

Leading Together for Mutual Benefit: Shared Leadership in the Context of Co-operative Banking

Rosas Saila (Corresponding author)

Department of management and International Business
School of Business, Lappeenranta University of Technology
P.O. Box 20, FI-53851, Finland
E-mail: saila.rosas@op.fi

Jussila Iiro

Department of management and International Business
School of Business, Lappeenranta University of Technology
P.O. Box 20, FI-53851, Finland
E-mail: iiro.jussila@lut.fi

Tuominen Pasi

Department of management and International Business
School of Business, Lappeenranta University of Technology
P.O. Box 20, FI-53851, Finland
E-mail: pasi.tuominen@lut.fi

Received: October 30, 2012
doi:10.5430/bmr.v1n4p99

Accepted: November 20, 2012

Online Published: November 22, 2012

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5430/bmr.v1n4p99>

Abstract

While also opposing views have been presented, reaching decisions in co-operatives has primarily been considered to be a collective process. Despite this longstanding belief, there is lack of research on the collectivity of leadership processes actually ongoing in co-operative context(s). The paper at hand makes use of shared leadership construct showing that it helps us think of and articulate how leadership manifests in co-operative banks and their co-operative arrangements. The utility of this idea for future research and practice of co-operation is discussed.

Keywords: Shared leadership, Co-operation, Co-operative bank, Constellation

1. Introduction

Thousands of years ago, Plato proposed that leadership is a very rare skill of a single, exceptional individual who has the unique wisdom and relationship with the universal truth. Aristotle, on the other hand, pointed out that the best leaders know not only how to command but also how to obey others and are able to grasp complex realities through questioning and careful observation of particularities. According to O'Toole, Galbraith and Lawler (2003, 251), it was Plato's idea that emerged dominant in (western) leadership discourses. It follows that leadership in business and industrial organizations (typically characterized as capitalistic, mechanistic, and bureaucratic) has traditionally been seen as a symbol of power and taken a top-down approach according to which the execution of organizational activities is seen as influenced primarily by the chief executive (Pearce & Conger, 2003; Kearins, 1996). In other words, individual leadership has had a central position in the modern organization. As it has thousands of years of cultural background, it has been difficult to propose alternative aspects or views.

The information age (post-industrialism) and the introduction of more organic social structures (Burns & Stalker, 1961) and complex networks did, however, challenged the traditional notions (and ideologically laden discourses;

van Dijk, 1998) of leadership (Moxley, 2000). The new era emphasized the role of knowledge (and learning) as a source of power (something that is in motion all the time) and as a “vehicle” of particular interests (Foucault, 2001; 1998). As put forward by Spears and Lawrence (2002), it also moved us away from the belief that strong hierarchy works for our organizations. In this process view, leadership (power) is shared and the leading individual in any given situation is the person that has the desired knowledge and skills (i.e., those effective in that specific context). In other words, a variety of people are interactively involved instead of a single individual holding the leadership role – giving rise to a new construct: shared leadership (for the historical bases of shared leadership, see Pearce & Conger, 2003, 4-5). From the shared leadership perspective, the main job of an administrator is to promote the development of the skills and knowledge of the people combined to create a mutual result (Elmore, 2000).

In the new era, there has been growing interest towards organizational arrangements that fit the timely demands. One of such arrangements is the co-operative: a previously marginalized, but widely and increasingly used form of organization (e.g., Jussila, Byrne, & Tuominen, 2012). It did not smoothly fit the centralized and individualistic notions of leadership in the first place. This is because co-operatives are built on the idea of association: joining together, coalescing, combining, integrating and remaining united in order to satisfy common needs, achieve common ends, or derive mutual advantage (Jussila, Goel, & Tuominen, 2012; Watkins, 1986). Consistently, co-operative studies describe co-operatives as democratically controlled network organizations (e.g., Uski, Jussila & Saksa, 2007; Spear, 2004) in which collective decision-making skills are an essential part of managerial competence both on the level of co-operatives and their multiparty alliances (Tuominen, Jussila, & Rantanen, 2010). In other words, it is seen that reaching decisions in co-operatives is to great extent a collective process (Birchall & Simmons, 2004). However, there are those, who argue that collective decision-making (in which uniformity is a key value) can harm the co-operative and its membership. Notably, the criticism seems to relate to the competencies of the decision-makers (as collective decisions easily reflect average competence in the group). Thereby, Davis (2001) emphasizes co-operative manager’s important and powerful position as an authorized leader. According to him, a manager of a co-operative is a “stand-alone-hero” of the membership who should be “capable of seeing farther and in seeing be capable of communicating and motivating to turn the vision into reality” (p. 38) – through words and action (cf. Westley & Mintzberg, 1989). This view does not, however, necessarily assume dictatorship (for the best of the society). It accepts the idea of a participatory style, which is also seen as one of co-operative managers’ key competences (Tuominen et al., 2010). However, it does highlight the single individual’s authority and right to make decisions.

