes that have occurred in the business environment, accelerating technology growth, and intensifying competition between organizations, organizational leadership and how it is implemented have been more considered in recent years. The initial definitions of this category were more in the form of one-person and vertical leadership in the literature. By changing the conditions, other styles in which team members are also involved in the leadership process have been proposed and examined in organizations (Mehra et al., 2006). Yukel defines leadership as:

«Leadership is the process of influencing each other to understand and agree on what needs to be done and how to do it effectively, and the process of facilitating and coordinating individual and collective efforts to achieve common goals» Yukl, (2009). In the 1940s and 1950s, the MIT Research Center also researched the effect of communication position in the communication network on perceptions of shared leadership (Mehra et al., 2006). In 1954, Bill also suggested that assigning leadership tasks to team members can have a positive effect on team performance (Sivasubramaniam et al., 2002). In addition, to control the organization and create a collective spirit, many organizations have used participatory leadership styles.

Due to the lack of knowledge of many employees with this leadership model, implementing this type of leadership in organizations has many problems (Ensley, Hmieleski, & C. L. Pearce, 2006). The implementation of this leadership style in those institutions will be more effective if more managers and employees of institutions become familiar with this type of leadership and its functions. According to the observations of many employees, managers, and leaders in organizations, they have not even heard of shared leadership even though they implement it and processes similar in their organization. As a result, they are experimentally implementing this type of leadership or something similar.

The conducted quantitative research in this field shows that the implementation of this type of leadership in educational organizations can lead to greater satisfaction, higher work commitment, and greater loyalty to the organization (Yassini et al., 2013; Yassini, Zain Abadi, Nouh Ibrahim, and Arasteh, 2012). Employee satisfaction is one of the factors influencing people's attitudes toward the organization. It has a great impact on organizational performance. There has been a lot of research on job satisfaction and its consequences. But in brief, job satisfaction is a positive and pleasant feeling and a consequence of job evaluation or experience. This condition greatly contributes to the physical and mental health of people. In terms of organization, the high level of job satisfaction reflects a very favorable organizational climate that leads to employee recruitment and retention. It seems that little research has been done on the nature of leadership and the management of teaching aids, as well as on how to implement shared leadership in organizations.

It seems that quantitative research has been conducted on the nature of leadership, the management of training aid organizations, and the way of implementing shared leadership in organizations. Shared leadership is not an old theory and has not been widely discussed (Mehra et al., 2006). The various dimensions of this phenomenon in different contexts have not yet been specifically and comprehensively addressed, although, in recent years, this theory and this type of leadership in organizations have been used more and more.

It has been reported that this type of leadership has been used in many institutions in recent years, in times of economic recession and highly competitive markets in various fields. This type of leadership has created many problems for its implementers because the various dimensions of this type of leadership, including the formation of process and outputs of this model in the context of institutions, are not fully considered (Pearce et al., 2009).

Depending on their contextual factors, the executives of this type of leadership can offer their customers better and more productive services if they have more knowledge in this field.

Theoretical support:

It is believed that organizational or team leadership is a phenomenon that a person who has the highest position in the team or organization can influence their subordinates through actions for the goals of the organization (Sivasubramaniam, Murry, Avolio, & Jung, 2002). In this view, this person should have certain characteristics. For example, he should have good self-confidence, high energy, and internal locus of control are also some of the characteristics that have been mentioned for this person in the literature. Today, these theories are less important than other theories and have become more inclined to behavioral and contingency theories (Yukl, 2009). This research subject specifically refers to shared leadership in the team. But investigating the shared leadership history in organizations plays a crucial role in understanding this type of leadership. For this purpose, we study

a description of the history of this type of leadership in the organization and related research, and then we study specifically the team.

In modern management knowledge, and especially in the literature on organizational leadership, leadership is not just known as the specific type of one-person leadership. Yukel defines leadership as: «Leadership is the process of influencing each other to understand and agree on what needs to be done and how to do it effectively, and the process of facilitating and coordinating individual and collective efforts to achieve common goals» Yukl, (2009). This definition only refers to a process but does not refer to a leader who does these things.

For shared leadership in the organizational leadership literature, it is possible to find the theoretical roots that Pierce and Sims addressed in their 2006 article. Theories that have created shared leadership or encouraged some researchers to explore this theory are known as theoretical roots. In this article, the roots of shared leadership in the management literature are attributed to four cases. The first case is related to Mary Parker Follett's writings (1868-1933). He always suggests people not to look for a designed leader to advance the team affairs. Sometimes, they should go ahead and play the manager's rule. The second case concerns Emergent Leadership. In this case, individuals choose a leader from among themselves, and this choice is made by the group members themselves. In this condition, shared leadership is the serial selection of the leader in different situations by the members. The third case concerns the theory of Substitutes for Leadership. In this condition, characteristics of the team cause leadership to have a less important role in the team (Kerr, 2005). In addition, shared leadership and the participation of members can be recognized as a substitute for leadership. For example, there may be no longer a need for a vertical leader to encourage the team for the team's vision, or this need may diminish when everyone in the team is interested in determining the team's vision and always sees the team's vision in front of themselves. The final case is empowerment and self-governing teams that indicate the role of team members in leadership. In this condition, empowering members and helping their team manage itself can also have a significant effect on people participating in shared leadership. (Ensley, Hmieleski, & Pearce, 2006).

As mentioned, there was a theory about not using vertical leadership, in which only one person is recognized as the leader of a team or organization, and commands are executed from top to bottom throughout the team or organization. This theory is not a topic that has recently been considered by scientific research or implemented in organizations. For example, Moreno, and Jenning in the 1930s, researched intra-group relationship networks to examine how is leadership in an organization. In the 1940s and 1950s, the MIT Research Center researched the effect of communication position in the communication network on perceptions of shared leadership (Mehra et al., 2006). In 1954, Bill suggested that assigning leadership tasks to team members has a positive effect on team performance (Sivasubramaniam et al., 2002). In addition, to control the organization and create a collective spirit, many organizations use shared leadership styles. For example, Robert Tunsand, the Avis CEO, presented the benefits of using participatory leadership in organizations in 1969. It was more about two-way leadership, which will be explained more. In the 1970s, many organizations used two-way leadership. After seeing the benefits of using this type of leadership in organizations, researchers gradually found the idea of creating a system in which all members of the organization participate in leadership. (O Toole, Galbraith, & Lawler, 2002).

