Is Leading from the Second Chair a New Leadership Theory: Examining the Theoretical Underpinnings

By
Nicholous M. Deal

A Research Project Submitted to
Saint Mary's University, Halifax, Nova Scotia
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree of Master of Business Administration.

December, 2015, Halifax, Nova Scotia

Approved:	Wendy R. Carroll, PhD Supervisor
Approved:	Margaret C. McKee, PhD MBA Program Director
Date:	December 1, 2015

**Is Leading from the Second Chair a New Leadership Theory:
Examining the Theoretical Underpinnings**

By
Nicholous M. Deal

A Research Project Submitted to
Saint Mary's University, Halifax, Nova Scotia
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree of Master of Business Administration.

December, 2015, Halifax, Nova Scotia

Approved: ______________________
Wendy R. Carroll, PhD
Supervisor

Approved: ______________________
Margaret C. McKee, PhD
MBA Program Director

Date: December 1, 2015

Abstract

Is Leading from the Second Chair a New Leadership Theory:
Examining the Theoretical Underpinnings

By Nicholous M. Deal

A burgeoning area of inquiry exists that is concerned with leading from a place of subordination in an organizational context. In what is called "second chair leadership," this concept metaphorically expresses this unique leadership arrangement. The aim of this research project was two-fold. First, a study was conducted using the techniques of a quasi-systematic literature review to provide an in-depth overview of what has been written about second chair leadership. The main inquiry was to determine how second chair leadership is defined in existing literature. In a final sample of eight publications deemed appropriate for inclusion, a convergence of meanings was established and key research themes were discovered. A second study sought to investigate inherent themes found in second chair leadership. Through a thematic analysis that examined the tenets of second chair leadership, a synthesis of findings is presented and contrasted with existing leadership theories. The main inquiry in a second study was to determine whether second chair leadership truly merited a new leadership theory when compared to existing theoretical frameworks. It was concluded that second chair leadership is characteristic of several existing leadership theories, namely, transformational, servant, ethical, and leader-member exchange. This study contributes to the limited examination of second chair leadership in that it is the first systematic review that surveys all relevant scholarly works. I conclude by discussing the findings of each study and offer several suggestions worthy of future research.

December 1, 2015

Acknowledgements

I dedicate this research project to those who serve in subordinate leadership positions and to their commitment of serving others. This capstone research project is the fruit of tiresome labour that was motivated by my curiosity of what it means to 'lead from the second chair.' I have had the privilege of serving in several support capacities throughout my professional life thus far. The diligent servant-like attitude of those whom reprise the subordinate role of second chair leadership is what I truly admire.

To whom the honour is due, I wish to recognize several people from my personal life who have made this learning journey possible. In recognizing the important role of my faith, I would like to first acknowledge my creator and redeemer, the Lord Jesus Christ. Without Him, I could not have completed this program and research project in one of the most trying seasons of my life. Philippians 4:13: "I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me." To my darling wife Laurie: Your unconditional love, support, and commitment to me throughout the last five years while I pursued an education has been remarkable. You have endured countless gripes and temporary absences. Thank you for working to support me from start to finish as I achieved this milestone. I love you always. To all of my family who have been a source of comfort to me, thank you. I especially thank my mother, Paula, who taught me through her many sacrifices as a single mother, the value of a hard work ethic and helping others. Also to my step-father, Graham, for being a rock of stability and my mother-in-law Sherry, for all her encouragement and support. To my pastor, Rev. Tony Gratto: thank you for believing in me and entrusting me the privilege of working together in leadership at Calvary Tabernacle. You have shown me the example of a gentle leader – quick to listen, slow to speak, and slow to wrath. It is my hope that this research project captures the special bond between the first and second chair. I would also like to acknowledge Roger Patterson. Roger, along with his colleague Michael Bonem, conceived the idea of second chair leadership. In a failed search for his doctoral contribution to second chair leadership, I had emailed Roger to obtain access to his dissertation, not expecting a reply. As a testament of his Christian character, Roger graciously shared it with me and encouraged me to write.

I have made a sincere effort to take full advantage of the many opportunities afforded to me through the Sobey MBA program at Saint Mary's University. The University community has empowered me to think for myself and become a globalized citizen of the world. Proper recognition must be given to the MBA Department, specifically, Margaret McKee for her leadership example. Her editorial feedback and advice is what has strengthened the quality of this project. I also wish to recognize the staff at Saint Mary's Patrick Power Library, as well as those institutions who worked with me to retrieve and access difficult-to-find resources.

There have been many who have helped me along the way and I would be remiss not to acknowledge them here. I sincerely thank my supervisor, Wendy Carroll, for agreeing to supervise this unique project and all her help in completing it in such a limited period of time. Wendy has been an inspiration to me as a teacher, researcher, and advisor throughout my graduate studies at Saint Mary's. I am indebted to her kindness and expertise. Special recognition is due to those who have helped me find my way in the academy: Anthony Yue, Karen Blotnicky, Mallika Das, Gabrielle Durepos, David Wicks, Jean Helms Mills, and Albert Mills. A special thanks must also be given to my mentor, Scott MacMillan, who has truly been a servant leader. Thank you for your continued guidance, challenging me to engage in critical thinking, and for exposing me to the academic community.

Finally, I would be remiss not to also extend a heartfelt thanks to my classmates, friends, and colleagues at Saint Mary’s University. I had long looked forward to being a part of your scholarly community. I will always be a proud alumnus.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1 – An Overview

Introduction

The evolution of leadership inquiry has contributed to a plethora of theory building studies, practical development, and frameworks that now exist in an ever-expanding landscape (Hunt & Dodge, 2001). Leadership is a mature field of research. With many theories and models that populate academic and practical discourses, it is arguably the most published area of behavioural sciences research to date (Schermerhorn, Hunt, & Osborn, 2000). From this, emerging leadership concepts can, at times, be revered as accepted theories without proper scrutiny.

Second chair leadership enters the discussion in leadership literature as it contributes to the voluminous collection of theories and concepts, and could quite possibly expand our understanding of what it is to lead from a place of subordination. At present, a burgeoning area of inquiry is concerned with the complexities of leading from a subordinated, albeit senior position within an organizational hierarchy. Known in some ecclesiastical circles as ‘second chair leadership,’ this term is a metaphoric expression gleaned from the physical arrangement of an orchestra seating arrangement. Emphasis is given to ‘first violins’ while ‘second violins,’ although just as important in their supporting role, are not as visually prominent. Bonem and Patterson (2005) introduce this concept as a subordinated leadership-like theory in their popular press book entitled, *Leading from the Second Chair: Serving Your Church Fulfilling Your Role, and Realizing Your Dreams*. In essence, second chair leadership is considered to be a key theoretical framework that describes the influential relationship between an executive, his/her senior leader(s), and followers.

It is found to be enacted in several settings yet second chair leadership literature is predominately emphasized in ecumenical contexts. While it is not strictly contingent on traditional power in a positional sense, leading from the second chair seeks to achieve improvement throughout the entire organization without the formal authority of *the* leader.

The general acceptance of many leadership concepts as being theories without a closer examination further contributes to the confusion about leadership theory. The leadership enterprise – characterized as being enormously lucrative with thousands of popular press books, blogs, and practitioner workshops – has contributed to a crisis of sorts. We now have several empirically tested leadership theories yet a seeming plethora of discourse exists introducing new emergent conceptions of leadership 'theories.' In his recent work, Pfeffer (2015: viii) encourages people "to rethink, to reconceptualise, and to reorient their behaviors concerning the important topic of leadership." Kieser (1994) pointed to a growing obsession of fashionable management trends within organizations as being problematic, challenging what should be a thorough understanding of the picture of organizational leadership. In discussing research dissemination antecedents in leadership perspectives, Hunt and Dodge (2001) argue that influential social forces lead to this problem in leadership research and practice. This notion of an expansive landscape, where conceptions of leadership are often untested and void of critique, is the central problem in second chair leadership as an assumed theory. What the existing literature does not tell us, in the limited work that has been published and is readily available, is whether this subordinate-like style of leadership merits a distinct inquiry of study or not.

The specific objectives of the two studies captured in this research project are two-fold. First, given the unknown nature of this concept, what it means to lead from the second chair, I will conduct a quasi-systematic literature review to provide a high-level overview of the topic. This will provide a timely compilation of what has been written thus far on second chair leadership. It also serves to inform a second, in-depth study that will synthesize themes found in the literature. This subsequent study will dissect the discovered themes by contrasting them with the theoretical underpinnings of existing leadership theories. The result will determine whether or not second chair leadership is truly distinct from other empirically validated theories, thus, providing clarity to the concept found in the populous domain of study.

The Many Aspects of Leadership Theory

> Leadership can come from anyone. When we stop equating leadership with greatness and public visibility, it becomes easier to see our own opportunities for leadership and recognize the leadership of people we interact with every day. Leaders come in all shapes and sizes, and may true leaders are working behind the scenes. Leadership that has big outcomes often starts small. (Daft, 2015: 6).

The nature of leadership is complex and often misunderstood. Scholars, practitioners, and enthusiasts contend with idea of leadership being an ambiguous discipline deserving careful consideration of its development (Mowles, 2013; Rost, 1993). Leadership is among the most researched topics within the social sciences (Avolio, Sosik, Jung, & Berson, 2003; Bass, 1990; Bennis, 2007). Bennis and Nanus (1985: 4) echo this sentiment, claiming leadership to be “the most studied and least understood topic of any in the social science.” Countless definitions have attempted to explain its essence, to an end whereby renowned scholar James MacGregor Burns concluded: “leadership is one of the most observed and least understood phenomena on earth” (Burns, 1978: 2). Contributing to ambiguity, the depths of its study – leadership – continues to evolve the discipline and concept.

The classic pictures of leadership often evoke familiar frames of Winston Churchill defying the Nazi threat as German forces captured much of Europe. Mahatma Gandhi leading the two-hundred-mile march protesting the Salt Act. Steve Jobs returning to Apple to transform the technology industry. Martin Luther King Jr. standing before the Lincoln Memorial challenging the American people to accept racial equality. The inspirational figure of Sheryl Sandberg encouraging young girls and women to challenge patriarchal power in corporate North America.

In forwarding a framework for understanding organizational behaviour, Schneider (1987) argues that building an organization with a legacy of success is predicated on the people who exist in it, those of whom include followers (i.e. employees, subordinates, and volunteers) as well as leaders. While leadership theories are vast in number they all seek to define, explain, and organize the varying complexities of leadership and its consequences (Bass & Bass, 2008).

For as much as leadership is glorified to be a personification of influence and change, this merely explains one side of a multifaceted concept. It is important to recognize the evolving concept of leadership and how it has indeed changed over the last several decades. Boneau and Thompson (2013) posited that leadership paradigms often reflect a greater societal context such that theories have evolved as norms, attitudes, and convictions of the larger world change over time. The developments of leadership perspectives is reflected in the dominant leadership theories of present day.

Seminal theories of leadership sought to identify physical characteristics and/or psychological traits that differentiated leaders from non-leaders and distinguishable traits of predicted success (House & Aditya, 1997; Lord, De Vader, & Alliger, 1986). Critiques of the trait theories paradigm led scholars to consider how leaders' behaviours predicted effectiveness (Jenkins, 1947; Mann, 1959; Stogdill, 1948). Research on initiation of structure and consideration progressed toward the behavioural paradigm of leadership inquiry, informing successive leadership theories such as Fielder's (1967) contingency theory, the renowned path-goal theory (House, 1971), Blake and Moulton's (1985) leadership grid, and Bass's (1985) transformational and transactional leadership model. Transformational leadership remains the most significant relational theories of leadership today.

Research Design

The central purpose of this research project was to extend the understanding of second chair leadership by determining whether this notion of subordinated leadership is, in fact, a new leadership theory, an existing framework presented in an emergent lens, or a combination of prominent leadership theories. Numerous publications found in the popular press informally discuss the influence of a second chair leader. In their seminal work on the topic, authors Mike Bonem and Roger Patterson (2005) write in *Leading from the Second Chair: Serving Your Church Fulfilling Your Role, and Realizing Your Dreams*, that this unique type of leadership is a balancing act whereby one can lead effectively while serving the leader and, by proxy, the collective organization. There is a deafening absence, however, of significant scholarly inquiry validating the merits of this emerging leadership theory.

The research project designed herein aims to determine whether second chair leadership is distinctly an emergent framework or the combination of existing, empirically validated leadership theories. In order to achieve the study purpose and aims, a two-step process was followed. Specifically, the techniques of a systematic review were first employed to examine the literature on second chair leadership in scholarly, practitioner, and popular press domains. Using content analysis methods, results were then extrapolated to compare and contrast themes of the second chair leadership framework to existing leadership theories. As will be discussed in greater detail in the methodological approach chapter, the chosen research method was appropriate in synthesizing leadership theories in a social science context.

Objectives and Research Questions

The objectives of the two studies in the research project were to: 1) use techniques of a quasi-systematic review to examine the existing literature on second chair leadership, 2) develop a complete understanding of the theoretical underpinnings (if any) and conceptual framework of second chair leadership, 3) compare and contrast the second chair leadership framework to existing leadership theories to determine if second chair leadership is a truly new theoretical development or a simple fusion of existing theories. The major research questions are:

1. How is second chair leadership defined in the existing literature?
2. Do the merits of second chair leadership constitute a distinctly new leadership theory?
3. Are there any key differences between second chair leadership and the current theoretical frameworks of leadership?