The paper at hand starts from the insight that shared leadership construct (e.g., Pearce & Conger, 2003) has potential to provide additional rigor to theorizing of leadership in the co-operative context. We first came to think of the potential of the construct based on our observations in co-operative contexts and through our debates with fellow academics. Our view was that traditional leadership discourses should not constrain our attempts to enrich the field. Since the first author had generated extensive amount of qualitative data in Finnish co-operative financial institutions with lots of accounts on leadership, we decided to study the data carefully to see if the accounts fit the landscape of the shared leadership construct. To our knowledge, the construct has not been used to carefully analyze leadership in the context of co-operative organizations. This is actually somewhat surprising, since shared leadership construct has been employed to study leadership, for example, in team settings (e.g., Carson, Tesluk & Marrone, 2007; Mehra, Smith, Dixon & Robertson, 2006; Mayo, Meindl, & Pastor, 2003), boardroom settings (e.g., Vandewaerde, Voordeckers, Lambrechts & Bammens, 2011), groups (e.g., Seibert, Sparrowe & Liden, 2003; Shamir & Lapidot, 2003) and wider collaborative settings (e.g., Lambrechts, Bouwen, Grieten, Huybrechts & Schein, 2011; Huxham & Vangen, 2000). Nevertheless, the following sections are dedicated to filling this gap.

We start by describing the context(s) of our study, our methods and the data generated. Next we analyse accounts of leadership in the co-operative banking context(s) using shared leadership as a lens. To avoid repetition, the paper does not have a separate ‘theory’ section. Instead, the definition and essential aspects of shared leadership are introduced in the empirical section when they are found consistent with the accounts of leadership in our data. After summarizing our findings, we specify how our work complements existing research and how it should be elaborated in future research. We also put forward some implications to co-operative leadership education and discuss the reach of these implications.

2. Context, data and methods

OP-Pohjola Group is the leading financial group in Finland. It is made up of 198 local member co-operative banks, central bank Pohjola Bank PLC (formerly OKO Inc), and OP-Pohjola Group Central Cooperative (OPK), including subsidiaries and closely related companies as OP-Services Ltd. Pohjola Bank PLC, founded in 1902, is a Finnish

bank listed in the Helsinki Stock Exchange since 1989, with a market capitalization (A and K shares) of approx. EUR 1,300 million as of September 9, 2005. It is the most significant subsidiary of the OP-Pohjola Central Cooperative that is the central institution of the multiparty alliance of the co-operative banks. (OP-Pohjola Group Annual Review, 2009)

Co-operative banks in OP-Pohjola Group provide banking and financial services to private customers, firms and communities (OP-Pohjola Group, 2011). The 198 member banks are rather different in size and can be categorized in three groups: about 15 biggest banks comprise 50 % of the volume of the group, about 40 middle-size banks 25 % and the rest, 155 small banks 25 %. The biggest bank is Helsingin Op –pankki with 320.000 customers, 36 offices, 811 workers, operating profit 36,2 million euros (31.12.2010) and balance of 4,555 million euros, when the same statistics to one of the smallest, UukuniemenOsuuspankki are 1.000 customers, 1 office, 4 workers, operating profit 92.000 euros (31.12.2010) and balance of 11.120.000 euros.

2.1 Data generation

The corresponding author works in one of the member banks as a bank manager and, thereby, has ‘hands on’ experience of leadership processes in the banking group. As part of her studies on co-operative management and organization (aiming at Doctor’s degree), she gathered and generated extensive sets of highly descriptive qualitative (Gephart, 2004; Denzin & Lincoln, 1994). Archival materials are from 2005 to 2012 in form of annual reports, protocols, press releases, information sheets and magazines to customers and personnel consisting several thousand pages. They describe, among other things, particular organizational changes in the banking group, strategic management as it relates to those changes and leadership as it relates to those changes and more ordinary operations of the group. Interviews on the other hand were organized in year 2009 with thirty-six decision-makers of the OP-Pohjola Group: CEOs, managing directors and managers both in central units and local banks. Decision-making processes as well as different aspects of strategic management and leadership of the banks and the constellation were thoroughly covered as “starters” to a larger set of themes. The interviewer sought for open, broad and informative discussions on each theme. A list of questions was used during the interviews to make sure all essential themes are thoroughly covered. However, specific questions were not revealed to the informants before the interviews. Instead, the interviewees were given the subject and main themes beforehand. These thematic interviews lasted from one to three hours. The interviews were recorded by the interviewer and later transcribed carefully by a professional typist.