The potential benefits of shared leadership:

Using multiple brains instead of one brain is one of the possible benefits of this type of leadership, which is crucial due to the use of knowledge in today's organizations. The reason is that due to the specialization of jobs, only one person cannot do the best to manage people everywhere, and all people in the organization should be used to perform the leadership process in the organization or team as well as possible.

In an article in 2009, Pierce, Mans, and Sims, three well-known experts in this field, presented the following factors on the reasons why shared leadership is important in organizations:

Elias Karbasforoshan, Dr. Yaghoob Maharati, Dr. Golamreza Malekzadeh, Dr. Fariborz Rahimnia

The first case is that an individual does not have enough information and knowledge to manage teamwork, and it should be divided among several people. In this case, different people can do each work professionally in their skills.

The second case is the required speed to respond and react to the environment. In the case of vertical leadership, all decisions are made by the vertical leader, which made the organization wait for the leaders' decision. But there is no need for this suspension in the case of shared leadership.

The third case is the complexity of the task. A group of people can easier cope with complex issues if they work together to orient the organization and make decisions. (Pearce et al., 2009).

It is interesting to compare the impact of vertical and shared leadership. In a 1989 article, Sirs introduces a structure called Member exchange that tries to explain the concept of dual relationships between group members. High-quality member interactions mean excellent work and social relationships in the group so that individuals do things in their interests and for the benefit of subordinates. Sir's finding is an important part of the shared leadership theory. He found that the impact of the quality of members' relationships with each other on team outputs is greater than the impact of the quality of the vertical relationships that the leader communicates with subordinates. (Sivasubramaniam et al., 2002). It is concluded that shared leadership practices in teams where members have a significant level of communication with each other have a better impact than the same practices performed by the vertical or single leader. In this case, the quality of relationships acts as a moderator variable and affects the relationship between leadership practices and output (Sivasubramaniam et al., 2002).

There are also other attitudes to shared leadership. Shared leadership creates social capital in the organization in terms of social media attitudes. The leaders of the organization can create networks for their subordinates so that they benefit from the advantages of using networks and relationships. This will be a step towards empowering the members of the group to lead it by these people. In this case, group members can become powerful by creating networks. In terms of network, leadership also becomes stronger when group members are in contact with people with that group leader is not in contact. Therefore, the network will be more powerful by having more members. In addition, individuals will develop themselves due to these exchanges (Balkundi & Kilduff, 2006).

Factors influencing the formation of shared leadership:

In various studies, many backgrounds have been dedicated to shared leadership. Pirs divides them into group characteristics, environmental characteristics, and job characteristics. In this case, other items have also been separately mentioned. For example, the internal environment of the team, the external leadership of the team, and the collective orientation among the members have been suggested as shared leadership backgrounds (Mathieu, Maynard, Rapp, & Gilson, 2008). In this study, Pierce's classification will be considered and will be mentioned briefly.

In an organization, shared leadership is considered from several perspectives according to mentioned factors. The issues that have been mentioned in the literature are the characteristics of the group members, the background conditions of the group, and the job characteristics. On the other hand, the backgrounds and consequences of this leadership are examined in detail to see what dimensions will be included in the team. In this research, we deal with different dimensions of this type of leadership and its components in the organization by using semi-structured interviews. We examine possible advantages, disadvantages, implementation, and mechanisms. On the other hand, Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire is used to analyze the impact of this type of leadership on employee satisfaction in Mashhad educational institutions, which concerns the entrance exam.

Research Methods:

Creswell (2005) states that phenomenological research provides insights into mental change, beliefs, perceptions, and the reference framework for human lived experiences. This strategy is useful when the researcher seeks to better understand human relationships (Sreejesh, Mohapatra, 2013). In some concepts, it is difficult to understand human behavior through objective actions; deep

understanding can only be achieved through the participants' mental experience (Gupta, Awasthy, 2015). The nature of phenomenological strategy identifies phenomena based on lived experiences, perceptions, and perceptions of people and helps to understand phenomena more deeply. The strategy of the qualitative part of the research, or the discovery of the components of shared leadership, is called phenomenological. Due to the volume of competition and the scope of diversity of work, and other cases mentioned in the previous sections, shared leadership is being implemented, and the staff is experiencing such leadership behavior in many entrance exam institutions in Mashhad.

The leaders and managers of entrance exam institutions in Mashhad are the statistical populations of the present study. They are currently controlled by a shared leadership team and are members of the shared leadership team.

In the present study, the study population is all managers or management team of Mashhad entrance exam institutions who have at least a bachelor's degree, significant work experience, relevant knowledge, are currently experiencing shared leadership in their work environment, and have experienced this type of leadership in their organization for more than one year. Because:

1. Recognizing shared leadership behaviors in the organization is typically done by people who have participated in this process.

2. The correct knowledge of leadership processes in the organization is achieved only with high work experience.

3. Adequate interaction during cooperation creates a better attitude in the organization and helps people to identify the dimensions of the issue better.

4. The phenomenon of shared leadership is a special type of leadership in the organization. Therefore, it is possible that low-level forces do not have accurate knowledge of their dimensions and cannot properly understand the mechanisms that occur in the organization to divide activities.

In the present study, twenty-seven people are included in the community treasury. Adequacy of sampling based on the saturation and reproducibility of the collected data indicates that sufficient data has been collected for all aspects of the phenomenon. In the present study, the data was saturated after thirteen interviews so that during the interview, the researcher was repeatedly confronted with similar words and opinions. The information from the interviews only confirmed and repeated the previous data. Three additional interviews were conducted to confirm and ensure data saturation. Finally, 16 interviews were conducted for theoretical saturation. In this study, to collect qualitative data, semi-structured interviews are used to discover the components of shared leadership. In the present study, the combination method was used to prove the validity and research process. In terms of gender, work experience, place of activity, and specialty, data were collected from different managers. Among 16 interviewees, there were 14 men and two women with a work experience of a minimum of 2 years and a maximum of 11 years. Four different organizations were also interviewed in terms of the variety of workplaces. The qualitative content analysis begins with an in-depth reading of the text to discover less obvious or hidden content. Analysts create code while analyzing qualitative data, such as handwritten interviews. The result of the content analysis is shown as "class." Classes show larger concepts. Identifying the contents of categories seems to be a repetitive process. Therefore, the researcher spends more time reviewing previously identified categories, integrating or dividing them, and resolving inconsistencies if he analyzes the text more.