The potential contributions from the research are several. There is clearly no scarcity of available leadership theories and emerging frameworks; much about the topic remains to be understood (Barker, 1997; Burns, 1978; Meindl, Ehrlich, & Dukerich, 1985). One of the primary goals of leadership research is to make informed judgements about the utility and validity of its theories in a social science context (Parry, 1998). The analysis and outcomes of the research study have the potential to contribute to academic and practitioner research as the proposed theory, second chair leadership, persists in popular press without rigorous evaluative support.

This study could have particular implications for ecclesiastical circles, consultants, and practitioners as they grapple with making sense of being second chair and leading from a subordinated position. Collins (2001) posited success of leading an organization to be predicated on the emphasis of first building a strong and broad base of leadership. For stakeholders, espousing second chair leadership as a valid paradigm, and determining the underpinnings of its theoretical construct will validate the appropriateness of its existence in practice. As previously discussed, second chair leadership is, at present, considered a key theoretical framework to describe the unique position and relationship in ecumenical contexts. Thus, this study endeavours to dissect and examine the number of leadership frameworks to determine the validity of its theoretical claim.

Organization of this Research Project

In summary, this research project addresses two apparent gaps in the literature. First and foremost, it provides a close examination of the understanding of second chair leadership. To a greater effect, it also explores the contrasting elements of existing leadership theories and frameworks that have been empirically tested and accepted by the academy. As a result, the synthesis of key factors in established frameworks permit an objective evaluation of second chair theoretical validity.

Now having completed this overview of the research, in Chapter 2, I will proceed with a discussion of the relevant literature. In Chapter 3, I will provide the research methodology of this research project, its approach, and context. I will then present the findings of the two studies in Chapters 4 and 5. Lastly, in Chapter 6, I will provide a conclusion that highlights a discussion on the results of each study, research contributions, limitations, future research, and closing remarks featuring a brief self-reflection piece.

Chapter 2 – Literature Review

Introduction

In reviewing the breadth of research on leadership, I have organized this chapter to review the key leadership theories that resonate with second chair leadership. I will first present the literature on leadership research in a historical context that follows a developmental progression of leadership thought. Then I will proceed to review the associated leadership theories. Lastly, I will endeavour to dissect the second chair leadership model and proceed to discuss my rationale for its selection within this research project.

The Landscape of Leadership Research

> As the topic of scholarly debate for centuries and the subject of systematic theoretical and empirical research for much of the past 100 years, leadership has a long tradition in the social sciences. Not surprisingly, with such an extensive history, the leadership literature has demonstrated ebbs and flows of prevailing wisdom. Although many ideas of the past have fallen from popular favor, the evolution of leadership perspectives is both reflected in and critical to the understanding of the dominant leadership theories of present day. (Barling, Christie, & Hoption, 2010: 183-184).

An Evolution of Conceptions

With an evolutionary perspective beginning in the early "great man" theory of leadership, psychologist William James (1880) associated societal changes and world events to be the result of great men whose vision changed the direction of society. Carlyle (1869) argued that the criteria for successful leaders is holistically based on the possession of certain personality and character traits. This individualistic perspective was the result of early empirical psychology that sought the extension of traits into nascent leadership contexts (Vroom & Jago, 2007). Mid-twentieth century scholars gave pause to the study of trait leadership. Stogdill (1948) reviewed 124 studies, and proposed leadership to be more situational than that based on traits of greatness:

> The persistence of individual patterns of human behaviour in the face of constant situational change appears to be a primary obstacle encountered not only in the practice of leadership, but in the selection and placement of leaders. It is not especially difficult to find persons who are leaders. It is quite another matter to place these persons in different situations where they will be able to function as leaders. It becomes clear than an adequate analysis of leadership involves not only a study of leaders, but also of situations. The evidence suggests that leadership is a relation that exists between persons in a social situation, and the persons who are leaders in one situation may not necessarily be leaders in other situations. (Stogdill, 1948: 65).

Rather than dissecting the nuances of personality traits and characteristics of leaders, diverse research programs focusing on behavioural approaches engaged by effective leadership began to captivate social scientists. Beginning with initial studies on leadership behaviours, researchers from the University of Iowa posited the existence of a dichotomy of leadership style – being either autocratic or democratic (Lewin, 1939; Lewin & Lippett, 1938; Lewin, Lippett, & White, 1939). Further work by Tannenbaum and Schmidt (1958) argued that leadership behaviour could be situated on a continuum reflecting varying degrees of employee/follower participation depending on organizational circumstance. Early research of leadership, being reflected in behaviour, is also attributed to Hemphill and Coons (1957) in the Ohio State Studies. In developing the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ), researchers found two wide-ranging categories of a leader's behaviour: consideration (the extent to which a leader cares about his/her subordinates) and initiating structure (the extent to which a leader is task oriented and directs work of subordinates toward goal achievement). The University of Michigan Studies compared the behavior of effective and ineffective managers. Two types of leadership behaviour were discovered: employee-centered (a leadership behaviour that emphasizes the human needs of others), and job-centered (a leadership behaviour which directs activities toward efficiency, emphasizing goals and work facilitation). Lastly, in what is colloquially known as the Leadership Grid, Blake and Mouton (1985) formed a two-dimensional model that classified major leadership styles from the earlier works of the Ohio and Michigan Studies.

Situational leadership theory, or more commonly known in literature as the "contingency approach," extended understanding of the leadership grid by emphasizing the characteristics of followers whereby the determination of effective leader behavior is dependent on elements of situation (Hersey & Blanchard, 1969). Fiedler's (1967) contingency model found that leader effectiveness can be, depending on the situation, categorized as being either task-motivated (motivated by task accomplishment) or relationship-motivated (concern for others). Path-goal theory posits that a leader's goal is to align followers with those of the organization (House, 1971). This is achieved through motivation exercises that clarify the behaviours necessary for task accomplishment, and subsequent rewards. As presented in a qualitative summary of the empirical research, Schriesheim and Neider (1996) found the most consistent results of situational leadership can be observed in the theory's relationship between clarifying behaviour and follower satisfaction. Kerr and Jermier's (1978) substitutes for leadership theory suggest that situational variables can substitute the need for leadership. Past research indicates this theoretical framework lacks adequate evidence, and thus, is rarely discussed in the literature (Dionne, Yammarino, Atwater, & James, 2002).

Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership is considered to be among the most critically examined and empirically scrutinized theories of leadership (Bono & Judge, 2004). Burns (1978) is credited with conceptualizing the origins of this theory, stemming from his life's work as a political scientist, historian, and former presidential adviser. This theory emphasized the differentiation of exchange leadership, whereby transformational and transactional frameworks would be situated on a dichotomous model. Transactional leadership involves the use of reward power as an inducement of follower compliance whereas transformational leadership involves the appeal to, and heightening of, followers' consciousness through higher order values and morals (Burns, 1978).

Bass (1985) extended the work of Burns through the introduction of a psychological aspect through the identification of four behavioural sub factor components (Bass & Riggo, 2006). Idealized influence, the first of these behavioural factors, centres on leaders' behaviour that creates a futuristic vision, cements a collective sense of the mission, and serves as an ideal role model for followers to example (Bass & Avolio, 1994). The second factor, inspirational motivation, describes the ability of leaders to motive their followers to achieve more than what is believed possible through passionate communication (Hater & Bass, 1988). The third facet, intellectual stimulation, describes the leaders' encouragement for followers to engage in independent and critical thought processes, questioning their preconceived biases and assumptions, and approach problem solving with creativity (Bass, 1985; Deluga, 1988). Lastly, the fourth dimension of individual consideration characterizes the leader who emphasize employees' personal needs for achievement and development of their potential. Said leaders strive to build an environment that supports wellbeing, emotional dimensions, and work potential (Bass & Avolio, 1994).

Ethical Leadership

Effective leadership and the question of ethics provides a nexus of the emerging leadership paradigm primarily concerned with a normative perspective (Ciulla, 2014). Researchers have long associated personal trait themes like integrity with perceptions of leadership effectiveness. For example, perceived leadership effectiveness and ethical traits of honesty, integrity, and trustworthiness have been found to be empirically linked (Den Hartog, House, Hanges, Ruiz-Quintanilla, & Dorfman, 1999; Kouzes & Posner, 2011; Posner & Schmidt, 1992). In further examination of the leadership and ethics intersection, Treviño, Hartman, and Brown (2000) surveyed senior executives and ethics/compliance officers to ascertain a connection between personal characteristics and ethical leadership. It was found that "moral managers" explicitly position ethics as a central component of their leadership agenda by communicating an ethics and values message, role modeling ethical behaviour, and leveraging a reward system based on positive ethical outcomes (Treviño, Hartman, & Brown, 2000). A follow-up study further validated these results and concluded that such explicit behaviour from ethical leaders gets followers' attention by standing out from other organizational messages (Treviño, Brown, & Hartman, 2003). Brown, Treviño, and Harrison (2005: 120) proposed that "leaders become attractive, credible, and legitimate as ethical role models in part by engaging in ongoing behaviors that are evaluated by followers as normatively appropriate, and that suggest altruistic (rather than selfish) motivation."

Servant Leadership

Shifts in research literature preoccupied with transformational leadership themes have resulted in a relational exchange characterized within the servant leadership context (Smith, Montagno & Kuzmenko, 2004; Avolio, Walumbwa, & Weber, 2009). Earlier theoretical works proposed a movement away from management theories of agency that had been the traditional argument of organizational behaviour, and positioned a governance model that viewed followers as individuals with unique qualities of trust, self-actualization, and collectivism (Davis, Schoorman & Donaldson, 1997). Such discourses resonate with the fundamental constructs of servant leadership (i.e. personal growth and development of individuals).

Research on servant leadership largely hails from Greenleaf's (1977) dissertation. Developed as a theoretical framework, several scholarly contributions have informed this emerging leadership approach. While still in its infancy, servant leadership research has largely consisted of its definition, the development and classification of an array of character traits, and conceptual models. Robert Greenleaf (1970), author of the revolutionary essay, *The Servant as Leader*, originally coined the term 'servant leader' upon reading Hermann Hesse's (1956) *Journey to the East*. This literary work chronicled the story of a leader, charged with the task of leading a group of men through their travels on a mythical journey. Within the story, the leader assumes both leader and servant-style roles that helps keep the group together during their odyssey. Contained within his essay, Greenleaf provides the following rationale behind this developing concept of servant leadership:

> The servant-leader is servant first… It begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve first. Then conscious choice brings one to aspire to lead. That person is sharply different from one who is leader first, perhaps because of the need to assuage an unusual power drive or to acquire material possessions… The leader-first and the servant-first are two extreme types. Between them there are shadings and blends that are part of the infinite variety of human nature. (Greenleaf, 1977: 7).

Spears (1995) first proposed a list of mutually exclusive character traits that servant leaders are apt to exhibit. As a former executive of the Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership, Spears was privy to the original workings of Robert Greenleaf, father of the modern servant leadership concept. Laub (1999) sought to define specific characteristics through the development of a measurable instrument, all in an effort to quantify servant leadership. Laub's research is credited for establishing espoused values as being foundational in the embodiment of servant leadership (Smith, Montagno & Kuzmenko, 2004; Van Dierendonck, 2011). Farling, Stone, and Winston (1999) base the servant leadership concept on five key characteristics: vision, influence, credibility, trust, and service. This is most often associated with Spears's trait model in that it seeks to classify the servant leader in attributive categories. Page and Wong (2000) offered a model that categorized servant leadership qualities into four key domains: character (integrity, humility, and servant-hood), people (empathy, empowering and developing others), task (vision, settings goals, and leading), and process (modeling, team building, and democratic decision-making). Russell and Stone (2002) have further developed the servant leadership concept by blending character traits in a model that supports the preceding qualities found in research.

Leader-Member Exchange

The emergence of the leader-member exchange (LMX) theory stemmed from the departure of an emphasis on situational factors, instead, shifting to the relational perspective of leadership (Dansereau, Graen, & Haga, 1975; Gerstner & Day, 1997). This relational framework is concerned with the specific relationship between a leader and each individual follower (Yammarino & Dansereau, 2002; Yukl, O'Donnell, & Taber, 2009; O'Donnell, Yukl, & Taber, 2012). It is viewed as an exchange to describe a series of two-person interactions that give and receive (Dansereau, 1995; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Leader-follower relationships yield outcomes that coincide with the measured quality. Schriesheim, Castro, and Cogliser (1999) found that high-quality LMX relationships are characterized as being defined by mutual support, trust, liking, provision of latitude, attention, and loyalty. Poor-quality LMX embodies opposite traits: downward influence, role distinctions, social distance, contractual obligations, and distrust. Either orientation varies on the individualized differences within a dyad (House & Aditya, 1997). Recent extensions have examined the gendering of dyadic relationships (Adebayo & Udegbe, 2004) and social network theory intersectionality (Graen, 2006; Uhl-Bien, 2006).