2.2 Method justification

As the corresponding author gathered and generated the data (together with the interviewees) for purposes that go beyond this single paper, also the justifications for the selected methods lie in part outside the scope of this particular paper. It is worth acknowledging though that overall the data was gathered and generated for theory elaboration purposes (Lee, Mitchell, & Sablinski, 1999). It was in connection to a co-operative research conference in year 2011 and discussions with fellow academics that the authors of the paper came to ask if the data could serve a study like the one at hand. It followed that the corresponding author picked up the data to see if it reveals shared leadership operating in particular co-operative examples (Gephart 2004, 454-455; Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007). The use of the previously gathered and generated qualitative data is justified (Edmondson, 2002), as it includes accounts of leadership and in this study we are set to investigate if the observed operational details of leadership in this particular context (co-operative banking) match what leadership scholars discuss in general terms with the label ‘shared leadership’ (e.g., Pearce & Conger, 2003). As will be shown below, a match is found.

2.3 Data analysis

To compose a valid and reliable study, the material from the interviews was first studied systematically to develop an overall understanding of essential meanings. Next, as shared leadership was found as a construct that captures well the leadership processes depicted in the data, features of shared leadership (see Table 1.) were adopted as a more structured theoretical basis for coding.

Insert Table 1 here

Thereby, we focused our interest on the way shared leadership is expressed across the data and coded accordingly (cf. Braun & Clarke, 2006). The outcomes of our analyses are reported in the following.

3. Shared leadership in the context(s) of co-operative banking

According to Moxley (2000), shared leadership is the basic model of two or more people sharing power and joining forces to move toward accomplishment of a shared goal. In OP-Pohjola, leadership seems to operate according to this definition both on the level of individual banks and the group. This is in line with the work of Tuominen and

colleagues (2010), who identify collective and participative decision-making skills as essential part of competence for co-operative managers.

The group level. OP-Pohjola Group Central Cooperative– tasked with supporting (e.g., analysing the operating environment, collecting information about financial sector changes and markets, developing international connections, taking care of market capitalization), supervising and controlling the group’s business – is owned and governed by local and provincial co-operative banks. In other words, the central organization is required to operate in line with a jointly agreed strategy and in compliance with the shared rules (and, of course, legal requirements). The central co-operative is also responsible for the overall corporate image, reputation, identity and brand, while enhancing the group’s pooled trustworthiness (OP-Pohjola Group annual report 2009). Noteworthy, the member banks are not only framing the operation of the central organization through governance, but contributing to it through different kind of task forces. In thematic task forces managers (and employees) of the central co-operative join their forces with representatives of the member banks to accomplish shared goals (e.g., define protocols and practices for the group relating their different business).

The member bank level. The member banks are owned and governed by their local members (approximately 1.1 million altogether) following the principle of democracy. Difference to the group level is that the content of shared leadership emphasizes issues relevant to the particular member community (and local market) – not necessarily the entire group. In other words, specialization to some extent defines the contents of shared leadership in the two different, but related contexts.

In the following sections we illustrate manifestations of shared leadership in these two contexts, following the features presented in Table 1. We do point out the organizational context of the data samples (bank or group), but our focus is not on the differences the phenomenon of shared leadership might have comparing the two levels. While paying attention to the potential differences is likely to be important to explaining the extent to which leadership is shared in particular contexts, such an objective is beyond the scope of this paper.

3.1 Leadership displayed by the quality of people’s interactions

According to Pearce and Conger (2003), shared leadership is “a dynamic, interactive influence process among individuals in groups” (p. 1). It offers a conceptualization of leadership practice as a social (inter-subjective) process (Fletcher & Käufer, 2003). This idea of leadership is clearly manifest in our data:

“we reflect, get to the bottom of the issue in question and prepare...and negotiate” (group level)

“if we can discuss together.. know how increases every day.. so we discuss a lot..” (bank level)

It is noteworthy that person’s positions or hierarchies are not referred to as the interviewees make sense of leadership practices in the group. Instead, the data is rich of descriptions about leadership as interactive processes in which both the amount and quality of interaction are essential. They are needed in order to create the best possible understanding of the complex realities at hand before selecting the course of action. As our interviewees put it:

“one that takes a bit longer to prepare, but once made it is better informed” (group level)

“in OPK we were used to ... thinking, finding out, and preparing..” (group level)

In other words, our interviewees do not value fast decisions (by a single individual), but high quality decisions that are a result of high quality interactions. As leadership is displayed by the quality of people’s interaction, shared leadership can be seen as being practiced.