The researchers began coding them after conducting the interviews. Then, phrases containing topics were taken. The number of topics was significantly reduced by removing similar and synonymous terms. Some sub-themes and compression units appeared after a thorough study of the text.

Research findings:

Elias Karbasforoshan, Dr. Yaghoob Maharati, Dr. Golamreza Malekzadeh, Dr. Fariborz Rahimnia

Eleven sub-themes were identified by using content analysis. They include participatory leadership, participatory decision making, rotational management, supportive management, participatory attitude, positive personality trait, collectivism, high organizational capacity building, organizational learning, organizational integration, and responsibility participatory. They are shown in Table 1.

Theme	sub-themes	Compression units	Repeat
Shared leadership	Participatory leadership	Leadership Committee	18
		Several leaders, key leaders	12
	Participatory decision making	Decision-making sessions	11
		Decide together	19
		Comment by the board team	5
	Rotational management	Change people at the top	10
		The leadership of different members	5
	Supportive management	Listen to team members talk	6
		Relationships with people and opinions	9
	Participatory attitude	Common approach	6
		Fixed sessions	10
	Positive personality traits	Comments from people	15
		personality trait	12
	Collectivism	Expressing different opinions	15
		Different perspectives and experiences	15
		More different people	20

High organizational capacity building	Professional development	8
	Capacity Building	10
	Expand the network of people	8
Organisational Learning	Information sharing	8
	Thinking and consulting together	20
	Learn from others	10
	Use similar experiences of others	6
Organizational integration	The trust	7
	Harmony and empathy	8
Responsibility participatory	Delegate responsibility	11
	Joint responsibility	21

In the following, we will explain each of the cases and refer to the literature related to the subject. In Table 2, examples of the sentences mentioned in the interviews are presented.

Theme	Sub-theme	Compression units	Semantic units
Shared leadership	Participatory leadership	Leadership Committee	I think that the school principal is a leader. They have a leadership committee, and they were all leaders. One main leader, I say common leaders or dependent leaders. However, there are many leaders involved.
		several leaders	We have members of the leadership team. They will be the main leaders. In addition, we have a training manager who supervises and directs a lot of work.
	Participatory decision making	Decision sessions	If we want to bring new ideas, we can go to the collective decision-making meetings or those leaders to communicate our ideas directly to them.
		Group decision making	As a group, we make decisions that we come up with ideas and make decisions together

	Leadership team meetings	The leadership team holds a meeting once a month. Then, different sections in the leadership team comment
Rotational management	Managerial rotation	There is great composition and changes. It is a good thing. You do not want everyone to be the same
	Leadership chance for members	The leadership team is almost a two-year term. It provides an opportunity for people to attend leadership councils and have different members, and people are not the same.
Supportive management	Effective listening	The management model in our organization is not controlling everything. Listening to people in the organization and solving their problems is based on trust.
	Close relationships with others	There is naturally a manager who is a member of the organization's leadership team; I think he acts so that he has been able to connect with people and use the team to build relationships and networks.
Participatory attitude	Create a common approach	Weekly meetings are held to involve all stakeholders in the organization to have a completely common approach on how everyone works together for collective impact.
	Weekly meetings	We have weekly meetings. The information is discussed on how to better influence common activities.
Positive personality traits	Popular personality	The thing concerning my personality is that I can talk to people. It helps everyone to be like a page and be open to sharing ideas.
		In my group, they are all very noisy. Therefore, the leaders of my organization did not have to work very hard to make sure that everyone's voice could be heard.
	Self-contained personality traits	I do not know if it relates to the organization or possibly to my weakness. I know my personality. I

		worked for a long time as a teacher and then as a consultant and secretary in institutions, and I used to work myself.
Collectivism	Ability to express opinions	I have seen that they try to give people a chance to express different opinions and influence coordinated decisions.
	Pay attention to different perspectives and experiences	I say that the benefits are different perspectives; different groups present their experiences. These two are the best events, with different perspectives and different experiences.
	There are different people in the leadership team	It just offers different perspectives and helps you need more if different people come in. This gives a better idea of what the group needs because it is not practical for the CEO to see all the dimensions.
High organizational capacity building	Professional development	We provide professional training and development for all our employees. Therefore, those who work directly with our programs should make real progress in terms of professional development.
	Capacity Building	Members have led to more capacity building in the organization. Because each of them specializes in a part of the work and manages the training, they also provide training and access to specialists in each department.
	Networking	Implementing this type of leadership has helped me expand my network and meet new people who are becoming potential partners.
Organisational Learning	Information sharing	There are many events, meetings, or social events to share information about this organization. After you go to one of them, you have a face-to-face meeting with people in this section or market, which is very useful.
	Thought and consultation	I talk to other members of the leadership team. This will give you a variety of ways to manage your organization's projects to give you ideas on how to provide training in that area.
	Learn from others	By having leaders together, I can learn from them. I learned from how they think and how they deal with attracting and managing students about entrance

		exam education, and how they approach the leadership of the organization.
	Use similar experiences of others	It's like if you are struggling with the performance of an employee, you can rely on each person and say, 'Have you ever had a coach do that? How did you overcome it?
Organizational integration	the trust	The people you have seen for a long time, you feel more connected to them, and you feel you can trust them more. They are not just trying to make a name for themselves or doing something, so you can have more confidence there
	Harmony and empathy	Having a specific meeting that is responsible for making coordination decisions gives people in the organization a sense of trust and coordination
Responsibility participatory	Delegate responsibility	And through that discussion, we determine a good action, and then we determine how to proceed with this process. And then, from there, we delegate responsibilities to one or more people based on needs.
	Joint responsibility	One of the advantages is shared responsibility, shared responsibility in doing a particular job. If it was something you were trying to do at the institutional level, we'd better do it together

Participatory leadership:

A common feature of shared leadership compared to the traditional vertical approach is dividing or sharing leadership with different people (Carson Et Al., 2007; Pierce and Conger, 2003). Choosing several leaders identified in this study is consistent with previous literature. It shows that shared leadership can be planned and implemented so that several leaders work in the organization at the same time. (D'lnnocenzo et al., 2019, Xiao et al. 2004, Pitelis, Wagner, 2006). Pitlis and Wagner (2019) described this approach particularly as shared leadership, and a small group of designated leaders plays a key role in implementing shared leadership in the organization. According to findings, dividing leadership among multiple people in organizational activities allows individuals to take the initiative in planning and implementing activities to serve students. (Kang, svensson, 2019, Welty Peachey, Schulenkorf, hill, 2019, Whitley, Welty Peachey, 2020). The presence of several leaders in the organization is consistent with the previous literature on shared leadership with the distribution of leadership among all members no matter with or without apparent leadership (Carson et al., 2007; Hoch, Dulebohn, 2017; Kang, Svensson, 2019; Pierce et al., 2004, zhu et al., 2018, Morgeson et al., 2010).

In general, leadership roles or functions are formally shared by program managers and leadership council members. Based on this study findings, a combination of formal and informal types of shared leadership helps to increase job satisfaction and team productivity, which is consistent with previous findings (Marion et al., 2016). Therefore, educational organizations should have the expertise and participation of interested members in the leadership process, so that determined groups

of formal and informal leaders encourage each other to benefit from the complete potential of shared leadership. For this purpose, the leaders are suggested to create small groups of internal staff to participate in various organizational tasks and projects.

Participatory decision making:

Participatory decision-making has been emphasized as a vital aspect of shared leadership compared to vertical leadership (Carson et al., 2007; Pierce et al., 2008; Hoch, Kozlowski, 2014). For example, Carson et al. (2007) found that member participation facilitates the emergence of shared leadership in a series of organizational decisions. They stated that the participation of organizational members in decision-making, discussion of goals, tasks, and other organizational issues could increase the collective presence of members in the leadership process. A recent study examines the role of collective decision-making for leadership shared through the concept of hearing the voice. Wu et al. (2018) state that "hearing voice is described as a constructive transformational relationship, participation in decision-making, and participation in key processes. In this case, a high level of participation of organizational members in the decision-making process can facilitate the development of shared leadership according to results. Therefore, to move towards a participatory leadership approach to achieve better organizational results, educational organizations should involve staff members and activists in the decision-making process. (Kang, svensson, 2019, Schulenkorf, 2017, Svensson, Hambrick, 2016).

Rotational management:

This finding supports Pierce and Kangar's (2003) conceptualization of shared leadership. It also emphasizes the ongoing impact of peers across the organization to guide each other. The results provide a practical consequence for training organizations on how to practice shared leadership in partnership. (Welty Peachey, 2018, Jones et al., 2017). Based on the results, to facilitate the development of the organization, people who participate in leadership can use the rotation of the leading period. These people should know that the development of the organization in joint management is time-consuming, and progress reduces with the frequent relocation of cooperating members. If existing leaders and leadership teams want to apply new members to the shared leadership role and existing structures and processes, they should provide guidance and ongoing training for them. By showing the role of leadership transfer for the development of shared leadership, this study results confirm the educational management literature on leadership (Kang, Svensson, 2019; Svensson, 2019). More research is required to determine the most appropriate forms of leadership transfer for the development of shared leadership. There was no specific standard for leadership that could benefit from shared leadership advantages, and participants determined how long they would serve in leadership roles (for example, 1-2 years).

Supportive management:

This finding is consistent with the findings of Pierce and Mans (2005). They believe that organizations that operate shared leadership formally designate leaders and leadership roles as part of their organizational structure. Researchers have previously focused on the role of formally appointed leaders who encourage followers to actively participate in a collective form of leadership (Fausing et al., 2015). Past research has shown that servant leaders humbly confirm their limitations. Consequently, it causes a culture of shared decision-making by encouraging the participation of other members of the organization (Van Dierendonck, 2016). In addition, the genuine emphasis of servant leaders on prioritizing the development and interests of followers has a positive effect on followers to become selfless leaders and people who help other members grow (Wang et al., 2017).

Some researchers have highlighted the relationship between existing vertical leadership styles and have not exclusively identified shared leadership; that's why it seems that shared leadership contradict traditional vertical leadership styles (Pearce et al., 2008, Hoch, dulebohn, 2013, Wang et al., 2017, Chiu et al. 2016). Instead, they believe that shared leadership completes vertical leadership (Fausing et al., 2015).

On the other hand, this finding is consistent with previous research, which confirms vertical leaders. Sometimes, they make the final decision based on the context, but in practice, these

organizations carry out shared leadership (Pearce et al., 2008). In the previous literature, there is consensus on the vital role of vertical leaders in supporting the establishment of shared leadership according to the complementary relationship between vertical and shared leadership (Zhu et al., 2018; Wang et al., 2017, Martin et al. al., 2013, Kezar, Holcombe, 2017, Hoch, 2013, Barnett et al., 2016).

In addition, this finding attracts us to the importance of the non-hierarchical role and encouragement of vertical leaders to implement shared leadership. Researchers have previously focused on the role of formally appointed leaders who encourage followers to actively participate in a collective form of leadership (e.g., Fausing et al., 2015). The findings of this study are consistent with the need for specific types of vertical leadership to facilitate leadership development (Kezar, Holcombe, 2017).

In the leadership literature, several scientists have mentioned that "hierarchical leaders are doomed to create fewer hierarchical organizations." They consider it as the paradox of shared leadership (Fletcher, Kaufer, 2003).

In this study, the less hierarchical nature of the vertical leader identified supports Pierce and Menz's (2005) emphasis on the role of leaders. They are also considered as visible models to lay the foundation for leadership performance shared over time. On the other hand, these findings support previous research on servant leadership as a facilitator of shared leadership (Carson et al., 2007; Hoch, Kozlowski, 2014; Jones et al., 2018, Kang, Svensson, 2019, Van Dierendonck, 2016, Wang et al., 2017, Welty Peachey, Burton, 2017).

