

The role of the vertical leader in developing a shared leadership work team

Walter ten Eikelder (6257003)

Master thesis Educational Sciences (201600025)

Supervisor: Isolde Kolkhuis Tanke

Utrecht University

Abstract

In recent years, organizations more often make use of teams in which leadership is shared amongst its members. The present study investigated the role of the vertical leader in developing such a team. Literature suggested that this leader should develop and empower self-leadership skills in the team members. The following question is answered in the study: *How can a vertical leader develop and empower self-leadership-skills in team members that contribute to the development of shared leadership work teams?* Team members and vertical leaders have been interviewed using in-depth semi-structured interviews. Results showed that a vertical leader can adopt three roles. First, the leader should create a working environment with a suitable balance in autonomy and structure. In this environment team members should be helped to obtain insight in their self-leadership skills. Second, the leader should learn his new role, i.e. transferring the decision making process to the team. Third, the leader should provide clear direction and communication to the team. These results contribute to the research field of implementing shared leadership in a team with a designated vertical leader. Organizations and vertical leaders can use these results when making a transition to self-managing teams in which leadership is shared.

Keywords: vertical leadership, shared leadership, self-leadership skills, empowering leadership, superleadership, self-managing team

The role of the vertical leader in developing a shared leadership work team

In recent years, organizations face an increasingly dynamic, fast-changing and complex environment (Hoch, Pearce, & Welzel, 2010; Nicolaidis et al., 2014). To cope with this contemporary, organizational landscape, organizations use flatter and more diverse ways of organizing (Bligh, Pearce, & Kohles, 2006; Carson, Tesluk, & Marrone, 2007; Uhløi & Müller, 2014). More specifically, team-based structures become the building blocks of organizations (Morgeson, DeRue, & Karam, 2010; Nicolaidis et al., 2014; Wang, Waldman, & Zhang, 2014). To indicate this proliferation of work teams Morgeson et al. (2010) mentioned a study which found that 91% of high-level managers agreed with the statement: *teams are central to organizational success*. This shift in the underlying basis of organizational work has initiated a rapidly growing amount of research regarding work teams (Kozlowski & Bell, 2003; Mathieu, Maynard, Rapp, & Gilson, 2008; Morgeson et al., 2010).

Nowadays, teams are required to deal with increasingly complex work that can hardly be performed by an individual (DeChurch & Mesmer-Magnus, 2010). It is considered to be extremely difficult for a single employee to possess all the knowledge, skills and abilities necessary for such complex tasks (Pearce, 2004). The expansion of team work has led to the challenge of how those teams can be best managed (Hoch et al., 2010), as leadership of teams is often identified as an important factor to team success (Nicolaidis et al., 2014). Moreover, leadership of teams is considered to be crucial for team effectiveness (Carson et al., 2007). Several scholars mentioned that it is becoming more difficult for a single leader to have all knowledge, skills and abilities required to lead organizational teams nowadays (D'Innocenzo, Mathieu, & Kukenberger, 2016; Kocolowski, 2010; Uhløi & Müller, 2014).

Hence, research regarding leadership and teams has changed its focus (Carson et al., 2007; Nicolaidis et al., 2014; Pearce, 2004; Zhu, Liao, Yam, & Johnson, 2018). Originally, the focus was on vertical leadership, in which a single appointed manager (vertical leader) was hierarchically positioned above the team members. More recently, shared leadership, in which leadership is distributed across multiple team members, has gained more attention (Zhu et al., 2018). Evidence suggests that this form of leadership is positively related to a team's performance (Carson et al., 2007; Chiu, Owens, & Tesluk, 2016; Hoch et al., 2010; Pearce & Sims, 2002).

Despite this increased attention for shared leadership, several questions and territories regarding this issue require future research (Chiu et al., 2016; Nicolaidis et al., 2014; Wang et al., 2014). More specifically, there still is a lack of a comprehensive understanding of factors beneficial for developing shared leadership in a team (Ulhøi & Müller, 2014; Zhu et al., 2018). To date, several scholars even claim that research regarding these factors, usually named antecedents, is still in its infancy (Conger & Pearce, 2003; Chiu et al., 2016; Zhu et al., 2018). Research into antecedents would be beneficial for managers that aim to introduce shared leadership (Bligh et al., 2006; Carson et al., 2007, D'Innocenzo et al., 2016; Nicolaidis et al., 2014).

Most scholars describe two main kinds of antecedents: team related antecedents and vertical leader related antecedents (Carson et al., 2007; Chiu et al., 2016; Zhu et al., 2018). Vertical leader related antecedents refer to the role of a vertical leader during the process of introducing shared leadership (Carson et al., 2007; Hoch, 2013; Zhu et al., 2018). In the sequel of this study a vertical leader is defined as the designated leader of a work team, who wants to develop shared leadership (Pearce, 2004). The actions of such a vertical leader are considered to

be critical for the implementation of shared leadership in a team (Carson et al., 2007; Chiu et al., 2016; Hoch, 2013; Zhu et al., 2018). Remarkably, this role of the vertical leader has gained limited attention in the literature (Pearce & Conger, 2002; Chiu et al., 2016; Zhu et al., 2018). Therefore, the purpose of the current study is to determine insights that can support a vertical leader in developing shared leadership work teams.

Shared leadership in work teams

To start a definition of a work team will be given. In several reviews of the literature work teams are described by the following characteristics: (a) consist of two or more people, (b) execute relevant tasks for an organization, (c) share one or more common goals, (d) interact socially, (e) show task interdependencies, (f) maintain and manage boundaries, and (g) are embedded in the context of an organization which sets boundaries, constrains the team and influences exchange processes with other units (Kozlowski & Bell, 2003; Kozlowski & Bell, 2013; Mathieu et al., 2008).

Below, shared leadership will be described more in-depth. The most widely cited definition of shared leadership is the one from Pearce and Conger (2002). They describe shared leadership as a dynamic, interactive influence process among individuals in groups for which the objective is to lead one another to the achievement of group or organizational goals or both. Another frequently used definition is that of Carson et al. (2007) who state that shared leadership is an emergent team property that results from the distribution of leadership influence across multiple team members. More recent studies mention that shared leadership has been conceptualized in many different ways over the years (Chiu et al., 2016; D'Innocenzo et al., 2016; Zhu et al., 2018). In a recent state of the art article of Zhu et al. (2018) it was mentioned that most conceptualizations share three key characteristics.

The first characteristic is about the source of influence in a team (Carson et al., 2007; Morgeson et al., 2010; Zhu et al., 2018). In the case of shared leadership, this influence can be described as horizontal, lateral leadership which originates from multiple team members (D’Innocenzo et al., 2016; Zhu et al., 2018).

The second characteristic specifies the unit of analysis (Zhu et al., 2018). Shared leadership reflects leadership as a concept derived from a collective of team members (Carson et al., 2007; Morgeson et al., 2010; Wang et al., 2014; Zhu et al., 2018). It focuses on leadership that should be analyzed at group level, since leadership is collectively shared among members (Zhu et al., 2018).

The last characteristic concerns the distribution of influence in a team. In a shared leadership team this influence is broadly distributed across all team members (Carson et al., 2007; Zhu et al., 2018). This indicates that all team members are willing to act as a leader (Chiu et al., 2016).

The facilitating role of the vertical leader

The vertical leader should employ the following facilitating roles to develop shared leadership: (1) develop team members skills, (2) empowering team members, (3) selecting team members, (4) filling in lacking skills, and (5) managing boundaries (Houghton, Neck, & Manz, 2003). The present study focuses on the first two roles, since these are considered to be the most important for the success of shared leadership teams (Houghton et al., 2003). More specifically, mainly the self-leadership skills among team members should be developed and empowered (Carson et al., 2007; Houghton et al., 2003; Pearce & Manz, 2005). This crucial aspect will be described in more depth below.

Self-leadership is most often defined as the self-influence process of using strategies through which individuals can lead themselves to obtain the necessary self-direction and self-motivation to perform well (Houghton et al., 2003; Schnake, Dumler, & Cochran, 1993; Stewart, Courtright, & Manz, 2011; Zhu et al., 2018). The idea of developing and empowering self-leadership is that team members first must be able to lead themselves before they are capable of leading their fellow team members (Houghton et al., 2003). Three types of self-leadership strategies are often described: behavior-focused, natural reward, and constructive thought pattern strategies (Bligh et al., 2006; Houghton et al., 2003).

The behavior-focused strategies aim to stimulate positive, desirable behaviors as well as to suppress negative, undesirable behaviors (Houghton et al., 2003; Stewart et al., 2011). These strategies aim to improve someone's self-awareness and hence their management of behavior (Houghton et al., 2003).

The natural reward strategies intend to focus attention on the positive parts of a work task (Houghton et al., 2003). This means that natural rewards result when an individual performs a task mainly for its own sake and is motivated or rewarded by the task itself (Bligh et al., 2006; Stewart et al., 2011).

The constructive thought pattern strategies aim to create positive, constructive ways of thinking in order to improve performance (Bligh et al., 2006; Stewart et al., 2011). People who engage in this thought self-leadership are more likely to become opportunity thinkers (Bligh et al., 2006).

The goal of these three types of self-leadership strategies is the improvement of employees self-efficacy, which is defined as a person's belief regarding his own capabilities (Houghton et al., 2003). Using these strategies, self-efficacy of team members for undertaking

leadership roles and responsibilities within a team should increase. Developing and empowering self-leadership within team members is considered to be an important mechanism for facilitating shared leadership (Houghton et al., 2003).

The vertical leader as superleader

The facilitating role of the vertical leader is also often described as empowering leadership or superleadership (Fausing, Joensson, Lewandowski, & Bligh, 2015; Neck & Houghton, 2006; Pearce, Manz, & Sims, 2008; Pearce & Sims, 2002). A superleader stimulates self-leadership and hence shared leadership in his team (Houghton et al., 2003; Wild, 2015). According to Manz and Sims (1991) a superleader can do this in seven steps: (1) becoming a self-leader, (2) modeling self-leadership, (3) encouraging self-set goals, (4) create positive thought patterns, (5) teach reward and constructive reprimand, (6), promote teamwork and (7) facilitate a self-leadership culture.

In step 1 the superleader should learn to become an effective self-leader, using the described self-leadership strategies, before he is capable of leading others (Manz & Sims, 1991). Step 2, which is often mentioned in the literature (Pearce & Manz, 2005; Grille, Schulte, & Kauffeld, 2015; Fausing et al., 2015), means that a superleader demonstrates his self-leadership skills to his team members, from which they can learn. In step 3, the superleader helps and encourages employees to set specific challenging goals for themselves (Fausing et al., 2015; Grille et al., 2015; Neck & Houghton, 2006). This self-goal setting is a previously mentioned, behavioral-focused strategy (Bligh et al., 2006; Houghton et al., 2003). In step 4 the superleader should communicate constructive thought patterns to the team members (Manz & Sims, 1991), using the earlier explained related strategies (Houghton et al., 2003; Stewart et al., 2011). In step 5 the superleader teaches how employees should use natural reward strategies and how they

should deal with reprimands (Manz & Sims, 1991). The use of reprimands should focus on dealing with mistakes as learning opportunities, which leads to more constructive feedback and consequently improved employees self-leadership (Manz & Sims, 1991). In step 6 the superleader promotes teamwork in order to stimulate self-leadership. This step seems rather obvious when a team switches to a shared leadership approach. In step 7 an organizational wide culture which aims to encourage self-leadership should be promoted (Manz & Sims, 1991). However, this step may be less relevant for the current study since only work teams will be investigated and not entire organizational systems.

Research question

As previously mentioned, the purpose of the current study is to determine insights that can support a vertical leader in developing shared leadership work teams. In order to achieve this goal the following research question will be answered: *How can a vertical leader develop and empower self-leadership skills in team members that contribute to the development of shared leadership work teams?*

Method

Research Design

To answer the research question a qualitative case study has been conducted. This involves a profound research that explores a phenomenon among a limited number of participants (Baxter & Jack, 2008; Boeije, 2010). More specifically, in-depth semi-structured interviews were conducted amongst team members and vertical leaders. In-depth interviewing focuses on understanding the experience of people and their interpretations (Seidman, 2006). A semi-structured interview provides structure based on the interests of the research and interview guide, but works flexible with this guide and gives the participant room for elaborations

(Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015). In-depth semi-structured interviews are considered to be appropriate for analyzing the experiences of team members and vertical leaders.

Participants

In this study three teams of three different organizations have been investigated. These shared leadership work teams all fulfilled the following inclusion criteria. They: (a) consist of four or more people, (b) perform task relevant for an organization, (c) share common goal(s), (d) interact socially, (e) show task interdependencies, (f) maintain and manage boundaries, (g) are embedded in the context of an organization, (h) have a vertical designated leader, and (i) are working with a shared leadership approach. In the Dutch practice the studied teams call themselves self-managing teams. In the sequel of this study a self-managing team refers to a team that made the transition from hierarchically vertical leadership towards leadership which is shared among all team members.

Characteristics of the teams are given in Table 1. The healthcare team provides all kinds of professional care at the home of the customers. In this team a reorganization took place in 2016 after which the team consisted of the current 8 members. The team of the bank was a Methodology team of the Operational Risk Management department. This team develops methods to deal with various risks the bank encounters. The secondary education team consists of teachers of students in the first, second and third year of pre-university education, with particular attention for Greek and Latin.

Table 1

Characteristics of the participating teams

Type of team	Year of transition	Amount of team members	Interviewed team members	Interviewed vertical leader
Healthcare institution	2013	8	3	1
Bank	2018	17	3	1
Secondary Education	2016	15	4	1

Note. $N = 13$.

This sample has been selected using convenience and purposive sampling. Many qualitative studies partly use convenience sampling, which is sampling the most accessible subjects (Marshall, 1996). In the present study an e-mail has been sent to a wide range of organizations in different sectors to find self-managing teams. In this e-mail the researcher introduced himself and the study, asked if within the organization teams recently became a self-managing team and if such a team was willing to participate. The e-mail contained an Appendix explaining more details about the study and the described inclusion criteria (see Appendix A). The first three teams that were willing to participate have been selected, which is a form of convenience sampling. However, the teams fulfilled the inclusion criteria, which means also purposive sampling is used (Boeije, 2010; Coyne, 1997).

Instruments

In the current study semi-structured interviews were used to gather rich data. First, an interview topic list has been developed containing the following main topics: 1) personal characteristics, 2) meaning of shared leadership, 3) choice for shared leadership, 4) differences after transition, 5) role vertical leader in development self-leadership and 6) role vertical leader in development shared leadership (see Appendix B). These topics are further divided into

subtopics, the topics were mainly derived from the theoretical framework of the current study (Reulink & Lindeman, 2005).

Based upon the topics an interview guideline has been developed, this is a list of questions related to the topics the researcher wants to investigate (Creswell, 2014; Edwards & Holland, 2013; Kallio, Pietilä, Johnson, & Kangasniemi, 2016). The described topics are ordered from more familiar topics to the more central topic of the study, which enhances the quality of the interview guideline (Kallio et al., 2016). Two slightly different interview guidelines have been developed for the team members and the vertical leader (see Appendices C and D), since both have a different role in the team. These guidelines consist of main questions and follow-up questions, which appear in italics. Follow-up questions are used because these questions make main topics more understandable for participants, guide the interview towards the research question (Kallio et al., 2016) and give participants the possibility to explain their ideas in more detail (Creswell, 2014).

After the interviews at the first organization had been conducted some minor adjustments have been made in both interview guidelines. After consultation of the supervisor of Utrecht University is decided to add one main question and a few follow-up questions, which are marked in blue (see Appendix C and D). This has been done to enrich the data and to uncover all factors that contribute to the development of sharing leadership in a self-managing team.

Procedure

The interviews were conducted individually and in person at the location of the organizations in a closed room, which can be considered as a setting with little distraction (Turner, 2010). First, the researcher introduced himself and the process of the interview. The purpose and structure of the interview were explained and an estimation of the time was given,

which are components for preparing an interview (McNamara, 2009). Also, the participants were asked if they had questions about the interview before starting. Second, the participants were asked to sign an informed consent (see Appendix E), which informs them about the goal of the study and their rights as a participant. This provided evidence that the participants agreed with the format of the study (Creswell, 2014). Participants were also given the option to not participate in the study (Shenton, 2004). Third, participants were asked to answer honestly. The researcher started the audio record and the interviews were conducted for approximately 45 minutes. The interview started with discussing the personal characteristics of the participants, after which the other main topics were addressed. At last, the participants were thanked for their participation and were informed that a member-check would follow.

Data Analysis

In qualitative research, data has to be prepared and then analyzed (Boeije & Bleijenbergh, 2005; Boeije, 2010). The preparation consists of three steps: 1) the recorded interviews were stored in a secure place, 2) the interviews were transcribed and 3) the transcripts have been anonymized (Boeije, 2010). The data has been analyzed in Nvivo, using the method Template Analysis. This refers to a thematic analysis that offers a high degree of structure in analyzing textual data as well as the possibility to adapt it to study's needs (Brooks, McCluskey, Turley, & King, 2015; King, 2012).

