

Co-Leader Subjectivity in an Educational Setting

Ragnvald Kvalsund

Eleanor Allgood

Norwegian University of Science and Technology

Abstract: The study focuses on the subjectivity of co-leadership as it is experienced in certain counselling, guidance and leadership courses in higher education in Norway. The learning process is always facilitated by two leaders who work together. In this intensive study, six experienced co-leaders sorted the sample six times with the different conditions of instruction focusing on various perspectives of the co-leadership relation. Rogers' ideal and real selves and Laings' direct and meta-perspectives are among the conditions of instruction. The experimental design was constructed around three effects – relation, role and activity. A 3-factor solution was chosen that revealed different views of the co-leader relation. Role effect played a minor part in the factors and activity was not operational. The finding that some leaders had difficulty seeing their co-leader as different from them was an interesting discovery that prompts further investigation.

Introduction

In certain counselling, guidance and leadership courses at the university and college levels in Norway, it is normal practice that two leaders facilitate the learning processes. This co-leadership practice is ideologically based in a relational concept of the self where the basic unit is 'I-You' (Kvalsund 1998, Macmurray 1961/1999) or 'I-Thou' (Buber, 1958). It implies a view of personhood in which I need 'You' to fully know myself and vice versa. In its most mature developmental form one finds various expressions of dependency, independency and interdependency in the relational dynamics between 'I' and 'You'. Interdependency is viewed as the most inclusive developmental stage having the capacity to include both dependency and independency as necessary but insufficient stages for mature relational selves (Allgood & Kvalsund 2003, Kvalsund 1998).

Most academic leadership and management writers concentrate their views on the leadership role as an individual entity or feature, for example, on intelligence or other individually differentiating features important

for defining a particular individual leader characteristic (Johnson & Johnson 2005). Almost nothing is said about the leader or manager as oriented towards the conception of a relational self, neither in the form of 'co-leadership', 'co-management' nor as leadership open to the potential mutual interdependency between manager and managed. There is a small but growing body of literature in the business field where co-leadership has been defined as one primary leader co-leading with a vice-leader who is in training for the main position (Heenan & Bennis 1999). In the counselling and social work fields there is also evidence of a growing body of literature, particularly in group work (Atieno Okech & Kline 2005, Cohen & DeLois 2001, Fall & Wejnert 2005, Furr & Barret 2000, Nosko 2003, Osborn, Daninhirsch & Page 2003, Trepal, Burnell & Goodnough 2004) but it has been characterized as often lacking empirical studies (Fall & Menendes 2002).

In a review of four or five books on either organizational themes in general or group leadership and management in particular, the concept of co-leadership or leadership seen from within an ontological framework of relational self-reflexivity was not found. The concept of 'self' in terms of management and leadership, despite the introduction of a post-modern era in academia, still seems to be mostly associated with the conception of a modern individual and independent self-entity in the practical world of leadership. Although there is recognition of the complexity of organizational business processes with an accompanying acknowledgement of interdependency within teams and team-production (Hargie, Dickson & Tourish 1999, p. 46), management and leadership are basically seen from within a non-relational self-understanding.

Co-leading in the relational context means something more than being two persons responsible for leading a group while having well-defined autonomous tasks and roles. It means that any self-understanding is ontologically interdependent upon persons communicating with one another and the conception of 'co'-leadership becomes a core understanding of any leadership agency as well. In this regard, co-leading should be the normal activity of leadership agency, since even leading alone is basically grounded in a co-operative mutual agency of moving persons and tasks forward towards some end.

Co-leading

To explore co-leadership as a genuine and even necessary organizational condition for the development of leaders' relational self-understanding, one must start with the need for leaders to be in an inner relation. In co-leading one must transcend independence and individuality in leadership agency, by the sheer fact that it takes at least two persons to constitute a leadership-self. A minimal attentive and co-operative recognition of the other leader's needs

deconstructs the notion of being in fully independent control over the leadership position. By being two, the 'I and You' relation operates for the sake of a relational wholeness that de-centralizes the individualistic position, if it is to function logically and consistently as co-leadership. De-centralizing the position does not mean destroying it, rather it means subordinating it as an individualistic and independency feature in favor of being in relation.

Co-leaders' agency increases the potential actions to be taken within the leading domain and therefore the possibilities for solutions in the rational agency of organizational goal fulfillment. The richness of possibilities also decreases the predictability of leadership as a single, individual action and introduces insecurity, since the relational self-understanding becomes dependent upon interaction with another leader. Interdependency and mutuality within the relation becomes paradigmatic in co-leadership. The relation's symmetry is promoted by the recurring equality between the leading participants. As one can see, then, co-leadership promotes an attitude of equalizing even if it is not always the actual quality operating in the co-leading relation. Sometimes co-leading operates in the service of training or learning the art of leading. Such co-leading, defined as participation of two very different leaders in terms of their knowledge and experiences, leads to an asymmetrical power base between them that can be described as having dependency qualities. However, despite such differences both leaders still participate in the leading endeavor with the co-leadership premise. One leader trains and teaches the other leader while they both are co-leading a group.

Co-leadership as a 'relational-self' is further understood as a complex dynamic between two leaders. The co-leaders relate to each other with the implicit if not explicit goal of achieving a working relationship imbued with mutual respect, flexibility, tolerance and care. At its best, the co-leadership expresses its goal of equality and non-hierarchy. Even in cases, as mentioned above, in which one co-leader is less experienced than the other the goal remains the same. This reflects another ideology that the inevitably different competencies and knowledge bases of individuals are seen as positive elements in a complexity of relational and individual resources that each person brings to the co-leadership task.

Therefore, the 'relational-self' co-leadership model exceeds the two most common models of co-leadership. It is more than two leaders performing their leadership tasks independently by turn and thus sharing the facilitator load. It is a holistic non-hierarchical co-leadership model that is more complex than the usual business model in which one leader has a designated subordinate position to the head leader, no matter how closely, for example, the CEO and his or her vice-president work together (Heenan & Bennis 1999).

Main Purpose

In the process of developing leadership training programs in a university setting, the authors became interested in exploring the reasons for holding the individual notion of the leadership role as well as in looking at whether there might be rational reasons for transcending such a notion in the aspiration of self-understanding as 'relational-self' ontology. In the case of such a potential rationality, it could be interesting to explore epistemological as well as methodological implications.

In addition, based on the authors' thirteen years experience as co-leaders, the notion of the 'relational-self' seems plausible and compelling. Co-leadership as the authors experience it reflects a relational view of leadership going beyond simple or trivial co-operation that does not necessarily include the notion of complementary selves in the sense of a genuine interdependency. Exploring such a relational notion of the self based on experience reflects the authors' personal interest and commitment, and so forms part of a silent or implicit knowledge that perhaps needs expression.