Followership

Leader-centric studies provide an unbalanced discussion that dissects leadership in relational terms. Acting in accordance to their social role, leaders and followers, acting together, produce leadership (Hurwitz & Hurwitz, 2009). In spite of the voluminous works that delve into organizational leadership, little attention has been paid to the issue of followership in leadership research, until recently (Baker, 2007; Bligh, 2011; Carsten, Uhl-Bien, West, Patera, McGregor, 2010; Kelley, 2008; Sy, 2010). According to Dvir and Shamir (2003), followership, as being a contribution (or detraction) of the leadership process, is part of an interactive social system dynamic. As found in the literature, an apparent divergence of theoretical orientation exists. The role-theory approach (Katz & Kahn, 1978) is fixed on position and ranks within a hierarchical structure, whereas constructionist approaches see followership and leadership as a mutually constructed interaction between people that grants influence (DeRue & Ashford, 2010). It is duly noted that the function of followership theory is to encourage subordinated follower behaviours in support of a leadership context (Hurwitz & Hurwitz, 2009; Uhl-Bien & Ospina, 2012). However, Shamir (2007) advocated for a balanced approach that values both leaders and followers in the process of leadership.

Discourses of Second Chair Leadership in Literature

Surveying the leadership literature in existence reveals a vast expanse of competing theories and frameworks, including this concept of second chair (subordinated) leadership. In *Leading from the Second Chair: Serving Your Church Fulfilling Your Role, and Realizing Your Dreams*, Bonem and Patterson (2005: 2) provide a working definition that encapsulates the essence of a second chair leader: “[S/he is] a person in a subordinate role whose influence with others adds value throughout the organization.” Leading from a place of subordination is unique in that it is not predicated on traditional leadership themes of power, authority, and position.

Second chair leaders are not necessarily the “number two person.” He/she seeks to improve the organization – from the top executive to the most insignificant stakeholder – through influence and relationships.

> A second chair leader does not have to fit a particular mold or hold a particular title, and this was certainly true for the individuals with whom we spoke… They served in small and large churches judicatories, and other organizations, and they covered the spectrum of denominations. They were men and women. Some saw the second chair as their lifelong calling, while others saw it as a step on their way to a first chair role. (Bonem & Patterson, 2005: xiii).

Bonem and Paterson (2005) dedicate much of their work to developing three paradoxes that are said to exist within the second chair role, and are described as “tensions” since they are often interpreted to be incompatible and contradictory: (1) The subordinate-leader paradox: Traditional mental models of leadership view it as being “top-down” oriented with complete freedom and unfettered control. Rigid organizational hierarchies, processes, and procedures are characteristic of this autocratic style.

> “Effective second chair leaders do not have a zero-sum view of organizational responsibility… They are able to lead without being at the top of the pyramid… They understand that their authority and effectiveness as a second chair stem from a healthy, subordinate relationship with their first chair.” (Bonem & Patterson, 2005: 4).

(2) The deep-wide paradox: Executives are often responsible for a broad, organization-wide perspective that considers each department and function in strategic management. However, a second chair leader, with specific roles, is usually responsible for a narrow and deep scope yet requires a broad view to realize perspective. (3) Contentment-dreaming: The tension of contentment-dreaming is largely situated on both transformational leadership and servant-leader principles.

Second chair leaders intentionally seek to shape the organization through intertwining components of their individual dreams with the boarder vision (and strategy). This is achieved by serving the executive (first chair) and influencing all other stakeholders. As well, second chair leaders refuse to compete with the vision and direction of the executive (first chair); instead, they maintain a healthy contentment with the present.

Identification of Gaps in the Literature

Second chair leadership, as it has been seminally introduced, values a healthy working relationship between the "first" and "second chair." This relational dyad is similar to that proposed by high-level relationship-based leadership theories. Useem (2001) forwards an influence strategy in leading organizations (and their key decision makers): "Leading up." This, of course, is also relationally-based. Second chair leadership also emphasizes influence as a construct of social power. This claim remains untested and neglects a particular contrast with that of the LMX, servant leadership, and followership literature.

The literature concerning transformational leadership emphasizes the closure of a gap between an ideal and reality. Transformational leaders desire to achieve organizational outcomes through the work of followers. From the lack of a conceptualized framework, what we do not yet know is whether second chair leaders are situated along a tripartite continuum primarily concerned with some combination of achieving outcomes, managing relationships, and/or asserting their own agenda. In similar circumstances and by extension, Uh-Bien, Riggio, Lowe, and Carsten (2014), in their admonishment to researchers of related relational-based leadership theories, argue that future research in this area must feature: strong theory-building

(Bacharach, 1989) and, among others, adopt a range of methodological approaches (Fairhurst & Uhl-Bien, 2012).

Bonem and Patterson (2005), ecumenical leaders and management practitioners, primarily situate the second chair in servant leadership principles. They casually position second chair leadership as being thematic of servitude without considering the theoretical framework of servant leadership. In their work to refine the servant leadership research paradigm, Russell and Stone (2002) consolidated an array of attributes by deriving a model with striking similarities to the themes raised by second chair leadership. For instance, service is one of the nine functional attributes studied according to its “repetitive prominence in [servant] literature” (Russell & Stone, 2002: 146). Thus, given that service in leadership introduces a “moral imperative” (Nair, 1994: 71) and that research in second chair leadership extends an element of servitude in the place of subordinated leadership, this research project will address the claim of theoretical design by examining what has been discussed in second chair leadership literature.

Summary

Research developments in leadership continue to evolve yet there is much more to be discovered. Our understanding of leadership thought has progressed from physical features, psychological traits, and expected behaviours that were believed to be key determinants in leadership effectiveness, to humanistic considerations found within the transformational leadership paradigm. As raised in this chapter, the popularity of leadership in the social sciences demonstrates the importance of making informed judgements of the existing leadership theories. This inquiry of second chair leadership presents an opportunity to examine the associated literature and determine whether or not its underpinnings support a new theory.

To date, little has been concluded from evaluative work that investigates the theoretical framework of leading from the second chair and its linkages to established, empirically tested theories of leadership. As such, the work that has investigated second chair leadership and this notion of a framework for subordinated leadership will be reviewed in Chapter 4 as part of the discussion resulting from the systematic review. In the next chapter, I introduce the research process and discuss the methodology approach to this project.

Chapter 3 – The Research Process

Introduction

In this chapter I describe the overall research approach that informs this research project. I introduce both research studies to be conducted, discuss the methodology of both studies that will be used to determine the originality of second chair leadership theory. At the conclusion of this chapter, a brief summary of the research process is presented.

Research Approach

As our understanding of leadership theories and models evolve, and while the scholarly contributes further develop the burgeoning domain of leadership research, there is “no dearth of available leadership theories” (Barling, Christie, & Hoption, 2010: 228). Opportunities that seek to expand the inquiry of leadership persist. This research project aims to understand the theoretical underpinnings of second chair leadership – an area that has emerged in the popular press as a possible new theory.

This research project is divided into two purposeful studies. The first study will, through the techniques of a systematic review, examine the literature on second chair leadership in scholarly, practitioner, and popular press domains. The resulting evidence that discusses the theoretically underpinnings and the conceptual framework of second chair leadership will then be used in the second study. This subsequent study will compare and contrast the second chair leadership framework to existing leadership theories, namely, the high-level relationship-based theories as previously reviewed in Chapter 2. The objective of both studies will be to determine whether the construct of second chair leadership explains a new theoretical development or issimply a fusion of existing theories to discuss leadership from a different perspective.

Methodology

The first study will employ the techniques of a systematic review in an effort to capture what has been written on second chair leadership. This method was considered appropriate given the constraints of investigating a new theoretical framework that has yet to be empirically tested. Klassen, Jahad, and Moher (1998: 700) defined a systematic literature review as “a review in which there is a comprehensive search for relevant studies on a specific topic, and those identified are then appraised and synthesized according to a pre-determined explicit method.” Weed (2005) argues that the systematic literature review method is objective, replicable, comprehensive, and organized in a manner similar to that of empirical research. Systematic literature reviews in management studies are utilized to lend an inclusive, impartial coverage on a particular topic (Thorpe, Holt, Pittaway, & Macpherson, 2006). Since the focus of the first study is to provide an understanding of second chair leadership, it being a relatively unknown concept in leadership studies, extensive searches of relevant databases were deployed to ensure the resulting data captured all relevant writing on the topic. Since this quasi-systematic literature review compiles the works of second chair leadership, I first examine the popular press and, then, extend beyond this initial search to determine if there is any empirical research to support second chair leadership as a new theory.

Database Search Methods

The search of published literature will be identified through systematic searches of electronic databases hosted by and accessible through the Saint Mary's University library system. Databases included within this research program were: ATLA Religion, Canadian Business and Current Affairs (CBCA), EBSCO Academic Search Premier, EBSCO Business Source Premier, Emerald Insight, Eric, Google Scholar, JSTOR, ProQuest, ProQuest Digital Dissertations & Theses, PsycArticles, and PsycINFO. All results were limited to the English language. The search was conducted in only those aforementioned databases to preserve the appropriateness of results.

Inclusion and Exclusion Search Criteria

Criteria of inclusion and exclusion guided the literature search in that publications had to be: (a) retrieved within a scholarly database or publicly accessed; (b) be written and presented in the English language; (c) use the keywords "second chair," "second chair leader," "second chair leaders," and "second chair leadership;" (d) bibliographical resources that are identified in the initial search. There was an unrestricted range of the publication year and duplicate articles were deleted. Next, results of each database search were recorded and then assessed for evidence of any external duplicates from the current database that had already been previously searched. Finally, additional resources meeting the inclusion and exclusion search criteria were found by the close examination of bibliographies in the initial database search.

Data Analysis

Analysis of this data utilized Garrard's (1999) matrix method. After the initial literature search, a table was created to summarize the findings according to: (a) database; (b) publication/journal; (c) count; (d) level of evidence; (e) reference; (f) number of citations (see Table 1). To uncover key themes found within the systematic literature review, the following information was compiled and presented according to: (a) result theme(s); (b) description; (c) reference(s) (see Table 2). A synthesis of key themes identified in the second chair leadership concept became the second study. Study 2 sought to contrast themes to ascertain the representativeness of existing leadership frameworks (as previously discussed). The findings from this second study were summarized and conveniently organized within a matrix table to assist in associating key research themes to test the model's theoretical claim. Within the matrix, the following information was compiled from the resources found in the quasi-systematic literature review, and presented according to: (a) result theme(s); (b) connections with existing leadership theories; (c) reference(s) (see Table 3).

Summary

To briefly summarize, this research project will feature two studies. Study 1 uses the techniques of a quasi-systematic literature review to provide a thorough understanding of second chair leadership. Systematically reviewing the existing literature on this emergent leadership concept is fitting as the methodology is key to organizing the framework for the second study. Study 2 focuses on synthesizing the key factors of second chair leadership and comparing them to those found within established frameworks, all in an concerted effort to evaluate the theoretical legitimacy of this emergent leadership conception. Lastly, the analysis and outcomes of this research study have the potential to contribute to academic and practitioner research as the theory itself is, at present, largely unverified. In the following two chapters, I will present the results of these studies.

Chapter 4 – Study 1: Systematic Review of Second Chair Leadership

Introduction

While second chair leadership is considered an accepted leadership theory in practitioner and ecumenical circles, as previously noted, a scholarly study that compiles the “theory’s” literature in a systematic-like review has not been conducted. This first study aims to provide a thorough review of the literature on second chair leadership. It will use the techniques of a systematic review to appraise and synthesize the theoretical constructs of second chair leadership.

Results

This review serves to highlight the second chair leadership topic as a new interest among scholars and enthusiasts. Here, I endeavor to discuss the eight most prominent authors on second chair leadership whose work has contributed to an understanding of the theory. My analysis of this study yields a consensus of meaning in how second chair leadership is defined. It also shows the framework has been investigated across several contexts, and is explored using both qualitative and quantitative methodologies, resulting in a number of key research themes.

Table 1 – Database and Journals Included in Systematic Literature Review

Database	Publication/Journal	Count	Level of Evidence	Reference	Number of Citations
ATLA Religion Database	Congregations	1	Expert Opinion	(McCullar, 2009)	0
EBSCO Academic Search Premier	The Journal of Applied Christian Leadership	1	Expert Opinion	(Wiley, 2009)	0
ProQuest Digital Dissertations & Theses	Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary Repository (Doctoral dissertation)	1	Local-Context Evidence	(Patterson, 2006)	0
PsycINFO	Asbury Theological Seminary Repository (Doctoral dissertation)	1	Local-Context Evidence	(Griffin, 2009)	0
Google Scholar	Josey-Bass	1	Practitioner Expertise & Judgment	(Bonem & Patterson, 2005)	10
EBSCO Business Source Premier	Academy of Business Research Journal	1	Evaluated Research Evidence	(D'Angelo & Epstein, 2014).	0
Google Scholar	Christian Education Journal	1	Evaluated Research Evidence	(Powell, 2009)	3
ProQuest Digital Dissertations & Theses	Spalding University College of Education Repository (Doctoral dissertation)	1	Evaluated Research Evidence	(Chai, 2010)	1

How Second Chair Leadership is Defined

The roots of second chair leadership are founded within an ecumenical context. In describing the need for developing subordinate leaders, author Kevin Lawson (2000: 4) in *How to Thrive in Associate Staff Ministry*, concludes that: "The growth of this ministry field has been accompanied by a variety of stresses and problems. In general, associate staff positions have been characterized by relatively brief tenures and high attrition rates.” Little has been written to emphasize the subordinate leader tension of being both leader and follower. In resolving this dilemma, authors Michael Bonem and Roger Patterson (2005: 2) write in *Leading from the Second Chair: Serving Your Church, Fulfilling Your Role, and Realizing Your Dreams:*

> The good news is this resource has been written just for you! We want you to understand that you are not alone... Second chair [leadership is] a transforming season in your life. This role challenges your ego, buffers your speech, and keeps you anchored in your calling. It is a place of growth and development, a place of real contribution, and a place that tests your commitment... It is often the most uncomfortable chair in the room… But it can be deeply fulfilling.