First, three interviews have been read to become familiar with the data (Brooks et al., 2015) and then a preliminary coding of the data has been performed to discover the emergent themes. The analysis was started with a few a priori themes based upon the developed topic list (see Appendix F), which is a good starting point for the analysis (Brooks et al., 2015). It has been chosen to use a limited number of pre-defined codes, to avoid steering the analysis in a pre-

defined direction (King, 2012). The preliminary coding has been performed on four interviews (two vertical leaders and two team members), with at least one participant from each organization. This has been done to acquire all different perspectives.

Second, an initial template was developed based upon the described subset of data (see Appendix G). This template was completed when no more new codes emerged from the data, which was the case after the four mentioned interviews. The template contained 170 codes, which was considered to be a too wide set of codes without a clear direction (Boeije 2010; King, 2012).

Third, the template was applied to two more interviews (one vertical leader and one team member) to reorganize the hierarchical structure of the code tree and to reduce the amount of codes. This iterative process of adapting the initial template was done to produce the final template. The template was finalized when all relevant data could be coded and when a clear hierarchical structure was build (Simon & Cassell, 2012). The final template contained 127 codes: 7 main codes, 34 sub-codes and 86 lowest-order codes. The main codes 'Background information' and 'Process information' were specifically developed to understand the context of the teams.

Last, the final template was applied to the full data set (see Appendix H). The modifications that were made in the process from the initial template to the final template are described in Appendix I.

The quality of the above described method will be discussed below using the trustworthiness criteria of Guba and Lincoln (1989). To ensure for credibility of the study member checks have been performed. Participants received their transcripts via e-mail and were asked whether all data could be used for analysis, whether personal information had to be deleted

and whether there were other comments. Two participants noticed a few typing errors and one participant asked to remove some personal information. After these adjustments were made all participants agreed with the data.

Next, to establish dependability of the research process the modifications in the interview guidelines (see Appendix C and D) and development of the final template have been described (see Appendix I). This provides insight and transparency in how and which decisions have been made during the research process (Guba & Lincoln, 1989).

Further, confirmability can be improved, by reducing investigator bias and by taking into account the context of the participants and organizations (Guba & Lincoln, 1989). To improve confirmability several codes have been developed to understand the context of each team. Also, the audio records have been transcribed as literally as possible and only a few pre-defined codes are used to avoid influencing the researchers data-analysis process in advance.

The last criterium, transferability, refers to the extent of which the results of a study are applicable to other similar organizational contexts (Anney, 2014; Guba & Lincoln, 1989). In this study teams of three different organizations of different sectors have been investigated with participants of different roles (team members and vertical leaders) to acquire different viewpoints and to enhance the transferability of the results.

Results

The data-analysis process has led to several important themes for answering the research question. These themes are described below. In Appendix J the codes that were used for describing the themes are listed per theme.

Results transition

The majority of the participants indicated that the transition to a self-managing team eventually succeeded, ratings varied from an 6/10 to an 8/10. Nevertheless several participants said that after the transition still improvements could be made. Further, it was said that working in the self-managing team was experienced as more fun than the former way of working. Team members described this working method as more motivating and felt more connected with other team members. Also, six team members mentioned that sharing leadership within their team is functioning. They became better at distributing the work amongst each other and in taking their responsibilities. One team member said the following about the current situation:

“Yes, I actually think it [sharing of leadership] functions. In any case it is discussed concretely: ‘Who does what? Who is responsible for what?’ That is more concrete than we had it earlier. So, yes then I think it functions well.”

Moreover, two vertical leaders and eight team members said that team members became better at self-leadership after the transition. Team members said they can better monitor and guide their own working progress. They are more aware of their own self-leadership and communicate more clearly to other team members. One team member described this development as:

“So, what it [the transition] did yield, I think, is that some people are more aware of their own qualities or something like that? Or in which tasks they want to engage in. So it may cause some more self-reflection, about ‘what am I doing actually and why?’”

Remarkably, a few team members said they already mastered self-leadership before the transition. According to them self-leadership skills are required to perform their work. On the other hand, the majority of the participants indicated that team members are still developing their self-leadership. They said progress can be made to become better self-leaders.

Role vertical leader

In the previous section the key results of the transition and developments in self-leadership and shared leadership were described. In this section the role of the vertical leaders in developing self-leadership and shared leadership is elaborated.

Development self-leadership. Despite that the majority of the team members became better at self-leadership, about half of them indicated that their vertical leader did not play any role in this development. They said that their vertical leader did not intentionally develop their self-leadership skills and did not help them to acquire insights in their current skills. Hence, team members were not aware of their possible improvement areas. In line with these experiences, two vertical leaders also mentioned they did not intentionally try to improve the self-leadership of their team members. One team member said the following about this:

“I wonder whether X [the vertical leader] really did that [developing self-leadership]? X has his own structure, his own way of working. X likes to give a lot of freedom. But I did not experience that X was really trying to ensure every team member had the appropriate level of self-leadership.”

By contrast, four team members also pointed out a positive aspect of the role of their vertical leader. Their vertical leader provided them with autonomy to develop their own self-

leadership. They were given space for development and were offered learning opportunities. More specifically, team members were given the autonomy to participate in formal learning sessions in which also self-leadership was discussed. In these sessions they could acquire new practical insights, develop their knowledge and exchange experiences with others. In addition, one vertical leader tried to make clear the amount of autonomy team members could take to develop their self-leadership. This vertical leader made the following remark:

“Every time if they came to me, I consequently said ‘no, this is your responsibility. This is your playground, you can make your own choices. No, you don’t have to. No, you don’t need me for that. You can choose yourself. I would do this, but you can also do that. It is up to you.’ Every time I had to reply that it was their development space.”

Development shared leadership. As mentioned before more than half of the team members experienced that sharing leadership after the transition functioned well. Remarkably, the majority of the team members said that their vertical leader did not prepare them for how they should share leadership. According to them, no information or training about sharing leadership, dividing tasks and making decisions was provided. The team members indicated they were not coached how to take leadership and how to share it.

Furthermore, nine participants indicated that in the self-managing team they had to address their team members more regarding their responsibilities and tasks than before. Providing feedback to each other about these topics was experienced as difficult for the majority of the team. They said it was hard to equally divide responsibilities and related tasks amongst each other. A few members said that addressing a team member that did not perform well was

difficult, because all members are at the same hierarchical level and the former vertical leader does not do that anymore. One team member said the following about this:

“In the team it is even more difficult, since you are all equal and everyone has his own approach. And some people already function for 20 years in a certain manner. Already 20 years not much has been done to change that. So, then I ask myself: ‘Should I try to address this or not?’. These are all considerations you make.”

On the other hand, in one organization some team members mentioned a positive role of their leader. This leader took a facilitating role to stimulate team members in their decision making process and taking on leadership in performing projects. According to these team members this contributed to the development of shared leadership. More specifically, this role consisted of providing money for projects and giving decision-making authority about new projects to the team. This role was appreciated and made it possible for the team members to learn taking and sharing leadership in practice.

Team members needs

Team members indicated several needs which could have contributed to their development to a self-managing team. A lack of guidance during the transition missed. In this section first this lack of guidance is described. Subsequently, three themes are elaborated in which the vertical leader plays an important role in providing this guidance: a) framework and autonomy, b) direction and communication and c) change of role.

Guidance self-managing team. Eight team members stated that their team was not or barely guided in their transition to a self-managing team. This is in line with the above described

lack of developing self-leadership skills and preparing team members for sharing leadership. The guidance that was missed during the transition mainly could be provided by the vertical leader, but also the organizations could play a role. Team members indicated they had not been coached and it was not clear what was expected of them. It was experienced that the transition was implemented too quickly. The teams suddenly had to be a self-managing team, without clear guidance on what they had to do and how they should function. One team member pointed this out very clearly:

“I think that you really should coach more during such a transition: ‘What is the intention? And how do we have to do this?’ It was from one day to the next that we heard that we were a self-managing team.”

Team members felt a lack of guidance for the whole team. Remarkably, even relatively new members quickly noticed an extent of uncertainty in their team and stated that more guidance could have been helpful during the transition. This is illustrated by one participant, who said:

“I think the group as a whole could use it [guidance] more. It is not that I individually needed guidance. But I think, based upon what I see around me, that there should have been more guidance in making the team self-managing.”

Role vertical leader. As mentioned above, several team members missed guidance for their self-managing team. Below, the role of the vertical leaders in providing this guidance is described.

Framework and autonomy. Five team members indicated that their vertical leader should have established a clearer framework for their team. They said that boundaries in performing tasks were not clear. Team members felt autonomy to initiate new projects, but experienced a lack of framework in which they could use this autonomy. Frustration emerged when an idea for a project was developed, but eventually could not be implemented. Expectations were not clear and team members did not know what were their tasks and those of the vertical leader. They mentioned that the former vertical leader should have provided this framework with clear expectations and tasks. This need can be illustrated by the following remark of a participant: “Yes, that [a lack of a framework] is really demotivating. Yes, you even get frustrations. Definitely when something is developed, time is invested and that you hear that it is not possible. People take that badly.”

Moreover, five team members pointed out that team members did not know how to cope with the large amount of autonomy that was given by their vertical leader. They took the autonomy and started various projects. Unfortunately, these projects often were not experienced as useful or were not coordinated. Team members felt they suddenly had to take decisions and start projects without knowing how to. A few participants said that too much autonomy was given too quickly after the transition. Time was needed to adapt and to learn to cope with this autonomy. This is illustrated by a participant who said:

“Yes, very much space. You know that if you are always used that someone takes decisions and defines everything for you and suddenly you are set free, then you have to learn to live with it and adapt. That is a very big step.”

Team members did not only indicate improvements for their vertical leader, but also mentioned their own role. Half of the team members said that they should have taken more responsibility in determining a clearer framework for themselves. It was mentioned that shared responsibility was missed and more commitment was needed to perform better as a team. One participant illustrated that both team members and the vertical leader have a role in creating a clear framework:

“They still miss a framework; a clearly defined story. I sometimes also miss those things, but then I think: ‘Yes, I will take action.’ But they expect; they have certain expectations from the former vertical leader and you have to let them go. But that is really difficult. And you have to take more action yourself to get things done.”

An interesting finding was that six participants said that top-down influence of their organization had a negative impact on their functioning as a self-managing team. They indicated that sometimes the top of the organization gave a new task to the team, which influenced their planning and extent of autonomy. It was said they cannot completely decide their own tasks. A few participants said this top-down influence is difficult to change, since not all teams of their organization work as a self-managing team.

Direction and communication. Several team members said that their former vertical leader should have provided more focus and direction during the transition to a self-managing team. These team members felt their team was rudderless. They did not know what the intention was of their new way of working. It was said that their former vertical leader should communicate and share a clear vision within the team and should convey this vision within the organization. This need for a strong vision can be illustrated by the following quote: “I miss especially that there is a vertical leader that expresses his vision and shares with us. Now we have to do that by ourselves.”

A few team members said that their vertical leader could have communicated more clearly and open about the transition. Information about how their self-managing team should operate and what was expected of the members was missed. It was mentioned that this relevant information should have been communicated in a more planned, systematic way by the vertical leader. Team members felt they were not involved in the transition to the self-managing team. It was said that a more clear direction and communication during this transition by the vertical leader could have contributed to performing new projects, in which self-leadership and hence sharing leadership could be developed.

Change of role. In one organization, it was mentioned that the job of the vertical leader during the transition to a self-managing team was relatively complex. This vertical leader had a role in setting out the strategy of the team. Also, this leader became a team member in the team, in which he performed substantive work like other members. Some participants described that this leader had to learn to apply this complex role. He had to learn to share leadership within the team, in which he could not operate anymore in his former role as vertical leader. This means that decisions had to be made within the team, in which all members are at the same hierarchical

level. For the former vertical leader it was difficult to be less involved in these decision making processes, because leadership had to be shared. Some participants said that if the leader would have taken more distance while decisions had to be made, this could have contributed to a better sharing of leadership. This was difficult for him, since he had the most knowledge and experience in the team.

A few team members also mentioned they too often approached their vertical leader as former leader for help in making difficult decisions. These team members, just as their former vertical leader, returned to their former roles. They said that in a self-managing team they should handle these difficult moments as a team. One participant clearly described this behavior pattern of some team members: “Some people remain applying the old style. So, they keep approaching the former vertical leader as a sort of manager. Definitely when there is tension, we get the old patterns from the old hierarchy.”

Contributing factors

In the beginning of the result section it was mentioned that most participants said that the transition to a self-managing team succeeded. In this section is elaborated which other aspects, besides the role of the vertical leader, contributed to success of the transition according to team members. The role of team members themselves and the role of the organizations are described.

Team members.

Learn by experience. About half of the team members said they became better at self-leadership and sharing leadership because they learned from practical experiences. They felt they had to find out themselves how their team should operate. Over time they encountered problems and learned from mistakes they made. It was mentioned it was a learning process for them, since a vertical leader was not present anymore to guide decision making processes. In this learning

process team members became better at monitoring themselves and in steering their team members. One participant said the following about this: “Yes, it has been a learning process for years. It depends on the fact whether people take ownership. It is easier to hide yourself, because nobody can call you to account. There is no boss anymore.”

Initiatives. Remarkably, half of the participants said that a few initiatives had been started to receive more guidance about how leadership should be shared. In two organizations an external party was asked for help. These parties helped the teams in implementing structure in the self-managing team. Team members were helped in defining team roles, the division of these roles and in specifying and assigning tasks per role. Moreover, it was mentioned that meetings were structured in order to make decisions more quickly. This helped them to better understand how their team should function, how tasks and roles should be shared and what role leadership had to take in their team. In another organization a talent analysis had been done to get to know each other’s talents and how these talents could be used to distribute roles and tasks in the team. Some participants said that informal leaders played an important role in starting these initiatives and in helping sharing leadership in the team.

Organization.

Development and help. Several team members said that the organization offered options for developing self-leadership and shared leadership. First, the organization provided formal learning options to develop their self-leadership skills. Team members could make use of courses and trainings about leading themselves. Second, team members could exchange their experiences with colleagues from other teams who already had experience in working in a self-managing team. This was described as helpful for practical insights about sharing leadership in a team. Last, a few participants said that information about a self-managing team was provided by the

organization via different methods. Remarkably, it was indicated that the supplied information was aligned with the needs of the team members.

Discussion

Conclusion

The present study aimed to answer the following research question: *How can a vertical leader develop and empower self-leadership skills in team members that contribute to the development of shared leadership work teams?* The results showed that a vertical leader can adopt three roles to develop and empower self-leadership skills in team members and hence shared leadership development.

First, a vertical leader should create a working environment with a suitable balance in autonomy and structure. Team members should be given autonomy: a) to initiate projects with their own decision-making authority, b) to decide participating in self-leadership trainings and c) to exchange knowledge with members of other self-managing teams. The amount of autonomy should be increased gradually to stimulate the learning process of team members. A certain amount of structure must also be provided, but this framework should not limit team members in their projects. In addition, a vertical leader should help team members to obtain insights in their own self-leadership skills and how these can be improved.

Second, just like team members, a vertical leader also has to learn his new role. This means the vertical leader should learn to transfer the decision making process to the team. In this way, team members learn to develop their self-leadership and share leadership amongst each other.

Third, a vertical leader should provide clear direction and communication to the team. The intention and vision of the self-managing team should be communicated in an open and

systematic manner. This makes team members feel more involved in the transition and in the team's purpose. In this way team members feel more empowered to work on projects, in which they learn to develop self-leadership and shared leadership.

Theoretical implications

Autonomy and structure. In line with other studies, it was found that providing autonomy to team members is an important component in facilitating self-leadership (DiLiello and Houghton, 2006; Yun, Cox, & Sims, 2006). Literature confirmed that team members should be given autonomy in decision-making and leading themselves in projects (Houghton et al., 2003; Fausing et al., 2015). In new projects team members learn to take initiative, to solve problems and to take decisions (Houghton et al., 2003). Practicing self-leadership may lead to a higher extent of autonomy, independence and control for team members (Neck & Houghton, 2006). Further, it was concluded that team members should be given the opportunity to participate in self-leadership trainings. According to literature, a vertical leader can empower team members to participate in possibilities for self-leadership development (Fausing et al., 2015; Pearce et al., 2008). Pearce and Manz (2005) claimed that it cannot be expected from untrained team members that they have the required self- and shared leadership skills. Moreover, the found usefulness of exchanging knowledge with other self-managing teams was also reported in recent literature (Jassies, 2012). Using each other's knowledge and practical insights can help with solving problems and preventing that the wheel has to be reinvented twice (Van Amelsvoort & Scholtes, 1994).