Last but not least, it seems important to understand the role of leaders and managers in a rapidly changing environment that seems to emphasize human capital or human resources more than was the case in the modern industrial project of individual self-development. It seems to be a pressing time for many leaders to develop an extensive understanding of self that transcends the exclusive notion of an individually defined self (Heenan & Bennis 1999). The main purpose of this study is to investigate the subjectivity of co-leaders in Norway who have experience with the 'relational-self' co-leadership model. A secondary purpose is to uncover the implicit theories that leaders have vis-à-vis their colleagues and partners or close working associates.

Setting, Design and Development

The study's context is co-leadership as it is experienced in a post-diploma or post-graduate education program, in which approximately 25 adult students learn counselling/guidance and leadership skills in a group setting. Two co-leaders facilitate the learning process through three central educational activities – counselling/guidance demonstrations, teachings and open forums. In the counselling/guidance demonstrations, students are invited to take up some specific workplace or daily life concern with one or both of the co-leaders. The purpose is to demonstrate guidance using some specific skills or tools that the students shall learn and practice. It is a demanding and complex situation for the co-leaders in that they are both demonstrating skills and at the same time being in an authentic relationship with the student who has accepted the invitation to be in the demonstration. In the teaching activity the two leaders often teach a theme together, sharing the task in a dialogue or in a dynamic presentation. At other times one leader is the teacher while the other is attentive towards students' reactions, especially non-verbal behavior. In both cases, the two leaders work together complementarily. The open

forum is a plenary session open for all sorts of input and discussion. The two co-leaders lead together in adaptive and flexible modes in the uncertainties and insecurities of the challenging here-and-now situation. The concourses revolving around these activities reflect the co-leaders' relational positions, their work divisions and their levels of skilled on-the-spot performance.

The experimental design is organized around three main effects (see Table 1). One effect is the relation itself, as a dynamic between two co-leaders as two different persons with three levels of relational qualities as understood in the theory of the person: dependency, independency and interdependency (Allgood & Kvalsund 2003, Kvalsund 1998, Macmurray 1961/1991). This theory has also been applied as a framework for at least part of the education program that is the setting of the study. Briefly, the structure of theory helps to understand the relational qualities as they may shift between the relational levels.

The second effect is the role that the two co-leaders take in terms of their task performance. Two levels of this effect can be seen as superior/subordinate and equal reflecting the two leaders' competency and experience levels. The placement of leadership role as an effect reflects the conventional attitude of positioning, either above, under or beside, superior, subordinate or equal. This positioning attitude is common knowledge, at least in the western culture, and has been part of the general discourse in organizational life as well as in the particular setting for this study.

The third effect is activity with the three specific types of core co-leadership activities described above – counselling/guidance demonstration, teaching a topic and leading open forums, as levels. The setting in itself denoting core activities is important in order to specify the context for the co-leadership performance.

Table 1: Experimental Design

<i>Main effects</i>	<i>Levels</i>		
<i>Relation</i>	(a) Dependency	(b) Independency	(c) Interdependency
<i>Role</i>	(d) Superior/subordinate		(e) Equal
<i>Activity</i>	(f) Demonstration	(g) Teaching	(h) Open forum

Sample size: $3 \times 2 \times 3 = 18 \times 3$ replications = 54 statements (see Appendix for a list of the statements).

Over a period of more than ten years co-leaders in the continuing education context of the study have met twice a year for more than two days to discuss, learn and develop their knowledge, skills and performances. The sample of statements is drawn from this discourse. The concourse is very

familiar to the sorters, although here as elsewhere in Q studies, statements generate discriminations between sorters regarding saliency and neutrality. For example, neutral statements for some may be very salient for others. The sample is balanced through the design.

The sorting process was a forced sort in the form of a quasi-normal distribution with the ends of the continuum +/- 6 with the following pattern: (1 2 4 5 6 6 6 6 6 5 4 2 1). The ends of the continuum were labeled 'like me' (+6) and 'unlike me' (-6).

Six experienced co-leaders, including the authors, in the continuing education program participated in the study. Most of the co-leaders had worked together more than once and they all have at least 10 years co-leading experience. They sorted the sample with six different conditions of instruction that included Rogers' (1951, 1961) real and ideal selves and Laing's (Laing, Phillipson & Lee 1966) direct and meta-perspectives which were used as loose rules or laws (Stephenson 1961, pp 5-8) for generating a pragmatic framework for observing abductory principles in operation.

Briefly, Rogers' (1951, 1961) law concerns his concepts of real (how one see things as they are) and ideal (how one would like things to be) selves and how the relation between them may reveal features of congruence or incongruence. In co-leadership such congruence or incongruence is of utmost interest in terms of understanding the quality of co-leadership relationships. Features of congruence or incongruence will be discriminated by the factor structure revealing differences or similarities among Q sorts reflecting real and ideal selves. In a similar way, Laing's (Laing, Phillipson & Lee 1966) use of what he called direct and meta perspectives in understanding interactions between couples or relationships in general have the potential for revealing whether or not discrepancies exist, for example, among how I look at my self, how I believe you look at me and how you in fact look at me. In co-leadership such discrepancies may generate possibilities for co-leaders obtaining more accurate symbolization of each other in the service of better communication. Similarities and differences in such cross-relational perspectives may disclose degrees of mutuality or lack thereof through factor structure.

There was adequate time between sortings to avoid a contamination effect (Brown, 1980). The 6 conditions of instruction were: 1) how you see yourself, 2) how you would like to be, 3) how you think your co-leader sees you, 4) how you see your co-leader, 5) how you would like your co-leader to be and 6) how you think your co-leader would like you to be. The participants who co-led most together sorted the four last sorts in relation to each other. Thirty-six sorts were inter-correlated, factored and rotated to simple structure. A 3-factor varimax solution was chosen for interpretation (Atkinson 1992, Schmolck 1997). After the initial interpretation by the authors, the co-leader participants who loaded most highly on the factors were interviewed together.

Factor Interpretations

General Comments

Under the six conditions of instruction, three co-leaders loaded on one factor and three loaded on two factors (see Table 2). In terms of the design the levels in the activity effect did not seem to play a role in differentiating the factors. The relation and role effects were operative.

Table 2: Factor loadings arranged according to co-leader pairs: Ray-Kathy; Bev-Anne; Elaine-Rob and Conditions of instruction.