Second chair leadership is first introduced to readers by Bonem and Patterson (2005) in a piece that positions the leadership theory as a subordinate leadership-like role within an ecumenical context. That said, throughout their ground breaking work, both authors expand second char leadership understanding to an ecumenical orientation that captures the growing number of ministry leaders who serve in a subordinate role within a local church or judicatory setting. However, much of their work also leverages the understanding of what it is to be a ‘number two’ leader in a much broader sense, suggesting it is applicable to “nonprofits and for-profits, volunteer-based organizations and businesses with paid employees, multilayered enterprises and smaller ones. If your organization involves at least a handful; of people, it is likely to have one or more second chair leaders” (Bonem & Patterson, 2005: 7-8).

Generally, the authors curiosity of writing about second chair leadership make links to Bonem and Patterson's (2005) work and credit it as being ground breaking. After all, Bonem and Patterson's work conceptualize the theory's essence; as a result, they are the most cited authors on second chair leadership. The majority of authors in this study have used Bonem and Patterson's (2005: 2) definition, or some variation:

> A second chair leader is a person in a subordinate role whose influence with others adds value throughout the organization. Think about it: even though you are not in the first chair, your actions can change the entire organization for the better. Of course, you may struggle with the idea of subordination, or think it impossible to have an impact throughout the organization. Each term in this definition has multiple shades of meaning, but the second chair leaders with whom we spoke consistently demonstrated this picture.

Patterson (2006), following his seminal piece on second chair leadership, also authored a Doctor of Ministry thesis entitled *A Theological Foundation and Workshop for Subordinate Leaders in the Local Church*. Patterson's (2006: 4) research examines the picture of subordinate leadership from a theological perspective, while positioning second chair leadership as a framework:

> To be a subordinate, is to be one under the leadership and authority of another. This has the potential to include any associate staff member, not just an associate pastor or executive pastor. This could include lay leaders who impact the organization in a substantial way.

Powell (2009) investigated the role of an executive pastor to determine correlations between administrative and managerial competency and ministry satisfaction. In this study, second chair leadership is embodied in the most senior subordinated leadership position (i.e. assistant/associate pastor or executive pastor) within large American churches (weekly attendance average of at least 1,000 members). The executive position of a second chair leader, thus, is described in a number of ways: chief of staff, chief operating officer, helmsman, assistant, executive shepherd (Fletcher, 2004; Powell, 2009).

Wiley (2009: 12), a contributor to Christian leadership writing, contextualizes the second chair definition of Bonem and Patterson by providing a description of subordinate functional positions within an organizational setting that works *for* a leader:

> She may truly be second chair, i.e., assistant director, vice president, or associate pastor. Or he might be a farm hand, custodian, data entry clerk, or, an administrative assistant. But whatever the venue, the distinguishing feature that makes second chair occupants into second chair leaders is their ability to influence others – to lead – in a way that benefits the organization for which they work.

Wiley (2009) reflects on his own journey in an ethnographical piece to make sense of the "second chair" meaning. He frames his experience as a personal discovery that sheds light on the nuances between occupying a position of second chair leadership and becoming a second chair leader. The former seeks ways to, at every opportunity and without hesitation, implement the vision of his/her first chair leader (i.e. superior), whereas the latter takes initiative to "take the lead in appropriate ways and under the right circumstances" (Wiley, 2009: 12).

In summary, the definitions that attempt to construct a preliminary definition of second chair leadership theory confirm the infancy of this leadership paradigm. It appears as though scholars and practitioners endeavour to articulate Bonem and Patterson's (2005) conceptualization of second chair leadership by using vastly similar frames and language. Thus, a consensus of meanings is observed such that they all originate from the seminal work of Bonem and Patterson (2005).

The Contexts of Second Chair Leadership Inquiry

The sample examined in this systematic review is studied across a variety of cultural perspectives of contributors and contexts, and spans diverse research foci. The contextual analysis of the systematic sample revealed a needful analysis of second chair leadership being applied in the following contexts: ecumenical organizations (n=5), which consisted of local Christian churches (n=4) and denominational governing bodies (n=1); post-secondary education (n=1); and in self-reflection (n=2). It is important to note the overwhelming religious context, namely the Christian faith, which informs second chair leadership. In 8 studies, there are 6 that are of a religious context, representing 75% of all studies within this sample. Baptist theology is the predominate faith of the authors (n=4), followed by nondenominational belief (n=1), Adventist (n=1), Presbyterian (n=1), and unidentified religious affiliation (n=1).

The gender of each author contributing to second chair leadership research, generally speaking, was predominately male (n=7), with a lone co-authored piece from two female researchers (n=1) who used second chair leadership as a framework. Second chair leadership literature is written from a Western perspective, whereas the total number of authors in this sample hail from the United States of America (n=7). There is, however, one author (n=1) whose country-of-origin is South Korea, a departure from the overwhelmingly American emphasis. This figure, the cultural perspective of each author, is also characteristic of their ethnicity. As captured in this systematic sample, Caucasian (n=7) and East Asian (n=1).

The Methodologies of Second Chair Leadership Inquiry

Contained within this sample, there are a variety of research methodologies used to investigate second chair leadership. There is a no one methodology favored in second chair leadership research. Thus, this section will review the selection of methodologies used by researchers and contributors to the second chair literature sampled in this study.

Qualitative analysis, through the use of the semi-structured interview format, is the methodology of choice for two studies. Bonem and Patterson's (2005) seminal work on second chair leadership, their research used qualitative semi-structured interviews of 17 associate staff members in faith-based organizations throughout the United States. The resulting study produced a validated framework for second chair leadership described as three apparent paradoxes (to be discussed in the key research themes section and dissected in the following chapter). Griffin (2009) also took advantage of a semi-structured interview format, using the snowballing technique for participant selection, in his qualitative study that explores the qualities of second chair leaders. Griffin's (2009) study analyzes the interview data from 25 participants who self-identify as second chair leaders within an ecumenical context.

In this systematic review, second chair leadership research was also found to feature two thoughtfully written autoethnographic contributions. McCullar (2009) describes his unique experience of fulfilling numerous subordinated roles within the clergy to highlight the often misunderstood position of being a second chair leader. Aside from McCullar's (2009) self-reflection, he also provides insightful, albeit anecdotal, analysis of the tensions associated with this type of leadership. Similarly, Wiley (2009) also provides a reflective piece that highlights personal experience in his career that spans both ecumenical and post-secondary education contexts. Both ethnographical pieces extensively rely on Bonem and Patterson's (2005) original work to contextualize and make sense of their own personal experiences in fulfilling second chair leader roles.

In Patterson's (2006) doctoral thesis, the research program is primarily concerned with the development of a training manual/study guide. Considering that the nature of some Doctor of Ministry theses favour project-based work than the authorship of original research, Patterson (2006) takes advantage of the opportunity to "make use of this [dissertation] material to write an accompanying resource to *Leading from the Second Chair: Serving Your Church Fulfilling Your Role, and Realizing Your Dreams*" (Patterson, 2006: 125). Thus, Patterson (2006) writes extensively on the practical application of second chair leadership in principles and best practices. There is a pre/post workshop program included in one of several appendices. This is not a part of Patterson's research project, but rather written for practitioners to use in training programs. The questionnaire (survey) is employed to gauge the feelings of both first chair and second chair leaders. Questions from the workshop survey are primarily based on elements within the second chair leadership framework espoused by Bonem and Patterson (2005).

The remaining three studies in this sample are rooted in a quantitatively-based approach to second chair leadership research with surveys as the key data collection method. Chai (2010) investigates the dimensions of followership in relation to ecumenical leaders in the context of the Korean American church; five congregations were selected whose local constituencies exceeded 300 individuals. From this population, 684 surveys collected. In his quantitative study, Chai (2010) uses the Followership Questionnaire, developed by Kelley (1992), to measure followership behaviours and styles. In his quantitative study on the experience of executive pastors, the typical hierarchical position of second chair leadership within a religious organization, Powell (2009) investigates the incidence of administrative and managerial competency within his sample of clergy and, then, measures of ministry satisfaction are sampled. With data from 222 respondents, and correlational testing, competencies are categorized and an executive pastor profile is derived from a synthesis of survey responses. The work of D'Angelo and Epstein (2014) uses second chair leadership, as posited by Bonem and Patterson (2005), as a guiding framework to study peer mentor relationships within a post-secondary education context. The study involves the pre/post survey inquiry of a formal peer mentoring research program in an undergraduate business course at Drexel University's LeBow College of Business. Covey's (1992) four leadership roles – model, align, path-find, and empower – were used to aid the 360-degree evaluation in an effort to uncover leadership development within mentoring relationships.

Key Research Themes

This systematic review study has revealed several key research themes that will be further discussed and synthesized in the next chapter. It is important to note that some of the studies and literature within this sample also contain more than one area of focus, blending multiple topics of interest to inform what has been written about and on second chair leadership. An overall count and description of each theme is as follows: (a) subordination – the first paradox in the second chair leadership framework that uses themes of position, servitude, and followership (n=6); (b) deep-wide – the second paradox in the framework that discusses effectiveness as being an important orientation in leading an organization strategically (n=6); (c) contentment-dreaming – the third paradox described in the second chair leadership framework that emphasizes leadership influence (n=5); (d) calling – spiritual connect between God and servant-led leadership orientation (n=4) ; (e) the relationship between first and second chair – the unique bond between first and second chair leaders with subthemes of trust, honesty, and peer mentorship (n=5).

Table 2 – Overview of Key Research Themes

Result themes	Description	References
Subordination	First paradox that highlights three subthemes: Position, servitude, and followership	(Bonem & Patterson, 2005); (Chai, 2010); (Griffin, 2009); (McCullar, 2009); (Patterson, 2006); (Wiley, 2009).
Deep-wide	Second paradox that discusses leadership effectiveness as being a crucial orientation in leading an organization strategically as second chair.	(Bonem & Patterson, 2005); (Chai, 2010); (Griffin, 2009); (Powell, 2009); (McCullar, 2009); (Wiley, 2009).
Contentment-dreaming	An emphasis on leadership influence within the organization	(Bonem & Patterson, 2005); (Chai, 2010); (Griffin, 2009); (Patterson, 2006); (Wiley, 2009).
Calling	The spiritual connection between God and servant-led leadership of the second chair	(Bonem and Patterson, 2005); (Griffin, 2009); (McCullar, 2009); (Patterson, 2006).
Relationship	The unique interpersonal relationship shared between the first and second chair that highlights subthemes of trust, honesty and integrity, and principles of mentorship.	(Bonem & Patterson, 2005); (D'Angelo & Epstein, 2014); (Griffin, 2009); (Patterson, 2006); (Wiley, 2009)

Summary

In summary, this first study chronicled the results of a quasi-systematic literature review of second chair leadership. In total, eight unique pieces of work were identified through the database search process. A definition of the theory was produced as a synthesis of findings to answer the first research question. Next, a review of the many contexts in which the existing research on second chair leadership was organized. This study also found that there are multiple qualitative and quantitative methodologies used by studies of second chair literature. These findings provide substantial evidence to satisfy my first research question of the theory's definition and meaning. As this review also demonstrates, there are several key research themes that emerge from the literature. In the next chapter, in Study 2, I will focus on synthesizing the key themes of second chair leadership as presented in this chapter and seek to examine the theory using the tenets of existing, validated leadership theories.

Chapter 5 – Study 2: Examining Second Chair Leadership: A Synthesis of Themes

Introduction

This chapter features the second study of this research project; it endeavours to respond to the remaining two research questions regarding the theoretical claim of second chair leadership by examining the elements of the theory's key research themes and comparing findings with validated leadership theories. I will begin by investigating the merits of the three paradoxes of second chair leaders as posited by Bonem and Patterson (2005). Then I will deconstruct and synthesize two of the remaining themes: the calling of second chair leadership and the relationship between the first and second chair. In synthesizing the results, I will seek to delineate key differences between the elements of second chair leadership and current theoretical frameworks of leadership. This exercise will aid in the final determination of whether second chair leadership constitutes a new leadership paradigm.

Results

In this synthesis study, I begin by organizing the results of the key research themes uncovered by the systematic literature review study in the previous chapter. To assess the originality of second chair leadership, I examine each key theme. Each research theme is dissected into manageable topics that are then synthesized using the components of existing theoretical leadership frameworks (as introduced in chapter two of this research project). The results of this second study yield a clear and concise outcome: second chair leadership is found to use multiple components of existing leadership theories to explain an ecumenical framework.