Participatory attitude:

Carson et al. (2007) believe that members of the organization are more likely to share organizational leadership responsibilities if they spend their time discussing project goals, expectations, and operational plans. In addition, some leadership researchers have emphasized the role of professional development programs such as workshops in creating a collective identity which helps strengthen shared leadership (Jones et al., 2014; Kezar, Holcombe, 2017).

Therefore, educational organizations and executives managers are suggested to design and organize events deliberately so that members of the organization have the opportunity to interact intellectually with others, especially with those who have less cooperation. This plan can motivate leadership team members to invest their efforts in shared leadership in organizational partnerships.

There would be more shared responsibilities and identities if they spent more time on shared events (Kezar, Holcombe, 2017; Jones et al., 2014; Carson et al., 2007). Therefore, the findings show that leaders create collaborative events in which individual members evaluate their contribution to organizational collaboration through shared leadership.

Positive personality traits:

The present study is consistent with the literature by showing the role of personal characteristics and traits of members to establish relationships with other members in partnerships which leads to the emergence of shared leadership (Kang, Svensson, 2019; Hoch, Dulebohn, 2013; Pearce, Sims, 2000). This finding is important because the quality of relationships between members of the organization can affect the development of shared leadership (Zhu et al., 2018). In the findings, members' characteristics are a vital element for shared leadership. In this regard, some employees of the organization have been able to participate in shared leadership as relationship-oriented personalities. By showing the role of personal characteristics and staff capacity, these findings are consistent with previous studies to facilitate or prevent the development of shared leadership in training (Hoch, Dulebohn, 2013; Hoch, Dulebohn, 2017; Kang, Svensson, 2019; Small, Rentsch, 2016). Leaders and training organizations should consider the characteristics of the members who participate in the partnership when they want to implement shared leadership. Leaders need to recognize at the same time the potential insights of participating members who are uncomfortable about sharing their ideas or opinions in shared leadership practice. On the other hand, Hoch's (2017) conceptualization of group characteristics can interpret these findings. Extraversion is particularly one of the social skills and openness to experiences. It is also one of the factors that may increase a person's desire to participate in leadership.

In addition, the findings are consistent with Hoch and Dolbohens' research (2017) on five major personality dimensions, including extraversion, openness to experience, and conscientiousness for the development of shared leadership. On the other hand, these findings support Jacksons' (2000) idea about members' commitment and attitude and motivation to work together. It also shows that the characteristics and commitment of individuals are the pioneers of shared leadership.

Collectivism:

Shared leadership has unique features because it focuses on identifying the opinions and expertise of individuals for organizations. It is also different from the traditional delegation and decision-making (Kezar, Holcombe, 2017). This study helps the literature in shared leadership by showing the vital role of creating a supportive environment in organizational activities and encouraging the expression of diverse perspectives. This study also provides evidence that how shared leadership promotes different perspectives on decision-making rather than over-adaptation to a single decision-maker in education. The findings of the present study are consistent with the previous literature. The benefit of shared leadership increases with mutual respect for team members and open culture (Lyndon, Pandey, 2019). Lyndon and Pandi (2019) found that shared leadership creates an open culture in which employees feel comfortable, expressing their opinions and sometimes confronting the opinions of others.

In this regard, this study provides new insights into the perceived role of shared leadership. This new insight unifies unilateral efforts or the voices of different individuals to support collective educational efforts. These findings are consistent with the literature, which indicates that shared leadership focuses on collective achievement in the organization (Kezar, Holcombe, 2017).

Based on results, shared leadership can help educational organizations to increase their persuasive power to support their sustainable development while dealing with people in the organization. This issue should be supported by all educational organizations or activities that use shared leadership because the collective leadership approach is valuable for collective influence in the education sector. This type of internal collaboration is critical for two reasons: to educate all relevant staff about the process and the potential impact of leadership and to see why it can provide an effective way to develop more inclusive efforts to achieve collective impact.

The findings obtained in this study and reported in management and leadership flow studies are aligned. In the previous literature, scientists have reported the collective thinking and attitude of organizational members as a prerequisite for the development of shared leadership (Hoch, 2017; Hoch, Dulebohn, 2017; Zhu et al., 2018).

The concept of a common mental model explains such a relationship (Burke et al., 2003).

To facilitate the bottom-up approach of the organization, the results of this study support the important role of shared leadership in combining knowledge and insight of organizational staff (Darnell et al., 2018, Rossi, Jeanes, 2019, Kang, Svensson, 2017, Welty Peachey, Whitely, 2020). The literature shows that teams with common knowledge, skills, and abilities in several people can skillfully influence other members and increase team performance (Cakiroglu et al., 2003, Pearce, Conger, 2020, Ramthun, Matkin, 2014).

High organizational capacity building:

Researchers usually see organizational capacity as the ability of organizations to use a variety of resources to achieve their goals especially, those who examine the managerial aspects of nonprofits (Christensen, Gazley, 2008, Clutterbuck, Doherty, 2019). , Millar, Doherty, 2016, Svensson et al., 2018). According to Hall et al. (2003), organizational capacity is divided into several dimensions, including human resources, financial resources, and structural resource capacity. For example, based on a recent quantitative evaluation of shared leadership, the capacity of human resources is a predictor of shared leadership (Svensson et al., 2019).

Elias Karbasforoshan, Dr. Yaghoob Maharati, Dr. Golamreza Malekzadeh, Dr. Fariborz Rahimnia

Most of the past organizational research is in environments that encourage interactions through shared leadership. Because this type of leadership allows improvement and facilitates knowledge sharing among members of the organization (Carson et al., 2007), opportunities to improve knowledge sharing through leadership shared in partnerships can subsequently develop the professional abilities of leadership team members as noted in the previous literature (Carmeli et al., 2018, Hann et al. ., 2007, Carson et al., 2015, Choi, 2015, Kang, Svensson, 2019)).

At the same time, the findings show that skills and knowledge have been learned from others, and actors' partnerships are subsequently shared with other employees. The present study seems to provide evidence of a common role. Leadership to increase human resource capacity (e.g., member expertise) can lead to the development of relevant skills and knowledge among individuals by sharing individual expertise with other members through shared leadership (Clutterbuck, Doherty, 2019, Doherty et al., 2019, Kang, Svensson, 2014, Svensson et al., 2018).