<i>Sorter</i>	<i>Factor 1</i>	<i>Factor 2</i>	<i>Factor 3</i>
1. Ray	70	15	34
2. Ray	86	11	18
3. Ray	80	-01	20
4. Ray	89	--12	07
5. Ray	90	-05	11
6. Ray	90	-01	14
1. Kathy	74	-03	36
2. Kathy	78	-21	33
3. Kathy	65	16	12
4. Kathy	54	02	43
5. Kathy	85	-13	35
6. Kathy	80	-13	43
1. Bev	45	44	06
2. Bev	52	55	31
3. Bev	58	28	10
4. Bev	-07	59	23
5. Bev	62	37	01
6. Bev	-08	65	12

1. Anne	02	24	48
2. Anne	03	78	23
3. Anne	-26	10	51
4. Anne	-09	30	38
5. Anne	16	85	17
6. Anne	21	67	07
1. Elaine	68	26	12
2. Elaine	68	26	-02
3. Elaine	49	54	10
4. Elaine	70	29	05
5. Elaine	83	20	09
6. Elaine	83	34	-02
1. Rob	48	13	54
2. Rob	46	04	63
3. Rob	24	18	71
4. Rob	33	24	70
5. Rob	45	10	76
6. Rob	38	20	59

The loadings defining the factors are shown in bold, decimals omitted
 Conditions of instruction, noted at the left of sorter's name:

1. How you see yourself
2. How you would like to be
3. How you think your co-leader see you
4. How you see your co-leader
5. How you would like your co-leader to be
6. How you think your co-leader would like you to be

Factor 1: Dialogue and Interdependence

Twenty Q sorts and four persons' views defined factor 1, which seems to be a portrait of a dialogic and interdependent paradigm. This view seems to have a preference for an open, flexible, free and spontaneous atmosphere. Within the view there is a will to see connections and commonalities leading to a community factor within the co-leadership relation that seems to overshadow individuality and independence. Statements that enhance individuality and separate the two leaders have either negative or indifferent scores.

As shown in Table 3, the positive statements for factor 1 seem to express a high appreciation for a highly flexible and free floating relational quality and a low appreciation for a closed structure (3, 47, 51). It is almost as if one gets the feeling that mutual trust and confidence in both real and ideal situations create a space between the co-leaders that makes them feel equal and so evidence a high tolerance for holding unpredictability and insecurity in their relationship. The relationship seems to be a container for holding excitement and being mutually adaptive as the dialogue flows on an equal and interdependent basis.

A deep value of sharing, and depending upon each other in a reciprocal way seems to be operating. The co-leaders trust each other in a way that opens up for being creative and spontaneous in their co-leading agency and behavior. Sharing of responsibility (45) seems to be built on some safe ground.

Four distinguishing statements for factor 1 (2, 14, 20, 35) all show that the co-leaders have tolerance and openness towards each other such that at any moment each one can break freely and spontaneously into the ongoing mediation. This freedom seems to operate in all three educational situations: counselling/guidance demonstration, teaching and open forums.

Dialogue as free-floating and spontaneous communication between the co-leaders does not reflect rivalry, frustration or anger through the fact that one leader is in the foreground mediating something while the other is in the background. Being in the background is simply not seen as separation or division, rather both leaders feel that what they are doing in the moment is something that they are both doing together and in that manner they are equal (54).

Three other statements (18, 10, 26) confirm the general tendency of this factor to view co-leadership as a highly communal and mutual dialogic endeavour in which insecurity and unpredictability can occur within the freedom of agency and interaction.

Table 3: Factor 1: Salient Statements

No.	Statement	Factor Score
3	Being in an ongoing dialogue in the teaching process creates a feeling that the co-leaders are really in an equal relationship. This feeling is very important for me whether or not I have the main responsibility for teaching.	+6
51	In open forums the co-leaders become fully equal and experience reciprocity when both freely lead and communicate with each other spontaneously and as openly as in the open forum.	+5
47	Only when co-leaders also co-teach and jointly express themselves in an exciting dialogue can the participants manage to grasp the essence of what the guidance relation implies as a possibility for equality and mutuality.	+5
45	Co-leaders share the responsibility of leading open forums according to all the rules of freedom and spontaneity.	+3
35	If I have the main responsibility for the guidance, it is fine with me if the other asks to come in if he or she feels passionately about something important concerning the demonstration.	+3
20	If a co-leader really desires to say something when the other leader is teaching a topic, it doesn't matter if he or she breaks in and presents his or her material.	+3
21	It is quite all right to disturb or disrupt a guidance demonstration. Despite everything, it is only a demonstration.	0
9	When we lead open forums, we must be clear about who will have the main responsibility.	-2
26	Equality in demonstrating guidance for the whole group as co-leaders is taken care of when one leader demonstrates one day that the other demonstrates the next day.	-3
10	It is very important to feel that one has control over the situation when one demonstrates guidance skills for the whole group.	-3
18	It is so important to have control and continuity in every guidance demonstration in front of the whole group that co-leaders, as a matter of course, cannot break in and take over the demonstration.	-3
54	Being in the background in an open forum, when at the same time the other leader gives me the feeling that I am not as equal as him or her creates frustration and anger in me.	-4
15	If the other co-leader has something important to say when I am teaching, I think it is best if he or she waits until I am finished before he or she says it.	-4
2	The worst thing for me is to be disrupted by the other leader when I am in the middle of teaching a topic.	-4

In terms of the design, factor 1 belongs to the interdependency and equal levels. There seems to be a clear tendency for promoting equality and community over distinct individuality. One could argue that such an emphasis on interdependency over independency might be idealistic and further that with independency in the background there might be a tendency for it to be masking dependency and/or confluence between the co-leaders.

The above interpretation finds some support from the co-leader pair, Ray and Kathy, who both load on factor 1 and express that they are at times frustrated by the lack of distinctiveness in their co-leading behaviour. Dynamics between two co-leaders with different views and behaviours that can add to the participants' experience of the group diversity is lacking with this co-leader pair. On the other hand, another co-leader Elaine who also mainly loads on factor 1, is very aware of her independency and is consciously transcending it to be in cooperative dialogic mutuality. Both her experience (condition of instruction: how you see yourself) and ideals (how you would like to be) lean in that direction, although she still thinks that her co-leader sees her as individualistic. Under the condition of instruction: how you think your co-leader sees you, Elaine loads on factor 2.

Factor 2: Separateness and Individualism

Six sorts and 3 persons load on factor 2. The perspective that seems to operate in factor 2 prefers individuality within the co-leading endeavour (see Table 4). The need for becoming clear about individualities and particularities within the co-leading relation seems to be linked to the recognition and acknowledgement of different competencies (33, 50). This difference seems to be an appreciated value within the relation as a potential for learning and development in the direction of future equality and mutuality.

