
CHAPTER 15

Co-Leadership as a Management Option for Ecclesial Administration

Emmarex Elemeiye OKHAKHU

Introduction

Traditional views of leadership as a top-down process are increasingly challenged by critical perspectives that acknowledge that leadership may involve several people. Using the seminal work of David Sally¹ as the launchpad for this critical conceptual analysis, this research explored co-leadership where members share several leadership responsibilities. The research traces co-leadership through its definitional, management, and ecclesial lens. It challenged the deep-seated traditional leadership of parish functions and Church administration by bringing to the fore some biblical and canonical precepts and considerations that should steer ecclesial thinking in co-leadership. Beyond its contributions to the current leadership research, this work conceives the Church as a living organization with strategies, norms, and discipline; a corporate of sorts in dire need of shared responsibilities and accountabilities. The overview of the existing literature, fused into ecclesial leadership models in the Bible and Post-Conciliar teachings should wake up fresh insights into the Church's understanding of *Gaudium et Spes*, the Church in the modern world.

In David Sally work: *Co-Leadership: Lessons from Republican Rome*,² a leadership framework was created for Ancient Rome after a century of kingly successions. In 510 BCE, the Republic was founded and the first pair of Consuls was appointed. From the perspective of battle-as-marketplace and government as-firm-metaphor, Rome was

conceived as a high-growth company with sufficient scale of leadership to ensure a more complex organizational structure. “In addition to the pair of Consuls (CEOs), two Censors (CFOs) were added, two Praetors (COOs), four Aediles (SVPs of production and operations), four Quaestors (Comptrollers), and numerous provincial governors (Regional VPs)”³

However, Sally’s analysis insufficiently explained the social conflicts that consumed the Patricians (Nobles) and the Plebs (Common People), who though were full-fledged citizens of Rome, were denied political opportunities. The Patricians’ monopoly on power “could not withstand the growing numbers, motivation, and wealth of the Plebs, as they organized the own bureaucracy, laws, and rights – a state within a state,”⁴ devolving into more anarchy. This failure and crisis of leadership continued into 367 BCE and further, even when a merger was effected to include the Plebs in every strata of governance.

Power asymmetries in this new inclusive governance only widened the divide between the lame duck and the rising stars, and made cohesiveness and learning impossible to the extent that if a co-leader departs unexpectedly, the others could not forge on to lead the organization. Such leadership lacked flexibility, learning, and continuity: “for when news came that a huge army of Gauls had encamped in [the] Latin territory, Scipio was seriously ill; and the conduct of the war was given by special enactment to Popilius”⁵

Co-leadership, practised in Roman Republic was power shared between the two highest officers of state: the consuls. In this Republic, the consuls shared power at the apex of a power-sharing system in which every official had to have a colleague with equal authority but never trickled down to the ‘subordinates’. Such leadership at best was vertical devoid of parallel ownership. It dictated top-down the minds of the gods that were reverently obeyed. In this world order, co-leaders had no chance of immediately and permanently descending to the group. That decision would have to be made by the ex-Consuls as entrenched in their laws guiding their dictatorship⁶. This model leadership did not lead ‘with’ rather, it led ‘over’ others. This is where Sally’s discourse appeared to have missed the mark. His use of the descriptive term ‘co-leadership’ to capture the leadership of Republic Rome rubs off negatively against its ideal meaning in management and

leadership studies, and begs us for its re-definition and re-conceptualization in modern organizations.

Co-leadership in the Literature

Leadership can be an elusive term to describe but easily identified when practised. Based on its common element of relation-building “. . . a leader is someone who touches another’s future”⁷ Peter Senge, writing in *The Fifth Discipline Fieldbook*, concurs with this understanding and notes that it is easy to perceive both good leadership and the absence of good leadership. “You can always sense the presence or absence of leadership when you begin working in a new organization”⁸ The stake gets higher when defining co-leadership.