3.2 Leadership evaluated by how well problems are solved together

In our data, as setting objectives, solving problems and making decisions are concerned, the word ‘together’ is frequently used both in connection to the banks and the financial group. This can be seen as an indication of a deep rooted decision-making process (Vroom & Yetton, 1973) that fulfils the definition of shared leadership (Nemmerowicz & Rosi, 1997). In fact, it is argued that the core of shared leadership in the group is to do and think together (Ruderman, Ohlott, Panzer & King, 2002). Also the word ‘we’ is used a lot in connection to leadership, pointing to a group-level phenomenon that shared leadership is (Pearce & Conger, 2003; Pearce & Sims, 2000). As some of our interviewees put it:

“what we start with is that objectives are negotiated and set together” (group level)

“meetings are organized in order to discuss a topic together and to decide what to do” (bank level)

Cox, Pearce & Perry (2003) point out that shared leadership relies on a dynamic exchange of lateral influence among peers. Our data shows that in OP-Pohjola Group lateral influence among peers is at the heart of running the group.

Leadership is not in this context evaluated by how well for example the CEO of the central organization solves problems, but how well the group does it together. As put forward in our data:

"we are a co-operational organization to the full, not a centrally run group, but a collaborative entity in which doing together, acting together and mutual respect are extremely important" (group level)

"for sure as there are an enormous number of views it is difficult and challenging, but one must face the challenges.. not start by discarding some (views) to make it easier to act...one must make it work as one's own practice is.."(group level)

As ideals are often that against which results are evaluated, it serves to note that there seems to be some pride associated with what our interviewees call "a co-operational decision-making process". Overall, these findings suggest that shared leadership characterizes what is seen in OP-Pohjola Group as 'their own way to lead'.

3.3 All individuals contribute to the process of leadership

One of the key distinctions 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 (e.g., Cox et al., 2003). According to our data, in OP-Pohjola Group the view of and expectations for the so called quiet members are consistent with the idea of shared leadership. The quiet members do and are expected to assume specialist roles and participate in the leadership processes despite the extent to which questions at hand are strategic (cf. Pearce, Manz, & Sims Jr, 2009; Senge, 1990). In other words, in the co-operative financial group and the individual banks people do not simply rely on vertical, downward influence by an appointed leader (i.e., answers are not provided top-down) (cf. Cox, et al., 2003). As our interviewees put it:

"..people have had a say, they have been involved in the process" (bank level)

"strategy process is a very illustrative example of this.. everybody comprehensively contributes to it and becomes united around it and committed to it through extensive discussions.."(group and bank level)

"creating strategy.. through a procedure everyone is part of it in one way or the other.. this is how we get the group's units along to bring a positive spirit to this (group and bank level)

The accounts are in line with the notion that certain ideas of participative decision-making (e.g., Vroom & Jago, 1988) define also important aspect of shared leadership (Shamir & Lapidot, 2003). They are also consistent with prior co-operative research (Birchall & Simmons, 2004) suggesting that shared goals and values uplift peoples' aspirations (Senge, 1990), connect people and motivate them to participate in co-operation in which leadership is broadly distributed among individuals (Yukl, 1998) instead of a single individual acting in the leading role (Ropo & Sauer, 2008; Pearce & Conger, 2003; Senge, 1990). In other words, all work to enhance the process and to make it more fulfilling and, thereby, shared leadership manifests in the co-operative banking context(s).

3.4 Leadership is a joint effort of interdependent individuals

When leadership is shared, "important decisions about what to do and how to do it are made through the use of an interactive process that involves many different people who influence each other" (Yukl, 1998, p.3). Further, Pearce and Conger (2003) point out that in shared leadership individuals in groups "lead one another to the achievement of group or organization goals or both" (p. 1). In our data, this feature of shared leadership is well manifest. Some of the interviewees even go as far as describing OP-Pohjola Group as the "world of multi-headed leadership". The multiple heads lead each other towards achieving the group's goals by interdependent efforts. Interdependence of those sharing leadership seems to be, in fact, another key feature of the leadership practice in the group. As our interviewees state:

"we are like Siamese... the more we grow together... the more dependent we are of each other" (group level)

"people are crisscross wearing different hats in different meetings.. sometimes one forgets one's role and task and has to pinch oneself asking who am I when sitting in an OPK task force or committee.."(group level)

The data suggest that there is not only active participation in various leadership processes, but a variety of roles in which the organizational members participate. As the above quotations indicate, the interdependence and reciprocal contributions to the leadership processes are associated with a sense of 'us' even to the extent that the participants become confused about their individual selves, thereby manifesting leadership as a group level phenomenon (Pearce & Conger, 2003; cf. Senge, 1990; Senge et al., 1994; Fletcher & Käufer, 2003). It seems that in this context the classical idea of differences (and the distinction) between 'leaders' and 'followers' becomes out-dated as the roles of participants constantly change.