The awareness of differences, therefore, seems to be a presupposition for both learning and development. There also seems to be a deep value for respecting each other as individuals within the co-leading activities. For example, when one leader is teaching the group, he or she needs the other leader to be sensitive and respectful (5) towards him or her. The feeling of equality also seems to be connected to being respectful and sensitive rather than being linked to superior or subordinate competencies. Thus mutuality seems (11) to be attached to a common understanding of differences in competencies and levels of positions rather than to equality in task authority.

In factor 2 there also seems to be mutual agreement in dividing the tasks according to competency level (12, 44, 32, 28). Individuality, learning from each other, differences in professional development, and acceptance of hierarchy in terms of organizing the co-leading activities are clearly appreciated.

Table 4: Factor 2: Salient Statements

No.	Statement	Factor Score
7	When one has responsibility for leading the open forum, the other leans back and tries to see the wholeness of the group and follows the whole group process. Here superiority and subordination are organized more as a relation where one leader is in focus and the other is in the background yet also actively leading.	+6
50	Even though we co-lead together it is important to view each other as independent beings who do our own things. This creates an understanding of different sides of the demonstration process.	+5
33	Acknowledgement and acceptance of each other's different competencies as basis for subordination and superiority creates a possible mutuality for future competence development.	+5
5	When I am leading an open forum I would like the other leader to be attentive and sensitive toward my leadership, respecting that I am leading without feeling less worthy on that basis.	+5
11	Mutuality for co-leaders is possible if both partners develop understanding for each other's positions in guidance demonstrations that can be either superior or subordinate in the moment. Then mutuality is expressed through a shared understanding of superiority and subordination.	+4
12	It is right that the co-leader who knows most about a theme can teach it without the other leader feeling that he or she is not equal on that basis.	+3
44	Agreeing about superiority and subordination is a factual necessity when equal competence is not present.	+2
32	A mutual understanding between the co-leaders about their teaching competence and theoretical strength is essential at any time for deciding which one of them will teach the group.	+2
28	The one who has the most experience and knowledge teaches the group. The other co-leader subordinates him or herself to that fact and tries to learn from the other in order to build satisfactory competence.	+2
15	If the other co-leader has something important to say when I am teaching, I think it is best if he or she waits until I am finished before he or she says it.	+1
3	Being in an ongoing dialogue in the teaching process creates a feeling that the co-leaders are really in an equal relationship. This feeling is very important for me whether or not I have the main responsibility for teaching.	-1

17	Mutuality and equality is achieved only if both leaders supplement each other simultaneously in their guidance demonstrations; that is to say that they both include each other in the demonstration process and express their complementary perspectives.	-3
20	If a co-leader really desires to say something when the other leader is teaching a topic, it doesn't matter if he or she breaks in and presents his or her material.	-3
21	It is quite all right to disturb or disrupt a guidance demonstration. Despite everything, it is only a demonstration.	-5
54	Being in the background in an open forum, when at the same time the other leader gives me the feeling that I am not as equal as him or her, creates frustration and anger in me.	-5
14	Being two equal and independent partners in co-leadership means that both of us are free to break into every guidance demonstration to put forward an important point.	-6

While there are negative feelings in factors 1 and 3 towards needing to respect the other leader's teaching time (15) and to maintain order over chaos (31), factor 2's view either seems indifferent to these issues or does not believe them to be important. Dialogue and spontaneous communication also do not seem to be virtues (3) in this view of co-leadership.

The co-leaders on this factor have a clear view that there is no value in breaking into each other's task performances (14, 20, 21). This is just another confirmation of the importance of individual independence. This orderly way of organizing the co-operation seems to ensure that there will be no chaos, confusion or confluence between the co-leaders or for those being led.

Even though statements 54 and 7 are consensus statements for factors 1 and 2 there seems to be different meanings operating in them. In factor 1 the co-leader in the background does not feel unequal or frustrated (54) because the co-leaders' shared view is that they are doing everything together in a common sphere. In contrast, in factor 2 inequalities are not felt because of a mutual agreement of trust in dividing the tasks and a respect for the leader performing a task in the moment. In factor 2, statement 7 seems to point to a complementary division of separate tasks assigned to individuals, while in factor 1 it expresses the wholeness which binds together rather than separates their distinctness. To put it differently there seems to be no need for separation in factor 1 as there seems to be in factor 2. These are examples of how statements obtain different meanings with the same score when they operate under two very different perspectives.

Factor 2 seems to represent a view in which the individual has primacy in the co-operative co-leadership endeavour. Equality and mutuality are not reached by a complementary and diverse complexity that binds the leaders

together, rather they are reached by task separation and by making a simple and complementary wholeness out of the distinctly independent individuals (17).

The co-leader pair, Bev and Anne, who most represent this factor indicate and confirm factor 2's view of strong, competent individuals who have a low confidence in the relational as a deeply shared interdependence. Although Bev loads both on factor 1 and 2 she is uncertain about how she would like to be (condition of instruction 3: confounded). She would like her co-leader to be with her on factor 1 (condition of instruction 5) but she experiences that Anne is more individualistic (condition of instruction 4: factor 2) and believes that Anne would like her to be the same (condition of instruction 6: factor 2). Anne, who loads on factors 2 and 3, admits that she does not believe fully in such a mutually shared reality, because she has experienced that it is too difficult to realize in practice. She used to believe in it, but is now disappointed and has a goal of being more independent (condition of instruction 2: factor 2) and wants her co-leader to be there with her (condition of instruction 5: factor 2). She also projects that her co-leader would like her to be independent (condition of instruction 6: factor 2). Bev also confirms that Anne holds such a view. She is familiar with it herself, being confounded between factors 1 and 2 on sort 2.

Factor 3: Dialogue and Mutuality Together with Individuality

Nine sorts and 2 persons load on factor 3. The complexity of factor 3 seems to be multi-directional, as seen in Table 5.