Heenan and Bennis⁹ introduced the concept of co-leadership as an activity that several people can share. This makes the term synonymous with shared leadership. The collective nature of leadership focuses on it as being shared and distributed¹⁰ between formally appointed managers, particularly at lower and middle management levels. Position-sharing within pairs of managers demonstrates an alternative way of organizing leadership within a managerial position. This two-person instance is a “special case of shared leadership”¹¹

In clearer terms, Pearce & Conger argue that:

The key distinction between shared leadership and traditional models of leadership is that the influence process involves more than just downward influence on subordinates by an appointed or elected leader [...]. Rather, leadership is broadly distributed among a set of individuals instead of centralized in the hands of a single individual who acts in the role of a superior.¹²

The concept of ‘shared and distributed’ is defining and emerges, as it is needed since one leader in the traditional sense cannot be the expert in teams composed of people with different expert skills. Rather, the team becomes more effective if the leadership is distributed and all members are allowed to influence the direction¹³. The idea of top-down leadership weakens the concept of empowered teams since shared leadership occurs when the team is exerting influence.

There is empirical evidence that managerial positions are successfully shared in most corporations.¹⁴ Even so, the sharing

formula is fraught with problems. We still witness both ignorance of and resistance to the idea of shared leadership within a managerial position¹⁵ Even in Sweden, where shared leadership has been mostly demonstrated recently has a problem arising from its new Education Act, which forbade school principals to formally share leadership on an equal basis; each so-called school unit has to have only one principal¹⁶. This motivates a discussion about how to conceptualize the phenomenon and its different forms.

Klinga, Hanson, Hanson, and Anderson¹⁷ explored the concept of co-leadership as “one approach to meet the managerial challenges of integrated services --- practiced by pairs of managers – each manager representing one of the two principal organizations in integrated health and social care services”¹⁸ functional and project managers with either dotted or solid reporting lines of leadership. These researchers argue that “to deliver sustainable health and social care, cross-boundary collaboration is needed.”¹⁹ In addition, Stein, Barbazza, Tello, and Kluge, stated that collaboration between professionals from different sectors is likely to develop more people-centred and holistic care.”²⁰ Individuals with complex morbidities, such as those with mental illness, HIV, and disabilities, are vulnerable to fragmented care. “A higher degree of cooperation between services or integration of services is required to decrease the fragmentation”²¹

Schools are beginning to imbibe the concept of shared leadership as a partnership, where teachers, staff, parents and students are equal partners. “Creating this balance of power is probably one of the hardest aspects in shared leadership”²² Even so, school boards are working on effective and clear parameters that can empower all members of the group. Hughes and Pickeral believe in the importance of,

safe, equitable, engaging and high-quality school climates. Shared Leadership is when teachers, staff, parents, students and principals collaborate to solve problems. Working together to create an engaging school climate that accelerates student learning is common sense. Where shared leadership exists with youth and adults working collaboratively, there is a student-focused school.²³

Co-leadership, therefore, is a departure from the formal leader to a shared leadership model resulting in shared power and decision-

making. Instead of an 'elite' individual leading the crew, others are invited to share the responsibility for leadership and develop a positive school climate.

In the complex world of health care, it is inconceivable that the traditional top-down, heroic leadership really works. In fact, it would be a disservice to the healing profession. Health care leadership is a "competency-based behaviour that has to come from everyone involved in health care. Doctors work in multidisciplinary teams focused on the needs and safety of the patient where leadership becomes the responsibility of the team"²⁴ While there is a functional leader of the team who is accountable for the performance of the team, the responsibility for identifying problems, solving them and implementing the appropriate action is shared by the team. The key distinction between shared and traditional models of leadership in this scenario is that the influence process involves more than just the downward influence of subordinates by a positional leader. Leadership is distributed amongst a set of individuals instead of being centralized in the hands of a single individual who acts in the role of leader.²⁵