3.5 Conversation is stressed in leadership associated communication

In extant literature (e.g., Ruderman et al., 2002; Erkut, 2001; Fletcher & Jacques, 2000; Held, 1990; Ruddick, 1989), shared leadership is also referred to as ‘conversational decision-making.’ It helps create a shared vision, which is vital for organizations as it provides the focus and energy for learning (cf. Senge, 1990). In our data, consistent with the above findings, the role of conversation in leadership communication is highlighted:

“I claim that our leadership culture has been extremely conversational.. I would say sometimes even overly conversational..” (bank level)

“a conversational culture...is good.. first we discuss, discuss, and discuss and reach an agreement” (group level)

“our way to carry out things is conversational” (bank and group level)

“the way things are carried on is very conversational, very much a Swedish style to search for mutual solutions”. (bank and group level)

Interestingly, this leadership style is referred to by the interviewees (as a quotation above shows) as a consensus-driven ‘Swedish way’ to lead (see e.g., Vaara, Risberg, Soderberg & Tienari, 2003). The on-going informal communication provides the participants to the leadership processes not only a shared vision, but a shared sense of purpose (cf. Senge, 1990). Thereby, this intensive multi-way communication is seen as crucial for successful leadership in OP-Pohjola Group, providing additional evidence of shared leadership operating in the co-operative banking group.

3.6 Leadership seeks for mutual benefit via open and honest communication

While traditional conceptions of leadership highlight the role of an individual leader in many ways, it also highlights individual value (and opportunism), thereby creating incentives to rely on secrecy and even deception (to maintain one’s power or illusion of it and to gain personal benefits). Co-operatives seek individual benefits via mutual value and, thereby, the traditional notions are not necessarily the best fit to this context. According to our data, a more democratic, honest, and open way is valued and aimed at, as shown in the following quotations (S Group that is referred to is a co-operative group operating primarily in retail business):

“as we talk about our banking group or S Group just as well.. transparency is in order” (group level)

“we are dealing with an enormously important issue here.. we can only operate like this based on mutual in-group trust..” (group level)

“we are like an ameba that searches solutions beyond boundaries (of individual banks).. but this of course is based on.. there must be total trust..”(group level)

Our data indicates that the joint search for solutions and the joint search for better knowledge to base decisions on as well as co-operation in general would not be successful without open and honest communication between participating entities and individuals. Thereby, shared leadership is the way the banks and the group are run.

3.7 Summary of the findings

The above analysis shows that leadership manifests itself in the operations of OP-Pohjola Group and its member banks in ways that can be at the level of concepts communicated as shared leadership. The evidence is strong in the sense that there is consistency between various aspects of leadership covered by the interviewee accounts and the features included in shared leadership at the conceptual level (Nemerowicz & Rosi, 1997). In other words, in the data leadership is made sense in terms of frequent interaction between individuals participating to the leadership process in which high quality of the interaction is important for successful leadership. It is also highlighted that those sharing leadership prefer using time for the interaction to secure high quality decisions. Consistently, leadership is seen as a process in which doing and acting together is essential. ‘We lead together’ can be identified as a more or less explicit motto. As working together, solving problems together, deciding together are the starting point, goal and ideal in co-operative banks, it is evident that they also set the criteria for evaluating leadership in the group, thereby manifesting shared leadership. Maintaining the consistency is the finding that in the context(s) of our research each person is expected to comprehensively contribute to the process of leadership and everyone is also offered the possibility to do this. What further highlights this feature is that leadership is a joint effort of dynamically interdependent individuals, who see themselves as becoming united in the process. Communication, in such a form of leadership, is not (only) vertical and formal, but (also) horizontal and informal. Conversation is stressed to degrees that even evoke amusement amongst participants. Overall, the process of leadership takes place in a context of trust and mutual respect with the aim of mutual benefits via open and honest communication (transparency).

4. Discussion and conclusion

In co-operative banks and the group the form leadership is shared (Pearce & Conger, 2003). This means that all the participants to leadership contribute to the questioning and careful observation of particularities. Together they create the best knowledge of complex realities. On the other hand, ideas of how to deal with these complexities are the aim and core of leadership processes, thereby echoing the voices of Foucault (1999) and Aristotle – the information age providing the sounding board.