Table 5: Factor 3: Salient Statements

No.	Statement	Factor Score
4	As co-leader, I see myself as equal to the other leader and am ready to step in, and if necessary, contribute my part to making the demonstration successful.	+6
36	When I demonstrate guidance for the whole group it is important that the other co-leader gives me both positive and negative feedback afterwards. This means very much to me.	+5
3	Being in an ongoing dialogue in the teaching process creates a feeling that the co-leaders are really in an equal relationship. This feeling is very important for me whether or not I have the main responsibility for teaching.	+4
22	If I'm going to break in and contribute my ideas and proposals as a co-leader, I must know that it is OK for the other leader.	+4
33	Acknowledgement and acceptance of each other's different competencies as basis for subordination and superiority creates a possible mutuality for future competence development.	0

54	Being in the background in an open forum, when at the same time the other leader gives me the feeling that I am not as equal as him or her, creates frustration and anger in me.	0
5	When I am leading an open forum I would like the other leader to be attentive and sensitive toward my leadership, respecting that I am leading without feeling less worthy on that basis.	-2
32	A mutual understanding between the co-leaders about their teaching competence and theoretical strength is essential at any time for deciding which one of them will teach the group.	-3
21	It is quite all right to disturb or disrupt a guidance demonstration. Despite everything, it is only a demonstration	-3
31	Independence is important for both leaders but they must co-ordinate things so that one leader subordinates him or herself to the other and does not create too much chaos in the group.	-3
15	If the other co-leader has something important to say when I am teaching, I think it is best if he or she waits until I am finished before he or she says it.	-4
28	The one who has the most experience and knowledge teaches the group. The other co-leader subordinates him or herself to that fact and tries to learn from the other in order to build satisfactory competence.	-4
14	Being two equal and independent partners in co-leadership means that both of us are free to break into every guidance demonstration to put forward an important point.	-4
46	Each leader teaches the group and doesn't interfere with the other's area of competence.	-5
49	At the end of the day, one leader is needed for an open forum. The other shall just be a support and wait for his or her turn in the next time period.	-6

There seems to be a preference for togetherness and dialogue within the co-leading agency (3), but with more structure, planning and an appreciation for the value of individual performance (22) than can be seen in factor 1. Individuality in factor 3 is based on equality from within the perspective of two strong and independent co-leaders. There seems to be a respect for and willingness to maintain individuality within the interdependent dialogic context of co-leading. Equality (28) is a strong thread throughout the factor where there is no basis for and therefore indifference towards superiority and subordination (33, 54).

The importance of getting feedback (36) distinguishes this factor. One interpretation of this statement could be that it appreciates the individual for egotistical and independent reasons. Another could be that it embraces individuality from within the relation understood as a unity of 'I and You' as in the 'relational-self' interdependent perspective it is important to maintain and enhance both co-leaders' individualities. There is a strong argument for the latter interpretation since in this factor the value of individuals also

embraces equality (4). Feedback as it is integrated into the communicative perspective, therefore, seems to maintain and enhance distinct but fully equal individualities within the unity of 'I and You' co-leadership. The willingness to receive negative feedback points to confidence in each other as leaders.

Generally Factors 1 and 3 share both openness and flexibility in dialogue within the co-leading activity. Factor 3, however, does not value one leader breaking in and disrupting the other (21). There are feelings against creating coherence through subordination (31). Independence is important, but not in order to avoid chaos. Rather it is important for enhancing the awareness of the dialogic unity of 'I and You'. It is in this connection that there must be some order and respect for each leader's independence.

Based on the growing notion of equality in factor 3's view, there is no need for using differences as the basis for deciding upon subordination or superiority or for deciding upon who does what based on differences in theoretical strengths or weaknesses (32).

In fact, both co-leaders in factor 3 perform their co-leadership tasks together in common. Still, there seems to be a need for distinguishing the individualities within the tasks and for not creating a togetherness that can lead to confluence. Togetherness, division and differentiation of task performances are achieved within the spirit of interdependence, with no feelings of competition and rivalry (5).

One can say that Factor 3's view seems to embrace dialogue and mutuality while at the same time underlining a need for maintaining the individual within the co-leading activities. Independence and individuality are appreciated as necessary but not sufficient conditions for co-leading. Individuality is not seen as an external entity, but rather as distinct within the unity of 'I and You' that is highly valued for defining and contributing to the totality of co-leader mutual agency and interaction.

Bev who loads on this factor under conditions of instruction 1, 3 and 4 sees interdependency as something she performs more or less out of habit and as confirmed by an equality value in the Norwegian culture. This is an ideology that she wants to replace with the ideal of a stronger and competent individual as discussed above. On the other hand, Rob, with all his sorts on this factor, clearly values the importance of not losing one's individual distinctness within the more relational and mutual dialogic worldview. This value seems to be communicated to his co-leader, Elaine, who believes that he sees her as independent (condition of instruction 3: factor 2). In their co-leading relation, he appreciates their independence and strong theoretical positions. For him their teaching competencies do not determine who does what in their co-leading agency, rather pragmatic considerations are decisive (32).

Consensus Statements

Many of the consensus statements recognize the necessity of including a 'relational-self' perspective in order to co-lead (see Table 6). There is consensus in having two leaders who co-operate even if the understanding and meaning of that co-operation seem to operate for different reasons (34, 49) on different factors. Consensus statements that are in the negative part of the distribution (23, 40) also reveal that there is little support for the feeling of being excluded from the co-leadership when one of the leaders is more active than the other.

All three factors seem to support a complementary view of co-leadership roles, although for different reasons according to the main view of each factor. For example, factor 1 sees complementary roles (7) under the perspective of shared commonality and mutual dialogue while factor 2 sees them from within a strengthening of individual competencies that create a better wholeness, and factor 3 values the combination of the two perspectives.

From within its complementary view on co-leading, statement 7 also indicates that subordination does not distinguish between the co-leaders. It is quite easy to agree upon this statement since factors 1 and 3 basically do not appreciate hierarchical organization of the co-leader roles and factor two approves of orderly organized co-leader individualities. The same tendency is apparent in statement 48.

Table 6: Consensus Statements

No.	Statement	Factor Score		
		1	2	3
7	When one has responsibility for leading the open forum, the other leans back and tries to see the wholeness of the group and follows the whole group process. Here superiority and subordination are organized more as a relation where one leader is in focus and the other is in the background yet also actively leading.	4	5	6
13	Co-leaders actively lead groups in open forum in their own way and thus perform independently and clearly.	-2	0	-1
16	When I am actually less competent than the other leader to lead an open forum I compensate by checking out with the other leader if he or she feels that I am developing my skills. This is something that gives me a feeling of being on the way to equality.	-1	-2	0
23	In the moment that one leader demonstrates guidance for the whole group; I can't see myself or feel equal as a leader.	-5	-3	-3

27	Rivalry between us co-leaders in teaching situations must be taken up outside the situation so that it doesn't become a part of the group's process. The latter would be unprofessional.	-2 -1 -2
34	Both co-leaders of the open forum must have a mutual understanding that each one can break in naturally, even though one of the leaders has the main leadership responsibility.	4 2 2
40	Being invisible as a co-leader in an educational situation makes me feel small and gives me a feeling of not being so meaningful. .	-3 -3 -2
43	Becoming clear as co-leaders is important in relation to open forums such that the group knows who does what and what the differences are between the two leaders	0 0 0
48	Co-leaders become mutual and equal partners when one teaches and the other holds his or her attention on the group as a whole and tries to stimulate the ongoing learning process by paying attention to different barriers in the teaching situation.	4 2 4
49	At the end of the day, one leader is need for an open forum. The other shall just be a support and wait for his or her turn in the next time period.	-5 -4 -6
53	As co-leaders it is important that we are independent and competent but the teaching must be coordinated in order not to split the group regarding which one of the two leader authorities to follow	0 0 0

In conclusion, one can see a general meaning emerging from the consensus statements connected to the fact that each factor appreciates co-leadership as an important leadership structure. Therefore, each factor probably also holds the 'relational-self' dimension as a basis for leadership operations, although, as we have seen, this seems to be a weaker notion in factor 2. Statements 23 and 40 both indicate a 'relational-self' understanding that can be seen as an implicit motivating force for co-leading.