For better task-related performance, the present study contributes to the educational literature by demonstrating the role of shared leadership in increasing knowledge sharing (Hambrick et al., 2019). Researchers have found that there is evidence that participation in organizational activities leads to increased organizational capacity (Svensson et al., 2018; Svensson et al., 2020). About the role of shared leadership in the development of relationships and network capacity, the findings provide experimental evidence from the lived experience of the organization's employees. Shared leadership can benefit members by providing meaningful communication opportunities with other training actors. Therefore, leaders and members of the leadership team should arrange more informal meetings or gatherings for members so that they strengthen their communication based on the findings of this study. For new members, these types of opportunities can be very valuable to build relationships with others because they have less presence in the organization and cause them to get accustomed faster in the organization.

Organizational Learning:

The behavior of members of the organization who share information and knowledge to do better is called Knowledge sharing (Mesmer-Magnus, Dechurch, 2009). Social interactions with other people seem to be the best way to engage in organizational partnerships. One of the key elements of shared leadership is the consideration of interaction among individuals (Carson et al., 2007, Pearce, Conger, 2003). There is an important relationship between shared leadership and organizational learning in the context of educational partnerships based on the results. The present study shows that organizational leaders can elevate organizational learning by using shared leadership. For example, organizational leaders should share coaching programs in organizational activities. In addition, more experienced members can share experience and best practices for implementing organizational programs with newer members. These practices also provide important mechanisms for better interaction and support for newer members. Investigation of how individuals influence organizational or collective learning has been less considered in the studied organizations. Meanwhile, several researchers have highlighted the role of collective learning in education (Svensson, Hambrick, 2019, Svensson, Loat, 2019). Therefore, these findings support the leadership literature that emphasizes the positive impact of shared leadership on the team or organizational learning behaviors (Hann et al., 2018; Kezar, Holcombe, 2017, Liu et al., 2014, Wang et al., 2017, Lorinkova et al., 2013).

Organizational integration:

Some people who are involved in organizational activities have talked about the positive cognitive dimensions of shared leadership, such as cohesion and trust. They have particularly realized that shared leadership helps to create coherence between activities. In previous research, the role of shared leadership has been highlighted in controlling conflict and facilitating cohesion in teamwork (Bergman et al., 2012; Cox et al. 2012, Pearson, Ensley, 2003, Perace, 2003 Kezar, Holcombe, 2017, Mathieu, 2015). This literature emphasizes that the conducted commitments are

important due to their presence in the leadership of the organization to build trust in organizations that use shared leadership (Robert, You, 2018). Therefore, the findings of this study and previous studies are consistent and show the impact of shared leadership on employee trust (Robert, You, 2018; Drescher et al., 20014; Avolio et al., 1996). These findings provide a practical outcome for organizational training activities. The participating organization should determine the proven ability of individuals to ensure a sense of trust in their commitment among other members to serve as co-leaders when shared leadership is implementing.

In addition, Pierce et al. (2004) stated that shared leadership affects several key factors which are necessary for group cohesion, such as empathy, cooperation, and teamwork among social workers. This study generally supports the previous literature, which indicates that if the leadership is more shared, the cohesion of that group of people is greater (Bergman et al., 2012; Ensley et al., 2003; Mathieu et al., 2015; Zhu et al., 2018). This study results particularly confirm the previous literature that emphasizes the positive impact of shared leadership on social cooperation (Bergman et al., 2012; Pearce et al., 2004).

Responsibility participatory:

To serve in education-based organizations, it is massively recognized that employees of educational organizations are required to accept multiple responsibilities (Kang, Svensson, 2019, Shin et al., 2020, Svensson et al., 2017). To lead activities and others that may affect the feelings of members of the leadership team, these findings are interpreted as a division of responsibilities or a shared responsibility. Sharing responsibilities for organizational activities brings trust among leadership team members based on previous research (Bergman et al., 2012).

The finding provides insights that are valuable to employees of institutions in understanding shared responsibility with other stakeholders. Because it decreases the responsibility among individuals. According to previous findings, participation in organizational leadership has additional responsibilities on employees, but there are many benefits, and it is more beneficial to use this type of leadership (Agranoff, 2006; Austin, Seitanidi, 2012; Hambrick et al., 2019).

On the other hand, the present study supports previous studies. Shared leadership can play a role in sharing the stress of working with others and consequently reducing job burnout (Alanezi, 2016; Lyndon, Pandey, 2019). Members of the organization feel a sense of ownership in the organization when they are empowered and take responsibility for the organizational performance through shared leadership (Pearce, Conger, 2003; Pearce, Manz, 2005; Kang, Svensson, 2003). , Khasawneh, 2011, Hooker, Csikszentmihalyi, 2003). In addition, a sense of ownership or power can facilitate successive participation in shared leadership processes (Van Ameijde et al., 2009). Many researchers reported that a sense of ownership could reinforce functional outcomes such as commitment to work (Pearce, Manz, 2005). To promote shared responsibilities, organizational activity leaders can deliberately use shared leadership based on the findings of this study.

We will discuss the research hypotheses in the next step.

Discussion:

In the management literature, collaboration with the leadership team in the education sector is a case as a positive solution because it is an alternative to overcome organizational challenges in educational organizations. Today, these participatory structures have become the current educational process. Education management scientists have started to analyze different aspects of commonalities. Leadership approaches have had limited attention. As a result, it can contribute to managerial challenges in organizational collaboration. Therefore, this study is conducted to investigate such a gap in the literature to examine the role of shared leadership in organizational partnerships. This study's findings showed the current experience of shared leadership in organizational partnerships by accepting the concept of shared leadership and organizational collaboration. The dimensions obtained during the interview with educational activists were

consistent with the previous literature in this field. It was referred to the text as explained in the previous section. Eleven components and 24 sub-components were identified, such as participatory leadership, participatory decision-making, rotational management, supportive management, participatory attitude, positive personality traits, collectivism, high organizational capacity building, organizational learning, organizational integration, and participatory responsibility. We can identify the dimensions of shared leadership in private organizations in Mashhad and have a better understanding of the issues mentioned about shared leadership by reflecting on the results. The impact of these findings is summarized based on the history of shared leadership from the current experience of educational activists in the field of organizational collaboration. We have a limited understanding of how to develop shared leadership in educational activities; however, several educational management studies have examined shared leadership (jones et al., 2018; Kang & Svensson, 2019). Therefore, this study results help the literature to demonstrate the importance of a systematic approach using shared leadership in education.