As it comes to co-operative management research that is the target of contribution, the above findings are more in line with the works of Tuominen and colleagues (2010), Birchall and Simmons (2004), and Spear (2004) than they are with the ideas set forth by Davis (2001). In other words, collective and participatory nature of decision-making is emphasized and leadership is not seen an act of a stand-alone hero. On the other hand, the sequential and reciprocal contributions of individuals to the multi-headed processes of leadership are emphasized along with the roles of competence and vision that seem to be the primary concern for Davis (2001). The difference is that in the context(s) of our study, the competences and visions are seen as a result of joint efforts.

The study shows that shared leadership construct helps us think of and articulate leadership in the co-operative banking context(s). A simple implication is that future co-operative management research should incorporate the shared leadership construct into the frameworks used to study leadership in co-operatives and co-operative groups. For example, future research should incorporate knowledge and understanding of shared leadership as well as shared leadership skills into the list of key competences. The construct utilized in this study might actually help take the work of Tuominen et al. (2010) towards a more detailed understanding of managerial competences required in consumer co-operatives.

As a practical implication, the training and mentoring of co-operative bank administrators should focus on knowledge and skills required in shared leadership. Especially important it is to keep in mind that in shared leadership the main job of an administrator is to promote the development of the skills and knowledge of the people combined to create the joint results (Elmore, 2000). Even in contexts in which it is considered as the 'own way' to lead, shared leadership will not serve mutual benefits in the best possible way unless it is systematically promoted. However, before this can be properly done, researchers should investigate what shared leadership skills actually are and how they can be measured, evaluated and developed (thereby helping both research and practice).

On a broader landscape, but closely related to the context of financial institutions, the possible connections between shared leadership and sustainability (social and economic) should be studied. Taking time to do jointly discuss and reflect the complexities of market and general environment have not been (it seems) in the core of decision-making in the financial sector. A question raised by our study is: Can shared leadership in part explain the fact that co-operative financial institutions have been the rock on which the entire sector has to some extent relied on? Another important question for the future is: Can shared leadership help prevent financial crises? Overall, there is need to study what kind of consequences shared leadership has (good or bad) in the contexts it manifests itself.

As it seems that the co-operative context is particularly suitable for shared leadership, it would be interesting to study what in fact are the antecedents of shared leadership and how they relate to ideas and principles of co-operation. Our work provides some leads, but a comprehensive modelling is needed. As a related issue, to proceed in theory elaboration, it also serves to ask: What are the boundary conditions for shared leadership? Our work points towards critical roles individual competence and trust.

Evidently, our work has limitations, such as specific industry context as well as the purpose of the study and, thereby, the methodological choices made. Future research should attempt to go beyond the limitations of our work. First, as it comes to leadership, research should be directed towards investigating particularities of specific industry contexts including other than the financial sector. Second, once a more complete model of shared leadership is generated, a quantitative and statistical approach could be taken to test the model and evaluate its generalizability to particular populations. We trust that more research will follow.

References

- Birchall, J. & Simmons, R. (2004). What Motivates Members to Participate in Co-operative and Mutual Businesses? A Theoretical Model and Some Findings. *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics*. 75(3).465-495. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8292.2004.00259>
- Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2006). Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*. 3(2).77-101. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1191%2F1478088706qp063oa>