Brief Discussion

In terms of a 'relational-self' perspective all three factors underline relational qualities and do not express the value of being only one leader (see consensus statements above). Both factors 1 and 3 seem to express interdependence but with quite different weightings on independence which plays a necessary but subordinate role in the person theory (Allgood & Kvalsund 2003, Kvalsund 1998, Macmurray 1961/1991). Factor 2 clearly seems to express independence. The differences between factors 1 and 3 are especially interesting and will be discussed after a short comment on factor 2.

An interesting question within factor 2's separatist and individuality co-leadership paradigm is whether or not the co-leaders will end up as fully external and independent entities, and so lose the potential for becoming mutually equal and interdependent. There seems to be such a protective attitude for being an independent individual and at the same time being willing to subordinate to superiority for the sake of development that the following question seems legitimate. Is this view basically a dependency perspective where the goal is to cooperate in order to reach an independent status judged as a necessary and sufficient condition for ideal co-leadership? This view's negative feelings for dialogic, free and spontaneous communication can be a signal in such a direction.

Within the overall interdependency paradigm of factors 1 and 3, factor 1 seems to express interdependency as a free-floating and fused collective endeavour. The factor has a rich and open attitude towards the co-leaders' relationship where dialogue and spontaneous intrusion upon each other's performance seems to be extensive. One way to interpret this factor is to say that there is real interdependence and a virtue of mutuality operating within a dialogic perspective.

There is a feature, however, in this factor that could point to a different interpretation. Within the espoused interdependence there could be an overshadowing of the individual partialities of the co-leaders. The lack of interest in and concern for the individual and his or her independent stance could give an impression of a confluent and therefore a conflated interdependence. One could interpret the factor as leaning towards being against individuality, which is simply expressed in fusion and confluence. One reason for such an interpretation resides in the fact that true interdependence, as it has been defined within the theory of the person (Kvalsund 1998), ensures that independence is included and not threatened. Co-leadership relations or relational selves in factor 1 can be at risk of not taking the individual seriously as a distinct partiality within the co-leaders' agency. In this interpretation there will be no troubled 'I-You' relation with concern for each other. Interdependence as an ideology often seems to create pretences of distinct co-operation and if confluence is the consequence of such pretensions, dependence might be a more adequate description of the relationship since fusion and confluence are well known field descriptions of such relationships.

Interviews with Ray and Kathy who loaded highly on factor 1 lend some support to the above interpretation. As noted above, they are both aware and sometimes frustrated by the lack of distinctness in their co-leading behaviour. Their need for distinctness, however, is most often replaced by good feelings of togetherness based on an intuitive trust that each is mindful of including the other.

The most salient loadings on factor 1 reflect ideal views but there are also high loadings for real views as well, and in that manner factor 1 also

exhibits congruence between ideal and real views. A hypothesis for this factor is that it is a highly developed interdependent view mixed with some risk of becoming dependent upon interdependence as an ideology and as a result suppressing and losing sight of the individual as separate and independent.

In contrast to factor 1, factor 3's concern for dialogic mutuality has a deep consideration for individual separateness within that mutual domain. There seems to be clear boundaries between the individual partners within the co-leading agency. There is a feeling of equality within the relational domain of co-leading and at the same time a respect for individual differences; in one case not as a function of task authorities but of language capacities.

Elaine and Rob who co-lead together remark that decisions regarding who does what are often taken on the pragmatic basis of Elaine's lesser linguistic ability in the working language, Norwegian, which is not her mother tongue. Both leaders agree that the need to communicate most effectively is the determining factor in making such decisions. Although in this regard when Rob takes the lead in some activities, Elaine does not hesitate to jump in and contribute with her knowledge and skill when she feels it appropriate.

A general discussion of the factor loadings can now proceed on the basis of the six conditions of instructions that interrelate the co-leaders' view of themselves and each other. On factor 1, Ray and Kathy represent the same view for themselves as well as for each other. One could say that their interdependence is a fully shared experience that they both agree upon. They have both revealed an empathic view of each other by saying that they know that they are alike and, yet, a question remains: what happened to their differences?

Another situation exists for co-leaders Elaine and Rob, and Bev and Anne. They are on different factors, at least for some of their sorts thus being different as well as similar. The fact that Rob and Elaine are on different factors means that they do not see each other in the same way. Even with the instruction to empathize with the other's point of view under the conditions of instruction, how you see your co-leader, and how you would like your co-leader to be, each one seems to end up seeing the other as him/herself. They think they are the same, while factors 1 and 3 reveal that they are not. There seems to be a lack of relational and social awareness of each other's viewpoints that needs development. On the other hand, Bev and Anne see each other such that Anne (condition of instruction 5) would like Bev to be more individually oriented and Bev (condition of instruction 6) empathizes with Anne's wish. Except for this, reciprocity does not seem to exist strongly either for Rob and Elaine, or Bev and Anne.

This surprising finding suggests an opportunity for further exploration into why it is so difficult to empathize with close colleagues and friends. Tentatively one could say that there might be a wish to decrease differences

by understanding the other as oneself. In the discussion among the participants after the interviews, this discovery of non-empathic co-leader subjectivities created a basis for deconstructing and re-constructing perspectives about one another. The finding was highly appreciated as a surprising basis for new and more discoveries about one another's subjectivities.

From group and organizational perspectives one can see that the lack of valuing each other's uniqueness within co-leadership might be an expression of Argyris and Schön's (1996) theory on the differences between espoused theories and theories in use. The co-leaders' theories-in-use as expressed through the co-leader pairs' subjectivities can be seen to reveal both a yearning for sameness and a projection of one's view onto the other. These theories in use may indicate an underlying need for confirmation of oneself by the other that is more highly weighted than the espoused theory of co-leadership as valuing uniqueness. The tendency for persons to choose colleagues that they think are like them is well known. Less well acknowledged, perhaps, is the value of individual uniqueness as a resource in group and organizations.