The present study concluded that the amount of autonomy for team members should gradually increase. According to the notion of superleadership, team members need more guidance from their vertical leader in the beginning of the transition (Houghton et al., 2003).

Self-leadership can best be developed if team members are given time to learn how to handle increasing responsibilities (Houghton et al., 2003; Manz & Sims, 2001). A more recent study also found that team members need for control by their former vertical leader in developing self-leadership declines over time (Wild, 2015). The current study found a need for structure, i.e. clear boundaries between the declining tasks of the vertical leader and the increasing tasks of the team members. This seems hardly to have been studied in the literature. The literature regarding boundaries mainly mentions that the vertical leader should invest time in managing boundaries between the team and the organization (Houghton et al., 2003; Perry, Pearce, & Sims, 1999).

It was concluded that a vertical leader should help team members to obtain insight in their own self-leadership skills and how these can be improved. A possible way to do this may be using the earlier described behavior-focused strategies, which improve a person's awareness of current behaviors (Houghton et al., 2003; Neck, Neck, & Manz, 1999; Furtner, Rauthmann, & Sachse, 2015). In this situation self-observation and self-goal setting might be the most appropriate strategies. Self-observation refers to the process of examining one's own behavior to identify how it can be changed or enhanced (Houghton et al., 2003). This increases a person's self-awareness and provides insight in which personal goals can be set (Houghton et al., 2003; Neck et al., 1999).

New role of vertical leader. Several studies mentioned that a vertical leader should provide team members with authority to make decisions, solve problems and assuming leadership responsibilities (Houghton et al., 2003; Zhu et al., 2018). The challenge of a vertical leader is to pass responsibility to the team and to reduce the seizure of control (Pearce, 2004; Zhu et al., 2018). The current study found that similar to the team members also the vertical leader has to learn his new role, in particular involving less in the team's decision making process.

Sometimes it is speculated that the role of the vertical leader becomes less important in the case of shared leadership (Grille, 2015). However, in line with the current study several studies indicated that the role of the vertical leader will be particularly important (Grille, 2015; Pearce, 2004). It may be important to guide the learning process of a vertical leader. A possible approach for this may be the use of formal training for vertical leaders (Hoch, 2013).

Direction and communication. The current study showed that vertical leaders should provide a clear direction and communication to team members. Other studies also addressed that the vertical leader should communicate a clear vision to the team (Pearce, 2004) and should put the teamwork in a larger framework that helps members to understand the organization's mission (Grille, 2015). The vertical leader should ensure that the team has a clear and shared direction and purpose (Carson et al., 2007). A new finding of the present study is that a clear direction and communication additionally empower team members to initiate projects, in which self-leadership and hence shared leadership can be developed.

Practical implications

The findings of the current study provide several useful insights for organizations and vertical leaders that want to develop shared leadership. First, organizations should realise that this is a learning process for both team members and the vertical leader. This means that the organization should provide guidance and/or training for both. Second, at the start of the transition the vision and the purpose of the self-managing team should be communicated to the team members in a clear and open manner. In an ideal case, the organization and vertical leader align this communication in order to empower team members to take develop self-leadership. Third, during the transition the vertical leader can best ensure a balance between autonomy and structure. During the transition the balance has to shift from little autonomy and much structure

towards much autonomy and less structure. Finally, the vertical leader should help team members to gain insight in their self-leadership skills. This can be done by supporting team members to identify their self-leadership skills and possible improvements. Team members should be encouraged to set personal goals aimed at their improvements.

Limitations

For the current study also some limitations have to be mentioned. As described earlier, the participating teams have been selected via a combination of convenience and purposive sampling. It is possible that this sampling method has led to a bias towards teams that successfully made the transition to a self-managing team. Furthermore, only three teams participated in this study with different size and context of work. This may limit the transferability of the results. However, as the studied teams originated from different working sectors and were in different phases of the transition, the results of the study may be transferable to these various types of teams. Although the confirmability of this study is possibly limited since no inter-rater reliability check has been performed, it was tried to reduce investigator bias by using almost literally transcripts and only a few pre-defined codes.

Future research

Remarkably, a validated self-leadership assessment scale is missing (Houghton & Neck, 2002) and suitable self-leadership trainings are lacking (Müller & Wiese, 2010). Since self-leadership is often described as a learnable skill (Furtner, Rauthmann, & Sachse, 2010; Furtner et al., 2015; Müller, 2004), future studies could investigate the possibilities and outcomes of self-leadership trainings for team members. Another research direction could be to investigate how to support the vertical leader during the transition. Recent literature also mentions the importance of

studying the possible contribution of vertical leader training, as this may be cheaper than training leadership for each team member (Hoch, 2013; Grille, 2015).

References

- Anney, V. N. (2014). Ensuring the quality of the findings of qualitative research: Looking at trustworthiness criteria. *Journal of Emerging Trends in Educational Research and Policy Studies*, 5(2), 272-281. Retrieved from <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/1419/f7b54e6b7f1215717a5056e0709f8946745b.pdf>
- Baxter, P., & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative case study methodology: Study design and implementation for novice researchers. *The qualitative report*, 13(4), 544-559. Retrieved from <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1573&context=tqr>
- Bligh, M. C., Pearce, seidman C. L., & Kohles, J. C. (2006). The importance of self-and shared leadership in team based knowledge work: A meso-level model of leadership dynamics. *Journal of managerial Psychology*, 21(4), 296-318. doi:10.1108/02683940610663105
- Boeije, H. (2010). *Analysis in Qualitative Research*. London: Sage Publications.
- Boeije, H., & Bleijenbergh, I. (2005). *Analyseren in kwalitatief onderzoek*. Amsterdam: Boom Lemma uitgevers.
- Brinkmann, S., & Kvale, S. (2015). *Interviews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing* (Vol. 3). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Brooks, J., McCluskey, S., Turley, E., & King, N. (2015). The utility of template analysis in qualitative psychology research. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 12(2), 202-222. doi:10.1080/14780887.2014.955224
- Carson, J. B., Tesluk, P. E., & Marrone, J. A. (2007). Shared leadership in teams: An investigation of antecedent conditions and performance. *Academy of management Journal*, 50(5), 1217-1234. doi:10.5465/amj.2007.20159921
- 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. doi:10.1037/apl0000159

Conger, J. A., & Pearce, C. L. (2003). A landscape of opportunities. Shared leadership.

Reframing the hows and whys of leadership, 285-303. London: Sage Publications.

Coyne, I. T. (1997). Sampling in qualitative research. Purposeful and theoretical sampling; merging or clear boundaries?. *Journal of advanced nursing*, 26(3), 623-630.

doi:10.1046/j.1365-2648.1997.t01-25-00999.x

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. 4th ed. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

DeChurch, L. A., & Mesmer-Magnus, J. R. (2010). The cognitive underpinnings of effective teamwork: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(1), 32.

doi:10.1037/a0017328

DiLiello, T. C., & Houghton, J. D. (2006). Maximizing organizational leadership capacity for the future: Toward a model of self-leadership, innovation and creativity. *Journal of managerial psychology*, 21(4), 319-337. Retrieved from

https://s3.amazonaws.com/academia.edu.documents/42973222/Maximizing_Organizational_Leadership_Cap20160223-22940-14f3qyb.pdf?response-content-disposition=inline%3B%20filename%3DMaximizing_organizational_leadership_cap.pdf&X-Amz-Algorithm=AWS4-HMAC-SHA256&X-Amz-Credential=AKIAIWOWYYGZ2Y53UL3A%2F20200108%2Fus-east-1%2Fs3%2Faws4_request&X-Amz-Date=20200108T104240Z&X-Amz-Expires=3600&X-Amz-SignedHeaders=host&X-Amz-Signature=95c7670506eb941b4cc28238a8a9a44559d518e8a6323dbbb78cce94ab07e663

- D’Innocenzo, L., Mathieu, J. E., & Kukenberger, M. R. (2016). A meta-analysis of different forms of shared leadership–team performance relations. *Journal of Management*, *42*(7), 1964-1991. doi:10.1177/0149206314525205
- Edwards, R., & Holland, J. (2013). *What is qualitative interviewing?* London: Bloomsbury.
- Fausing, M. S., Joensson, T. S., Lewandowski, J., & Bligh, M. (2015). Antecedents of shared leadership: empowering leadership and interdependence. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *36*(3), 271-291. doi:10.1108/LODJ-06-2013-0075
- Furtner, M. R., Rauthmann, J. F., & Sachse, P. (2010). The socioemotionally intelligent selfleader: Examining relations between self-leadership and socioemotional intelligence. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, *38*(9), 1191-1196. doi:10.2224/sbp.2010.38.9.1191
- Furtner, M. R., Rauthmann, J. F., & Sachse, P. (2015). Unique self-leadership: A bifactor model approach. *Leadership*, *11*(1), 105-125. doi:10.1177/1742715013511484
- Grille, A., Schulte, E. M., & Kauffeld, S. (2015). Promoting shared leadership: A multilevel analysis investigating the role of prototypical team leader behavior, psychological empowerment, and fair rewards. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, *22*(3), 324-339. doi:10.1177/1548051815570039
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). *Fourth generation evaluation*. London: Sage Publications.
- Hoch, J. E. (2013). Shared leadership and innovation: The role of vertical leadership and employee integrity. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *28*(2), 159-174. doi:10.1007/s10869-012-9273-6
- Hoch, J. E., Pearce, C. L., & Welzel, L. (2010). Is the most effective team leadership shared?

- The impact of shared leadership, age diversity, and coordination on team performance. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, 9(3), 105. doi:10.1027/1866-5888/a000002
- Houghton, J. D., & Neck, C. P. (2002). The revised self-leadership questionnaire: Testing a hierarchical factor structure for self-leadership. *Journal of Managerial psychology*, 17(8), 672-691. doi:10.1108/02683940210450484
- 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. doi:10.4135/9781452229539.n6
- Jassies, R. (2012). *Het feedbacksysteem voor continue ontwikkeling van zelfsturende teams in de zorg: Een proces naar en voorwaarde voor succes: Een onderzoek naar ervaringen, meningen en wensen van belanghebbenden* (Bachelor's thesis, University of Twente). Retrieved from https://essay.utwente.nl/61858/1/Bachelorrapport_augustus_2012__Bedrijfskunde_-_Renske_Jassies_S1007394.pdf
- Kallio, H., Pietilä, A. M., Johnson, M., & Kangasniemi, M. (2016). Systematic methodological review: developing a framework for a qualitative semi-structured interview guide. *Journal of advanced nursing*, 72(12), 2954-2965. doi:10.1111/jan.13031
- King, N. (2012). Doing template analysis. *Qualitative organizational research: Core methods and current challenges*, 426. doi:10.4135/9781526435620.n24
- Kocolowski, M. D. (2010). Shared leadership: Is it time for a change. *Emerging Leadership Journeys*, 3(1), 22-32. Retrieved from https://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/elj/vol3iss1/Kocolowski_ELJV3I1_pp22-32.pdf
- Kozlowski, S. W., & Bell, B. S. (2003). Work groups and teams in organizations. *Handbook of*

- psychology*, 333-375. doi:10.1002/0471264385.wei1214
- Kozlowski, S. W., & Bell, B. S. (2013). Work groups and teams in organizations: Review update. Retrieved from <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/144985378.pdf>
- Manz, C. C., & Sims, H. P. (2001). *The new superleadership: Leading others to lead themselves*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Manz, C. C., & Sims Jr, H. P. (1991). Superleadership: Beyond the myth of heroic leadership. *Organizational dynamics*, 19(4), 18-35. doi:10.1016/0090-2616(91)90051-A
- Marshall, M. N. (1996). Sampling for qualitative research. *Family practice*, 13(6), 522-526.
- 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), 410-476. doi:10.1177/0149206308316061
- McNamara, C. (2009). *General guidelines for conducting interviews*. Retrieved from <http://managementhelp.org/evaluatintrview.htm>
- 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. doi:10.1177/0149206309347376
- Morse, J. M., Barrett, M., Mayan, M., Olson, K., & Spiers, J. (2002). Verification strategies for establishing reliability and validity in qualitative research. *International journal of qualitative methods*, 1(2), 13-22. doi:10.1177/160940690200100202
- Müller, G.F. (2004). Selbstführungskompetenz. In B. S. Wiese (Eds.), *Individuelle Steuerung beruflicher Entwicklung* (pp. 91-104). Frankfurt: Campus.

- Müller, G.F., & Wiese, B.S. (2010). Selbstmanagement und Selbstführung bei der Arbeit. In U. Kleinbeck & K. H. Schmidt (Eds.), *Enzyklopädie der Psychologie* (pp. 623-667). Göttingen: Hogrefe.
- Neck, C. P., & Houghton, J. D. (2006). Two decades of self-leadership theory and research: Past developments, present trends, and future possibilities. *Journal of managerial psychology*, *21*(4), 270-295. doi:10.1108/02683940610663097
- Neck, C. P., Neck, H. M., Manz, C. C., & Godwin, J. (1999). "I think I can; I think I can" A self-leadership perspective toward enhancing entrepreneur thought patterns, self-efficacy, and performance. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *14*(6), 477-501. doi:10.1108/02683949910287912
- Nicolaides, V. C., LaPort, K. A., Chen, T. R., Tomassetti, A. J., Weis, E. J., Zaccaro, S. J., & Cortina, J. M. (2014). The shared leadership of teams: A meta-analysis of proximal, distal, and moderating relationships. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *25*(5), 923-942. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2014.06.006
- Pearce, C. L. (2004). The future of leadership: Combining vertical and shared leadership to transform knowledge work. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, *18*(1), 47-57. doi:10.5465/AME.2004.12690298
- Pearce, C. L., & Conger, J. A. (2002). *Shared leadership: Reframing the hows and whys of leadership*. Sage. doi:10.4135/9781452229539
- Pearce, C. L., & Manz, C. C. (2005). The new silver bullets of leadership: The importance of self-and shared leadership in knowledge work. doi:10.1016/j.orgdyn.2005.03.003
- Pearce, C. L., Manz, C. C., & Sims Jr, H. P. (2008). The roles of vertical and shared leadership in the enactment of executive corruption: Implications for research and practice. *The*

- Leadership Quarterly*, 19(3), 353-359. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2008.03.007
- Pearce, C. L., & Sims Jr, H. P. (2002). Vertical versus shared leadership as predictors of the effectiveness of change management teams: An examination of aversive, directive, transactional, transformational, and empowering leader behaviors. *Group dynamics: Theory, research, and practice*, 6(2), 172. doi:10.1037//1089-2699.6.2.172
- Perry, M. L., Pearce, C. L., & Sims Jr, H. P. (1999). Empowered selling teams: How shared leadership can contribute to selling team outcomes. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 19(3), 35-51. doi:10.1080/08853134.1999.10754180
- Reulink, N., & Lindeman, L. (2005). Kwalitatief onderzoek. Retrieved from [http://www.cs.ru.nl/~tomh/onderwijs/om2%20\(2005\)/om2_files/syllabus/kwalitatief.pdf](http://www.cs.ru.nl/~tomh/onderwijs/om2%20(2005)/om2_files/syllabus/kwalitatief.pdf)
- Riege, A. M. (2003). Validity and reliability tests in case study research: a literature review with "hands-on" applications for each research phase. *Qualitative market research: An international journal*, 6(2), 75-86. doi:10.1108/13522750310470055
- Schnake, M., Dumler, M. P., & Cochran, D. S. (1993). The relationship between "traditional" leadership, "super" leadership, and organizational citizenship behavior. *Group & Organization Management*, 18(3), 352-365. doi:10.1177/1059601193183006
- Seidman, I. (2006). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences*. New York: Teacher College Press.
- Shenton, A. K. (2004). Strategies for ensuring trustworthiness in qualitative research projects. *Education for information*, 22(2), 63-75. doi:10.3233/EFI-2004-22201
- Simon, G., & Cassell, C. (2012). *Qualitative Organizational Research*. London: Sage Publications.
- Stewart, G. L., Courtright, S. H., & Manz, C. C. (2011). Self-leadership: A multilevel review.