In critical care for patients with cancer, HIV, AIDS, brain aneurysm, or even an automobile accident victim, a community of practice is deployed quickly in a multi-disciplinary fashion. This critical team may include different experts: surgeons, oncologists, anesthesiologists, palliative care specialists, specialist nurses, general nurses, therapists, radiologists, general practitioners, physiotherapists, nephrologists, cardiologist etc. These individual expert leaders co-jointly make contributions in the planning and care delivery of the patient. "Within a shared leadership model, leadership passes from individual to individual along the patient's pathway of care. This provides continuity of care for the patient without compromising the standards of care"²⁶ No one surgeon, medical director, or clinical expert satisfies the professional training of the individual experts in the interdisciplinary team to lead them in the traditional model. This fact does not diminish the need for a functional leader.

Interdisciplinary teams now characterize effective organizations, taking the burden off one person or discipline to have all the bulk knowledge and experience that solves the complexity of today's problems. The breakthroughs in science, organizations, and people management are more likely to come from the collective interactions, contributions, and leadership between multiple disciplines

rather than a single positional leader. So, what are the specific benefits and drawbacks of co-leadership?

Benefits and Challenges of Co-leadership

Successful co-leadership demands the ability to listen to team members' thought processes, which can challenge your own opinions based on fact. This disposition on a wider scale may lead to better solutions. Such Partnership binds people together toward common goals, sharing a common vision. It elicits human creativity, mutual respect, and allows partnership and compromise to trickle down to the rest of the organization. This concept can shrink factions, silo mentalities, and hero worship.

Co-leadership is a hard process that works when people commit to its discipline. It invites a voluntary commitment and deep desire to be involved in the process. One must clearly want to improve self and believe sincerely that others have good ideas as well. Like in every true partnership, it's imperative to start with the same vision, a desire to keep the conversation alive in spite of disagreements, and springing new compromises. O'Toole, Galbraith and Lawler captured these ideas more aptly: "... co-leadership is much more likely to be successful with clear and agreed differentiation. This isn't a one-off conversation. Make co-leadership sustainable by regularly re-evaluating your roles and effectiveness."²⁷

The concept of co-leadership shift the perspective from viewing leadership as a single-person activity to viewing it as collective constructive processes, which opens space for all participants to express their agency at every stage of the change process, from ideation to implementation. However, Conger and Pearce are eager to mention that they do not view shared leadership as the universal solution to any leadership issue or group setting. The authors argue that:

there do exist some situations when shared leadership is not just non-optimal, but even harmful, e.g. when there is a lack of knowledge, skills and abilities necessary to shared leadership, when there is lack of goal alignment between members of the team, when there is lack of goal alignment between the team and the organization, when there is lack of time to develop shared leadership and finally, when there is lack of receptivity to shared leadership.²⁸

Therefore, the question raised here helps to examine the biblical foundation and appropriateness of co-leadership for ecclesial management. Is co-leadership right for the Church?

Co-leadership in Scriptures

Not all leaders are equal in their giftedness, biblical knowledge, leadership ability, and experience or communication skill. Therefore, those particularly gifted leaders and/or teachers will naturally stand out among the others. This is what the Romans called *primus inter pares*, ‘first among equals,’ or *primi inter pares*, ‘first ones among equals.’ Jesus practised this principle of ‘first among equals’ in His dealings with the Twelve. They were all empowered to preach, heal, and cast out demons, even Judas. However, Jesus singled out three for special attention – Peter, James, and John – *primi inter pares*. And among the three, Peter stood out as the most prominent, the *primus inter pares*. Perhaps, Peter’s personality made him a more outspoken, confrontational, and natural-born leader in the group, and rightfully called the Rock.

Christ insistence that the Church be built on Peter, the Rock and his triple command to ‘feed my sheep’ placed Peter, however, above the others (John 21:15-17). The three commands, although often translated the same way, are subtly different. The first time Jesus says it, the Greek means literally “pasture (tend) the lambs” (v. 15). The Greek word for “pasture” is in the present tense, denoting a continual action of tending, feeding and caring for animals.