Research Limitations

The difficulty of evaluating the relative importance of the components of a qualitative theory: The importance of each of the variables obtained in the research model is not accurately evaluated in qualitative research. On the other hand, Mashhad educational institutions are the sample studied in this research. Therefore, it requires caution to generalize its results to other organizations.

Suggestions for future research:

For future research, some suggestions are presented as follows in this field due to the experiences and the findings of this research:

Today, one of the categories that is being implemented in many organizations in Iran with different background conditions is shared leadership. Unfortunately, these organizations have started this model quite empirically because they do not have accurate information about the implementation of this type of leadership. It can be a fascinating subject of research to examine this issue in different organizations and contexts.

It is suggested to do thorough research on the personality traits of the members and this type of leadership in the organization. Because the personality traits of the people who share leadership in their organization (whether they are in the leadership team or the lower level, and this type of leadership is implemented in their organization) have a great impact on the implementation and results of this type of leadership. According to the personality traits of individuals, the outputs of this type of leadership can be examined.

Implementing shared leadership relevant to the literature can have a significant impact on commitment, performance, motivation, and other organizational outputs. Most of these cases have not been studied in Iran. Examining other outputs of this type of leadership in the organization is a valuable field in management research because this type of leadership is increasingly used in Iran.

It is suggested to evaluate the dimensions of shared leadership on the dimensions of job satisfaction in a separate and quantitative study.

Further research is needed to determine the most appropriate forms of leadership transfer for the development of shared leadership. The issue that requires further discussion is that how often and under what conditions the leader or manager of the organization changes.

References

Balkundi, P., & Kilduff, M. (2006). The ties that lead: A social network approach to leadership. The Leadership Quarterly, 17(4), 419–439.
Barnett, R. C., & Weidenfeller, N. K. (2016). Shared leadership and team performance. Advances in Developing Human Resources, 18(3), 334-351.
Burke, C. S., Fiore, S. M., & Salas, E. (2003). The role of shared cognition in enabling shared leadership and team adaptability. Shared leadership: Reframing the hows and whys of leadership, 103.
Cakiroglu, J., Telli, S., & Cakiroglu, E. (2003). Turkish High School Student's Perceptions of Learning Environment in Biology Classrooms and Their Attitudes toward Biology.

Carson, J. B., Tesluk, P. E., & Marrone, J. A. (2007). Shared leadership in teams: An investigation of antecedent conditions and performance. The Academy of Management Journal ARCHIVE, 50(5), 1217–1234.

Chan, S. C. (2019). Participative leadership and job satisfaction. Leadership & Organization Development Journal.

Chiu, C. Y. C., Owens, B. P., & Tesluk, P. E. (2016). Initiating and utilizing shared leadership in teams: the role of leader humility, team proactive personality, and team performance capability. Journal of Applied Psychology, 101(12), 1705.

Choi, K. I. (2019). The effect of the shared leadership on the job satisfaction: Difference between principals and teachers of child care center. Journal of Digital Convergence, 17(3), 455-461.

Christensen, R. K., & Gazley, B. (2008). Capacity for public administration: Analysis of meaning and measurement. Public Administration and Development: The International Journal of Management Research and Practice, 28(4), 265-279.

Clutterbuck, R., & Doherty, A. (2019). Organizational capacity for domestic sport for development. Journal of Sport for Development, 7(12), 16-32.

Conger, J. A., & Pearce, C. L. (2003). A landscape of opportunities. Shared leadership. Reframing the hows and whys of leadership, 285-303.

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2016). Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches. Sage publications.

Crowther, F., Kaagan, S. S., Ferguson, M., & Hann, L. (2007). Teachers as leaders. Uncovering teacher leadership: Essays and voices from the field, 51.

D'Innocenzo, L., Kukenberger, M., Farro, A. C., & Griffith, J. A. (2021). Shared leadership performance relationship trajectories as a function of team interventions and members' collective personalities. The Leadership Quarterly, 101499.

Ensley, M. D., Hmieleski, K. M., & Pearce, C. L. (2006). The importance of vertical and shared leadership within new venture top management teams: Implications for the performance of startups. The Leadership Quarterly, 17(3), 217–231.

Ensley, M. D., Pearson, A., & Pearce, C. L. (2003). Top management team process, shared leadership, and new venture performance: a theoretical model and research agenda. Human Resource Management Review, 13(2), 329–346.

Fausing, M. S., Joensson, T. S., Lewandowski, J., & Bligh, M. (2015). Antecedents of shared leadership: empowering leadership and interdependence. Leadership & Organization Development Journal.

Fletcher, J. K., & Kaufer, K. (2003). Shared leadership. Shared leadership: Reframing the hows and whys of leadership, 21-47.

Gupta, R. K., & Awasthy, R. (Eds.). (2015). Qualitative research in management: Methods and experiences. SAGE Publications India.

Hoch, J. E., & Dulebohn, J. H. (2013). Shared leadership in enterprise resource planning and human resource management system implementation. Human Resource Management Review, 23(1), 114-125.

Hoch, J. E., & Dulebohn, J. H. (2017). Team personality composition, emergent leadership and shared leadership in virtual teams: A theoretical framework. Human Resource Management Review, 27(4), 678-693.

Hoch, J. E., & Kozlowski, S. W. (2014). Leading virtual teams: Hierarchical leadership, structural supports, and shared team leadership. Journal of applied psychology, 99(3), 390.

Houghton, J. D., Neck, C. P., & Manz, C. C. (2003). Self-leadership and superleadership. Shared leadership: Reframing the hows and whys of leadership, 123–140.

John, W. "Creswel,(2009)." Social research (2nd ed.). London: MacMillan Press Ltd.

Jones, G. J., Wegner, C. E., Bunds, K. S., Edwards, M. B., & Bocarro, J. N. (2018). Examining the environmental characteristics of shared leadership in a sport-for-development organization. Journal of Sport Management, 32(2), 82-95.