- Journal of Management*, 37(1), 185-222. doi:10.1177/0149206310383911
- Turner III, D. W. (2010). Qualitative interview design: A practical guide for novice investigators. *The qualitative report*, 15(3), 754-760. Retrieved from <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol15/iss3/19>
- Ulhøi, J. P., & Müller, S. (2014). Mapping the landscape of shared leadership: A review and synthesis. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, 8(2), 66-87. Retrieved from <https://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/ijls/new/vol8iss2/full.pdf#page=75>
- Van Amelsvoort, P. & Scholtes, G. (1994). *Zelfsturende teams: ontwerpen invoeren en begeleiden*. Oss: ST-groep.
- Wang, D., Waldman, D. A., & Zhang, Z. (2014). A meta-analysis of shared leadership and team effectiveness. *Journal of applied psychology*, 99(2), 181. doi:10.1037/a0034531
- Wild, N. (2015). *Antecedent conditions of shared leadership: an examination of team personality composition, shared leadership, and team effectiveness*. Retrieved from <https://scholar.utc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=https://scholar-google-nl.proxy.library.uu.nl/&httpsredir=1&article=1313&context=theses>
- Yun, S., Cox, J., & Sims Jr, H. P. (2006). The forgotten follower: A contingency model of leadership and follower self-leadership. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(4), 374-388. doi:10.1108/02683940610663141
- 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*. doi:10.1002/job.2296

*Appendix A**Information letter with inclusion criteria*

Datum	15-05-2019
Onderwerp onderzoek	Gedeeld leiderschap in teams
Onderzoeker	Walter ten Eikelder
Emailadres	w.j.h.teneikelder@students.uu.nl



Universiteit Utrecht

Beste meneer/mevrouw,

Mijn naam is Walter ten Eikelder, masterstudent Onderwijswetenschappen aan de Universiteit Utrecht. Momenteel ben ik bezig met mijn afstudeeronderzoek naar gedeeld leiderschap in teams. Hiervoor zoek ik teams die voorheen werden aangestuurd door één formele leider, maar in de afgelopen jaren de overgang hebben gemaakt naar een team waarin het leiderschap verdeeld is over alle teamleden. Dit zijn in de praktijk vaak teams die de overstap hebben gemaakt naar een zelfsturende of zelforganiserende manier van werken. Met mijn onderzoek hoop ik inzicht te krijgen in de **rol van de leidinggevende** bij deze overstap.

Wat houdt het onderzoek in?

Enkele teamleden en de leidinggevende die de overgang naar gedeeld leiderschap heeft begeleid, zullen eenmaal door mij worden geïnterviewd. Deze interviews zullen rond de 45 minuten duren. Het gaat daarbij over hoe zij de ontwikkeling van een team met één leider naar een team met gedeeld leiderschap hebben ervaren.

Doelgroep

Ik ben dus op zoek naar teams die in de afgelopen jaren de overgang hebben gemaakt van een team met één formele leider, naar een team waar leiderschap verdeeld is over de teamleden. Teams kunnen deelnemen als ze voldoen aan de volgende criteria: a) bestaan uit vier of meer personen, b) delen een of meer gemeenschappelijke doelen en c) werken volgens het principe van gedeeld leiderschap.

Opbrengst

Het afstudeeronderzoek en een samenvatting van de resultaten worden na afloop van het onderzoek verstuurd aan de deelnemende teams. Deze rapportages kunnen nuttig zijn voor de deelnemende organisaties, leidinggevend en teams. Het kan inzicht bieden in hoe men een team zo goed mogelijk kan begeleiden naar een zelfsturend of zelf organiserend team waarin leiderschap gedeeld is. Dit zou kunnen leiden tot efficiëntere besluitvorming en betere resultaten in het team.

Privacy en vertrouwelijkheid

Alle data wordt vertrouwelijk behandeld en anoniem verwerkt. De gegevens zullen alleen gebruikt worden voor onderzoeksdoeleinden en worden niet verstrekt aan derden. Zowel de

participanten als de uitvoerende onderzoeker zullen een informed consent tekenen om overeenkomst te bereiken over de verwachtingen van het onderzoek.

Heeft u interesse in deelname aan mijn onderzoek of heeft u verdere vragen, neemt u dan contact op met w.j.h.teneikelder@students.uu.nl.

Met vriendelijke groeten,
Walter ten Eikelder

Appendix B

Topic list

Main topic	Sub topic	Concepts
Personal characteristics	Function	
	Work day	
Meaning shared leadership	Practical vision	
	Theoretical vision	
Choice for shared leadership	Reason for transition	
	People involved	
Differences after transition	Team members	Tasks & responsibility
		Decision making
		Feedback
	Autonomy	
Role leader: development self-leadership	Development self-leadership strategies	Tasks & responsibility
		Support
Role leader: development self-leadership	Development self-leadership strategies	Behavior-focused strategies
		Natural reward strategies
		Constructive thought pattern strategies
	Empowerment self-leadership	Becoming a self-leader
Role leader: development self-leadership	Empowerment self-leadership	Modeling self-leadership
		Self-set goals

		Positive thought patterns
		Reward and constructive reprimand
Role leader: development shared leadership team	Support shared leadership team	
	Empowerment shared leadership	

Appendix C

Interview guideline team member

Dutch version

Introductie

1. Naam + studie: Walter ten Eikelder, Onderwijswetenschappen
2. Eigen onderzoek: overgang verticaal leiderschap naar gedeeld leiderschap in teams
3. Doel onderzoek: inzicht bieden in rol leidinggevende bij stap naar gedeeld leiderschap
4. Tijdsduur en opbouw interview: 45 minuten en verschillende thema's
5. Verwachtingen interview: vragen niet begrijpen, vragen niet willen beantwoorden en zo eerlijk mogelijk antwoorden
6. Vragen:
 - a) Heeft u nog vragen over mijn onderzoek/interview?
 - b) Zou u het Informed Consent willen lezen en ondertekenen?

Context

- Grootte team
- Periode overgang
- Werkcontext

Onderwerp 1: demografische kenmerken en functiebeschrijving

1. Wat is uw naam?
2. Wat is uw functie binnen het bedrijf/team?
3. Hoe lang werkt u binnen het bedrijf/team?
4. Hoe zou u uw baan omschrijven?
 - a) Zou u een werkdag kunnen omschrijven?

Onderwerp 2: betekenis team met gedeeld leiderschap

1. Wat verstaat u onder een team met gedeeld leiderschap?
 - a) *Is in uw team de dagelijkse leiding verdeeld over de teamleden?*
2. Kunt u vertellen waarom uw team volgens u een team is waarin het leiderschap verdeeld is over de teamleden?
 - a) *Kunt u een voorbeeld geven van een situatie waaruit dat blijkt?*

Onderwerp 3: keuze voor team met gedeeld leiderschap

1. Kunt u vertellen waarom uw organisatie is gaan werken met teams waarin leiderschap gedeeld is?
 - a) *Wanneer is uw organisatie met de nieuwe manier van werken aan de slag gegaan?*
 - b) *Hoe lang heeft de overgang naar de nieuwe manier van werken geduurd?*
 - c) *Wanneer was het proces van begeleiding afgerond?*
2. Kunt u (globaal) omschrijven hoe de overgang naar de nieuwe manier van werken is verlopen?
3. Wie zijn er betrokken geweest om deze overgang soepel te laten verlopen?
 - a) *Wat was hun rol?*

b) Waren er meerdere procesbegeleiders/coaches/externe partijen betrokken?

Onderwerp 4: verschillen oude en nieuwe situatie

Sub-thema: verschillen – persoonlijk niveau

1. Zou u kunnen omschrijven hoe uw werk is veranderd na de overgang naar de nieuwe manier van werken?
 - a) *Zijn uw taken veranderd? Zo ja, hoe?*
 - b) *Zijn uw verantwoordelijkheden veranderd? Zo ja, hoe?*
 - c) *Is de manier van verantwoording afleggen veranderd? Zo ja, hoe?*
2. Wat zijn voor u persoonlijk de grootste verschillen geweest tussen beide manieren van werken?
 - a) *Voelt u zich verantwoordelijker voor uw eigen werk dan voorheen? Waarom?*
 - b) *Ervaart u meer of minder vrijheid om keuzes te maken binnen uw werk? Waarom?*

Sub-thema: verschillen – team niveau

1. Zou u kunnen omschrijven hoe het werk van uw team is veranderd na de overgang naar de nieuwe manier van werken?
 - a) *Zijn er taken veranderd? Zo ja, hoe?*
 - b) *Zijn er verantwoordelijkheden veranderd? Zo ja, hoe?*
 - c) *Is de manier van verantwoording afleggen veranderd? Zo ja, hoe?*
2. Hoe wordt er in de nieuwe manier van werken beslissingen gemaakt in het team?
 - a) *Zijn de overlegstructuren veranderd? Zo ja, hoe?*
 - b) *Hebben teamleden vrijheid om zelf keuzes te maken?*
3. Moeten teamleden elkaar meer aansturen dan voorheen, nu er niet meer één formele leidinggevende is?
 - a) *Zo ja, hoe gebeurt dit?*
 - b) *Geven teamleden elkaar feedback? Zo ja, hoe?*
 - c) *Spreken teamleden elkaar aan op fouten/hun verantwoordelijkheden? Zo ja, hoe?*

Uitleggen zelfleiderschap: een zelf-leider kan goed zijn eigen manier van werken sturen. Zo'n persoon kan goed plannen, is doelgericht, kan zichzelf goed motiveren en ook corrigeren als iets niet naar wens verloopt. Een zelf-leider is zich bewust van zijn eigen manier van werken en de kwaliteit van zijn eigen werk.

Onderwerp 5: rol leider bij ontwikkelen zelf-leiderschap

1. Heeft uw leidinggevende u geleerd om dit 'zelf-leiderschap' te ontwikkelen?
 - a) *Zo ja, hoe heeft uw leidinggevende dit uw geleerd?*
 - b) *Zo nee, welke andere factoren hebben hieraan bijgedragen? (denk aan trainingen/een coach/een externe partij/informatievoorziening/cursus)*
 - c) *Is hier bewust aan gewerkt?*
2. Heeft u geleerd om de kwaliteit van uw eigen werk te beoordelen?
 - a) *Zo ja, welke bijdrage heeft uw leidinggevende hieraan geleverd?*
 - b) *Zo nee, welke andere factoren hebben hieraan bijgedragen?*
 - c) *Bent u bewuster geworden van uw sterke en zwakke punten?*
 - d) *Wat doet u als u de kwaliteit van uw eigen werk niet goed vindt/als u een fout hebt gemaakt?*

3. Heeft u geleerd om verantwoordelijkheid te nemen om zelf keuzes te maken?
 - a) *Zo ja, welke bijdrage heeft uw leidinggevende hieraan geleverd?*
 - b) *Zo nee, welke andere factoren hebben hieraan bijgedragen?*
4. Heeft u geleerd om te werken aan persoonlijke (leer)doelen/doelgerichter te werken?
 - a) *Zo ja, welke bijdrage heeft uw leidinggevende hieraan geleverd?*
 - b) *Zo nee, welke andere factoren hebben hieraan bijgedragen?*
5. Heeft u geleerd om uzelf op een andere manier te motiveren?
 - a) *Maakt u gebruik van beloningen?*
 - b) *Zo ja, welke bijdrage heeft uw leidinggevende hieraan geleverd?*
 - c) *Zo nee, welke andere factoren hebben hieraan bijgedragen?*
6. Heeft u de kans gehad om deze vaardigheden (met betrekking tot het aansturen van uzelf) te oefenen?
 - a) *Welke leeractiviteiten zijn er geweest om aan deze vaardigheden te werken?*
7. Bent u beter geworden in dit 'zelf-leiderschap'?
 - a) *Zo ja, kunt u een voorbeeld geven waaruit dit blijkt?*
 - b) *Bent u momenteel een goede zelf-leider?*
 - c) *Wat heeft hieraan bijgedragen (leidinggevende als coach of andere zaken?)*
 - d) *Heeft uw leidinggevende u hierin versterkt/aangemoedigd?*

Uitleg gedeeld leiderschap: leiderschap in een team is breed verdeeld over alle teamleden, ze staan op hetzelfde niveau. De teamleden maken gezamenlijk beslissingen. Zelf-leiderschap wordt gezien als een voorwaarde voordat men in een team leiderschap kan delen. De vragen over dit onderwerp kunnen hierdoor op elkaar lijken.

Onderwerp 6: rol leider bij ontwikkelen gedeeld leiderschap

1. Heeft uw leidinggevende u geleerd hoe u leiderschap moet delen in uw team?
 - a) *Hoe heeft uw leidinggevende dit u geleerd?*
 - b) *Heeft u een training/een cursus/een presentatie gehad over het delen van leiderschap?*
 - c) *Bent u momenteel in staat om leiderschap te delen?*
 - d) *Wat heeft daaraan bijdragen naast de rol van de leidinggevende?*
2. Heeft u geleerd hoe u feedback kan geven en ontvangen binnen uw team?
 - a) *Zo ja, welke bijdrage heeft uw leidinggevende hieraan geleverd?*
 - b) *Spreekt u uw teamleden ook aan op hun fouten?*
 - c) *Bent u momenteel in staat om feedback te geven en ontvangen?*
 - d) *Wat heeft daaraan bijdragen naast de rol van de leidinggevende?*
3. Heeft u geleerd hoe u uw teamleden moet aansturen/wijzen op hun verantwoordelijkheden?
 - a) *Zo ja, welke bijdrage heeft uw leidinggevende hieraan geleverd?*
 - b) *Bent u momenteel in staat om teamleden aan te sturen/wijzen op verantwoordelijkheden?*
 - c) *Wat heeft daaraan bijdragen naast de rol van de leidinggevende?*
4. Heeft u geleerd hoe uw gezamenlijk beslissingen dient te nemen in uw team?
 - a) *Zo ja, welke bijdrage heeft uw leidinggevende hieraan geleverd?*
 - b) *Is er sprake van een evenwichtige overlegstructuur?*
 - c) *Voelt u zich vrij om eigen mening te geven?*

- d) Bent u momenteel in staat om gezamenlijk beslissingen te nemen?*
e) Wat heeft daaraan bijdragen naast de rol van de leidinggevende?
5. Heeft u de kans gehad om deze vaardigheden (met betrekking tot het delen van leiderschap in een team) te oefenen?
a) Welke leeractiviteiten zijn er geweest om aan deze vaardigheden te werken?
6. Bent u beter geworden in het delen van leiderschap? **Kunt u nu goed het leiderschap delen in uw team?**
a) Zo ja, kunt u een voorbeeld geven waaruit dit blijkt?
b) Wat ervoor gezorgd dat u dat nu kan? Leidinggevende/andere factoren? Heeft uw leidinggevende dit versterkt/aangemoedigd?
c) Heeft het ontwikkelen van uw zelf-leiderschap hierin een rol gespeeld?
d) Bent u bewust begeleid bij het ontwikkelen van uw zelf en gedeeld leiderschap?
7. *Is de overgang over het algemeen volgens u geslaagd?*
a) Waarom wel of waarom niet? Redenen voor succes/falen.
b) Wat waren knelpunten/goede punten in het algemeen?
c) Wat waren knelpunten/goede punten gezien de rol van de leidinggevende, als coach/begeleider bij uw ontwikkeling en de ontwikkeling van het team bij de overgang?

English version

Introduction

1. Name + study: Walter ten Eikelder, Educational Sciences
2. Own research: transition from vertical leadership to shared leadership in teams
3. Aim of the research: providing insight into the role of manager in the transition towards shared leadership
4. Interview duration and structure: 45 minutes and different themes
5. Expectations interview: not understanding questions, not wanting to answer questions and answering as honestly as possible
6. Questions:
 - a) Do you have any questions about my research/interview?
 - b) Would you like to read and sign the Informed Consent?

Context

- Team size
- Transition period
- Context of work

Topic 1: Personal characteristics

1. What's your name?
2. What is your function within the company/team?
3. How long do you work in the company/team?
4. How would you describe your job?
 - a) *Could you describe a working day?*

Topic 2: Meaning shared leadership

1. What do you mean by a team with shared leadership?
 - a) *In your team, is the daily management divided among the team members?*
2. Can you tell us why you think your team is a team in which the leadership is divided among the team members?
 - a) *Can you give an example of a situation that shows this?*

Topic 3: Choosing a team with shared leadership

1. Can you tell us why your organization has started working with teams in which leadership is shared?
 - a) *When did your organization start working with the new way of working?*
 - b) *How long did the transition to the new way of working last?*
 - c) *When was the process of guidance completed?*
2. Can you describe (roughly) how the transition to the new way of working went?
3. Who was involved to make this transition go smoothly?
 - a) *What was their role?*
 - b) *Were several process supervisors/coaches/external party's involved?*

Topic 4: Differences after transition**Sub-theme: differences - personal level**

1. Could you describe how your work has changed after the transition to the new way of working?
 - a) *Have your tasks changed? If yes, how?*
 - b) *Have your responsibilities changed? If yes, how?*
 - c) *Has the way you are held accountable changed? If yes, how?*
2. For you personally, what have been the main differences between the two ways of working?
 - a) *Do you feel more responsible for your own work than before? Why?*
 - b) *Do you experience more or less freedom to make choices within your work? Why?*

Sub-theme: differences - team level

1. Could you describe how your team's work has changed after the transition to the new way of working?
 - a) *Have tasks changed? If yes, how?*
 - b) *Have responsibilities changed? If yes, how?*
 - c) *Has the way of accountability changed? If yes, how?*
2. In the new way of working, how are decisions made in the team?
 - a) *Have the consultation structures changed? If yes, how?*
 - b) *Do team members have freedom to make their own choices?*
3. Do team members have to manage each other more than before, now that there is no longer one formal manager?
 - a) *If yes, how is this done?*
 - b) *Do team members give each other feedback? If yes, how?*
 - c) *Do team members address each other on errors/responsibilities? If yes, how?*

Explain self-leadership: a self-leader can easily steer his own way of working. Such a person can plan well, is goal-oriented, can motivate himself well and can also correct if something does not go according to plan. A self-leader is aware of his own way of working and the quality of his own work.