The second time, the literal meaning is “tend My sheep” (v. 16). In this exchange, Jesus was emphasizing tending the sheep in a supervisory capacity, not only feeding but ruling over them. This expresses the full scope of pastoral oversight, both in Peter’s future and in all those who would follow him in pastoral ministry. Peter follows Jesus’ example and repeats this same Greek word *poimaino* in his first pastoral letter to the elders of the Churches of Asia Minor: “Be shepherds of God’s flock that is under your care, serving as overseers” (1 Peter 5:2). Even so, the eleven were not his subordinates. They were not his assistants. He was simply first among his equals, the chief Apostle, acknowledged so by Jesus Himself. And it was James who headed the Jerusalem Council, not Peter (Acts 15).

In the context of the seven deacons (Acts 6), the dynamics of ‘first among equals’ leadership relationship is observed. These deacons were chosen to relieve the Apostles of certain responsibilities. Philip and Stephen stood out as prominent figures among the five other brothers (Acts 6:8-7:60, 8:5-40, 21:8). Yet, as far as the account records, the two held no special title or status above the others. The concept of ‘first among equals’ is further evidenced in the relationship between Paul and Barnabas. They laboured as partners in the work of the Gospel. They were both pioneers and leaders in missions, yet between them, Paul was ‘first among equals’ because perhaps he was “the chief speaker” and a more dynamic leader (Acts 13:13, 14:12). Paul, the ex-rabbi, definitely more learned, did not boss over Barnabas who could also stand on his own ground in the matter over John Mark.

The advantage of the principle of ‘first among equals’ is that it allows for functional, gift-based diversity within the leadership team without creating an official, superior or oppressive office over fellow leaders; just as the leading Apostles, Peter and John, did not lord it over others. These elders laboured in the Word and exercised good leadership.

However, current Church leadership seems easier without the encumbrance of others. Some leaders would prefer to dominate rather than rely upon the breadth of experience resident in the Church. Others fight hard to maintain unchallenged authority because they have a deep-seated need to be needed. Still, others feel that they are the only ones who could get the job done.

It’s true that this quick dash into Scriptures raises more issues and challenges against heroic leadership, on which the Church thrives especially within the power dynamics of the office of Bishops. It is truer, however, that it is the overall spiritual giftedness of the pastoral team that causes the Church to grow, not just the current leadership form of government. The early Church grew out of the anointing of the spirit and the common life, shared vision of members, not its lordship. Leadership anywhere works best when it is provided by teams of gifted leaders serving together in pursuit of a clear and compelling vision.

Perhaps, Churches more than ever have the dire need to helm-in some of its *primus inter pares* fanfare and seek shared and authentic leadership based on the spiritual gifts and energies that builds the Church. For Christ who, being in very nature God, did not consider equality with God something to be used to his own advantage. Rather,

He emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in human likeness...(Philippians 2:6-7).

The dialogue on co-leadership in the Church begins here. It revolves around the premiums we place on our positions, swayed by positional fanfare or whether we see them as invitations to spiritually build the body of Christ. The Church must decide on which of these values has eternity as a reward; then draw itself closer to the flock of Christ, fusing relationship in Christ and co-leading the affairs of the Church. From this height can co-leadership further cascade to the parish level.

While Episcopal collegiality and parochial co-responsibility are both of vital importance to the life of the Church, and needs to be constantly fostered, it seems opportune at this point to give some serious attention to the question of Presbyteral collegiality in order to balance the various organs of governance in the Church, and to balance the confusion of role and isolation experienced by many priests in their parishes. This is not to imply that the other dimensions of co-responsibility are of less importance; it is simply to address the issue in a more focused fashion.

The very first document issued at Vatican II, *The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* (#4), speaks of the close bond between the bishop and his presbyterate as they gather around the altar for the celebration of the Eucharist. It speaks thus:

The faithful must be convinced that the principle manifestation of the Church consists in the full, active participation of all God's people in the same liturgical celebrations, especially in the same Eucharist, in one prayer, at one altar, at which the bishop presides, surrounded by his priests and ministers.

