

Exploring the antecedents of shared leadership in event organisations

ABSON, Emma <<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-1333-4216>> and SCHOFIELD, Peter <<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-9109-7674>>

Available from Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive (SHURA) at:
<http://shura.shu.ac.uk/30655/>

This document is the author deposited version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

Published version

ABSON, Emma and SCHOFIELD, Peter (2022). Exploring the antecedents of shared leadership in event organisations. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 52, 439-451.

Copyright and re-use policy

See <http://shura.shu.ac.uk/information.html>

Exploring the antecedents of shared leadership in event organisations – tables

Table 1: Research design

Choices adopted in study	Purpose and Rationale	Internal consistency
Multiple-case study research – The Eisenhardt Method (1989, 2021)	The Eisenhardt Method focuses on building theory from multiple cases. It is useful for an exploratory, inductive, study that illuminates the way in which team members construct shared social meanings through the interactions that take place in the work environment, as well as providing individual understanding (Chen & Barnett Pearce, 1995). Multiple cases allow for more robust evidence via replication (Lee & Saunders, 2017) and facilitated an in-depth collection and analysis of the data. The method allows for both the constant comparison of data and theory and allowed for cross-case comparisons.	Consistent with a pragmatic research paradigm, and inductive contextualised studies based on qualitative data collection
Qualitative methods	The use of qualitative methods challenged the dominant discourse in leadership studies (Kempster & Parry, 2011; Sweeney et al., 2019) and provided a rich, thick set of data that allowed participants' voices to be heard. It also allowed for examination of participants' views of lived experiences and close collaboration between researcher and participant, thus enabling the researcher to better understand the participants' actions (Klenke et al., 2016).	Consistent with a case study approach

Table 1: Description of cases and summary of data collection

	Case 1 (Agency 1)	Case 2 (Agency 2)	Case 3 (Agency 3)
Business	Creative events & communication agency (Live events & experiential communications)	Experiential agency (Live events & experiential marketing campaigns)	Brand agency (Experiential marketing campaigns & live events)
Number of employees	78	155	100 (approx.)
Organisational teams	Board of directors MD & Leadership team Client account management Creative studio Production team Strategy team	Board of directors CEO MD & Leadership team Client account management Creative studio Production team Strategy team	CEO MD & Leadership team Client account management Creative studio Production team Strategy team
Number of interviews	7	12	15
Total interview hours	4 hours, 26 minutes	6 hours, 58 minutes	7 hours, 40 minutes
Total observation hours	5 hours	21 hours	7 hours

Table 3: List of interviewees, with job title and level of management

Case study	Participant code	Job title	Level of management	Number of interviews
Agency A	A1	Head of Engagement	Leadership team	1
Agency A	A2	Managing Director	Leadership team	1
Agency A	A3	Project Director	Team leader	1
Agency A	A4	Project Manager	Team member	1
Agency A	A5	Project Manager	Team member	1
Agency A	A6	Deputy Design Director	Team leader	1
Agency A	A7	Exhibition Designer	Team member	1
Agency A	A8	Creative Artworker	Team member	1
Agency B	B1	Comms & PR manager	Team member	2
Agency B	B2	Senior Account Director	Team leader	2
Agency B	B3	Account Director	Team leader	2
Agency B	B4	Strategy Director	Leadership team	1
Agency B	B5	Design Director	Team member	1
Agency B	B6	Senior Account Executive	Team member	1
Agency B	B7	Traffic Manager	Team member	1
Agency B	B8	Senior Account Manager	Team member	1
Agency B	B9	Creative Director	Leadership team	1
Agency B	B10	CEO	Leadership team	1
Agency B	B11	Marketing & PR manager	Team member	1
Agency C	C1	Account Director	Team leader	2
Agency C	C2	Strategy Director	Team member	1
Agency C	C3	Director - People	Leadership team	2
Agency C	C4	Senior Production Director	Team leader	2
Agency C	C5	Strategy Director	Team member	2
Agency C	C6	Founding Partner & CEO	Leadership team	2
Agency C	C7	Senior Account Manager	Team member	2
Agency C	C8	Senior Designer	Team member	1
Agency C	C9	Group Design Head	Team member	1
Agency C	C10	Creative Director	Team leader	1
Agency C	C11	Director - Creative and Strategy	Leadership team	1

Table 4: Antecedent categories with examples of how they were drawn from data

Categories	Level	Data
Expertise	Project team	'Surrounding yourself with the best people for the job, and also - it comes up again and again - not being an expert in everything but having someone that is an expert in that one thing and having the absolute trust in that person that they know what they are doing, and they are going to deliver on what we've tasked them to deliver'
Communication	Individual	'A lot of the time most problems are people because people aren't being understood...if there is an issue, it's because people aren't communicating particularly well'