- Burns, T., & Stalker, G.M. (1961). *The management of innovation*. London: Tavistock Publications.
- Carson, J.B., Tesluk, P.E., & Marrone, J.S. (2007). Shared Leadership in Teams: An Investigation of Antecedent Conditions and Performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(5), 1217-1234. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/20159921>
- Cox, J.F., Pearce, C.L., & Perry, M.L. (2003). Towards a Model of Shared Leadership and Distributed Influence in the Innovation Process: How Shared Leadership Can Enhance New Product Development Team Dynamics and Effectiveness. In C. L. Pearce & J. A. Conger (Eds.), *Shared Leadership: Reframing the Hows and Whys of Leadership*. (pp. 48-76) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Davis, P. (2001). The Governance of Co-operatives Under Competitive Conditions: Issues, Processes, and Culture. *Corporate Governance*, 1(4), 28-39. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/EUM0000000005975>
- Denzin, N.K., & Lincoln, Y.S. (1994). (eds). *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Edmondson, A. (2002). The Local and Variegated Nature of Learning in Organizations: A Group-Level Perspective. *Organization Science*, 13(2), 128-146. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1287/orsc.13.2.128.530>
- Eisenhardt, K. & Graebner, M. (2007). Theory Building from Cases: Opportunities and Challenges. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(1), 25-32. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2007.24160888>
- Elmore, R. (2000). *Building a New Structure for School Leadership*. Washington DC: The Albert Shanker Institute.
- Erkut, S. (2001). *Inside women's power: Learning from leaders*. Wellesley, MA: Wellesley College Centers for Women, for the Winds of Change Foundation.
- Fletcher, J.K. & Jacques, R. (2000). Relational Practice: an Emerging Stream of Theorizing and its Significance for Organizational Studies. CGO Working paper. Center for Gender in organizations, Simmons Graduate School of Management, Boston, MA.
- Fletcher, J.K. & Käufer, K. (2003). Shared Leadership: Paradox and Possibility. In C. L. Pearce & J. A. Conger (Eds.), *Shared Leadership: Reframing the Hows and Whys of Leadership* (pp. 19-47) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Foucault, M. (2001). Tarkkailla ja rangaista. Original: Surveiller et punir (1975). Helsinki: Otava.
- Foucault, M. (1998). Tiedontahto. Original: la Volonté de Savoir (1976). Helsinki: Otava.
- Gephart, R.P. (2004). Qualitative research and the Academy of Management Journal. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(4), 454-462. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2004.14438580>
- Held, V. (1990). Mothering versus contract. In J. Mansbridge (Ed.), *Beyond self interest* (pp. 287-304). Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Huxham, C., & Vangen, S. (2000). Leadership in the Shaping and Implementation of Collaboration Agendas: How Things Happen in a (Not Quite) Joined-up World. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(6), 1159-1175. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1556343>
- Jussila, I., Byrne, N., & Tuominen, H. (2012). Affective Commitment in Co-operative Organizations: What Makes Members Want to Stay? *International Business Research*, 5(10), 1-10. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ibr.v5n10p1>
- Jussila, I., Goel, S., & Tuominen, P. (2012). Governance of Co-operative Organizations: A Social Exchange Perspective. *Business and Management Research*, 1(2), 14-25. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5430/bmr.v1n2p14>
- Kearins, K. (1996). Power in Organisational Analysis: Delineating and Contrasting a Foucauldian Perspective. *Electronical Journal of Radical Organisation Theory*, 2(2)[Online] Available: http://www.mngt.waikato.ac.nz/ejrot/Vol_2/kearins.pdf
- Lambrechts, F., Bouwen, R., Grieten, S., Huybrechts, J., & Schein, E.H. (2011). Learning to Help Through Humble Inquiry and Implications for Management Research, Practice, and Education: An Interview With Edgar H. Schein. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 10(1), 131-147. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/AMLE.2011.59513279>
- Lee, T. W., Mitchell, T. R. & Sablinski, C. J. (1999). Qualitative Research in Organizational and Vocational Psychology, 1979-1999. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 55(2), 161-187. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1999.1707>
- Mayo, M., Meindl, J., & Pastor, J.-C. (2003). Shared Leadership in Work Teams. A Social Network Approach. In C. L. Pearce & J. A. Conger (Eds.), *Shared Leadership: Reframing the Hows and Whys of Leadership* (pp. 193-214). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Mehra, A., Smith, B., Dixon, A., & Robertson, B. (2006). Distributed Leadership in Teams: The Network of Leadership Perceptions and Team Performance. *Leadership Quarterly*, 17(3), 232-245. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.02.003>
- Moxley, R. S. (2000). *Leadership and Spirit*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Munkner, H-H. (1981). *Co-operative Principles and Co-operative Law*. Marburg/Lahn: Institute for Cooperation in Developing Countries.
- Nemerowicz, G., & Rosi, E. (1997). *Education for Leadership and Social Responsibility*. London: Falmer.
- OP-Pohjola. (2011). Retrieved September 19, 2011 from the OP-Pohjola Group website [Online]. Available: <https://www.op.fi/>
- OP-Pohjola Group Annual Review. (2009). [Online] Available: <https://www.op.fi/op/op-pohjola-group/media/year-2009?cid=161509740&kielikoodi=en&srcpl=3>
- O'Toole, J., Galbraith, J., & Lawler, E.E. III. (2003). The Promise and Pitfalls of Shared Leadership: When Two (or More) Heads are Better Than One. In C. L. Pearce & J. A. Conger (Eds.). *Shared Leadership: Reframing the Hows and Whys of Leadership* (pp. 250-268). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Pearce, C.L., & Conger, J.A. (2003). All those years ago: The Historical underpinnings of shared leadership In C. L. Pearce & J. A. Conger (Eds.). *Shared Leadership: Reframing the Hows and Whys of Leadership* (pp. 1-18) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Pearce, C.L., Manz, C., & Sims, H.P., Jr. (2009). Where Do We Go From Here? Is Shared Leadership the Key to Team Success? *Organizational Dynamics*, 38(3), 234-238. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2009.04.008>
- Pearce, C.L., & Sims, H.P., Jr. (2000). Shared leadership: Toward a multi-level theory of leadership. In M. Beyerlein, D. Johnson & S. Beyerlein (Eds) *Advances in interdisciplinary studies of work teams: Team Development* (Vol. 7, pp. 115-139). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Ropo, A., & Sauer, E. (2008). Corporeal Leaders. In D. Barry & H. Hansen (Eds.) *The Sage Handbook of New Approaches in Management and Organization*. London: Sage Publications.
- Ruddick, S. (1989). *Maternal thinking: Toward a Politics of Peace*. Boston: Beacon.
- Ruderman, M., Ohlott, P., Panzer, K., & King, S. (2002). Benefits of Multiple Roles for Managerial Women. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(2), 369-386. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3069352>
- Seibert, S.C., Sparrowe, R.T., & Liden, R.C. (2003). A Group Exchange Structure Approach to Leadership in Groups. leadership In C. L. Pearce & J. A. Conger (Eds.). *Shared Leadership: Reframing the Hows and Whys of Leadership* (pp. 173-192). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Senge, P.M. (1990). *The Fifth Discipline. The Art and Practice of The Learning Organization*. New York: Doubleday.
- Senge, P.M., Roberts, C., Ross, R.B., & Smith, B. J. (1994). *The Fifth Discipline Field book. Strategies and Tools for Building a Learning Organization*. London: WS Bookwell.
- Shamir, B., & Lapidot, Y. (2003). Shared Leadership in the Management of Group Boundaries. A Study of Expulsions From Officers' Training Courses. In C. L. Pearce & J. A. Conger (Eds.). *Shared Leadership: Reframing the Hows and Whys of Leadership* (pp. 235-249) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Spear, R. (2004). Governance in Democratic Member-Based Organizations. *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics*, 75(1), 33-59. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8292.2004.00242.x>
- Spears, L.C., & Lawrence, M. (2002). *Focus on leadership: servant-leadership for the twenty-first century*. New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons.
- Tuominen, P., Jussila, I., & Rantanen, N. (2010). Managerial Competence in Consumer Co-operatives: Inducing Theory from Empirical Observations. *International Journal of Co-operative Management*, 5(1), 9-22.
- Uski, T., Jussila, I., & Saksa, J.M. (2007). Regional Retail Co-Operation: A Strategic Network Perspective on a Customer-Owned Organization. *Journal of Co-operative Studies*, 40(1), 18-29.
- Vaara, E., Risberg, A., Soderberg, A-M., & Tienari, J. (2003). Nation Talk. The Construction of National Stereotypes in a Merging Multinational. In A-M. Soderberg & E. Vaara (Eds.). *Merging Across Borders. People, Cultures and Politics*. Copenhagen, DK: Business School Press.