The text is significant in that it takes us back to the writings of Ignatius of Antioch, indicating a desire on the part of the Council to retrieve an earlier understanding of the relationship between the bishop and his priests and to reorder ministerial relationships accordingly. It also indicates a desire to relocate collaboration between priests and bishops in the context of the bonds of communion created by the Eucharist.

The Dogmatic Constitution on the Church re-echoes the teaching of the document on the liturgy when it speaks of the bonds of communion and affection that are to exist between the body of priests and the bishop. The priests "share in the priesthood and mission of the

bishop.” They are “to see in him a true father” and the bishop is to treat the presbyters as “his helpers, as his sons and friends.” Among themselves, “priests are united together by bonds of intimate brotherhood ... through the medium of reunions and community life, work and fraternal charity.” Priests are also called “to unite their efforts and combine their resources under the leadership of their bishops” (#28).

In The Decree on the Bishops’ Pastoral Office in the Church, a diocese is described as “a section of the People of God entrusted to a bishop to be guided by him with the assistance of his clergy.” The priests are placed alongside the bishop in the task of preaching, building up the unity of the community, and celebrating the Eucharist. Later, priests are called “prudent co-operators with the episcopal order,” (#11) and are said to “assume a part of the bishop’s duties and concerns” (#15). Therefore, a bishop should treat them “with particular affection” and “regard them as sons and friends” (#16). In discussing the spirit of collaboration that is to exist between the presbyters and the bishop, the Decree says: “to ensure an increasingly effective apostolate, the bishop should be willing to engage in dialogue with his priests, individually and collectively, not merely occasionally, but if possible, regularly. Furthermore, the diocesan priests should be united among themselves and should be genuinely zealous for the spiritual welfare of the whole diocese” (#28). This is the language of collaboration, collegiality and co-responsibility of bishops with their priests and of priests among themselves.

At the beginning of his pontificate, John Paul II stated that “a spirit of collaboration and shared responsibility” (*Redemptor hominis*, #5) characterizes presbyteral councils, a feature of ecclesial life and mirrored the collegiality that existed among the bishops. Towards the end of his ministry, in the post-synodal exhortation, *Pastores Gregi* (#45), he reaffirmed the same thinking, “The presbyters, and among them, parish priests, in particular, are therefore the closest co-operators in the Bishop’s ministry...The Bishop will always strive to relate to his priests as a father and brother who loves them, listens to them, welcomes them, corrects them, supports them, seeks their co-operation and, as much as possible, is concerned for their human, spiritual, ministerial and financial well-being.”

These relationships are totally meant for the service of the Church so that the ecclesial community has an absolute need for the

ministerial priesthood to have Christ the Head and Shepherd present in her. From these relationships emerges the role of the priest. The parish priest is the *cura animarum* of the people of God, the parish, the powerhouse of our faith.

The Priest, Pastor, and Leader of the Parish Community

The ministerial priesthood is the fruit of an election, of a specific vocation: "he called his disciples, and chose from them twelve" (Lk 6, 13-16). Thanks to the ministerial priesthood, the faithful are made aware of their common priesthood and they live it (cf. Eph 4, 11-12); the priest reminds them that they are the People of God and makes them able to "offer spiritual sacrifices" (cf. 1 Pt. 2,5), through which Christ himself makes us an eternal gift to the Father (cf. 1 Pt. 3,18). Without the presence of Christ represented by the priest; the sacramental guide of the community, this would not be an ecclesial community in its fullness. So the priest is an *alter christus*, devoid of all authoritarian powers, politics, and lordship; he nurtures the faithful. He nurtures the common priesthood of the people of God, chosen by God. His role, therefore, is central to the growth of our faith and Church.