Topic 5: role of leader in development self-leadership

1. Has your supervisor taught you to develop this 'self-leadership'?
 - a) *If yes, how did your supervisor or manager teach you this?*
 - b) *If not, what other factors have contributed to this? (e.g. training/a coach/an external party/information provision/course)*
 - c) *Has this been done deliberately?*
2. Have you learned to assess the quality of your own work?
 - a) *If yes, what contribution has your supervisor made to this?*
 - b) *If not, what other factors contributed to this?*
 - c) *Have you become more aware of your strengths and weaknesses?*
 - d) *What do you do if you feel that the quality of your own work is not good/if you made a mistake?*
3. Have you learned to take responsibility to make your own choices?
 - a) *If yes, what contribution has your manager made to this?*
 - b) *If not, what other factors have contributed to this?*
4. Have you learned to work on personal (learning) goals/goal-oriented work?
 - a) *If yes, what contribution did your manager make to this?*
 - b) *If not, what other factors contributed to this?*
5. Have you learned to motivate yourself in a different way?
 - a) *Do you use rewards?*
 - b) *If yes, what contribution has your manager made to this?*
 - c) *If not, what other factors contributed to this?*
6. Have you had the opportunity to practice these skills (with regard to directing yourself)?
 - a) *What learning activities have there been to work on these skills?*
7. Have you improved in this 'self-leadership'?
 - a) *If yes, can you give an example demonstrating this?*
 - b) *Are you currently a good self-leader?*
 - c) *What has contributed to this (manager as coach or other things?)?*
 - d) *Has your manager strengthened/encouraged you in this?*

Shared leadership explanation: leadership in a team is widely distributed among all team members, they are at the same level. The team members make decisions together. Self-leadership is seen as a prerequisite for sharing leadership in a team. As a result, the questions on this topic may resemble each other.

Topic 6: role of leader in developing shared leadership

1. Has your supervisor taught you how to share leadership in your team?
 - a) *How did your supervisor or manager teach you this?*
 - b) *Have you had a training/course/presentation on leadership sharing?*
 - c) *Are you currently able to share leadership?*
 - d) *What has contributed to this in addition to the role of the manager?*

2. Have you learned how to give and receive feedback within your team?
 - a) *If yes, what contribution has your manager made to this?*
 - b) *Do you also address your team members on their mistakes?*
 - c) *Are you currently able to give and receive feedback?*
 - d) *In addition to the role of the manager, what contribution has your manager made?*
3. Have you learned how to manage/make your team members accountable?
 - a) *If yes, what contribution has your manager made to this?*
 - b) *Are you currently able to manage/designate team members according to responsibilities?*
 - c) *In addition to the role of the manager, what contribution has your manager made?*
4. Have you learned how to make joint decisions in your team?
 - a) *If yes, what contribution has your manager made to this?*
 - b) *Is there a balanced consultation structure?*
 - c) *Do you feel free to express your own opinion?*
 - d) *Are you currently in a position to take joint decisions?*
 - e) *In addition to the role of the manager, what contribution has your manager made?*
5. Have you had the opportunity to practice these skills (with regard to sharing leadership in a team)?
 - a) *What learning activities have there been to work on these skills?*
6. Have you improved in leadership sharing? **Are you now good at sharing leadership in your team?**
 - a) *If yes, can you give an example showing this?*
 - b) *What has made you able to do so? Leading/other factors? Has your manager reinforced/encouraged this?*
 - c) *Has developing your self-leadership played a role in this?*
 - d) *Have you been consciously guided in the development of your self and shared leadership?*
7. In your opinion, was the transition generally successful?
 - a) *Why or why not? Reasons for success/failure.*
 - b) *What were bottlenecks/good points in general?*
 - c) *What were bottlenecks/good points given the role of the manager, as coach/guide in your development and the development of the team during the transition?*

Appendix D

Interview guideline vertical leader

Dutch version

Introductie

1. Naam + Studie: Walter ten Eikelder, Onderwijswetenschappen
2. Eigen onderzoek: overgang verticaal leiderschap naar gedeeld leiderschap in teams
3. Doel onderzoek: inzicht bieden in rol leidinggevende bij stap naar gedeeld leiderschap
4. Tijdsduur en opbouw interview: 45 minuten en verschillende thema's
5. Verwachtingen interview: vragen niet begrijpen, vragen niet willen beantwoorden en zo eerlijk mogelijk antwoorden
6. Vragen:
 - a) Heeft u nog vragen over mijn onderzoek/interview?
 - b) Zou u het Informed Consent willen lezen en ondertekenen?

Context

- Grootte team
- Periode overgang
- Werkcontext

Onderwerp 1: demografische kenmerken en functiebeschrijving

1. Wat is uw naam?
2. Wat is uw huidige functie binnen het bedrijf/team?
 - a) *Hoe zag uw functie eruit voordat de overgang plaatsvond?*
3. Hoe lang werkt u binnen het bedrijf/team?
4. Hoe zou u uw baan omschrijven?
 - a) *Zou u een werkdag kunnen omschrijven?*

Onderwerp 2: betekenis team met gedeeld leiderschap

1. Wat verstaat u onder een team met gedeeld leiderschap?
 - a) *Is in uw team de dagelijkse leiding verdeeld over de teamleden?*
2. Kunt u vertellen waarom uw team volgens u een team is waarin het leiderschap verdeeld is over de teamleden?
 - a) *Kunt u een voorbeeld geven van een situatie waaruit dat blijkt?*

Onderwerp 3: keuze voor team met gedeeld leiderschap

1. Kunt u vertellen waarom uw organisatie is gaan werken met teams waarin leiderschap gedeeld is?
 - a) *Wanneer is uw organisatie met de nieuwe manier van werken aan de slag gegaan?*
 - b) *Hoe lang heeft de overgang naar de nieuwe manier van werken geduurd?*
 - c) *Wanneer was het proces van begeleiding afgerond?*
2. Kunt u (globaal) omschrijven hoe de overgang naar de nieuwe manier van werken is verlopen?
3. Wie zijn er betrokken geweest om deze overgang soepel te laten verlopen?

- a) *Wat was uw rol?*
- b) *Waren er meerdere procesbegeleiders/coaches/externe partij betrokken?*

Onderwerp 4: verschillen oude en nieuwe situatie

Sub-thema: verschillen – persoonlijk niveau

1. Zou u kunnen omschrijven hoe uw werk is veranderd na de overgang naar de nieuwe manier van werken?
 - a) *Heeft u nu een andere rol als leidinggevende?*
 - b) *Wat is er voor u veranderd qua taken en verantwoordelijkheden?*
 - c) *Wat is er voor u veranderd qua aansturing/begeleiding van uw team?*
2. Wat zijn voor u persoonlijk de grootste verschillen geweest tussen beide manieren van werken?
 - a) *Wat is er voor u veranderd qua aansturing/begeleiding van uw team?*

Sub-thema: verschillen – team niveau

1. Zou u kunnen omschrijven hoe het werk voor uw teamleden is veranderd na de overgang naar de nieuwe manier van werken?
 - a) *Zijn er taken veranderd? Zo ja, hoe?*
 - b) *Zijn er verantwoordelijkheden veranderd? Zo ja, hoe?*
 - c) *Is de manier van verantwoording afleggen veranderd? Zo ja, hoe?*
2. Hoe wordt er in de nieuwe manier van werken beslissingen gemaakt in uw team?
 - a) *Zijn de overlegstructuren veranderd? Zo ja, hoe?*
 - b) *Hebben teamleden vrijheid om zelf keuzes te maken?*
3. Moeten teamleden elkaar meer aansturen dan voorheen, nu er niet meer één formele leidinggevende is?
 - a) *Zo ja, hoe gebeurt dit?*
 - b) *Geven teamleden elkaar feedback? Zo ja, hoe?*
 - c) *Spreken teamleden elkaar aan op fouten/hun verantwoordelijkheden? Zo ja, hoe?*

Uitleggen zelfleiderschap: een zelf-leider kan goed zijn eigen manier van werken sturen. Zo'n persoon kan goed plannen, is doelgericht, kan zichzelf goed motiveren en ook corrigeren als iets niet naar wens verloopt. Een zelf-leider is zich bewust van zijn eigen manier van werken en de kwaliteit van zijn eigen werk.

Onderwerp 5: rol leider bij ontwikkelen zelf-leiderschap

1. Heeft u geprobeerd dit 'zelf-leiderschap te ontwikkelen bij uw teamleden?
 - a) *Zo ja, hoe heeft u dit gedaan? Heeft u dit bewust/onbewust gedaan?*
 - b) *Denkt u dat teamleden dit ontwikkeld hebben?*
 - c) *Wat heeft hieraan bijdragen?(denk aan trainingen/een coach/een externe partij/informatievoorziening/cursus)*
2. Heeft u uw teamleden geleerd om de kwaliteit van hun eigen werk te beoordelen?
 - a) *Zo ja, hoe heeft u dit gedaan?*
 - b) *Zijn ze bewuster geworden van hun eigen sterke en zwakke punten?*
 - c) *Zo nee, welke andere factoren hebben hieraan bijgedragen?*
3. Heeft u uw teamleden geleerd hoe ze verantwoordelijkheid moeten nemen om zelf keuzes te maken?

- a) *Zo ja, hoe heeft u dit gedaan?*
 - b) *Zo nee, welke andere factoren hebben hieraan bijgedragen?*
4. Heeft u uw teamleden geleerd om te werken aan persoonlijke (leer)doelen/doelgerichter te werken?
 - a) *Zo ja, hoe heeft u dit gedaan?*
 - b) *Zo nee, welke andere factoren hebben hieraan bijgedragen?*
 5. Heeft u uw teamleden geleerd om zichzelf op een andere manier te motiveren?
 - a) *Zo ja, hoe heeft u dit gedaan?*
 - b) *Maken ze gebruik van beloningen? Zo ja, hoe?*
 - c) *Zo nee, welke andere factoren hebben hieraan bijgedragen?*
 6. Heeft u uw teamleden de ruimte gegeven om deze vaardigheden (met betrekking tot het aansturen van zichzelf) te oefenen?
 - a) *Zo ja, hoe heeft u dit gedaan?*
 - b) *Welke leeractiviteiten zijn er geweest om aan deze vaardigheden te werken?*
 7. Zijn uw teamleden beter geworden in dit ‘zelf-leiderschap’?
 - a) *Zo ja, kunt u een voorbeeld geven waaruit dit blijkt?*
 - b) *Hoe heeft u hieraan bijgedragen? Hoe heeft u dit versterkt/aangemoedigd?*
 - c) *Welke andere factoren hebben hieraan bijgedragen? (denk aan trainingen/een coach/een externe partij/informatievoorziening/cursus)*
 - d) *Heeft dit invloed gehad op het ontwikkelen van het gedeelde leiderschap?*
 8. Hebt u zelf ook gewerkt aan uw ontwikkeling als zelf-leider?
 - a) *Zo ja, hoe?*
 - b) *Heeft u deze ontwikkeling ook gebruikt om uw teamleden het goede voorbeeld te geven?*
 - c) *Wat heeft u geleerd over uw eigen leiderschap?*

Uitleg gedeeld leiderschap: leiderschap in een team is breed verdeeld over alle teamleden, ze staan op hetzelfde niveau. De teamleden maken gezamenlijk beslissingen. Zelf-leiderschap wordt gezien als een voorwaarde voordat men in een team leiderschap kan delen. De vragen over dit onderwerp kunnen hierdoor op elkaar lijken.

Onderwerp 6: rol leider bij ontwikkelen gedeeld leiderschap

1. Heeft u uw team erop voorbereid dat ze leiderschap moesten delen in de nieuwe manier van werken?
 - a) *Zo ja, hoe heeft u dit gedaan?*
 - b) *Hebben uw teamleden een training/een cursus/een presentatie gehad over het delen van leiderschap?*
 - c) *Zijn de teamleden momenteel in staat om leiderschap te delen?*
 - d) *Wat heeft daaraan bijgedragen naast uw rol? Hoe zijn ze hierin gegroeid?*
 - e) *Heeft u bewust gewerkt aan het ontwikkelen van deze vaardigheid bij uw teamleden?*
2. Heeft u uw team geleerd hoe ze feedback kunnen geven en ontvangen?
 - a) *Zo ja, hoe heeft u dit gedaan?*
 - b) *Spreken uw teamleden elkaar ook aan op fouten?*
 - c) *Zijn de teamleden momenteel in staat om feedback te geven en ontvangen?*
 - d) *Wat heeft daaraan bijgedragen naast uw rol?*

3. Heeft u uw teamleden geleerd hoe ze elkaar moeten aansturen/wijzen op elkaars verantwoordelijkheden?
 - a) *Zo ja, hoe heeft u dit gedaan?*
 - b) *Zijn de teamleden momenteel in staat om elkaar aan te sturen/wijzen op elkaars verantwoordelijkheden?*
 - c) *Wat heeft daaraan bijgedragen naast uw rol?*
4. Heeft u uw teamleden geleerd hoe ze gezamenlijk beslissingen dienen te nemen in het team?
 - a) *Zo ja, hoe heeft u dit gedaan?*
 - b) *Is er volgens u sprake van een evenwichtige overlegstructuur?*
 - c) *Voelen teamleden zich volgens u vrij om hun eigen mening te geven?*
 - d) *Zijn de teamleden momenteel in staat om gezamenlijk beslissingen te nemen?*
 - e) *Wat heeft daaraan bijgedragen naast uw rol?*
5. Heeft u uw teamleden de ruimte gegeven om deze vaardigheden (met betrekking tot het delen van leiderschap in een team) te oefenen?
 - a) *Welke leeractiviteiten zijn er geweest om aan deze vaardigheden te werken?*
6. Zijn uw teamleden beter geworden in het delen van leiderschap?
 - a) *Zo ja, kunt u een voorbeeld geven waaruit dit blijkt?*
 - b) *Hoe heeft u hieraan bijgedragen? Hoe heeft u dit versterkt/aangemoedigd?*
 - c) *Welke andere factoren hebben hieraan bijgedragen?*
 - d) *Heeft het ontwikkelen van zelf-leiderschap hierin een rol gespeeld? Bewust/onbewust?*
7. Is de overgang over het algemeen geslaagd?
 - a) *Waarom wel of waarom niet? Redenen voor succes/falen.*
 - b) *Wat waren knelpunten/goede punten?*
 - c) *Wat waren knelpunten/goede punten gezien vanuit u als leidinggevende, als begeleider van de overgang?*

English version

Introduction

1. Name + study: Walter ten Eikelder, Educational Sciences
2. Own research: transition from vertical leadership to shared leadership in teams
3. Aim of the research: providing insight into the role of manager in the transition towards shared leadership
4. Interview duration and structure: 45 minutes and different themes
5. Expectations interview: not understanding questions, not wanting to answer questions and answering as honestly as possible
6. Questions:
 - a) Do you have any questions about my research/interview?
 - b) Would you like to read and sign the Informed Consent?

Context

- Team size
- Transition period
- Context of work

Topic 1: Personal characteristics

1. What's your name?
2. What is your function within the company/team?
3. How long do you work in the company/team?
4. How would you describe your job?
 - a) *Could you describe a working day?*

Topic 2: Meaning shared leadership

1. What do you mean by a team with shared leadership?
 - a) *In your team, is the daily management divided among the team members?*
2. Can you tell us why you think your team is a team in which the leadership is divided among the team members?
 - a) *Can you give an example of a situation that shows this?*

Topic 3: Choosing a team with shared leadership

1. Can you tell us why your organization has started working with teams in which leadership is shared?
 - a) *When did your organization start working with the new way of working?*
 - b) *How long did the transition to the new way of working last?*
 - c) *When was the process of guidance completed?*
2. Can you describe (roughly) how the transition to the new way of working went?
3. Who was involved to make this transition go smoothly?
 - a) *What was their role?*
 - b) *Were several process supervisors/coaches/external party's involved?*

Topic 4: Differences after transition**Sub-theme: differences - personal level**

1. Could you describe how your work has changed after the transition to the new way of working?
 - a) *Have your tasks changed? If yes, how?*
 - b) *Have your responsibilities changed? If yes, how?*
 - c) *Has the way you are held accountable changed? If yes, how?*
2. For you personally, what have been the main differences between the two ways of working?
 - a) *Do you feel more responsible for your own work than before? Why do you feel more responsible for your own work?*
 - b) *Do you experience more or less freedom to make choices within your work? Why do you experience more or less freedom to make choices within your work?*

Sub-theme: differences - team level

1. Could you describe how your team's work has changed after the transition to the new way of working?
 - a) *Have tasks changed? If yes, how?*
 - b) *Have responsibilities changed? If yes, how?*
 - c) *Has the way of accountability changed? If yes, how?*

2. In the new way of working, how are decisions made in the team?
 - a) *Have the consultation structures changed? If yes, how?*
 - b) *Do team members have freedom to make their own choices?*
3. Do team members have to manage each other more than before, now that there is no longer one formal manager?
 - a) *If yes, how is this done?*
 - b) *Do team members give each other feedback? If yes, how?*
 - c) *Do team members address each other on errors/responsibilities? If yes, how?*

Explain self-leadership: a self-leader can easily steer his own way of working. Such a person can plan well, is goal-oriented, can motivate himself well and can also correct if something does not go according to plan. A self-leader is aware of his own way of working and the quality of his own work.