- Van Dijk, T. (1998). *Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach*. London: Sage.
- Vandewaerde, M., Voordeckers, W., Lambrechts, F., & Bammens, Y. (2011). Board Team Leadership Revisited: A Conceptual Model of Shared leadership in the Boardroom. *Journal of Business Ethics*. 104(3).403-420. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-0918-6>
- Vroom, V.H., & Jago, A.G. (1988). *The New Leadership: Managing participation in organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Vroom, V.H., & Yetton, P.W. (1973). *Leadership and decision-making*. (Rev. ed.) New York: Scribner's.
- Watkins, W.P. (1986). *Co-operative principle: today and tomorrow*. Manchester: Holyoake Books.
- Westley, F., & Mintzberg, H. (1989). Visionary Leadership and Strategic Management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 10(S1).17-32.<http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/smj.4250100704>
- Yukl, G.A. (1998). *Leadership in organizations* (4thed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Table 1. Classical and shared leadership compared

Classical leadership	Shared leadership
Displayed by a person's position in a group or hierarchy.	Identified by the quality of people's interactions rather than their position.
Leadership evaluated by whether the leader solves problems.	Leadership evaluated by how people are working together.
Leaders provide solutions and answers.	All work to enhance the process and to make it more fulfilling.
Distinct differences between leaders and followers: character, skill, etc.	People are interdependent. All are active participants in the process of leadership.
Communication is often formal.	Communication is crucial with a stress on conversation.
Can often rely on secrecy, deception and payoffs.	Values democratic processes, honesty and shared ethics. Seeks a common good.

Drawing from material in Nemerowicz and Rosi (1997) *Education for Leadership and Social Responsibility*, London: Falmer Press. Page 16.