Table 3 – Synthesis of Second Chair Leadership with Existing Theories

Result themes	Connections with Existing Leadership Theories	References
Subordination	1. Subordinated position = Effective leadership 2. Submission = Servant leadership (influence character trait), Service = Servant leadership (service character trait), Thankfulness = Servant leadership (appreciation of others character trait) 3. Loyal follower = Followership (faithful work trait of followers)	(Bonem & Patterson, 2005); (Chai, 2010); (Griffin, 2009); (McCullar, 2009); (Patterson, 2006); (Wiley, 2009).
Deep-wide	1. Strategic thinking/orientation = Transformational leadership (intellectual stimulation) 2. Relationship/coalition of support building = Transformational leadership (idealized influence) 3. Creating a stimulating work environment = Transformational leadership (intellectual stimulation)	(Bonem & Patterson, 2005); (Chai, 2010); (Griffin, 2009); (Powell, 2009); (McCullar, 2009); (Wiley, 2009).
Contentment-dreaming	1. "Primary vision implementer" = Transformational leadership (idealized influence) 2. Need for spiritual growth = Servant leadership (spiritual growth character trait)	(Bonem & Patterson, 2005); (Chai, 2010); (Griffin, 2009); (Patterson, 2006); (Wiley, 2009).

Calling	1. Calling to serve others = Servant leadership (calling trait); Spiritual leadership (making a difference and realizing meaning in work)	(Bonem and Patterson, 2005); (Griffin, 2009); (McCullar, 2009); (Patterson, 2006).
Relationship	1. Mutual trust = Ethical leadership (character virtue) 2. Honesty and integrity = Transformational leadership (behavioural integrity); Ethical leadership (trait in virtue ethics); Spiritual leadership (component of intrinsic rewards based on altruistic love) 3. Mentorship = Leader-Member Exchange (in-group relations and mentoring functions); Transformational leadership (inspirational motivation)	(Bonem & Patterson, 2005); (D'Angelo & Epstein, 2014); (Griffin, 2009); (Patterson, 2006); (Wiley, 2009)

The First Paradox: Subordination

> The subordinate-leader paradox is challenging to successfully balance because it is relationally intensive and partially dependent on another person: your first chair. It deals with how you as a leader are interfacing with and following the lead of your senior leader. Some first chairs are a pleasure to work with, and some are not. Some are concerned about the personal lives and careers of their subordinates, and others seem detached or self-absorbed. Some give their second chairs ample room to lead while others are much more controlling. At the end of the day, the second chair can do little to change the first chair. A second chair leader's most valuable tool for promoting change is his or her own attitudes and actions. (Bonem & Patterson, 2005: 25)

In unpacking the meaning of leading from the position of second chair, Bonem and Patterson (2005: 30) raise subordination as an orientation of positional authority: "Subordination is recognizing and accepting that you are not the lead leader. It is acknowledging that you do not have the final authority; nor do you have the ultimate responsibility." Leadership, being thematic of an influential social dynamic between a leader and his/her followers, is a central argument of 'effective leadership.' Yukl (1999) describes leadership processes at the dyadic level such that the interaction between a leader and at least one individual follower is observed through an organizational structure lens. In an effort to gain a more thorough understanding of the subordinate dyad between the first and second chair, the design of effective organizational processes as posited by Hunt (1991) resembles the consideration of structure in second chair leadership. In this context, the first chair embodies the transformation process of ***effective leadership*** (i.e. designing an appropriate organization structure, determining authority relationships, and co-ordinating operations) while the second chair is subordinate to the actions of this type of leadership paradigm.

Service to the first chair and organization is typical of second chair leadership. This notion of servitude is first discussed as being central to the theological foundation of fulfilling second chair leadership:

> In the economy of Scripture there are guidelines for effectively serving and leading while under the authority of another. These guidelines and principles have at their foundation an understanding that God is the source of ultimate authority. Being the source of authority, God then grants authority to various leaders to accomplish His purpose. God often then provides these leaders with subordinates who are to serve under their authority and who are to lead out in various capacities to fulfill God's purpose. (Patterson, 2006: 15).

In somewhat of a similar fashion, Spears (1996: 33) describes ***servant leadership*** as "increased service to others; a holistic approach to work; promoting a sense of community; and the sharing of power in decision making." Given the religious tones that are foundational to second chair leadership, the promotion of service to a charitable cause (i.e. benefit of first chair and the organization) appears to closely tie with the servant leadership model: commitment to growth of others as highlighted in Spears's (1995) work on delineating the servant framework. This type of growth, as proposed by Spears (1995), is mainly focused on personal and professional realms; however, unlike other leadership paradigms, an emphasis on spiritual growth is also discussed in this model.

In another apparent link to servant leadership are four key attitudes as posited by Bonem and Patterson (2005): submission, service, thankfulness, and passion. Russell and Stone (2002), in their pursuit to further develop the servant leadership characteristic model as originally espoused by Spears (1995) and notably extended by Page and Wong (2000), blend character traits in a model. A list of 20 distinct characteristics derived from servant leadership literature is formulated to a support a set of nine attribute categories (vision, honesty, integrity, trust, service, modeling, pioneering, appreciation of others, and empowerment) and eleven supporting traits (communication, credibility, competence, stewardship, visibility, influence, persuasion, listening, encouragement, teaching, and delegation). One can reasonably draw a parallel between the four attitudes of second chair leadership and Russel and Stone's (2002) character model of servant leaders. For instance, submission is easily a derived characteristic of influence. Interestingly, service is featured in both character models. Second chair leadership's 'thankfulness' closely corresponds to Russel and Stone's (2002) 'appreciation of others' trait.

The theoretical framework of ***followership*** is loosely evident in the literature of second chair leadership. An organization has second chair leaders and these individuals, along with their status in leadership, are followers (Chai, 2010). Bonem and Patterson (2005: 33) paint a picture of the followership of a second chair:

> A second chair leader who is subordinate is still highly involved in the leadership process; he or she is not a doormat and does not listen to the first chair with a resigned, whatever-you-say attitude. The second chair is vocal in expressing ideas for improving his or her ministry and wants to fully use his or her spiritual gifts. Being deeply involved and not being insubordinate, even in disagreement, is the tension of the role.

The second chair leadership literature often highlights the careful balance between being a follower and leader. In an ethnographical piece, Wiley (2009: 12) describes his experience of balancing both conflicting roles by grounding himself as a faithful and loyal follower:

> The first paradox is the need to simultaneously be a bold initiator and a faithful follower. In my administrative assistant job, for example, my leader expected me to act with some autonomy, leading out in the projects and processes that were the stuff of my job. She gave me the conditional authority to take charge of my work. At the same time, I had to be ready to take direction from her. Sometimes she came to me with a project that pre-empted "my" project. At such a moment I had to trust her and choose to faithfully work for the good of the department and the people that we served. As a loyal follower, I gave her all the material and emotional support I could.

This style of followership, such that the close working relationship between the first and second chair be founded on organizational outcomes, is typical of Dvir and Shamir's (2003) work. In their longitudinal study investigating follower characteristics as a predictor of transformational leadership, Dvir and Shamir (2003) discovered a follower's contribution to the leadership process as being representative of an interactive social dynamic. The followership of a second chair leader is predicated on the collegial relationship of his/her first chair as demonstrated by

Wiley's (2009) as a 'loyal follower.' This example of second chair leadership is an example of what Uhl-Bien and Ospina (2012) concluded, that followership theory encourages subordinated follower behaviours in support of a leadership context (i.e. the 'faithful worker' as a 'loyal follower' in leading from the second chair).

The Second Paradox: Deep-wide

> Second chair leaders live in the deep-wide paradox every day. They have no choice. Their role requires them to see the big picture and make decisions that affect the entire organization. It frequently requires them to delve into the details to solve a problem in some part of the organization, or to launch a new ministry. They move from a strategic planning meeting to analysis of why one department is over budget, from a discussion about the church's spiritual maturity to recruiting additional small-group leaders. If a first chair is not well verse in the details, it is excused because he or she is the "visionary leader," a big-picture person. But if a second chair misses either end of the deep-wide continuum, the person's performance might be considered "in need of improvement. (Bonem & Patterson, 2005: 67)

As a part of an ongoing discussion of what it means to lead from the second chair, the act of adding value throughout the organization becomes the second paradoxical tenet of the theory. In this paradox, a second chair leader must be versed in the minute details, yet confident to visualize the big picture of an organization (Wiley, 2009). Bonem and Patterson (2005) first introduce the concept of deep-wide as a way to contribute to leading an organization effectively.

Gaining a comprehensive perspective of the nuances and complexities of an organization is said to be a key challenge: "If you want to be a deep-and-wide leader, you have to begin by developing an ability to see your organization from both deep and wide perspectives" (Bonem & Patterson, 2005: 72). Perspective, then, begins by developing insights into an organization by which the second chair paradigm is evident, and cultivated through Senge's (1990: 68-69) systems thinking approach: "It [systems thinking] is a framework for seeing interrelationships rather than things, for seeing patterns of change rather than static ‘snapshots.’…Today, systems thinking is needed more than ever because we are becoming overwhelmed by complexity.” From this orientation toward an executive-level view of organizational leadership, it appears as though second chair leadership borrows this element of system (strategic) thinking as an expression of effective leadership. This proposition of leader style is also deeply situated in the intellectual stimulation aspect of ***transformational leadership*** (Bass, 1985). Here, second chair leaders are catalysts for unorthodox thinking within their organization and subtly tasked with transformative synthesis of understanding in organizational life.

Transformational conceptions of leadership become more obvious in the relationship building process of the deep-wide paradox of second chair leadership. Powell (2009) writes of the importance of building relationships within an ecumenical context since the function of second chair leadership is partly responsible for navigating a complex matrix of organizational relationships. This could also be seen as a borrowed theme of Kotter’s (2012) building a guiding coalition strategy in organizational change. Bonem and Patterson (2005: 91) further this notion of building relationships by borrowing principles of idealized influence in an appeal to foster a sense of mission and purpose:

> A second chair who leads a team also has a role when it comes to relationships among the team members. It is essential to treat team members with respect. When you as leader are trying to establish a real team, this meanings allowing dissent. It means allowing time for everyone to contribute ideas, and valuing those contributions. You are not just a team member; you are a person with disproportionate influence over the group’s direction and decisions. How you use that influence sends important signals of respect, or lack thereof, to the rest of the team.

In a call-to-action piece from Bonem and Patterson (2005: 100), becoming a vision amplifier is said to be one of four practices that are found within the deep-wide paradox: "The first chair is the primary vision caster in the organization, but a second chair leader has many opportunities to repeat, clarify, and reinforce the vision." Griffin (2009) discovered through his research that second chair leaders are visionary leaders that support and seek to tirelessly implement the vision with the help of followers. In his/her role as an advocate for the leader's vision, the second chair is typical of inspirational motivation in transformational leadership that rallies followers to achieve more than what is believed possible (Hater & Bass, 1988).

Fostering a stimulating environment is said to be the catalyst for a deep-wide orientation within second chair leadership as well (Bonem & Patterson, 2005; Powell, 2009). "Give them [second chair leaders] the freedom and variety to accomplish more than what their official job requires. In doing so, you encourage them and will see the performance of your organization improve" (Bonem & Patterson, 2005: 114). Lawson (2000) also affirms this notion of intellectual engagement as a norm in this leadership type. Satisfying higher-level needs (i.e. self-actualization) embodies a construction of value to the organization, typical of the deep-wide paradox, through associating challenging tasks to the overall mission of the organization.

The intentional creation of a stimulating environment, within a leader and follower dynamic, pays homage to Burn's (1985) ***transformational leadership*** theory, and specifically, intellectual stimulation. Challenging work assignments, as advocated in second chair leadership by Bonem and Patterson (2005) and Lawson (2000), provide an opportunity for the individual to embark in a journey of cognitive development. Bonem and Patterson (2005: 114) counsel first chair leaders to allow their second chair "find specific ways of helping with new opportunities." Similarly contrasted, Bass, Waldman, Avolio, and Bebb (1987: 75) posit that this type of work dynamic "involves the intellectual stimulation of subordinates' ideas and values. Through intellectual stimulation, transforming leaders help subordinates think about old problems in new ways." Thus, the second chair leadership theory, in the deep-wide paradox, closely resembles the workings of transformational leadership to implement vision, refine organizational effectiveness, and construct a stimulating work environment.

The Third Paradox: Contentment-dreaming

> The third paradox, contentment-dreaming, reaches deep down inside each of us. It stirs up a restless tension in our souls. It makes us wonder if it is possible to dream great dreams and be content at the same time. Some people escape from this tension by running to one end of the paradox or the other. One person might be pushed beyond contentment to complacency, thinking that dreams are only for dreamers or first chair leaders who can control their future. Another person is wound tighter than a spring, intent on seeing her dreams realized now! Yet another tries to mentally escape from his current reality, spending all of his time dreaming about the future rather than dealing in the present. Effective second chairs understand and live with the tension of contentment-dreaming. They know they must avoid these traps. Rather than crumpling in the tension, they let it drive them toward God, toward a determination to capture the impossible dreams that He has given them for their own lives and their ministry. (Bonem & Patterson, 2005: 116)

As is the case with the initial framework for second chair leadership, the third paradox of contentment-dreaming is described as a "tension." This tension is more pronounced than the previous two paradoxes as it delves into the circumstance of leading by obediently serving the vision of another (in this case, the organization's first chair leader). Bonem and Patterson (2005: 119) uncover the individual approach of finding comfort in being subordinate: “Some, because of their circumstances and temperament, found contentment more easily than others. Some struggled with it because of the lofty dreams God put in their hearts. Some had a season when the realization of their dreams brought great satisfaction.” This sentiment closely resembles the concept of creative tension as posited in *The Fifth Discipline* by Senge (1990: 150):

> We are acutely aware of the gaps between our vision and reality… These gaps can make a vision seem unrealistic or fanciful. They can discourage us or make us feel hopeless. But the gap between vision and current reality is also a source of energy. If there was no gap, there would be no need for any action to move toward the vision. Indeed, the gap is *the* source of creative energy. We call this gap *creative tension*.