Topic 5: role of leader in developing self-leadership

1. Have you tried to develop this 'self-leadership' among your team members?
 - a) *If yes, how did you do this? Did you do this consciously/unconsciously?*
 - b) *Do you think team members have developed this?*
 - c) *What has contributed to this? (think training sessions/a coach/an external party/information provision/course).*
2. Have you taught your team members to assess the quality of their own work?
 - a) *If yes, how did you do this?*
 - b) *Have they become more aware of their own strengths and weaknesses?*
 - c) *If not, what other factors contributed to this?*
3. Have you taught your team members how to take responsibility for making their own choices?
 - a) *If yes, how did you do this?*
 - b) *If not, what other factors contributed to this?*
4. Have you taught your team members to work on personal (learning) goals/goal targeting?
 - a) *If yes, how did you do this?*
 - b) *If not, what other factors contributed to this?*
5. Did you teach your team members to motivate themselves in a different way?
 - a) *If yes, how did you do this?*
 - b) *Do they use rewards? If yes, how?*
 - c) *If not, what other factors contributed to this?*
6. Have you given your team members room to practice these skills (with regard to self-management)?
 - a) *If yes, how did you do this?*
 - b) *What learning activities have there been to work on these skills?*
7. Have your team members improved in this 'self-leadership'?
 - a) *If yes, can you give an example demonstrating this?*
 - b) *How have you contributed to this? How did you strengthen/encourage this?*
 - c) *What other factors have contributed to this (e.g. training/a coach/an external party/information provision/course)?*
 - d) *Has this influenced the development of shared leadership?*
8. Have you also worked on your development as a self-leader?

- a) *If yes, how?*
- b) *Have you also used this development to set an example for your team members?*
- c) *What have you learned about your own leadership?*

Explanation shared leadership: leadership in a team is widely distributed among all team members, they are at the same level. The team members make decisions together. Self-leadership is seen as a prerequisite for sharing leadership in a team. As a result, the questions on this subject may resemble each other.

Topic 6: role of leader in developing shared leadership

1. Did you prepare your team to share leadership in the new way of working?
 - a) *If yes, how did you do this?*
 - b) *Did your team members have a training/course/presentation on leadership sharing?*
 - c) *Are the team members currently able to share leadership?*
 - d) *What has contributed to this in addition to your role? How have they grown in this?*
 - e) *Have you consciously worked on developing this skill among your team members?*
2. Have you taught your team how to give and receive feedback?
 - a) *If yes, how did you do this?*
 - b) *Do your team members also speak to each other about mistakes?*
 - c) *Are the team members currently able to give and receive feedback?*
 - d) *What has contributed to this in addition to your role?*
3. Have you taught your team members how to manage/assign each other to each other's responsibilities?
 - a) *If yes, how did you do this?*
 - b) *Are the team members currently able to steer/direct each other towards each other's responsibilities?*
 - c) *What has contributed to this in addition to your role?*
4. Have you taught your team members how to make decisions together in the team?
 - a) *If yes, how did you do this?*
 - b) *In your opinion, is there a balanced consultation structure?*
 - c) *Do you think team members feel free to express their own opinions?*
 - d) *Are team members currently in a position to make joint decisions?*
 - e) *What has contributed to this in addition to your role?*
5. Have you given your team members room to practice these skills (with regard to sharing leadership in a team)?
 - a) *What learning activities have there been to work on these skills?*
6. Have your team members improved in leadership sharing?
 - a) *If yes, could you give an example demonstrating this?*
 - b) *How have you contributed to this? How did you strengthen/encourage this?*
 - c) *What other factors have contributed to this?*
 - d) *Did the development of self-leadership play a role in this? Consciously/unconsciously?*
7. Has the transition generally been successful?
 - a) *Why or why not? Reasons for success/failure.*
 - b) *What were bottlenecks/good points?*

c) What were bottlenecks/good points seen from your point of view as a manager, as supervisor of the transition?

*Appendix E**Informed consent*

Datum	24-01-2019
Thesis onderwerp	Shared leadership (gespreid leiderschap) in teams
Telefoonnummer	0630838398
Onderzoeker	Walter ten Eikelder
Emailadres	w.j.h.teneikelder@students.uu.nl

Beste meneer/mevrouw,

Mijn naam is Walter ten Eikelder, masterstudent Educational Sciences (Onderwijswetenschappen) aan de Universiteit Utrecht. Momenteel ben ik bezig met mijn afstudeeronderzoek naar shared leadership (gespreid leiderschap) in teams. Gedurende dit onderzoek word ik begeleid door Isolde Kolke Tankhuis, een docent aan de Universiteit Utrecht.

Wat is het doel van het onderzoek?

Het doel van het onderzoek is om inzichten te bepalen die een verticale teamleider kunnen ondersteunen in het ontwikkelen van een gespreid leiderschap team.

Wat houdt het onderzoek in?

Teamleden en verticale leiders van gespreid leiderschap teams zullen worden geïnterviewd. Dit interview gaat over hoe zij de ontwikkeling van een team met een verticale leider naar een team met gespreid leiderschap hebben ervaren. Het doel van deze interviews is om inzichten te krijgen in de ervaringen van deze werknemers met betrekking tot het proces van een team met verticaal leiderschap naar een team met gespreid leiderschap. Naast deze interviews zullen er ook documenten van het team/bedrijf worden bekeken om meer inzichten te krijgen in de werkwijze van het team/bedrijf omtrent gespreid leiderschap.

Privacy en vertrouwelijkheid

Alle gegevens en data die voortkomen uit dit onderzoek zullen vertrouwelijk behandeld worden en anoniem verwerkt worden. De teamleden en verticale leiders krijgen dus elkaars antwoorden op de interviewvragen niet te weten. De gegevens zullen alleen voor opleidings- en onderzoeksdoeleinden gebruikt worden.

Mogelijkheid tot vragen, informatie en toestemming

Mocht u nog vragen hebben over het onderzoek, dan kunt de verantwoordelijke onderzoeker een mail sturen: w.j.h.teneikelder@students.uu.nl. Als u verdere vragen heeft omtrent mijn begeleiding vanuit de Universiteit Utrecht kunt u mailen naar i.r.kolkhuistanke@uu.nl.

In te vullen door de deelnemer

Ik verklaar op een duidelijke manier te zijn ingelicht over de aard, methode, doel en risico's van het betreffende onderzoek. Ik ben er van op de hoogte hoe de gegevens en data verwerkt zullen worden. Mijn vragen zijn voorafgaand aan het onderzoek naar tevredenheid beantwoord. Ik vind het goed dat er opnames gemaakt worden van de interviews om de data zo volledig mogelijk te

kunnen verwerken. Ik weet dat meedoen geheel vrijwillig is en dat ik zonder reden tijdens het onderzoek zou kunnen beslissen om te stoppen met participatie.

Naam deelnemer:

Handtekening:

Datum:

In te vullen door de uitvoerende onderzoeker

Ik verklaar dat ik een duidelijke toelichting heb gegeven over mijn onderzoek. Mogelijke vragen zal ik proberen zo volledig mogelijk proberen te beantwoorden. Deelnemers kunnen voortijdig stoppen met het onderzoek, zonder opgave van een reden.

Naam onderzoeker:

Handtekening:

Datum:

Appendix F

A priori themes

Main theme	Sub theme	Possible codes
Personal variables	Function	
	Work day	
Meaning shared leadership	Practical vision	
	Theoretical vision	
Choice for shared leadership	Reason for transition	
	People involved	
Differences after transition	Team members	Tasks & responsibility
		Decision making
	Vertical leader	Feedback
		Autonomy
Role leader: development self-leadership	Development self-leadership strategies	Tasks & responsibility
		Support
		Behavior-focused strategies
	Empowerment self-leadership	Natural reward strategies
		Constructive thought pattern strategies
		Becoming a self-leader
		Modeling self-leadership
		Self-set goals

		Positive thought patterns
		Reward and constructive reprimand
Role leader: development shared leadership team	Support shared leadership team	
	Empowerment shared leadership	

Appendix G

Initial Template

Background information
Approach management
Practical vision shared leadership
Reason transition
Team specific information
Size transition
Team characteristics
Method in practice
Meetings and proposals
Role methodology
Working method team
Team cooperation
Team tasks
Impediments
Giving feedback
Lack of framework
Manager role vs. Team member role
Change mindset takes time
Problems to former vertical leader
Too much responsibility and freedom

Top-down management
ORM Work
Factors transition
General development
Delineation of roles helps
Team stranded
Individual development
Personal
Get autonomy
Feedback of colleagues
Dare to take initiative
Learn by experience
Education
Entire team
Role approach
Learn by doing
Options for information and help
Role vertical leader
Offer space
Opportunity to learn
Offer freedom
Self-leadership not consciously developed

Role external party
Development team
Role approach
Experiences other teams
Offer information and help
Provide framework
Learn by experience
Support from Lead Links
Role coach
Not prepared to share leadership
Passive support
Role external parties
2 - Consultancy firm
Improve group dynamics
Unclear framework
2 - Soopel
Offer structure
Does not fit the team
Get used to
Stimulate confidence
Role vertical leader
Give responsibility

Offer freedom
Role team
Practice giving feedback
Learned from crisis
Informal leaders
Take initiative
Learn by experience
Differences transition
The team
Call others to account and assessment
Assess yourself
Call others more to account
More assessment
New feedback structure
Consult stakeholders yourself
Admit mistakes is easier
Leadership and choices
More HR-tasks
More interaction and interrelations
More time to consult
More quick structured consultations
Joint decision-making

Team collaboration
Solving problems more together
More team connection
Responsibility
More responsibility and tasks
More sense of responsibility
Expectations
1 - Deliver higher level of care
More flexibility required
Experience freedom
More autonomy and freedom
2 - Less freedom
Work on own interests
Work pressure
Higher (work) pressure
More pressure on lower echelons of organization
Work more in leisure time
Work in irregular shifts
Vertical leader
Clear direction
Take less decisions
Less monitoring work

Less pressure
Less hierarchical management
Less HR tasks
Less responsibilities
Proces information
Action at start of transition
Complete transition
People involved in transition
Information provision transition
Reactions at start of transition
Negative reactions
Dominant team members
Resistance
Unreasonable expectations
Much doubt
Positive reactions
Enthusiastic clients
Enthusiastic employees
Time frame transition
Result transition
Other form of work
Rating 7.0-7.5

Rating 6.0
Shared leadership functions
Self-leadership is developed
Better collaboration
Focus on happiness at work
Shortened lines of communication
Fun way of working
Education possibility
New way of working functions
Form of work
Improvement areas
Alignment external parties
Complex role structure
Giving feedback
Problem situations
Active coaching
Speed of the transition
Take responsibility
Development self leadership
Learning self leadership
Already master self leadership
Self leadership part of the job

Appendix H

Final template with code descriptions

Background information	The participant describes background information about the transition in order to illustrate its context.
Approach management	The participant indicates what the approach of the organisation and the manager has been to supervise the transition.
Method in practice	The participant indicates how the methodology of the organization is used in practice.
1 - Working method team	The participant mentions characteristics that describe the working method of the 1st organization during the transition.
Team cooperation	The participant mentions characteristics that describe the cooperation in the team of the 1st organisation during the transition.
Team tasks	The participant provides information on how the team tasks are divided within the team of the 1st organisation.
2 - Role methodology	The participant mentions characteristics about the role methodology that the 2nd organization uses during the transition.
Meetings and decision making	The participant provides information about the meetings and form of decision making that the team of the 2nd organization uses during the transition.
Roles and division of roles	The participant provides information about the different roles that the team of the 2nd organization uses during the transition and how these roles are divided.
3 - Project teams and meetings	The participant describes the working method of the project teams and the type of meetings used by the 3rd organisation during the transition.

Practical vision shared leadership	The participant indicates what he believes shared leadership means in practice.
Reason transition	The participant indicates what he knows about the reason for the transition to the shared leadership team.
Team specific information	The participant describes organisational or substantive characteristics of the shared leadership team.
Factors transition	The participant mentions factors that have played a positive role in either the development of self-leadership in the team or the development of the shared leadership team.
Self-leadership development	The participant mentions factors that played a positive role in the development of self-leadership in the team.
Role approach	The participant mentions factors from the organisation's approach that have played a positive role in the development of self-leadership in the team.
Options for development and help	The participant indicates that the organisation has offered opportunities for help and learning in the field of self-leadership in order to develop this self-leadership in the team.
Learning by doing	The participant indicates that the organisation had the team learn by experience to develop self-leadership in the team.
Role vertical leader	The participant mentions factors from the vertical leader that played a positive role in the development of self-leadership in the team.
Individual conversations	The participant indicates that the vertical leader has had individual conversations in order to develop self-leadership in the team.
Opportunity to learn	The participant indicates that the manager has given opportunities and space to develop self-leadership in the team.

Role team	The participant mentions factors from the team that played a positive role in the development of self-leadership in the team.
Feedback colleagues	The participant indicates that feedback from colleagues has played a role in the development of self-leadership in the team.
Take own initiative	The participant indicates that daring to take the initiative has played a role in the development of self-leadership in the team.
Shared leadership development	The participant mentions factors that have played a positive role in the development of the shared leadership team.
Role approach	The participant mentions factors from the approach of the organization that have played a positive role in the development of the shared leadership team.
Offer information and help	The participant indicates that organization has provided information and help through different ways to develop the shared leadership team.
Learning by doing	The participant indicates that the organization has let the teams learn by experience to develop the shared leadership team.
Role external parties	The participant mentions factors from external parties that have played a positive role in the development of the shared leadership team.
2 – Consultancy firms	The participant indicates the positive role external parties have had in the development of the shared leadership team of the 2nd organization
Implement structure	The participant indicates that an external party has introduced structure into the working method of the team in the form of meetings and defining roles to develop the shared leadership team.

Stimulate confidence	The participant indicates that an external party has stimulated mutual trust between the team members to develop the shared leadership team.
3 – Guidance for self-managing team	The participant indicates the positive role that training and study days at the 3rd organisation have played in the development of the shared leadership team.
Initiate ideas	The participant indicates that an external party offered the team members a tool to initiate ideas in the team in order to develop the shared leadership team.
Division of roles	The participant indicates that an external party has helped the team members to define and divide roles within the team in order to develop the shared leadership team.
Role vertical leader	The participant mentions factors from the manager that played a positive role in the development of the shared leadership team.
Inspire and inform	The participant indicates that the vertical leader inspired and clearly informed team members in order to develop the shared leadership team.
Facilitate autonomy	The participant indicates that the manager has given the team members the freedom to take autonomy in order to develop the shared leadership team.
Role team	The participant mentions factors from the team that played a positive role in the development of the shared leadership team.
Stimulate and help each other	The participant indicates that the team members stimulated each other and helped each other to share leadership in order to develop the shared leadership team.
Practice giving feedback	The participant indicates that the team members have practiced giving feedback (including training) to each other in order to develop the shared leadership team.

Informal leaders	The participant indicates that informal leaders within the team have contributed to the development of the shared leadership team.
Take initiative	The participant indicates that taking initiative within the team has contributed to the development of the shared leadership team.
Learn by experience	The participant indicates that by learning from mistakes and experience, the team members have learned to share leadership.
Process information	The participant mentions information about the global process of the transition.
Action at start of transition	The participant indicates the work the team has done at the beginning of the transition.
Complete transition	The participant indicates how long it took before the transition was completed.
People involved in transition	The participant indicates which persons or business units were involved in initiating and realising the transition.
Information provision transition	The participant indicates which persons or business units have provided the team with practical information or insights about the transition, how they have done this and what information they have received in the process.
Reactions at start of transition	The participant indicates how team members reacted when they heard that they were switching to the new way of working.
Enthusiasm	The participant indicates that team members were enthusiastic when they heard that they were switching to the new way of working.
Resistance and doubt	The participant indicates that team members went into resistance and experienced a lot of doubt when they heard that they were switching to the new way of working.