Kang, S., & Svensson, P. G. (2019). Shared leadership in sport for development and peace: A conceptual framework of antecedents and outcomes. Sport Management Review, 22(4), 464-476.

Kerr, I. R. (2006). Leadership strategies for sustainable SME operation. Business Strategy and the Environment, 15(1), 30-39.

Kezar, A. J., & Holcombe, E. M. (2017). Shared leadership in higher education. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Lorinkova, N. M., & Bartol, K. M. (2021). Shared leadership development and team performance: A new look at the dynamics of shared leadership. Personnel Psychology, 74(1), 77-107.

Lyndon, S., & Pandey, A. (2019). Shared leadership in entrepreneurial teams: a qualitative study. Journal of Indian Business Research.

Marion, R., Christiansen, J., Klar, H. W., Schreiber, C., & Erdener, M. A. (2016). Informal leadership, interaction, cliques and productive capacity in organizations: A collectivist analysis. The Leadership Quarterly, 27(2), 242-260.

Martin, J., Cormican, K., Sampaio, S. C., & Wu, Q. (2018). Shared leadership and team performance: An analysis of moderating factors. Procedia computer science, 138, 671-679.

Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D. M. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. Psychological bulletin, 108(2), 171.

Mathieu, J., Maynard, M. T., Rapp, T., & Gilson, L. (2008). Team effectiveness 1997-2007: A review of recent advancements and a glimpse into the future. Journal of Management, 34(3), 410.

Mehra, A., Smith, B. R., Dixon, A. L., & Robertson, B. (2006). Distributed leadership in teams: The network of leadership perceptions and team performance. The Leadership Quarterly, 17(3), 232–245.

Millar, P., & Doherty, A. (2016). Capacity building in nonprofit sport organizations: Development of a process model. Sport management review, 19(4), 365-377.

Morgeson, F. P., DeRue, D. S., & Karam, E. P. (2010). Leadership in teams: A functional approach to understanding leadership structures and processes. Journal of management, 36(1), 5-39.

O'Toole, J., Galbraith, J., & Lawler III, E. E. (2002). When two (or more) heads are better than one: The promise and pitfalls of shared leadership. California management review, 44(4), 65-83.

Peachey, J. W., Schulenkorf, N., & Hill, P. (2020). Sport-for-development: A comprehensive analysis of theoretical and conceptual advancements. Sport Management Review, 23(5), 783-796.

Pearce, C. L, & Barkus, B. (2004). The Future of Leadership: Combining Vertical and Shared Leadership to Transform Knowledge Work [and Executive Commentary]. The Academy of Management Executive (1993-2005), 47–59.

Pearce, C. L, Manz, C. C., & Sims Jr, H. P. (2009). Is Shared Leadership the Key to Team Success? Organizational Dynamics, 38(3), 234–238.

Pearce, C. L., & Sims, H. P. (2000). Shared leadership: Toward a multi-level theory of leadership. In Advances in interdisciplinary studies of work teams. Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Pearce, C. L., Conger, J. A., & Locke, E. A. (2008). Shared leadership theory. The leadership quarterly, 19(5), 622-628.

Pearce, Craig L., & Sims, H. P. (2000). Shared leadership: Toward a multi-level theory of leadership. Advances in Interdisciplinary Studies of Work Teams (Vol. 7, pp. 115-139).

Pietsch, M., Tulowitzki, P., & Koch, T. (2019). On the differential and shared effects of leadership for learning on teachers' organizational commitment and job satisfaction: A multilevel perspective. Educational Administration Quarterly, 55(5), 705-741.

Pitelis, C. N., & Wagner, J. D. (2019). Strategic shared leadership and organizational dynamic capabilities. The Leadership Quarterly, 30(2), 233-242.

Ramthun, A. J., & Matkin, G. S. (2014). Leading dangerously: A case study of military teams and shared leadership in dangerous environments. Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 21(3), 244-256.

Schulenkorf, N. (2017). Managing sport-for-development: Reflections and outlook. Sport management review, 20(3), 243-251.

Sivasubramaniam, N., Murry, W. D., Avolio, B. J., & Jung, D. I. (2002). A longitudinal model of the effects of team leadership and group potency on group performance. Group & Organization Management, 27(1), 66-96.

Sreejesh, S., & Mohapatra, S. (2013). Mixed method research design: an application in consumer-brand relationships (CBR). Springer Science & Business Media.

Svensson, P. G., & Hambrick, M. E. (2016). "Pick and choose our battles"–Understanding organizational capacity in a sport for development and peace organization. Sport management review, 19(2), 120-132.

Svensson, P. G., Kang, S., & Ha, J. P. (2019). Examining the influence of shared leadership and organizational capacity on performance and innovative work behavior in sport for development and peace. Journal of Sport Management, 33(6), 546-559.

Thornhill, A., Saunders, M., & Lewis, P. (2009). Research methods for business students. Essex: Pearson Education Ltd.

Van Dierendonck, D., & Sousa, M. (2016). Finding meaning in highly uncertain situations: Servant leadership during change. In Leadership lessons from compelling contexts. Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Wang, D., Waldman, D. A., & Zhang, Z. (2014). A meta-analysis of shared leadership and team effectiveness. Journal of applied psychology, 99(2), 181.

Wang, L., Jiang, W., Liu, Z., & Ma, X. (2017). Shared leadership and team effectiveness: The examination of LMX differentiation and servant leadership on the emergence and consequences of shared leadership. Human Performance, 30(4), 155-168.

Welty Peachey, J., & Burton, L. (2017). Servant leadership in sport for development and peace: A way forward. Quest, 69(1), 125-139.

Whitley, M. A., & Welty Peachey, J. (2020). Place-based sport for development accelerators: a viable route to sustainable programming?. Managing Sport and Leisure, 1-10.

Xiao, Y., Seagull, F. J., Mackenzie, C. F., & Klein, K. (2004). Adaptive leadership in trauma resuscitation teams: a grounded theory approach to video analysis. Cognition, Technology & Work, 6(3), 158-164.

Yukl, G., O'Donnell, M., & Taber, T. (2009). Influence of leader behaviors on the leader-member exchange relationship. Journal of managerial psychology.

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