The Interim Leader:
Organizational Considerations Before the Permanent Leader Arrives

Tom Sechrest
St. Edward's University

Organizations have situations in which there is unexpected change at the executive level when a leader departs, and provisional leadership is required. Interim executives serve organizations for brief periods of time, but often play a pivotal role in leading successful executive transitions, providing crucial leadership while organizations take time to assess and strategically prepare for new permanent leadership. The author served in an interim executive role and did a review of the limited existing literature to help prepare for that role. This heuristic reflection suggests some important considerations for an organization faced with the immediate need for a new leader and a call for more research.

Keywords: leadership, interim, transition, succession planning, executive search

INTRODUCTION

Organizations are often ill equipped to deal with the abrupt change related to the departure of a senior leader. Many do not have succession-planning processes in place, even though leadership succession is inevitable in an organization's life cycle (Schepker, Nyberg, Ulrich & Wright, 2018). Saporito and Winum (2012) state succinctly, "With the complexities involved in selecting and transitioning the chief executive increasing with each passing decade, the mindset of the past and the methods used then are, in many ways, inadequate for ensuring success..." Often the leadership skill sets needed to continue or advance organizational strategy after an executive departure are either not available within current employee ranks, or an external candidate is desired by the Board or hiring officer. This involves a search for someone not currently affiliated with the organization. The search may be lengthy and complicated, entail the services of an external recruiter or search firm, necessitate unplanned budget expenditures for on-site interviews, and may demand alternative pay and benefits options for the incoming replacement.

As with any employee hire, there are elements of risk associated with either replacing a departed leader with a current employee or with an external candidate. Many organizations do not have processes or procedures to measure, manage or otherwise mitigate this risk. (Bartram, 2012; Cornwall, 2001; Moran & Green, 2009).

Regardless, this situation calls for someone to be selected for a provisional leadership role. Interim executives can be selected from internal employees as well as from a pool of experienced individuals who are available for such temporary assignments. There are even placement firms that specialize in finding candidates to serve in interim executive roles.

In addition, there are often challenges for the interim executive associated with relationships built and commitments negotiated during the departed leader's tenure; individuals disappointed that they were not

selected for the interim position; individuals who disagree with the interim selection decision; issues related to ongoing operations that the interim leader must confront; and a transition when the permanent replacement leader starts.

Consequently, leadership succession in organizations is considered one of the most critical events in an organization's operations (Favaro, Karlsson, & Neilson, 2014). Ram Charan, in a cover article in *Harvard Business Review*, called the CEO succession process in North America "broken," noting how few corporations have satisfactory succession processes in place (Charan, 2005). In a subsequent 2008 book, Charan described the state of leadership in today's corporations as a "crisis." A 2018 worldwide survey of 2,500 companies revealed that nearly 17.5 percent of CEOs of the world's largest companies left their posts (Karlsson, Turner & Gassman, 2018). Previous U.S. studies of nonprofit executives revealed large numbers of executives who were planning to leave their jobs as well as a significant percentage who were planning to leave their jobs but had not given notice that they were actively considering leaving (Bell, Moyers and Wolfred, 2006; Cornelius, Moyers & Bell, 2011). Whether caused by generational shifts as Baby Boomers approach retirement, by executive burnout, by lackluster financial performance in relevant markets, or a myriad of other reasons, leadership turnover is a reality among organizations, though many organizations are not prepared for the inevitable. Leadership transition is an opportunity for re-evaluation and growth, but it is also a time of uncertainty and vulnerability. Messersmith, Lee, Guthrie & Ji (2014) suggest that departures at the top leadership level can have deleterious effects on subsequent performance. Given the likelihood of executive change, and the opportunities and perils that accompany it, organizations should clearly benefit from engaging in a carefully planned transition process even if such a change is not currently anticipated. Consequently, the topic of executive leadership transition seems to demand more attention than it has received.

Balser and Carmin (2009) noted that not much research was devoted to the subject of leadership transitions and even less research devoted specifically to interim executive leadership as a part of the transition process. Two early major studies of interim leadership by Farquhar (1991; 1995) continue to inform much subsequent literature. Wolfred (2008) and Latif (2010) suggested that the impending retirement of many Baby Boomers will create more leadership vacancies than can readily be filled by younger generations, whose members seek a different work-life balance and may not as actively seek executive roles as did their Boomer predecessors. Nonprofit organizations tend to be smaller and have flatter hierarchies than for-profit organizations and thus may lack the financial or human resource bench strength to strategically prepare for leadership transition (Santora, Caro & Sarros, 2007; Wolfred, 2008). Adams (2004) noted also that the departure of an executive in smaller organizations might result in loss of valuable institutional memory. Organizations will benefit, therefore, by acquiring more knowledge about issues of executive transition and the role that interim executives might play in smooth and successful leadership changes.