Canon 532 stipulates that, despite the requirement for ecclesiastical communion, the *parochus* "*personam gerit*" –moves the juridic person of the parish in all its juridic affairs. In contrast, Canon 393 ties the "*personam gerit*" of the Bishop to the juridic person of the diocese, in all the juridic affairs. This is to say that the *parochus* directs the parish within the broad oversight of the Bishop. In essence, the priest is the daily, on-ground CEO of the parish.

It is important to emphasize that the *parochus* does not exercise his role of CEO, of office-holder, of a householder, on his own. He needs assistance. Moreover, as a member of Christ's faithful himself, he needs to co-opt other members of Christ's faithful to make the parish household a vibrant actuation of Christian communion. And who are the others that he needs to enlist in the life and work of the parish? Canon 519 puts it this way: he is to work for the "co-operation" of other presbyters or deacons and the "assistance" of lay members of the Christian faithful, according to the norm of law.

The co-operation of other presbyters or deacons (transitional or married) has its uneven dynamics that need new learning, healing, and acceptance. The co-operation and assistance of lay members of the Christian faithful needs focused nurturing as well. We submit here the

following: first, that the co-operation of the lay members of the Christian faithful is what makes parishes work. Second that this co-operation is found in the day-to-day functioning of the parish –with parish secretaries, parish catechetical directors, parish business managers, and pastoral associates.

The priest needs seasoned shared leadership to elicit the needed ‘co-operation’ of all in the parish(es) entrusted to his jurisdiction, especially in (a) the parish finance council and (b) the parish pastoral council, where Church laws are explicit.

The Finance Council

Canon 537 states:

In each parish there is to be a finance council, which is governed, in addition to universal law, by norms issued by the diocesan bishop and in which the Christian faithful, selected according to these same norms, are to assist the pastor in the administration of the goods of the parish, without prejudice to the prescript of can. 532 [i.e., that the *parochus* is the one who moves the person of the parish].

A point to be made is that the role of the council is consultative. There is nothing in the universal law that requires a *parochus* to consult with the finance council for the validity of his action. But there is no reason why a diocesan bishop cannot issue particular law, requiring consultation with the finance committee for the validity of the action of the *parochus* in certain financial affairs (canon 127). And given the volume of conflicts from Finance Councils, some co-responsibility and joint working are needed.

The parish pastoral council, unlike the finance council, is not an unconditional requirement of law. It is to be made up of the Christian faithful – baptized Christians who are in ecclesiastical communion with the Catholic Church. These persons need not be members of the Latin Church: they can be members of any Church *sui iuris*. Also included in its membership are “those who share in the pastoral care by virtue of their office in the parish: i.e., parochial vicars, deacons, pastoral associates, catechetical and liturgical directors. This membership gateway and that of the financial council opens multiple avenues for the priest to exercise and practice shared leadership, particularly as the

council and the *parochus* are distinct; the *parochus* presides at the meetings. He has leadership responsibilities to be shared with others.

His collaboration, on the flip side, may elicit the rich contributions, the experience of other leaders that can help the pastor grow in leadership. The priest needs his co-responsible team to help develop a vision. Sofield, Loughlan, and Kuhn²⁹ stressed the importance of crafting a guiding vision. The co-responsible team must conceive powerful goals, communicate amongst themselves, and gain enthusiastic acceptance. Champlin³⁰ advocated a three-pronged approach. 1. Gather grass-roots input. Unless people buy into the dream it will not significantly motivate them. 2. Keep repeating the dream. Keep the people focused on the vision by repeating it again and again. 3. Express the vision in some captivating way. Use symbols and appeal to the senses.

The co-joint parish team must thrive on Strategic Thinking. Peter Senge stated that strategic thinking helps grow strong leadership. The leader must articulate and differentiate what is truly essential from what is secondary. Good strategic thinking addresses dilemmas arising from conflict among competing goals and norms. Senge instructs that we must distribute power and authority, but we also want to improve control and coordination, for effective strategic thinking. These factors help organizations (Churches) become more responsive to changes, and helps grow the individual's stable and coherent sense of identity, purpose, and vision. These create a sense of ownership with corollaries to high productivity and creativity.