This point can also be a possible answer to the lack of value that co-leadership has had in educational and organizational settings where the theory-in-use has been sceptical to the need for two leaders; and, perhaps, especially two equal leaders. It is not surprising then that the educational setting's undervaluing view of co-leadership finds expression in these co-leader pairs' subjectivities. Consciously or not, co-leader subjectivity in this study supports the theory-in-use in that two equal leaders are more of the same. In the context of that theory, any administrative and political justification for having two leaders is likely to be based on one leader being in a superior position to the other. Therefore, task differentiation, as allocated by authority, becomes the *raison d'être* for individuality of the leader roles. Diversity lies in tasks and superior authority not in leader subjectivity. However, in the authors' experience task diversity within equality and mutually shared authority promotes quality differentiated leadership. For example, it has been especially valuable in cases in which one leader has come into conflict with a participant and the other leader has been able to facilitate the process out from his/her subjectivity.

The value of diversity and individuality seems difficult to practice, perhaps because one does not really believe in it. This can be an important area for further research into group and organizational behaviour that espouses diversity in teams, for example. Further research can bring clarity to what is meant by diversity. If diversity is to pertain to more than tasks and superior authority then more needs to be discovered about the implicit beliefs about sameness and uniqueness at the individual and group levels.

Further, this research project can be seen as the beginning of further explorations into developing understanding of organizational issues

involved in co-leadership from, for example, evaluative, accountability and remunerative perspectives.

Finally, the participants in this study were co-leaders in an educational setting, and an area for further research could be students' subjectivity regarding co-leadership, in particular, the dynamic between co-leaders. This is a field rich with possibilities for uncovering subjectivity in learning arenas.

References

- Allgood, E. & Kvalsund, R. (2003). *Personhood, professionalism and the helping relation*. Trondheim: Tapir.
- Argyris, C. & Schön, D. (1996). *Organizational learning theory II*. New York: Addison-Wesley.
- Atieno Okech, J. & Kline, W. (2005). A qualitative exploration of group co-leader relationships. *Journal for Specialists in Group Work*, 30 (2), 173-190.
- Atkinson, J.R. (1992). *Qmethod* Version 1.0 [Computer software.] Kent, Ohio: Computer Center, Kent State University.
- Brown, S. (1980). *Political subjectivity: Applications of Q methodology in political science*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Buber, M. (1958). *I and Thou*. New York: Schribner.
- Cohen, M. & DeLois, K. (2001). Training in tandem: Co-facilitation and role modeling in a group work course. *Social Work with Groups*, 24 (1), 21-36.
- Fall, K. & Menendez, M. (2002). Seventy years of co-leadership. *TCA Journal*, 30 (2), 24-34.
- Fall, K. & Wejnert, T. (2005). *Journal for Specialists in Group Work*, 30 (4), 309-327.
- Furr, S.R. & Barret, B. (2000). Teaching group counselling skills: Problems and solutions. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 40 (2), 94-99.
- Hargie, O.D.W., Dickson, D. & Tourish, D. (1999). *Communication in management*. Hampshire: Gower.
- Heenan, D. A. and Bennis, W. (1999). *Co-leaders: The power of great partnerships*. New York: John Wiley.
- Johnson, D.W. & Johnson, F.P. (2005). *Joining together*, 9th edition. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Kvalsund, R. (1998). *A theory of the person*. Trondheim: NTNU.
- Laing, R.D., Phillipson, H., and Lee, A.R. (1966). *Interpersonal perception*. New York: Springer.
- Macmurray, J. (1961/1991). *Persons in relation*. New Jersey: Humanities Press International.

- Nosko, A. (2003). Adventures in co-leadership in social work group practice. In R. Kurland & A. Malekoff (Eds.). *Stories celebrating group work*. (pp. 175-183). Binghamton, New York: Haworth Social Work Practice Press.
- Osborn, C.J., Daninhirsch, C.L. & Page, B.J. (2003). Experiential training in group counselling: Humanistic processes in practice. *Journal of Humanistic Counselling, Education and Development*, 42 (1), 14-24.
- Rogers, C. (1951). *Client-centered therapy*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Rogers, C. (1961). *On becoming a person*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Schmolck, P. (1997). *PQMethod* (Version 2.10, adapted from mainframe-program QMethod written by John Atkinson, 1992) [Computer software]. Neubiberg, University of the Bundeswher Munich. Available as freeware at: <http://www.rz.unibw-muenchen.de/~p41bsmk/qmethod/>.
- Stephenson W. (1961). Scientific creed. *The Psychological Record*, 11, 1-17.
- Trepal, H, Burnell, B. & Goodnough, G. (2004). Co-leadership: Whose needs are getting met here? In L. Tyson, R. Perusse & J. Whitledge. (Eds.). *Critical incidents in group counselling*. (pp. 27-31). Alexandria, Virginia: American Counselling Association.

Appendix

Factor Scores

No.	Statement	1	2	3
1	I think that it is impolite of me as a co-leader to break in with my proposals or ideas when the other leader is demonstrating guidance skills for the whole group.	-3	0	1
2	The worst thing for me is to be disrupted by the other leader when I am in the middle of teaching a topic.	-4	-1	-1
3	Being in an ongoing dialogue in the teaching process creates a feeling that the co-leaders are really in an equal relationship. This feeling is very important for me whether or not I have the main responsibility for teaching.	6	-1	.4
4	As co-leader, I see myself as equal to the other leader and am ready to step in, and if necessary, contribute my part to making the demonstration successful.	4	-2	5
5	When I am leading an open forum I would like the other leader to be attentive and sensitive toward my leadership, respecting that I am leading without feeling less worthy on that basis.	1	.5	-2

No	Statement	1	2	3
6	I don't want the other leader to tell me that I have made a mistake in my teaching. That is something that we can discuss together as equal partners and not in front of the whole group.	-2	0	0
7	When one has responsibility for leading the open forum, the other leans back and tries to see the wholeness of the group and follows the whole group process. Here superiority and subordination are organized more as a relation where one leader is in focus and the other is in the background yet also actively leading.	4	6	5
8	In a guidance demonstration, if I become stuck then I will look to my co-leader with the security that he or she can help me out of the problem.	2	1	3
9	When we lead open forums, we must be clear about who will have the main responsibility.	-2	3	3
10	It is very important to feel that one has control over the situation when one demonstrates guidance skills for the whole group.	-3	1	1
11	Mutuality for co-leaders is possible if both partners develop understanding for each other's positions in guidance demonstrations that can be either superior or subordinate in the moment. Then mutuality is expressed through a shared understanding of superiority and subordination.	-1	4	-1
12	It is right that the co-leader who knows most about a theme can teach it without the other leader feeling that he or she is not equal on that basis.	-1	3	-2
13	Co-leaders actively lead groups in open forum in their own way and thus perform independently and clearly.	-2	0	-1
14	Being two equal and independent partners in co-leadership means that both of us are free to break into every guidance demonstration to put forward an important point.	2	-6	-4