The essence of this tension is the reality of leading from the second chair, a place of subordination, yet remaining inspired to dream for an ideal personal and organizational future. The second chair leader, then, dreams of leading in his/her own right but must live in the present through the influence of occupying a senior level within an organization.

Bonem and Patterson (2005) discuss the positional authority needed for effective second chair leadership; both authors argue that influence is a commodity earned over a period of time and is an appropriate mechanism for impacting an organization. “Second chairs may have deeper influence in certain areas, but it takes longer for them to build broad organizational influence… Influence is the most important leadership building block in a second chair’s toolkit” (Bonem & Patterson, 2005: 13). If content in the present dynamic, the second chair leader is able to blend his/her positional authority and influence to realize their own dreams: “In most settings, you can do more than daydream… If the organizational vision is road and the boundary lines defining your responsibilities are clear, this creates a space in which you can take initiative" (Bonem & Patterson, 2005: 147). Griffin (2009) also discussed influence as being key to productive contentment as a second chair leader.

Contentment can also be realized in working towards garnering influence for positive change within the organization. Griffin (2009: 28) referred to the second chair leader as a "primary vision implementer" whereas responsibilities in his/her senior capacity is to "surround the success or failure of the vision. They handle it, reflect on it, recast it, and make decisions based on it." From this executive-level influence, second chair leadership borrows Burn's (1985) idealized influence theme in ***transformational leadership*** theory. Tasked with implementing the vision, the second chair leader is said to move people toward an idealized future through the mechanism of influence (Bonem & Patterson, 2005; Griffin, 2009; Wiley, 2009). In this context, contentment in being second chair and supportive of the grand vision can be viewed as typical of an organization's transformation, and thus, transformational leadership.

In discussing the varied sources of contentment, Lawson (2000) recognizes the need for spiritual growth as being central for second chair leaders to find fulfillment. In his study of associate staff members within an ecumenical context, Lawson (2000: 72) noted: "Of all the advice on how to thrive offered by veteran associate staff members in this study to those just beginning, the most frequently mentioned was taking time to nurture and maintain personal spiritual vitality." In a similar vein, Bonem and Patterson (2005: 131) exhort: "The very demands of ministry can squeeze the spiritual vitality out of the leader's life. Regardless of where you serve, allow time for the Spirit to sustain and strengthen your soul." Spiritual growth is found within the ***servant leadership*** model as one-character trait, among many, to comprise the essence of its theoretical foundation (Laub, 1999; Wicks, 2002). Spears (1998) included spiritual growth as a component of servant leadership's conceptual application in varied contexts. Thus, from this analysis, contentment-dreaming relies on the idealized influence aspect of ***transformational leadership***, as the second chair leader is said to be the "primary vision implementer." Also, this third tension is also typical of the spiritual growth character trait in ***servant leadership*** since second chair leaders recognize their personal need for spiritual growth.

A Second Chair's Calling

Spirituality in the workplace has seen a surge of interest in the academy (Oswick, 2009). The recent fascination with the blending of spirituality and the workplace can be partially explained by the growing importance of organizations as the dominant social institution (Kin, Biberman, Robins, & Nicol, 2007). In their scientific pursuit of understanding workplace spirituality, Giacalone and Jurkiewicz (2003: 13) defined workplace spirituality as: "A framework of organizational values evidenced in the culture that promotes employees' experience of transcendence through the work process, facilitating their sense of being connected in a way that provides feelings of compassion and joy." This intersection of spirituality in domains of work and recently, leadership, has created awareness of the incorporation of spiritual values in work: "Business owners, managers, policymakers, and academic researchers all need to remember, as many surveys indicate, that tens of millions of world citizens are hungering for transmaterial, mind-expanding, soul-enriching, and heart-centred (spiritual) values” (Butts, 1999: 329). Thus, it is within the context of a spiritual belief in a higher calling that second chair leadership can be considered from that perspective.

In a discussion on the biblical standard to be a subordinate leader-type, Bonem and Patterson (2005: 30) describe a spiritual connection with God in terms of a calling to fulfill second chair leadership:

> If you live and lead according to the biblical standard, you honor God, strengthen your congregation [organization], and more ably serve those whom God has placed in the lead position [in His church]. Whether God is ultimately preparing you for a first chair role or a lifetime of service in the second chair, you are much better equipped for the future because of your growth as a faithful disciple.

Though callings do not necessarily denote religious meaning, in the case of second chair leadership, it is often a life conversion that embraces a Christian belief. Griffin (2009) provides greater context to this discussion since calling was discovered to be an emergent theme of his research on vision building as a second chair leader. From the study’s 25 participants, eleven spoke of calling to be uniquely represented by the second chair. In explaining the sense of calling, one participant in particular referenced his transition into the role of a second chair as a conversion experience: “[Before], I was achieving a sense of fulfillment serving Christ as a volunteer, whereas now, it’s become my life’s work. The difference between coming [sic] from corporate America to here is we work for a different stockholder” (Griffin, 2009: 79). McCullar (2009: 12) writes of his obedience to a call he felt to fulfill second chair leadership:

> Whether we are called executive pastors, associate pastors, or assistant pastors, our role is rife with issues related to being the Number Two person… My unique experience began in college, where I was prepping for a career in the legal realm. But I felt a distinct calling to vocational ministry, and after several bouts of angst I said yes.

The calling in second chair leadership is found to serve two foci: the position itself; and the first chair as leader of the organization. Lawson (2000) called for research focused on the calling of individuals who spent their entire career in associate staff roles. In this sense, second chair leadership can be a calling but it need not be so in all cases.

Answering a call to leadership is not an claim exclusive to second chair leadership. In fact, the notion of calling is a familiar topic of inquiry in management and leadership discourses. Giacalone and Jurkiewicz (2003: xii), scholars of workplace spirituality, stated: “Leadership begins with something that grabs hold of you and won’t let go.” Describing ***servant leadership*** as a collection of common characteristics, Barbuto and Wheeler (2006: 304-305) directly connect calling with principles of servant leadership such that calling “is fundamental to servant leadership and have operationalized it as a desire to serve and willingness to sacrifice self-interest for the benefit of others.” Fry (2003) placed calling within a ***spiritual framework*** that described it as making a difference and realizing meaning in one’s life. Similarly, Block (1996) noted that a leader’s choice to serve others – servitude – is obeying a call. Thus, given the notable works of scholars in leadership, workplace spirituality, and management that attribute calling as a distinguished characteristic of servant-styled leadership, it can be reasonably concluded that the call of second chair leadership to serve is a borrowed theme from what has been established in the literature.

A Close Relationship between the First and Second Chair

The close working relationship with the first chair of an organization is said to be hallmark of second chair leadership (Bonem & Patterson, 2005; D'Angelo & Epstein, 2014; Griffin, 2009; Patterson, 2006; Wiley, 2009). Cultivating what authors Bonem and Patterson (2005: 35) deem "the right relationship" to be a crucial facet in the existence of such a subordinated leadership paradigm:

> Would you rather be right on the issues, or in right relationship? As you seek to be in right relationship first and foremost, you are more successful in implementing your approach… You cultivate credible and lasting influence with your senior leader. You will influence the organization over the long haul because of the relational seeds you sow. A right relationship opens the doors for success in the second chair.

There are a number of components highlighted in this relationship that are worth a closer examination and synthesis: trust, honesty and integrity, and mentorship.

Among the many characteristics of a capable leader, Patterson (2006) writes that trust between the first and second chair is paramount to navigate the many tensions and challenges of leading from a place of subordination. The importance of trust within this leadership dynamic cannot be understated, and in the literature its significance is emphasized: "It is the foundation for an effective partnership between first and second chair… Reaching a level of complete trust requires faithful service, but more than that it requires patience over a long period of time" (Bonem & Patterson, 2005: 36). This sense of mutual trust creates the foundation of the unique dyad relationship inherent in second chair leadership. Here we begin to see evidence of ***ethical leadership*** theory within this subordinate paradigm. Ethical stewards, those individuals who value “service over self-interest” in organizational outcomes (Block, 1996: 23), develop trust in relationships with followers and, in doing so, help create meaning by discovering the true nature of individuals found in a complex world (Pava, 2003). ***LMX theory*** seemingly provides support of this trust relationship as followers of a leader’s in-group have a high-quality exchange (Dansereau, Graen, & Haga, 1975). A leader demonstrates trust in their followers, provides preferential treatment and in turn, creates an upward virtuous circle of trust, empowerment, and discretion (Gomez & Rosen, 2001). Relationships founded on trust and service are also typical of servant leadership (Tantum, 1995). Greenleaf (1977) argued trust to be central in servant leadership theory since leadership legitimacy begins with a sense of leader trust. From this perspective, servant leadership is said to be both “a product and an antecedent of leader and organizational trust” (Joseph & Winston, 2005: 11).

Bonem and Patterson (2005: 39) provide a discourse on the outcomes of nurturing a right relationship between first and second chair leaders: “Strong trust-based relationships flourish in an environment in which honesty and integrity are valued in making decisions.” Coincidentally, honest/integrity is a widely researched theme in leadership contexts. Brown and Treviño (2006) point out that integrity is a commonality among three empirically tested leadership theories: transformational, ethical, and spiritual leadership. Simons (1999) posited Behavioural Integrity (BI) to be a key component of ***transformational leadership***, and work published by Parry and Proctor-Thomson (2002) demonstrated a positive relationship between integrity and transformational theory. In defining the elements of character in ***ethical***

leadership, Johnson (2015) highlights integrity as playing an important role in virtue ethics. The premise of a leader's moral authority is lived out of honest dealings with others (Simons, 2002; Palanski & Yammarino, 2009). Fry's (2003) model of ***spiritual leadership*** includes a set of intrinsic rewards based on altruistic love, integrity being one of the key aspects of the model. Walumbwa, Avolio, Gardner, Wernsing, and Peterson (2008) discuss behavioural integrity as a leader's internalized moral perspective. Honesty and integrity, as argued by second chair leadership, is thus found to be a common trait among the most widely regarded theoretical leadership frameworks. Thus, these two themes cannot be claimed as being uniquely situated in second chair leadership.

Extending the proposed second chair leadership model as a framework to investigate mentoring relationships, D'Angelo and Epstein (2014) argue the model enables actors within the dynamic to realize a positive outlook and exhibit significant growth in leadership development. Previous leadership research has discussed mentorship in a leadership framework. For instance, Graen and Scandura (1986) suggest ***LMX theory*** to be somewhat functional in explaining the effect of a leader, in this context mentoring a follower in an informal fashion. Thibodeaux and Lowe (1996) uncovered a convergent-like pattern of in-group LMX relations and mentoring functions. Mentorship is also characteristic of transformational leadership. Schein (1978) found transformational leaders to be integral in the creation of and change in organizational culture, accomplished through mentor-like behaviours. Godshalk and Sosik (1998) equate the human development component of mentoring relationships with inspirational motivation.

Summary

This second study was constructed to synthesize the output of a systematic literature review of second chair leadership with current theoretical frameworks of leadership. The tenets of second chair leadership were closely examined; raised as three main tensions of subordinated leadership: subordination, deep-wide, and contentment-dreaming. As reviewed, second chair leadership also includes two remaining research themes of calling and the relationship between first and second chair leaders. In the final chapter, I will provide concluding remarks, research limitations, and a concise overview of future research.

Chapter 6 – Conclusion

Introduction

In this final chapter, I wish to provide a timely conclusion to this research project. I first provide a discussion of findings from each study. Next, I highlight the contributions of my research. The quasi-systematic literature review is the first of its kind to compile the limited works that discuss second chair leadership. My study suggests that second chair leadership does not appear to constitute a new theory. Several research limitations are then discussed, as well as a number of opportunities for further study. To conclude, a brief self-reflection piece discusses my personal interest in leadership, how the research project came to be, and what it means to be subordinate.

Discussion of Study Findings

Study 1: Systematic Review of Second Chair Leadership

The results of study 1 suggests second chair leadership to be a widely discussed leadership framework that is defined using similar terms. The first question of this research project sought to unravel the meanings of this subordinated leadership theory and discover how second chair leadership is being defined. It was found that the majority of authors use Bonem and Patterson's (2005) foundational work to help make sense of second chair leadership in theory and practice. Thus, this study does not provide a conclusive model or definition that is different from existing leadership theories; it does, however, provide a survey of the multiple variations of its original definition to further our understanding. As was also discovered, second chair leadership is also rooted in several contexts. That said, given the diverse contexts found in existing literature, the framework can be widely applicable in a variety of flexible settings outside of its original meaning.