A pastor who is not using the parish pastoral council to help create a parish vision is probably carrying too much of a burden. Dennis O'Leary reminds us that "the primary responsibility of the parish pastoral council is to assist the pastor in directional and strategic planning. If planning in these two areas is done well, administrative and programme planning by the pastor, staff and programme leaders will naturally follow, and the result will be a more focused and integrated approach to ministry"³¹

Co-Leadership and the Future of Ecclesial Administration: Some Interrogatives

1. Do the tenets of co-leadership threaten the Church?
2. Is the Church more persuaded by power, authority, and prestige than by a sublime desire to grow?

3. Will priests and bishops lose power via co-leadership?
4. Will the people of God feel more empowered to participate in the Church through co-leadership?
5. Can communication and common sense-making of conflicts ensure that the process is democratic, honest and ethical, with a common goal in mind?
6. Can parish council meetings be co-led in ways where individuals' specific experience, knowledge, skills, and competencies complement the decision process?
7. Are priests prepared enough to lead parishes in this light?
8. Are the disciplines of deep listening to other viewpoints, transparency, trust, and co-thinking for the richer good of all, anti-Christian?

Conclusion and Future Research

This conceptual analysis and exploration extend our knowledge of co-leadership as a way of addressing managerial challenges in cross-boundary service cultures, especially in ecclesial settings. Sharing leadership between managers may be of specific interest for future leadership development in the post-heroic bent that we have tried to construct here. Co-leadership enabled environments to provide robust management, broader competence, continuous learning and joint responsibility for services. Therefore, co-leadership contributes to the provision of sustainable integration of faith and practice, the enrichment of the Church. On the individual Christian and interpersonal level, the prerequisites for successful co-leadership are the perception of the management role as a collective activity, continuous communication, trusting environment devoid of personal glories and prestige.

Defining leadership as a collective construction process makes a difference to managers' and co-workers' interaction and learning, which explains why the issue of how to organize leadership is important. Joint leadership, in its far-reaching togetherness, deserves special interest. Future research has several questions left to answer in order to further understand the relatively widespread³² but under-researched issue of shared leadership between managers, especially in the Church.

Endnotes

¹ Sally David, *Co-leadership: Lessons from the Republican Rome*, California Management School Climate Center. 2002.

² Sally David, *Co-leadership: Lessons from the Republican Rome*, *Ibid.*

³ Sally David, *Co-leadership: Lessons from the Republican Rome* 3.

⁴ Sally David, *Co-leadership: Lessons from the Republican Rome* 4.

⁵ Livvy. *The Rise of Rome*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press. 1998,126.

⁶ Livvy. *The Rise of Rome*. 89

⁷ J. M. Champlin, & C. D Champlin, *The Visionary Leader*. New York: Crossroad Publishing Company. 1993. 24

⁸ P. M. Senge, C. Roberts, R. B. Ross, B. J Smith, & A. Kleiner, A. *The Fifth Discipline: Shared Leadership*. London: Sage publications. 1994. 65.

⁹ D. A. Heenan & W. G. Bennis, *Co-leaders : The Power of Great Partnerships*. John Wiley. 1999.

¹⁰ R. Bolden, "Distributed Leadership in Organizations: A Review of Theory and Research" in *International Journal of Management Reviews*, Vol. 13, 251–269 (2011) DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-2370.2011.00306.x

¹¹ C. L. Pearce, & J. A Conger, *All Those Years Ago: The Historical Underpinnings of Shared Leadership*, (2003) Retrieved on August 29, 2019 from <https://www.leadershipacademy.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/776bc9c27b6e8741d0ff42e593ba44cf.pdf> Review 44(4): 8

¹² C. L. Pearce, & J. A Conger, *All Those Years Ago: The Historical Underpinnings of Shared Leadership* (2003) Retrieved on August 29, 2019 from <https://www.leadershipacademy.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/776bc9c27b6e8741d0ff42e593ba44cf.pdf> Review 44(4): 1