No	Statement	1	2	3
15	If the other co-leader has something important to say when I am teaching, I think it is best if he or she waits until I am finished before he or she says it.	-4	1	-4
16	When I am actually less competent than the other leader to lead an open forum I compensate by checking out with the other leader if he or she feels that I am developing my skills. This is something that gives me a feeling of being on the way to equality.	-1	-2	0
17	Mutuality and equality is achieved only if both leaders supplement each other simultaneously in their guidance demonstrations; that is to say that they both include each other in the demonstration process and express their complementary perspectives.	1	-3	2
18	It is so important to have control and continuity in every guidance demonstration in front of the whole group that co-leaders, as a matter of course, cannot break in and take over the demonstration.	-3	-1	1
19	Having two independent and competent leaders is a strength in an open forum only if each one gives the other a chance. Talking at the same time doesn't create leadership.	0	1	3
20	If a co-leader really desires to say something when the other leader is teaching a topic, it doesn't matter if he or she breaks in and presents his or her material.	3	-3	1
21	It is quite all right to disturb or disrupt a guidance demonstration. Despite everything, it is only a demonstration.	0	-5	-3
22	If I'm going to break in and contribute my ideas and proposals as a co-leader, I must know that it is OK for the other leader.	-1	3	4
23	In the moment that one leader demonstrates guidance for the whole group, I can't see myself or feel equal as a co-leader.	-5	-3	-3
24	Equality as co-leaders in the teaching situation is most clearly expressed when the teaching role is carried out so that the participants come to share both leaders' subject matter perspectives and strengths.	1	3	3

No	Statement	1	2	3
25	Demonstrating guidance for a whole group is a spontaneous affair – the leader doesn't need direct feedback about that. It is in the air and everyone knows what happened, both positively and negatively.	-2	-4	-5
26	Equality in demonstrating guidance for the whole group as co-leaders is taken care of when one leader demonstrates one day that the other demonstrates the next day.	-3	1	-1
27	Rivalry between us co-leaders in teaching situations must be taken up outside the situation so that it doesn't become a part of the group's process. The latter would be unprofessional.	-2	-1	-2
28	The one who has the most experience and knowledge teaches the group. The other co-leader subordinates him or herself to that fact and tries to learn from the other in order to build satisfactory competence.	-1	2	-4
29	Sharing teaching tasks so that the group receives the co-leaders' best competency serves the purpose of understanding guidance as a subject matter field.	3	3	1
30	Co-leaders agree about meeting the group in the open forum with their common leadership without deciding who has specific responsibility.	0	-4	-3
31	Independence is important for both leaders but they must co-ordinate things so that one leader subordinates him or herself to the other and does not create too much chaos in the group.	-2	1	-3
32	A mutual understanding between the co-leaders about their teaching competence and theoretical strength is essential at any time for deciding which one of them will teach the group.	0	2	-3
33	Acknowledgement and acceptance of each other's different competencies as basis for subordination and superiority creates a possible mutuality for future competence development.	2	5	0

No	Statement	1	2	3
34	Both co-leaders of the open forum must have a mutual understanding that each one can break in naturally, even though one of the leaders has the main leadership responsibility.	4	2	2
35	If I have the main responsibility for the guidance, it is fine with me if the other asks to come in if he or she feels passionately about something important concerning the demonstration.	3	0	2
36	When I demonstrate guidance for the whole group it is important that the other co-leader gives me both positive and negative feedback afterwards. This means very much to me.	1	-2	6
37	Leading open forums together makes it difficult to separate the two leaders in relation to who does what. It easily creates chaos and confluence for both the group and the leaders.	-4	-3	-2
38	Co-leadership in open forums gives both leaders scope but it is important to have a mutual understanding that the one who has the main responsibility for leading the exercise doesn't take away from the other.	2	4	3
39	Subordination and superiority in the leadership task in the open forum functions genuinely only if mutuality is seen as a necessity in such an arrangement.	2	-1	-2
40	Being invisible as a co-leader in an educational situation makes me feel small and gives me a feeling of not being so meaningful.	-3	-3	-2
41	What is demanding with mutuality and equality in the co-leader role is expressed uncertainty and tentative exercising of professionalism rather than control and secure expectation about a definite course of action.	3	-1	4
42	Superiority and subordination in the teaching situation is more an arrangement that creates structure and order than an expression of the co-leaders different competency levels.	1	-2	1

No	Statement	1	2	3
43	Becoming clear as co-leaders is important in relation to open forums such that the group knows who does what and what the differences are between the two leaders.	0	0	0
44	Agreeing about superiority and subordination is a factual necessity when equal competence is not present.	-1	2	-1
45	Co-leaders share the responsibility of leading open forums according to all the rules of freedom and spontaneity.	3	-4	-4
46	Each leader teaches the group and doesn't interfere with the other's area of competence.	-6	-2	-5
47	Only when co-leaders also co-teach and jointly express themselves in an exciting dialogue can the participants manage to grasp the essence of what the guidance relation implies as a possibility for equality and mutuality.	5	2	2
48	Co-leaders become mutual and equal partners when one teaches and the other holds his or her attention on the group as a whole and tries to stimulate the ongoing learning process by paying attention to different barriers in the teaching situation.	4	2	4
49	At the end of the day, one leader is needed for an open forum. The other shall just be a support and wait for his or her turn in the next time period.	-5	-4	-6
50	Even though we co-lead together it is important to view each other as independent beings who do our own things. This creates an understanding of different sides of the demonstration process.	1	4	2
51	In open forums the co-leaders become fully equal and experience reciprocity when both freely lead and communicate with each other spontaneously and as openly as in the open forum.	5	-2	-1
52	All co-leaders must be able to think and feel for themselves— teach their subjects independently and feel equal even if they are not able to teach the same material equally well.	2	4	2

<i>No</i>	<i>Statement</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>
53	As co-leaders it is important that we are independent and competent, but the teaching must be coordinated in order not to split the group regarding which one of the two leader authorities to follow.	0	0	0
54	Being in the background in an open forum, when at the same time the other leader gives me the feeling that I am not as equal as him or her, creates frustration and anger in me.	-4	-5	0