Study 2: Examining Second Chair Leadership:

A Synthesis of Research Theme Findings

The purpose of the second study was to closely examine and synthesize the key research themes that comprise the proposed second chair leadership theory. To answer the second research question, in respect to determining whether second chair leadership truly embodies a new theory, I dissected each of the three tensions as originally posited by Bonem and Patterson (2005) as well two other independent themes discovered in previous research. Through a synthesis of the second chair leadership literature that sought to compare and contrast the output of the first study's systematic review with the core tenets of existing leadership theories, I was able to establish numerous connections between each major theoretical construct. I can assert that second chair leadership, as a theory, borrows many components of existing leadership theories, namely from the transformational and servant leader models. From the final analysis, the idea of leading from the second chair appears to be a repackaging of transformational and servant leadership theories where the subordinate leader is called to serve an altruistic purpose through leveraging influence with the first chair and followers. That said, I do not mean to disparage the attempt by Bonem and Patterson (2005) to explain a unique position and relationship within an ecumenical organizational dynamic. In this case, the key difference between second chair leadership and current theoretical frameworks is that leading from the second chair involves a nuanced view of leadership suggesting that one is only able to truly lead from a place of subordination.

Contributions of this Research Project

This research sought to qualify the contributions to the literature regarding second chair leadership. I used the technique of a systematic literature review to undertake an exhaustive database search to provide a study that compiles what has been published about the topic to date. I began by highlighting what was observed to be a convergence of meanings that contributes to a unified definition. Then, I dissected the central components of second chair leadership to examine its merit as a new theory. Those who subscribe to the second chair leadership will be able to glean from the review and make their own determination on the available evidence.

Theoretical Contributions

This research project is the first systematic literature review and synthesis that compiles published works that discuss second chair leadership as a theory. The by-product of this labour is an auditable compilation of literature that could aid in the research process of future studies since the data is readily duplicable. Both studies in this research project enhance understanding of the meaning of second chair leadership, and illustrate the many contexts and research foci of the concept. Through a close examination of the concept's tenets, this research project provided a respectful yet thorough analysis that determined second chair leadership to be a combination of existing, empirically tested theories.

This research demonstrates the need to consider religious, spiritual, and ecumenical approaches as a lens through which to observe management and leadership research. The few publications that focus on second chair leadership as a theory are difficult to access and, as a result, strictly limit the potential impact of this emergent concept. As is the case in religious and spiritual texts, there are a limited selection of media to publish manuscripts. This research, however, provides exposure, by way of proxy, to authors on the topic and their findings. Future researchers are better equipped to thematically map out the existing body of second chair leadership literature.

Lastly, I have also sought to remain involved in the research process with careful consideration given to discouraging the perpetuation of preconceived mental frames through a tradition of examination. This contributes to the nuanced approach in systematically reviewing scholarly literature. That said, personal involvement in the research process can add a rich perspective that is not fully realized in a method that values a scientific approach to an intimately individual topic such as leadership.

Practical Contributions

It is my desire that those with an interest in leadership are able to leverage the themes of second chair leadership, uncovered in this research project, to better prepare for the challenges that wait in positions of leadership. Organizational leaders are now able to better understand the concept and meaning of subordinate leadership. They are better informed of its themes; how to lead in a senior position within an organization other than *the* first chair. Understanding, now, that leading from the second chair is not an unfamiliar concept, but rather a combination of well-known leadership theories, consultants and practitioners can equip organizations with this servant-like model. It also contributes to the debate regarding efficacy of leadership training. Leading from the second chair is thematic of mentor-protégé behaviours, which is both empowering and motivational.

Research Limitations

While this research project provides a thorough examination of second chair leadership studies conducted to date, there are a number of inherent research limitations that must be addressed. First, potential limitations involved in the database search process presented a unique challenge. Although I carefully endeavored to conduct a database review in a disciplined manner, the search process was limited to indexed journals, dissertations, and works that were made available through the author’s university library system. This also included a regional library and interlibrary loan service that delivered materials from a network of participating university institutions. Specifically, the libraries of the Atlantic School of Theology and Acadia University provided a number of resources due to the often religious nature of the topic. As a result of this expansive search, both physical and digital copies of articles and dissertations were retrieved for the purposes of this project. Results were refined to only include the English language. Thus, this project did not include peer-reviewed journal articles, dissertations, and other scholarly work published in a language other than English.

Given the limited landscape of existing research featuring second chair leadership as the subject of study, a significant portion of the synthesis and by extension, discourse, focused on the concept’s seminal work by Bonem and Patterson (2005). As a researcher, I had to consciously take care not to perpetuate inherent assumptions and biases. It is my hope that, throughout this research project, I have remained actively engaged in the thematic analysis while cognizant of authors' ideas; I was reluctant to forsake my personal involvement within the research process.

In subsequent inquiries interested in second chair leadership, I require additional training is needed on how to assess the quality of qualitative and quantitative research methodologies in leadership and management publications. Given the rich diversity of qualitative research methods used, researchers conducting a systematic review must be intimately familiar with the numerous qualitative data collection methods, techniques, and strategies. These concerns, raised as limitations, present an opportunity as a basis for future research.

Future Research

From this research project we now more fully understand the underpinnings of second chair leadership: the concept being a combination of varied leadership frameworks. However, what is not known is how subordinate leaders would respond to this reality and how they would make sense of their identity in a second chair position given second chair leadership's lack of grounded theoretical claims.

Scholars have argued that the complexity of leadership research necessitates movement away from positivism to the use of more unconventional methods (Alvesson & Sveningsson, 2003; Hunter, Bedell-Avers, & Mumford, 2007). This research project has been firmly grounded in a positivist tradition in that the findings of both studies were systematically constructed, measured, and observed. Examining this concept from a critical perspective could also be of interest since the leadership domain is populated with positivist, scientific studies that can discount the human experience.

We also need to investigate the natural progression of leadership, in terms of succession. Can someone who personally identifies with the principles of second chair leadership truly lead if/when called upon as a first chair? How do first chair leaders, having once fulfilled the function of a supportive second chair, lead with a sense of independence? Do first chair leaders, especially those who have previously served as second chair leaders, lead change initiatives within their organization differently than their first chair leader/mentor? Lastly, it would be interesting to study the opinions, feelings, and actions of those who consider themselves a follower within the first-second chair leadership dynamic. Specifically, how does a negative relationship dynamic between the first and second chair affect morale, culture, and organizational outcomes?

Concluding Reflections

This research project was born out of a particular interest in leadership. From since a young age, I have been enthralled by the influence and power welded by world leaders in politics, business, and faith. As I have matured, I have been afforded opportunities to observe the actions of leaders, especially those with whom I have worked closely. I have since learned that the act of leading is captured in everyday challenges and not just at pivotal watershed moments. For all of my professional life, I have had the privilege of fulfilling key support roles to senior leaders. My work as a subordinate leader has refined my worldview in a more meaningful way. In what I believed to be detrimental to organizations, little has been written about the leader-types who carry nearly as much influence as the leader but without similar privileges of power.

In discovering the concept of second chair leadership, as assembled by Bonem and Patterson (2005), I curiously began to consider my own experiences as a subordinate leader. This season of self-reflection morphed into an inquiry: What does leading from the second chair look like? In answering this question, I quickly discovered the deafening absence of any significant scholarly publication that addresses this type of "leadership." From this literature gap came an opportunity to qualify what has been written about the topic and then examine the merit of its authenticity. I have studied this phenomenon and can conclude that, ironically, as it currently exists, second chair leadership is an expression of subordination that attempts to capture the second-in-command notion. It is constructed using multiple existing theoretical themes. Uninspiring? Absolutely not. We are, as partakers in the human condition, all followers of something and/or someone. To lead from the second chair is to be human; for even the most senior leader is subordinate to a much higher power.

References

Adebayo, D. O., & Udegbe, I. B. (2004). Gender in the boss–subordinate relationship: A Nigerian study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 25*(4), 515-525.

Alvesson, M., & Sveningsson, S. (2003). Managers doing leadership: The extra-ordinarization of the mundane. *Human Relations, 56*(12), 1435-1459.

Avolio, B. J., Sosik, J. J., Jung, D. I., & Berson, Y. (2003). Leadership models, methods, and applications: Small steps and giant leaps. In W.C. Borman, R. Klimoski, D.R. Ilgen, & B. Weiner (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology* (Vol. 12, pp. 277–307). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Weber, T. J. (2009). Leadership: Current theories, research, and future directions. *Annual review of psychology, 60*, 421-449.

Bacharach, S. B. (1989). Organizational theories: Some criteria for evaluation. *Academy of Management Review*, *14*(4), 496-515.

Badaracco, J. (2002). *Leading quietly: An unorthodox guide to doing the right thing*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.

Baker, S. D. (2007). Followership The theoretical foundation of a contemporary construct. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, *14*(1), 50-60.

Barbuto, J. E., & Wheeler, D. W. (2006). Scale development and construct clarification of servant leadership. *Group & Organization Management, 31*(3), 300-326.

Barker, R. A. (1997). How can we train leaders if we do not know what leadership is? *Human Relations, 50*(4), 343-362.

Barling, J., Christie, A., & Hoption, A. (2010). Leadership. In S. Zedeck et al. (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 183-240). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

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

Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass & Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: The Free Press.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Bass, B. M., & Bass, R. (2008). *The Bass handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications* (4th ed.). New York, NY: The Free Press.

Bass, B. M., & Riggo, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bass, B. M., Waldman, D. A., Avolio, B. J., & Bebb, M. (1987). Transformational leadership and the falling dominoes effect. *Group & Organization Management*, *12*(1), 73-87.

Bennis, W. (2007). The challenges of leadership in the modern world: Introduction to the special issue. *American Psychologist*, *62*(1), 2-5.

Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1985). *The managerial grid III*. Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing.

Bligh, M. C. (2011). Followership and follower-centered approaches. In A. Bryman, D. Collinson, K. Grint, B. Jackson, & M. Uhl-Bien (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of leadership* (pp. 425-436). London, England: Sage.

Block. P. (1996). *Stewardship: Choosing service over self-interest.* San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Boneau, J., & Thompson, G. (2013). Leadership 4.0: It's a brave new approach. *Leadership Excellence*, *30*(1), 6.

Bonem, M., & Patterson, R. (2005). *Leading from the second chair: Serving Your Church Fulfilling Your Role, and Realizing Your Dreams*. San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass.

Bono, J. E., & Judge, T. A. (2004). Personality and transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *89*(5), 901-910.

Brown, M. E., & Treviño, L. K. (2006). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *17*(6), 595-616.

Brown, M. E., Treviño, L. K., & Harrison, D. A. (2005). Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *97*(2), 117-134.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper & Row Publishers.

Butts, D. (1999). Spirituality at work: An overview. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, *12*(4), 328-332.

Carlyle, T. (1869). *Heroes and hero-worship*. London, England: Chapman and Hall.

Carsten, M. K., Uhl-Bien, M., West, B. J., Patera, J. L., & McGregor, R. (2010). Exploring social constructions of followership: A qualitative study. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *21*(3), 543-562.

Chai, D. H. (2011). Leading as followers: A followership study of the Korean congregational leadership of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.). (Doctoral dissertation, Order No. 3458146). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global database.

Ciulla, J. B. (2014). *Ethics, the heart of leadership* (3rd ed.). Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.

Collins, J. C. (2001). *Good to great: Why some companies make the leap... and others don't.* New York, NY: HarperCollins.

Covey, S. R. (1992). *Principle-centered leadership*. New York, NY: Summit.

Daft, R. L. (2015). What does it mean to be a leader? In *The leadership experience* (pp. 3-32). Stamford, CT: Cengage Learning.

D’Angelo, D. C., & Epstein, S. A. (2014). Developing university peer mentors as second chair leaders. *Academy of Business Research Journal*, *3*, 124-135.

Dansereau, F. (1995). A dyadic approach to leadership: Creating and nurturing this approach under fire. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *6*(4), 479-490.

Dansereau, F., Graen, G., & Haga, W. J. (1975). A vertical dyad linkage approach to leadership within formal organizations: A longitudinal investigation of the role making process. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, *13*(1), 46-78.

Davis, J. H., Schoorman, F. D., & Donaldson, L. (1997). Toward a stewardship theory of management. *Academy of Management Review*, *22*(1), 20-47.

Deluga, R. J. (1988). Relationship of transformational and transactional leadership with employee influencing strategies. *Group & Organization Management*, *13*(4), 456-467.

Den Hartog, D. N., House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Ruiz-Quintanilla, S. A., & Dorfman, P. W. (1999). Culture specific and cross-culturally generalizable implicit leadership theories: Are attributes of charismatic/transformational leadership universally endorsed? *The Leadership Quarterly*, *10*(2), 219-256.

DeRue, D. S., & Ashford, S. J. (2010). Who will lead and who will follow? A social process of leadership identity construction in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, *35*(4), 627-647.

Dionne, S. D., Yammarino, F. J., Atwater, L. E., & James, L. R. (2002). Neutralizing substitutes for leadership theory: Leadership effects and common-source bias. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(3), 454-464.

Dvir, T., & Shamir, B. (2003). Follower developmental characteristics as predicting transformational leadership: A longitudinal field study. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *14*(3), 327-344.

Fairhurst, G. T., & Uhl-Bien, M. (2012). Organizational discourse analysis (ODA): Examining leadership as a relational process. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *23*(6), 1043-1062.

Farling, M. L., Stone, A. G., & Winston, B. E. (1999). Servant leadership: Setting the stage for empirical research. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, *6*(1-2), 49-72.

Fiedler, F. E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Education.

Fletcher, D. R. (2004). Case-studies of policy and vision implementation by the executive pastor (Doctoral dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary). Retrieved from http://www.xpastor.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/12/fletcher_xp_dissertation.pdf

Fry, L. W. (2003). Toward a theory of spiritual leadership. *Leadership Quarterly, 14*(6), 693-727.