Time frame transition	The participant mentions characteristics that indicate the time frame of the transition.
Result transition	The participant describes the results of the transition in terms of assessments, experiences or descriptions of the new way of working.
Ratings	The participant describes the results of the transition in terms of a rating.
Rating +- 8.0	The participant rates the result of the transition with approximately an 8.0.
Rating 6.0	The participant rates the result of the transition with an 6.0.
Rating 7.0-7.5	The participant rates the result of the transition with a 7.0 to 7.5.
Experiences	The participant describes the results of the transition in terms of an experience with the new way of working.
Shortened lines of communication	After the transition, the participant experiences shorter and faster communication lines within and outside the team.
Share leadership functions	After the transition, the participant experiences that the team is able to share leadership.
Possibilities to improve	After the transition, the participant experiences that the team still has opportunities to further develop shared leadership within the team.
Proud and regard	After the transition, the participant experiences that the team has a sense of pride and more prestige to the world outside of the organization.
Self-leadership is developed	After the transition, the participant experiences that the team members have become better at self-leadership.

Working method	The participant describes how the new way of working is running after the transition.
Fun, positive way of working	The participant indicates that the team experiences the new way of working as positive and fun.
New way of working functions	The participant indicates that the transition has resulted in a new way of working that is now running in the team.
Form of work	The participant indicates that the transition has resulted in the realisation of a new form of work, in which the content of the work has remained comparable to that of the past.
Improvement areas	The participant indicates what went wrong during the transition and what could have gone better for the team to develop into a shared leadership team.
Vertical leader	The participant indicates what was difficult during the transition and what the vertical leader could have done better to let the team develop into a shared leadership team.
Guidance	The participant indicates what was difficult during the transition and what the vertical leader could have done better in terms of guidance to allow the team to develop into a shared leadership team.
Active coaching	The participant indicates that the vertical leader could have coached the team more actively in order to develop the team into a shared leadership team.
Develop self-leadership	The participant indicates that the vertical leader did not consciously develop team members self-leadership skills.
Planned, systematic communication	The participant indicates that the vertical leader could have communicated more clearly and systematically to the team during the transition.

Prepare sharing leadership	The participant indicates that the vertical leader did not prepare the team members for how they should share leadership in the team.
Management	The participant indicates what went wrong during the transition and what the vertical leader could have done better in terms of management in order for the team to develop into a shared leadership team.
Provide framework	The participant indicates that during the transition the vertical leader could have established more and clearer frameworks for the team to develop it into a shared leadership team.
Apply new role	The participant indicates that during the transition the vertical leader could have learned team members more to share leadership and make decisions within the team without approaching the former vertical leader for help, to develop the team into a shared leadership team.
Provide direction	The participant indicates that the vertical leader should have provided more focus and direction during the transition in order to allow the team to develop into a shared leadership team.
Organization	The participant indicates what was difficult during the transition and what the organization could have done better to allow the team to develop into a shared leadership team.
Align implementations	The participant indicates that the organization could have better aligned the use of external parties to each other and to the context of the work being done in the team in order for the team to develop into a shared leadership team.
Organization-wide decision making	The participant indicates that the organization needs to make more organization-wide decisions in order for the team to develop into a shared leadership team.

Speed of transition	The participant indicates that the organization has implemented the transition too quickly and without clear communication.
Top-down influence	The participant indicates that the top-down influence of the organization on the team had a negative influence on the development of the shared leadership team.
Team	The participant indicates what was difficult during the transition and what the team could have done better to develop into a shared leadership team.
Giving feedback	The participant indicates that it is hard for team members to give each other feedback, if team members were better at this it could have contributed to the development of the shared leadership team.
Cope with autonomy	The participant indicates that the team was too quickly given too much autonomy to take its own initiatives, which had a negative influence on the development of the shared leadership team.
Problem situations	The participant indicates that in difficult situations the team too quickly seeks help from the former manager, which has had a negative influence on the development of the shared leadership team.
Take responsibility	The participant indicates that the team could have taken more responsibility and initiative to improve the transition to the shared leadership team.
Differences transition	The participant mentions differences between the old and new way of working.
The team	The participant mentions differences between the old and new way of working that apply to one or more team members.
Call others to account and assessment	The participant mentions differences between the old and new way of working that apply to one or more team members with regard to calling others to account and to assess each other.

<p>1 – More assessment within team</p>	<p>The participant indicates that one or more team members from only the first organization in the new way of working have to assess each other's work and behavior more frequently than in the old way of working.</p>
<p>2 – Provide and request for feedback</p>	<p>The participant indicates that one or more team members from only the 2nd organisation in the new way of working have to request more feedback from team members about themselves and have to provide more feedback to others than in the old way of working.</p>
<p>Call others more to account</p>	<p>The participant indicates that one or more team members in the new way of working have to call each other to account for their responsibilities more frequently than in the old way of working.</p>
<p>Experience freedom</p>	<p>The participant mentions differences between the old and new way of working that apply to one or more team members with regard to the degree of freedom they experience.</p>
<p>2 – Less freedom</p>	<p>The participant indicates that one or more team members from only the 2nd organization experience less freedom in performing their work in the new way of working than in the old way of working.</p>
<p>More autonomy and freedom</p>	<p>The participant indicates that one or more team members in the new way of working experience a higher degree of autonomy in carrying out their work and can take more responsibility for it than in the old way of working.</p>
<p>Have a say in own development</p>	<p>The participant indicates that one or more team members in the new way of working have more say in choosing their work and can work more from their own interests and ideas than in the old way of working.</p>
<p>Consultation</p>	<p>The participant mentions differences between the old and new way of working that apply to one or more</p>

	team members with regard to the way in which consultations are conducted within the team.
2 - More quick structured consultations	The participant indicates that team members from only the 2nd organization in the new way of working consult faster, more structured and in smaller steps than in the old way of working.
Joint decision-making	The participant indicates that in the new way of working team members make more joint decisions where not everyone has to express their personal opinion than in the old way of working.
Team collaboration	The participant mentions differences between the old and new way of working that apply to the team members with regard to the cooperation within and outside the team.
2 – More external interaction	The participant indicates that one or more team members of the 2nd organization cooperate more with other teams in the new way of working and therefore experience more interaction than in the old way of working.
Solving problems more together	The participant indicates that in the new way of working, team members have to solve more issues and make more choices together than in the old way of working.
More team connection	The participant indicates that team members feel more connected in the new way of working than in the old way of working.
Responsibilities and tasks	The participant mentions differences between the old and new way of working that apply to one or more team members with regard to their responsibilities and tasks at work.
2 – More HR tasks	The participant indicates that one or more team members of the 2nd organisation must perform more HR-related tasks in the new way of working than in the old way of working.

More responsibilities and tasks	The participant indicates that one or more team members in the new way of working have more responsibilities and must perform more tasks than in the old way of working.
More sense of responsibility	The participant indicates that one or more team members experience a greater sense of responsibility for their work in the new way of working than in the old way of working.
Expectations	The participant mentions differences between the old and new way of working that apply to one or more team members with regard to expectations from the organization for the team.
1 - Deliver higher level of care	The participant indicates that team members of the 1st organization must provide a higher level of care in the new way of working than in the old way of working, where some team members had to follow a training course to be able to deliver this level.
Work pressure	The participant mentions differences between the old and new way of working that apply to one or more team members with regard to the degree of workload that they experience.
1 – Work-private problems	The participant indicates that one or more team members of the 1st organization in the new way of working have to work more in their free time to deal with the private problems of team members within the team than in the old way of working.
Higher (work) pressure	The participant indicates that one or more team members experience a higher level of work pressure in the new way of working than in the old way of working.
Vertical leader	The participant mentions differences between the old and new way of working that apply to the vertical leader.

Experiences	The participant indicates the differences the vertical leader experiences between the old and new way of working.
Clear direction	The participant indicates that the vertical leader in the new way of working experiences a more transparent organization with a clearer direction than in the old way of working.
Less pressure	The participant indicates that the vertical leader in the new way of working experiences less pressure in performing his work than in the old way of working.
Actions	The participant indicates which differences there are for the vertical leader in performing his tasks between the new and the old way of working.
Less hierarchical management	The participant indicates that the vertical leader in the new way of working has less hierarchical management of the team whereby he has to make fewer decisions and monitor the work of the team less than in the old way of working.
Less HR tasks	The participant indicates that in the new way of working the vertical leaders needs to perform fewer HR-related tasks than in the old way of working.
Relinquish responsibilities	The participant indicates that in the new way of working the vertical leader gives his responsibilities more to the team by giving them more opportunities to carry out their work than in the old way of working.
Development self-leadership	The participant indicates in which phase team members are developing their self-leadership skills.
Already master self-leadership	The participant indicates that team members had already mastered self-leadership before the transition.
Learning self-leadership	The participant indicates that team members are still learning self-leadership.
Self-leadership part of the job	The participant indicates that self-leadership is already part of the work that is performed in the team.

*Appendix I**Modifications template***Modifications in main and sub codes**

Within the main code 'Background information' a few codes received a number. This means that these codes only apply to one of the three organizations.

The main code 'Impediments' has been changed to the code 'Improvement areas'. This has been done because the text fragments were more about areas of improvement than impediments.

Within this new main code 'Improvement areas' several sub codes have been created:

- Vertical leader: a) Guidance and b) Management)
- Organization
- Team

These codes have been created in order to create more structure within the code tree.

Within the main code 'Factors transition' a new sub code '3 – Guidance for self-managing team' has been created, which refers to only one organization. Also, the sub codes 'Personal' and 'Entire team' have been merged into the code 'Individual development'. This has been done because these codes were related to items that referred to someone's individual development and were not specifically for an individual or for the entire team.

Within the main code 'Result transition' three sub codes have been created 'Ratings', 'Experiences' and 'Working method'. This has been done in order to structure the different kinds of results from the transition.

Within the main code 'Differences transition' the sub code 'Consultation' has been created. Also within the sub code 'Vertical leader' two other sub codes have been created 'Experiences' and 'Actions'. This has also been done in order to create more structure.

Modifications of lowest-order codes:

Codes deleted:

- The code 'ORM Work' has been deleted.
- The code 'General development' has been deleted.
- The code 'Team stranded' has been deleted.
- The code 'Education' has been deleted.
- The code 'Team development' has been deleted.
- The code 'Support from Lead Links' has been deleted.
- The code 'Does not fit the team' has been deleted.
- The code 'Get used to' has been deleted.
- The code 'Improve group dynamics' has been deleted.
- The code '2 – Soopel' has been deleted.
- The code 'Learned from crisis' has been deleted.
- The code 'Assess yourself' has been deleted.
- The code 'Admit mistakes is easier' has been deleted.
- The code 'Consult stakeholders yourself' has been deleted.
- The code 'Leadership and choices' has been deleted.
- The code 'More flexibility required' has been deleted.
- The codes 'Negative reactions' and 'Positive reactions' have been deleted.

- The code 'Better collaboration' has been deleted.
- The code 'Education possibility' has been deleted.

Codes merged into other code:

- The codes 'Size transition' and 'Team characteristics' have been combined and then merged into the code 'Team specific information'.
- The code 'Delineation of roles helps' has been merged into the code 'Division of roles'.
- The codes 'Offer space' and 'Offer freedom' have been merged into the code 'Facilitate autonomy'.
- The code 'More assessment' has been merged into the code '1 – More assessment within team'.
- The code 'New feedback structure' has been merged into the code '2 – Provide and request for feedback'.
- The code 'Experiences other teams' has been merged into the code 'Offer information and help'.
- The code 'Passive support' has been merged to the code 'Active Coaching'.
- The code 'Offer freedom' has been merged into the code 'Facilitate autonomy'.
- The code 'More interaction and interrelations' has been merged into the code '2 – More external interaction'.
- The code 'More pressure on lower echelons of organization' has been merged into the code 'Higher (work) pressure'.

- The codes 'Work more in leisure time' and 'Work in irregular shifts' have been merged into the code '1 – Work-private problems'.
- The codes 'Take less decisions' and 'Less responsibilities' have been merged into the code 'Relinquish responsibilities'.
- The code 'Less monitoring work' has been merged into the code 'Less hierarchical management'.
- The codes 'Dominant team members', 'Resistance', 'Unreasonable expectations' and 'Much doubt' have been merged into the code 'Resistance and doubt'.
- The codes 'Enthusiastic clients' and 'Enthusiastic employees' have been merged into the code 'Enthusiasm'.
- The codes 'Focus on happiness at work' and 'Fun way of working' have been merged into the code 'Fun, positive way of working'.

Codes added to other code:

- The codes 'Meetings and decision making' and 'Roles and division of roles' are added to the code '2 – Role methodology'.
- The code 'Working method' with sub codes 'Team cooperation' and 'Team tasks' are added to the code '1 – Working method team'.
- The code 'Giving feedback' has been added to the sub code 'Team' under the main code 'Improvement areas'.
- The code 'Get autonomy' has been renamed into the code 'Facilitate autonomy' and has been added to the sub code 'Role vertical leader'.

- The codes 'More quick structured consultations' and 'Joint decision making' have been added to the sub code 'Consultation'.

New codes created:

- The code '3 – Project teams and meetings' has been created and added to the code 'Method in practice'.
- The codes 'Unclear framework' and 'Offer structure' have added to the new code 'Implement structure'.
- The code 'Stimulate and help each other' has been created.
- The code 'Rating 8.0' has been created.
- The code 'Proud and regard' has been created.
- The code 'Individual conversations' has been created.
- The code 'Inspire and inform' has been created.

Renamed codes:

- The code 'Role methodology' has been renamed to the code '2 – Role methodology'.
- The main code 'Impediments' has been renamed to the main code 'Improvement areas'.
- The code 'Lack of framework' has been renamed into the code 'Provide framework'.
- The code 'Manager role vs. Team member role' has been renamed into the code 'Apply new role'.

- The code 'Change mindset takes time' has been renamed into the code 'Speed of transition'.
- The code 'Problems to former vertical leader' has been renamed into the code 'Problem situations'.
- The code 'Too much responsibility and freedom' has been renamed into the code 'Cope with autonomy'.
- The code 'Top-down management' has been renamed into the code 'Top-down influence'.
- The code 'Feedback of colleagues' has been renamed to 'Practice giving feedback'.
- The code 'Dare to take initiative' has been renamed to the code 'Take initiative'.
- The code 'Self-leadership not consciously developed' has been renamed to 'Developed self-leadership'.
- The code 'Not prepared to shared leadership' has been renamed to develop self-leadership'.
- The code 'More HR-tasks' has been renamed to '2 – More HR-tasks'.
- The code 'Work on own interests' has been renamed to 'Have a say in own development'.
- The code 'Alignment external parties' has been renamed to the code 'Align implementations'.

*Appendix J**Themes and codes result section*

Below, all codes are mentioned that were used to describe the results of the study.

Theme ‘Results transition’

- Codes used: 1) rating +- 8.0, 2) rating 6.0, 3) rating 7.0-7.5, 4) possibilities to improve, 5) fun, positive way of working, 6) shared leadership functions, 7) self-leadership is developed, 8) already master self-leadership and 9) learning self-leadership.

Theme ‘Role vertical leader’

- Codes used: 1) self-leadership is developed, 2) develop self-leadership, 3) opportunity to learn, 4) facilitate autonomy, 5) shared leadership functions, 6) prepare sharing leadership, 7) call others more to account, 8) giving feedback.

Theme ‘Team members needs’

- Codes used: 1) active coaching, 2) speed of transition, 3) provide framework, 4) cope with autonomy, 5) take responsibility, 6) top-down influence, 7) provide direction, 8) planned, systematic communication, 9) apply new role and 10) cope with problem situations.

Theme ‘Contributing factors’

- Codes used: 1) learning by doing (3 different types), 2) take own initiative, 3) take team initiative, 4) implement structure, 5) initiate ideas, 6) informal leaders, 7) options for development and help, 8) offer information and help.