¹³ C. S. Burke, S. M. Fiore, & E. Salas, (2003). "The Role of Shared Cognition in Enabling Shared Leadership and Team Adaptability" in *Shared leadership: Reframing the hows and whys of leadership*, Craig L. Pearce & Jay A. Conger (Ed), DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781452229539.n5>, 105

¹⁴ S. Choi, I. Holmberg, J. Löwstedt, & M. Brommels, "Managing clinical integration: A Comparative Case Study in a Merged University Hospital". *Journal of Health Organization and Management*, 26(4), 486-507, (2012). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/14777261211251544>

¹⁵ M. Döös, *Together as One: Shared Leadership Between Managers*. International Fieldbook. New York: Doubleday. 2015.

¹⁶ M. Döös, *Ibid.*

¹⁷ C. Klinga, J. Hansson, C. Hasson & M. A. Sachs, "Co-Leadership – A Management Solution for Integrated Health and Social Care". *International*

Journal of Integrated Care, 16(2): 7, 1, 2016. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/ijic.2236>

¹⁸ C. Klinga, J. Hansson, C. Hasson & M. A. Sachs, “Co-Leadership – A Management Solution for Integrated Health and Social Care”. Ibid.

¹⁹ C. Klinga, J. Hansson, C. Hasson & M. A. Sachs, “Co-Leadership – A Management Solution for Integrated Health and Social Care”.

²⁰ Stein, K.V., Barbazza, E.S., Tello, J. & Kluge, H. “Towards people-centred health services delivery: a Framework for Action for the World Health Organisation (WHO) European Region”. *Int J Integr Care*, 2013 (105) 10

²¹ Stein, K.V., Barbazza, E.S., Tello, J. & Kluge, H. “Towards people-centred health services delivery: a Framework for Action for the World Health Organisation (WHO) European Region”. Ibid.

²² Hughes & Pickeral. “School Climate and Shared Leadership”. NY: National In Arthur X. Deegan (ed.) *Developing a Vibrant Parish Pastoral Council*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Paulist Press. 2013. 2

²³ Hughes & Pickeral. “School Climate and Shared Leadership”. NY: National In Arthur X. Deegan (ed.) *Developing a Vibrant Parish Pastoral Council*, 3

²⁴ NHS, (ND). Shared Leadership. Enhancing Engagement in Medical Leadership. Retrieved on

August 29, 2019 from <https://www.leadershipacademy.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/776bc9c27b6e8741d0ff42e593ba44cf.pdf>

²⁵ C. L. Pearce, & J. A Conger, *All Those Years Ago: The Historical Underpinnings of Shared Leadership*, 3

²⁶ NHS, (ND). *Shared Leadership. Enhancing Engagement in Medical Leadership*. Retrieved on August 29, 2019 from

<https://www.leadershipacademy.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/776bc9c27b6e8741d0ff42e593ba44cf.pdf>

²⁷ O’Toole, J., Galbraith, J., & Lawler, E. E. “When Two (or More) Heads are Better Than

One: The Promises and the Pitfalls of Shared Leadership”, (2002). *California Management Review* 44(4): 10.

²⁸ C. L. Pearce, & J. A Conger, *All Those Years Ago: The Historical Underpinnings of Shared Leadership*, *Review* 44(4): 299

²⁹ Sofield, Loughlan, and Donald H. Kuhn. *The Collaborative Leader*. Notre Dame, Indiana: Ave Maria Press. 1995.

³⁰ Champlin, J.M. & Champlin, C.D. *The Visionary Leader*. New York: Crossroad Publishing Company. 1993.

³¹ O’Leary, Dennis J. *Parish Pastoral Councils: Instruments of Visioning and Planning*. 1995. 32.

³² M. Döös, *Together as One: Shared Leadership Between Managers*. International Fieldbook. New York: Doubleday. 2015.