Garrard, J. (1999). *Health sciences literature review made easy: The matrix method.* Sudbury, MA: Jones and Bartlett Publishers.

Gerstner, C. R., & Day, D. V. (1997). Meta-Analytic review of leader–member exchange theory: Correlates and construct issues. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *82*(6), 827-844.

Giacalone, R. A., & Jurkiewicz, C. L. (2003). *Handbook of workplace spirituality and organizational performance.* Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.

Giacalone, R. A., & Jurkiewicz, C. L. (2003). Toward a science of workplace spirituality. In R. A. Giacalone & C. L. Jurkiewicz (Eds.), *Handbook of* *workplace spirituality and organizational performance* (pp. 3-28). Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.

Godshalk, V. M., & Sosik, J. J. (1998). The role of leadership style and mentoring relationships in influencing follower job-related stress. *Journal of Management Systems*, *10*(1), 15-28.

Gomez, C., & Rosen, B. (2001). The leader-member exchange as a link between managerial trust and employee empowerment. *Group & Organization Management*, *26*(1), 53-69.

Graen, G. B. (2006). In the eye of the beholder: Cross-cultural lesson in leadership from project GLOBE: A response viewed from the third culture bonding (TCB) model of cross-cultural leadership. *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, *20*(4), 95-101.

Graen, G. B., & Scandura, T. A. (1986). A theory of dyadic career reality. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, *4*(1), 147-181.

Graen, G., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain approach. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *6*(2), 219-247.

Greenleaf, R. K. (1970). *The servant as leader*. Indianapolis, IN: The Robert K. Greenleaf Center.

Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. New York, NY: Paulist Press.

Griffin, G. E. (2009). Vision building as a second chair leader for a large congregation (Doctoral dissertation, Order No. 3385085). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global database. (305138658)

Hater, J. J., & Bass, B. M. (1988). Superiors' evaluations and subordinates' perceptions of transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 73*(4), 695-702.

Hemphill, J. K., & Coons, A. E. (1957). Development of the Leader Behaviour Description Questionnaire. In R. M. Stogdill & A. E. Coons (Eds.), *Leader behavior: Its description and measurement* (pp. 49-57). Columbus, OH: Ohio State University.

Hersey, P. & Blanchard, K. H. (1969). *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Hesse, H. (1956). *The journey to the east*. New York, NY: Picador.

House, R. J. (1971). A path goal theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 16*(3), 321-339.

House, R. J., & Aditya, R. N. (1997). The social scientific study of leadership: Quo vadis? *Journal of Management*, *23*(3), 409-473.

Hunt, J. G., & Dodge, G. E. (2001). Leadership déjà vu all over again. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *11*(4), 435-458.

Hunter, S. T., Bedell-Avers, K. E., & Mumford, M. D. (2007). The typical leadership study: Assumptions, implications, and potential remedies. *The Leadership Quarterly, 18*(5), 435-446.

Hurwitz, M., & Hurwitz, S. (2009). The romance of the follower: Part 1. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, *41*(2), 80-86.

James, W. (1880). Great men, great thoughts and their environment. *Atlantic Monthly, 46*(10), 441-459.

Jenkins, W. O. (1947). A review of leadership studies with particular reference to military problems. *Psychological Bulletin*, *44*(1), 54-79.

Jennings, J. (2005). *Think big, act small: how America's best performing companies keep the start-up spirit alive*. New York, NY: Penguin.

Johnson, C. E. (2013). The leader's character. In C. E. Johnson (Ed.), *Meeting the ethical challenges of leadership: Casting light or shadow* (pp. 78-118). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Joseph, E. E., & Winston, B. E. (2005). A correlation of servant leadership, leader trust, and organizational trust. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *26*(1), 6-22.

Kelley, R. E. (1992). *The power of followership: How to create leaders people want to follow and followers who lead themselves*. New York, NY: Doubleday.

Kelley, R. E. (2008). Rethinking followership. In R. Riggio, I. Chaleff, & J. Lipman-Blumen (Eds.), *The art of followership: How great followers create great leaders and organizations* (pp. 5-16). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kerr, S., & Jermier, J. M. (1978). Substitutes for leadership: Their meaning and measurement. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 22*(3), 375-403.

Khurana, R. (2002). *Searching for a corporate savior: The irrational quest for charismatic CEOs*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Kieser, A. (1994). Why organization theory needs historical analyses – and how this should be performed. *Organization Science, 5*(4), 608-620.

King, S., Biberman, J., Robbins, L., & Nicol, D. M. (2007). Integrating spirituality into management education in academia and organizations: Origins, a conceptual framework, and current practices. In J. Biberman & M. D. Whitty (Eds.), *At work: Spirituality matters* (pp. 243-256). Scranton, PA: University of Scranton Press.

Klassen, T. P., Jahad, A. R., & Moher, D. (1998). Guides for reading and interpreting systematic reviews. *Archives of Pediatric & Adolescent Medicine, 157*(7), 700–704.

Kotter, J. P. (2012). *Leading change*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Review Press.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2011). *Credibility: How leaders gain and lose it, why people demand it.* San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.

Laub, J. A. (1999). Assessing the servant organization: Development of the servant organizational leadership assessment (SOLA) instrument (Doctoral dissertation, Order No. 9921922). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (304517144)

Lawson, K. E. (2000). *How to thrive in associate staff ministry.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Lewin, K. (1939). Field theory and experiment in social psychology: Concepts and methods. *American Journal of Sociology, 44*(6), 868-896.

Lewin, K., & Lippett, R. (1938). An experimental approach to the study of autocracy and democracy: A preliminary note. *Sociometry*, *1*(3/4), 292-300.

Lewin, K., Lippett, R., & White, R. K. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created social climates. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 10*(2), 269-299.

Lord, R. G., De Vader, C. L., & Alliger, G. M. (1986). A meta-analysis of the relation between personality traits and leadership perceptions: An application of validity generalization procedures. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *71*(3), 402-410.

Mann, R. D. (1959). A review of the relationships between personality and performance in small groups. *Psychological Bulletin*, *56*(4), 241-270.

McCullar, M. (2009). A chosen chair: the call and gifts of second-chair leadership. *Congregations, 36*(4), 12-14.

Meindl, J. R., Ehrlich, S. B., & Dukerich, J. M. (1985). The romance of leadership. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *30*(1), 78-102.

Mowles, C. (2013, December 5). Leadership is complex and those in charge are not always in control. Retrieved June 30, 2015 from http://www.theguardian.com/sustainable-business/leadership-complex-charge-control

O'Donnell, M., Yukl, G., & Taber, T. (2012). Leader behavior and LMX: A constructive replication. *Journal of Management Psychology, 27*(2), 143-154.

O'Reilly, C. A., & Pfeffer, J. (2000). *Hidden value: How great companies achieve extraordinary results with ordinary people*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.

Oswick, C. (2009). Burgeoning workplace spirituality? A textual analysis of momentum and directions. *Journal of Management, Spirituality & Religion, 6*(1), 15-25.

Page, D., & Wong, T. P. (2000). A conceptual framework for measuring servant leadership. *The human factor in shaping the course of history and development.* Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Palanski, M. E., & Yammarino, F. J. (2009). Integrity and leadership: A multi-level conceptual framework. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *20*(3), 405-420.

Parry, K. W. (1998). Grounded theory and social process: A new direction for leadership research. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *9*(1), 85-105.

Pava, M. (2003). *Leading with meaning: Using covenantal leadership to build a better organization*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Patterson, R. D. (2006). A theological foundation and workshop for subordinate leaders in the local church. (Doctoral dissertation, Order No. 0388686). Retrieved from the ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global database. (304957690).

Pfeffer, J. (2015). *Leadership BS: Fixing workplaces and careers one truth at a time*. New York, NY: Harper Business.

Posner, B. Z., & Schmidt, W. H. (1992). Values and the American manager: An update updated. *California Management Review, 34*(3), 80-94.

Powell, D. (2009). Skilled and satisfied: Research findings regarding executive pastors. *Christian Education Journal, 6*(2), 229-249.

Rost, J. C. (1993). Leadership development in the new millennium. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, *1*(1), 91-110.

Russell, R. F., & Stone, A. G. (2002). A review of servant leadership attributes: Developing a practical model. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *23*(3), 145-157.

Schein, E. H. (1978). *Career dynamics: Matching individual rout organizational needs*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Schermerhorn, J. R., Hunt, J. G., & Osborn, R. N. (2000). *Managing organizational behavior* (7th ed.). New York, NY: Wiley.

Schneider, B. (1987). The people make the place. *Personnel Psychology, 40*(3), 437-453.

Schriesheim, C. A., Castro, S. L., & Cogliser, C. C. (1999). Leader-member exchange (LMX) research: A comprehensive review of theory, measurement, and data-analytic practices. *The Leadership Quarterly, 10*(1), 63-113.

Schriesheim, C. A., & Neider, L. L. (1996). Path-goal leadership theory: The long and winding road. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *7*(3), 317-321.

Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York, NY: Currency Doubleday.

Shamir, B. (2007). From passive recipients to active co-producers: Followers' roles in the leadership process. In B. Shamir, R. Pillai, M. Bligh, & M. Uhl-Bien (Eds.), *Follower-centered perspectives on leadership: A tribute to the memory of James R. Meindl* (pp. ix-xxxix). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishers.

Simons, T. L. (1999). Behavioral integrity as a critical ingredient for transformational leadership. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, *12*(2), 89-104.

Simons, T. L. (2002). Behavioral integrity: The perceived alignment between managers' words and deeds as a research focus. *Organization Science, 13*(1), 18-35.

Smith, B. N., Montagno, R. V., & Kuzmenko, T. N. (2004). Transformational and servant leadership: Content and contextual comparisons. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, *10*(4), 80-91.

Spears, L. C. (1995). *Reflections on leadership: How Robert K. Greenleaf's theory of servant-leadership influenced today's top management thinkers*. New York, NY: John Wiley.

Spears, L. (1996). Reflections on Robert K. Greenleaf and servant-leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *17*(7), 33-35.

Spears, L. C. (1998). *Insights on leadership: Service, stewardship, spirit, and servant leadership*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Stogdill, R. M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature. *The Journal of Psychology*, *25*(1), 35-71.

Sy, T. (2010). What do you think of followers? Examining the content, structure, and consequences of implicit followership theories. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *113*(2), 73-84.

Tannenbaum, R., & Schmidt, W. H. (1958). How to choose a leadership pattern. *Harvard Business Review*, *36*(2), 95-101.

Tatum, J. B. (1995). Meditations on servant-leadership. In L. C. Spears (Ed.), *Reflections on leadership: How Robert K. Greenleaf's theory of servant leadership influenced today's top management thinkers* (pp. 308-312). New York, NY: Wiley.

Thibodeaux, H. F., & Lowe, R. H. (1996). Convergence of leader-member exchange and mentoring: An investigation of social influence patterns. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, *11*(1), 97-114.

Thorpe, R., Holt, R., Pittaway, L.A., & Macpherson, A. (2006). Knowledge within small and medium sized firms: A systematic review of the evidence. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, *7*(4), 257–281.

Treviño, L. K., Brown, M., & Hartman, L. P. (2003). A qualitative investigation of perceived executive ethical leadership: Perceptions from inside and outside the executive suite. *Human Relations*, *56*(1), 5-37.

Treviño, L. K., Hartman, L. P., & Brown, M. (2000). Moral person and moral manager: How executives develop a reputation for ethical leadership. *California Management Review*, *42*(4), 128-142.

Uhl-Bien, M. (2006). Relational leadership theory: Exploring the social processes of leadership and organizing. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *17*(6), 654-676.

Uhl-Bien, M., & Ospina, S. (2012). Paradigm interplay in relational leadership: A way forward. In M. Uhl-Bien & S. Ospina (Eds.), *Advancing relational leadership research: A dialogue among perspectives* (pp. 537-580). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishers.

Uhl-Bien, M., Riggio, R. E., Lowe, K. B., & Carsten, M. K. (2014). Followership theory: A review and research agenda. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *25*(1), 83-104.

Useem, M. (2001). *Leading up: Managing your boss so you both win*. New York, NY: Crown Business.

Van Dierendonck, D. (2011). *Servant leadership: A review and synthesis*. *Journal of Management*, *37*(4), 1228-1261.

Vroom, V. H., & Jago, A. G. (2007). The role of the situation in leadership. *American Psychologist*, *62*(1), 17-24.

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

Weed, M. (2005). "Meta interpretation:" A method for interpretive synthesis of qualitative research. Forum: *Qualitative Social Research (FQS)*, *6*(1), 1–21.

Wicks, J. (2002). Table for six billion please. In L. Spears & M. Lawrence (Eds.), *Focus on leadership: Servant leadership for the 21st century* (pp. 269-283). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Wiley, K. (2009). Playing second trombone. *The Journal of Applied Christian Leadership, 3*(2), 11-13.

Yammarino, F. J., & Dansereau, F. (2002). Individualized leadership. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 9*(1), 90-99.

Yukl, G. (1999). An evaluative essay on current conceptions of effective leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 8*(1), 33-48.

Yukl, G., O'Donnell, M., & Taber, T. (2009). Influence of leader behaviors on the leader-member exchange relationship. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 24*(4), 289-299.