*Appendix K**FETC form***APPLICATION FORM FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF A RESEARCH PROTOCOL BY THE FACULTY ETHICS REVIEW BOARD (FERB) OF THE FACULTY OF SOCIAL AND BEHAVIOURAL SCIENCES****General guidelines for the use of this form**

1. This form can be used for a single research project or a series of related studies (hereinafter referred to as: "research programme"). Researchers are encouraged to apply for the assessment of a research programme if their proposal covers multiple studies with related content, identical procedures (methods and instruments) and contains informed consent forms and participant information, with a similar population. For studies by students, the FERB recommends submitting, in advance, a research programme under which protocol multiple student projects can be conducted so that their execution will not be delayed by the review procedure. The application of such a research programme must include a proper description by the researcher(s) of the programme as a whole in terms of the maximum burden on the participants (e.g. maximum duration, strain/efforts, types of stimuli, strength and frequency, etc.). If it is impossible to describe all the studies within the research programme, it should, in any case, include a description of the most invasive study known so far.
2. Solely the first responsible senior researcher(s) (from post-doctoral level onwards) may submit a protocol.
3. Any approval by the FERB is valid for 5 years or until the information to be provided in the application form below is modified to such an extent that the study becomes more invasive. For a research programme, the term of validity is 2 years and any extension is subject to approval. The researcher(s) and staff below commit themselves to treating the participants in accordance with the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki and the Dutch Code of Conduct for Scientific Practices as determined by the VSNU Association of Universities in the Netherlands (which can both be downloaded from the FERB site on the Intranet¹) and guarantee that the participants (whether decisionally competent or incompetent and/or in a dependent relationship vis-a-vis the researcher or not) may at all times terminate their participation without any further consequences.
4. The researcher(s) commit themselves to maximising the quality of the study, the statistical analysis and the reports, and to respect the specific regulations and legislation pertaining to the specific methods.
5. The procedure will run more smoothly if the FERB receives all the relevant documents, such as questionnaires and other measurement instruments as well as literature and other sources on studies using similar methods which were found to be ethically acceptable and that testify to the fact that this procedure has no harmful consequences. Examples of studies where the latter will always be an issue are studies into bullying behaviour, sexuality, and parent-child relationships. The FERB asks the researcher(s) to be as specific as possible when they answer the relevant questions while limiting their answers

¹ See: <https://intranet.uu.nl/facultaire-ethische-toetsingscommissie-fetc>

to 500 words maximum per question. It is helpful to the FERB if the answers are brief and to the point.

6. **Our FAQ document that can be accessed through the Intranet provides background information with regards to any questions.**
7. The researcher(s) declare to have described the study truthfully and with a particular focus on its ethical aspects.

Signed for approval²:

Date: 08-01-2020

² The senior researcher (holding at least a doctoral degree) should sign here.

A. GENERAL INFORMATION/PERSONAL DETAILS

1.

a. a. Name(s), position(s) and department(s) of the responsible researcher(s):
Dr. Isolde Kolkhuis Tanke, Teacher 'Educatie en Pedagogiek - Sociale Wetenschappen'

b. Name(s), position(s) and department(s) of the executive researcher(s):
Walter ten Eikelder, Master student Educational Sciences

2. Title of the study or research program - Does it concern a single study or a research program?

Does it concern a study for the final thesis in a bachelor's or master's degree course?:

Title: the role of the vertical leader in developing a shared leadership work team

Single study for a master's degree in Educational Sciences.

3. Type of study (with a brief rationale):

Qualitative case study with in-depth semi-structured interviews conducted amongst team members and vertical leaders of three different teams.

4. Grant provider:

Utrecht University, Faculty of Social Sciences.

5. Intended start and end date for the study:

11 February 2019 till 15 January 2020 (presentations of the study)

6. Research area/discipline:

Educational Sciences - Learning in Organizations - Shared leadership in teams.

7. For some (larger) projects it is advisable to appoint an independent contact or expert whom participants can contact in case of questions and/or complaints. Has an independent expert been appointed for this study?³:

No.

8. Does the study concern a multi-centre project, e.g. in collaboration with other universities, a GGZ mental health care institution, a university medical centre? Where exactly will the study be conducted? By which institute(s) are the executive researcher(s) employed?:

The study does not concern a multi-centre project.

³ This contact may, in principle, also be a researcher (within the same department, or not) who is able to respond to the question or complaint in detail. Independent is to say: not involved in the study themselves. The FERB upholds that an independent contact is not obligatory, but will be necessary when the study is more invasive.

The study is conducted within three organizations that use shared leadership work teams, a team of a bank, a school and a healthcare institution.

9. Is the study related to a prior research project that has been assessed by a recognised Medical Ethics Review Board (MERB) or FERB?

No.

If so, which? Please state the file number:

Irrelevant.

B. SUMMARY OF THE BACKGROUND AND METHODS

Background

1. What is the study's theoretical and practical relevance? (500 words max.):

In recent years, organizations are faced with an increasingly dynamic, fast-changing and complex environment. Team-based structures are becoming the building blocks of organizations. Nowadays, teams are required to deal with the increasingly complex work that can hardly be performed by an individual. It is considered to be extremely difficult for a single employee to possess all the knowledge, skills and abilities necessary for such complex tasks. The expansion of team work has led to the challenge of how those teams can be best managed. Moreover, leadership of teams is considered to be crucial to team effectiveness. Several scholars mentioned that it is becoming more difficult for a single leader to have all knowledge, skills and abilities required to lead organizational teams nowadays. Hence, research regarding leadership and teams has changed its focus. Originally, the focus was on vertical leadership, in which a single appointed manager (vertical leader) was hierarchically positioned above the team members. More recently, shared leadership, in which leadership is distributed across multiple team members, has gained more attention. Evidence suggests that this form of leadership is positively related to a team's performance. Despite this increased attention for shared leadership, several questions and territories regarding this issue require future research. More specifically, there still is a lack of a comprehensive understanding of factors beneficial for developing shared leadership in a team. To date, several scholars even claim that research regarding these factors, usually named antecedents, is still in its infancy. Research into antecedents would be beneficial for managers that aim to introduce shared leadership. Most scholars describe two main kinds of antecedents: team related antecedents and vertical leader related antecedents. Vertical leader related antecedents, refer to the role of a vertical leader during the process of introducing shared leadership. Hence, in the sequel of this study a vertical leader is defined as the designated leader of a work team, who wants to develop shared leadership. The actions of such a vertical leader are considered to be critical for the implementation of shared leadership in a team. Remarkably, this role of the vertical leader has gained limited attention in the literature. Therefore, the purpose of

the current study is to determine insights that can support a vertical leader in developing shared leadership work teams.

2. What is the study's objective/central question?:

The purpose of the current study is to determine insights that can support a vertical leader in developing shared leadership work teams.

Central question: *How can a vertical leader develop and empower self-leadership-skills in team members that contribute to the development of shared leadership work teams?*

3. What are the hypothesis/hypotheses and expectation(s)?:

Irrelevant.

Design/procedure/invasiveness

4. What is the study's design and procedure? (500 words max.):

Design

In order to answer the research question a qualitative case study will be conducted. A qualitative case study involves an in-depth research among a limited number of participants (Boeije, 2010). Qualitative methodology is used to obtain the relevant information of the different cases. More specifically, in-depth interviews will be conducted amongst the employees and vertical leaders. In-depth interviewing focuses on understanding the experience of people and the meaning they make of that experience (Seidman, 2006). The in-depth interviews will be carried out using an semi-structured interviewing approach. A semi-structured interview, provides the researcher with some structure based upon the interests of the research and the interview guide, but works flexible with this guide and gives the participant room for descriptions and narratives (Brinkmann, 2015). This method of in-depth semi-structured interviews is considered to be appropriate to find how the employees and the vertical leader himself would describe the role of the vertical leader in developing their shared leadership work team.

Procedure

First, participants of the study are asked to sign an informed consent. This consent informs them about the goal of the study and their rights as an participant. Following this, the participants will be told that the interviews will be recorded and that all data will be handled anonymously. Second, the interviews will be conducted in person at the organization for approximately 45 minutes using the developed semi-structured interview. All interviews start with an introduction of the researcher, an explanation of the goal of the interview and questions regarding demographics and function description. Next, the participants will be asked to answer honestly and the interview topics will be discussed. At last, the interviewees will be thanked for their participation and will be asked to perform a member-check.

5.

a. Which measurement instruments, stimuli and/or manipulations will be used?⁴:

Team members and their vertical leaders will be interviewed. In these interviews the following topic list will be addressed:

- personal characteristics
- meaning shared leadership
- choice for shared leadership
- differences after transition
- role vertical leader in development self-leadership
- role vertical leader in development shared leadership

b. What does the study's burden on the participants comprise in terms of time, frequency and strain/efforts?:

Team members and vertical leaders have to participate in interviews of approximately 45 minutes. All team members that participate will only be interviewed once. Thus, the burden is not a lot.

c. Will the participants be subjected to interventions or a certain manner of conduct that cannot be considered as part of a normal lifestyle?:

Irrelevant for this study.

d. Will unobtrusive methods be used (e.g. data collection of uninformed subjects by means of observations or video recordings)?:

This is a possibility since the interviews will be recorded. However, only audio material will be recorded. In the informed consent will be stated that data will be handled ethically.

e. Will the study involve any deception? If so, will there be an adequate debriefing and will the deception hold any potential risks?:

No.

⁴ Examples: invasive questionnaires; interviews; physical/psychological examination, inducing stress, pressure to overstep important standards and values; inducing false memories; exposure to aversive materials like a unpleasant film, video clip, photos or electrical stimulus; long-term of very frequent questioning; ambulatory measurements, participation in an intervention, evoking unpleasant psychological or physical symptoms in an experiment, denial, diet, blood sampling, fMRI, TMS, ECG, administering stimuli, showing pictures, etc. In case of the use of a device (apparatus) or administration of a substance, please enclose the CE marking brochure for the relevant apparatus or substance, if possible.

6. Will the participants be tested beforehand as to their health condition or according to certain disorders? Are there any inclusion and/or exclusion criteria or specific conditions to be met in order for a participant to take part in this study?:

First, participants will not be tested in this study.

Second, teams can only participate if they team the following inclusion criteria, teams that: (a) consist of four or more people, (b) perform task relevant for an organization, (c) share one or more common goals, (d) interact socially, (e) show task interdependencies, (f) maintain and manage boundaries, (g) are embedded in the context of an organization, (h) with a vertical designated leader, and (i) working with a shared leadership approach. This means that teams without a vertical leader were excluded because of the study's focus on the role of the vertical leader in developing shared leadership work teams.

7. Risks for the participants

a. Which risks does the study hold for its participants?:

A possible risk is that the participants do not feel completely psychologically safe to answer all questions honestly. A reason for this is that the team members and vertical leaders have worked together and they might not want to say negative aspects about each other work and experiences.

b. To what extent are the risks and objections limited? Are the risks run by the participants similar to those in daily life?:

All data will be processed anonymously and participants will be asked to answer as honest as possible. However, if they do not want to answer all questions they are free to say 'no commentary'.

8. How does the burden on the participants compare to the study's potential scientific contribution (theory formation, practical usability)?:

The burden compared to the study's potential scientific contribution is very low., since all data will be processed anonymously. Furthermore, the study could lead to insights for improving the shared leadership teams of the participating companies.

9. Will a method be used that may, by coincidence, lead to a finding of which the participant should be informed?⁵ If so, what actions will be taken in the case of a coincidental finding?:

No.

Analysis/power

10. How will the researchers analyse the data? Which statistical analyses will be used?:

⁵ For instance: dementia, dyslexia, giftedness, depression, extremely low heartbeat in an ECG, etc. If coincidental findings may be found, this should be included in the informed consent, including a description of the actions that will be taken in such an event.

Data-analysis in qualitative research consists of two phases: data preparation and data analysis (Boeije, 2010). Below, these parts will be described.

The data preparation of the current study consists of three aspects. First, the recorded interviews will be stored in different files on a computer. Second, these audio materials will be transcribed. Third, all information that could possibly identify participants will be removed. At last, if necessary data will be manipulated in order to be able to enter them in a software program for coding.

The data will be analyzed with a template analysis using the program MEPA. A template analysis refers to a thematic analysis that offers a high degree of structure in analyzing textual data as well as the possibility to adapt it to the needs of a study (Brooks, McCluskey, Turley, & King, 2015; King, 2012). Using this type of analysis first a preliminary coding of the data will be performed with some themes based on the theoretical framework. These themes will be organized into meaningful clusters and relationships will be defined. Next, an initial coding template will be developed. This is an initial version of the coding template based on a part of the data rather than carrying out preliminary coding and clustering on all data before defining all themes (Brooks et al., 2015). With this initial template further data will be analyzed by means of coding meaningful fragments that relate to the same theme. This iterative process of coding meaningful fragments that relate to the same theme will be given a code. This iterative process of improving the template stops if no new codes are necessary to analyze the data. Afterwards, a final template will be developed, which will be applied to the full data set.

11. What is the number of participants? Provide a power analysis and/or motivation for the number of participants. The current convention is a power of 0.80. If the study deviates from this power, the FERB would like you to justify why this is necessary:

Three teams of three different organizations participate in the study, with in total 13 participants (3 vertical leaders and 10 team members). From the bank team three team members and one vertical leader have been interviewed. From the school four team members and one vertical leader have been interviewed. From the healthcare team three team members and one vertical leader have been interviewed. It is chosen to investigate teams from different sectors and interviewing team members as well as vertical leaders to obtain as much relevant and specific data as possible for answering the research question.

C. PARTICIPANTS, RECRUITMENT AND INFORMED CONSENT PROCEDURE

1. The nature of the research population (please tick):

1. General population without complaints/symptoms

2. General population with complaints/symptoms

3. Patients or population with a diagnosis (please state the diagnosis)

2. Age category of the participants (please tick):

- **18 years or older**
- 16-17 years
- 13-15 years
- 12 years or younger

3. Does the study require a specific target group? If so, justify why the study cannot be conducted without the participation of this group (e.g. minors):

The sample of the current study consists of three shared leadership work teams of three different organizations. Teams could only participate if they fulfilled the following inclusion criteria, teams: (a) consist of four or more people, (b) perform task relevant for an organization, (c) share one or more common goals, (d) interact socially, (e) show task interdependencies, (f) maintain and manage boundaries, (g) are embedded in the context of an organization, (h) with a vertical designated leader, and (i) working with a shared leadership approach. This means that teams without a vertical leader were excluded because of the study's focus on the role of the vertical leader in developing shared leadership work teams. These inclusion criteria originate from the literature about work teams and make sure the appropriate sample for answering the research question is investigated.

4. Recruitment of participants

a. How will the participants be recruited?:

Teams can only participate if they fulfill the following inclusion criteria, teams: (a) consist of four or more people, (b) perform task relevant for an organization, (c) share one or more common goals, (d) interact socially, (e) show task interdependencies, (f) maintain and manage boundaries, (g) are embedded in the context of an organization, (h) with a vertical designated leader, and (i) working with a shared leadership approach. This indicates that the sample will be intentionally selected according to the needs of the study, often referred as purposive sampling (Boeije, 2010). In order to recruit those teams contacts will be established with organizations that work with a shared leadership approach. Vertical leaders will be contacted in order to align if their teams fulfill the inclusion criteria and if they are interested to participate in the current study.

- b. How much time will the prospective participants have to decide as to whether they will indeed participate in the study?:

Recruitment will take about a month. After contacting the shared leadership teams and companies the teams have about two weeks to decide if they want to participate or not.

5. Does the study involve informed consent or mutual consent? Clarify the design of the consent procedure (who gives permission, when and how). Does the study involve active consent or passive consent? If no informed consent will be sought, please clarify the reason:

An active informed consent will be used. In this consent the aim, the content, the risks and benefits will be explained and both the researchers and the participants will sign that they agree how the data will be handled and what they can expect from each other during the research.

6. Are the participants fully free to participate and terminate their participation whenever they want and without stating their grounds for doing so?:

Yes.

7. Will the participants be in a dependent relationship with the researcher?:

No.

8. Compensation

- a. Will the participants be compensated for their efforts? If so, what is included in this recompense (financial reimbursement, travelling expenses, otherwise). What is the amount?

No.

- b. Will this compensation depend on certain conditions, such as the completion of the study?

No.

D. PRIVACY AND INFORMATION

1.

- a. Will the study adhere to the requirements for anonymity and privacy, as referred to in the Faculty Protocol for Data Storage⁶?:

- anonymous processing and confidential storage of data (i.e. storage of raw data separate from identifiable data): yes
- the participants' rights to inspect their own data: yes
- access to the data for all the researchers involved in the project: yes

If not, please clarify.

⁶ This can be found on the Intranet: <https://intranet.uu.nl/wetenschappelijke-integriteit-facultair-protocol-dataopslag>

2.

- a. Will the participant be offered the opportunity to receive the results (whether or not at the group level)?:

Yes at the individual level.

- b. Will the results of the study be fed back to persons other than the participants (e.g. teachers, parents)?:

No.

If so, will this feedback be provided at the group or at the individual level?

Irrelevant for this study.

3.

- a. Will the data be stored on the faculty's data server?:

Yes

- b. Will the data that can be traced back to the individual be stored separately on the other faculty server available for this specific purpose?:

No.

If not, please clarify where will the data be stored instead?:

This data will be stored on a different location with a password.

E. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Optional.

F. FORMS TO BE ENCLOSED (CHECKLIST)

- Text (advert) for the recruitment of participants
- Information letter for participant
- Informed consent form for participants
- Written or oral feedback information (debriefing text)
- (Descriptions of) questionnaires
- (Descriptions of) measurement instruments/stimuli/manipulations
- Literature/references

Signature(s):⁷

Date and place: 08-01-20120

Name, position:

Walter ten Eikelder, Master student Educational Sciences

⁷ The senior researcher (holding at least a doctoral degree) should sign here.