Whether exploring for-profit or nonprofit sectors, a large number of researchers and practitioners view executive transition as a time of potential crisis. Poorly-handled transitions can lead to low morale, lower productivity, and organizational fragility (Farquhar, 1991), organizational identity threat (Balser & Carmin, 2009), even permanent weakening of the exercise of authority by future leaders (Gilmore & Ronchi, 1995). McKee (2008) identified a number of authors who found executive departure to be traumatic--having ripple effects on staff, stakeholders, and the political and economic climate of the organization. Eder-Van Hook and Van Hook (2011) identified a number of characteristics affirming the stresses and confusion associated with executive transition. They found increasing conflict, power plays among staff, Board and other stakeholders, increased turnover, and emotions running high, often akin to a grieving process. These stresses often prompt Boards or hiring managers to act too hastily in selecting a replacement for the departed executive. Stock (2008) also noted that nonprofit Board members, often selected because of specific business or management skills or community networks, frequently lacked the emotional intelligence needed to handle the turbulent emotional responses surrounding executive departure and transition. A hastily chosen new executive may meet with resistance from staff, or fall victim to the "Rebecca myth," (an allusion to a character in a Daphne DuMaurier novel), in which remaining staff attribute superhuman virtues and qualities to departed leaders (Farquhar, 1991; Gilmore &

Ronchi, 1995). On the other hand, if the former leader was disliked by staff or departed under a cloud, lingering resentments may transfer to the successor (Farquhar, 1991). Gilmore (1988) noted that if a former executive had been fired, this might trigger departures from other staff that felt loyalty to the departing leader, or may result in factions forming as remaining staff divide according to their views on what occurred. Bridges and Mitchell (2000) note that higher-ranking leaders in an organization tend to grasp long-range change vision more rapidly than lower-ranking staff members, who are more concerned with daily details and operations. Organizational leaders need to be sensitive to this difference, and allow time for the entire organization to process emotions and issues during transition.

Adams (2004) found that as many as 70% of nonprofit executive transitions are non-routine; that is, they occur due to an organizational crisis or the departure of a founder or visionary leader. Adams (1998) defined a routine transition as one that occurs "when an executive retires or takes another position and a stable organization goes through an orderly process of hiring a new executive" (p. 50). He identified four different types of non-routine nonprofit executive transitions:

- Turnaround transitions, when there is a financial or programmatic crisis, a need to conduct an extensive Board or staff reorganization, or a possible merger;
- Organizational startups, when a Board is hiring its first paid executive after a period early in its life cycle, shifting from a volunteer-driven to a staff-driven operation;
- Underperforming organizations, often a prelude to full-blown crisis, indicating the possibility of a worn out executive or lack of attention to necessary systems infrastructure;
- Founder successions, in which an organization's culture is strongly linked to an often visionary, charismatic founder.

Adams (1998) further noted that non-routine transitions create vulnerability for the new executive, who may be asked to resolve an overwhelming number of issues that have not been thoroughly considered by the Board prior to launching a replacement search. A hasty selection process can result in short tenures for incoming executive directors. The ramifications of a poorly-handled executive transition can be serious (Chapman & Vogelsang, 2005). Funders may withdraw or decrease their support if they perceive difficulties with the leadership transition (Wolfred, 2008). It was also observed that poorly-managed transitions can lead to high executive turnover, extended periods of underperformance, and reduced delivery of crucial services to the organization's constituencies. In extreme cases a failed leadership transition resulted in the organization going out of business (Adams, 2004). In subsequent work, Adams (2010) called for moving "…beyond episodic and scattered attention to leader transitions…to a consistent and thoughtful ongoing strategy."

While transition is clearly a time of risk, many scholars and practitioners have also found it to be an important opportunity for positive organizational change. Gilmore (1988) described the transition period as an opportunity for turnaround or reorganization that might not have been possible under the previous leader. Farquhar (1995) suggested that an interim period is a buffer, particularly after a non-routine or traumatic executive departure, during which organizations can stabilize and prepare for new leadership. Goler (2003) and Berkshire (2010) also viewed the time between leaders as a strategic opportunity for evaluation and reflection.

Researchers and practitioners who study and work with executive transition frequently cited William Bridges' work on transition (1991) as a useful model (Allison, 2002; Goler, 2003; Wolfred, 2005). Bridges and Mitchell (2000) drew the following distinction between transition and change in organizations:

"Transition is the state that change puts people into. The *change* is external (the different policy, practice, or structure that the leader is trying to bring about), while *transition* is internal (a psychological reorientation that people have to go through before the change can work)" (p. 31).

Bridges (1991) defined three distinct phases in the process of transition, as follows:

- Ending or letting go. In this phase, stakeholders involved in a transition must have an opportunity to say goodbye to the past. In the case of executive transition, this may include grieving the departure of a former supervisor and preparing to relinquish old ways of doing business.
- Neutral zone. After letting go, those experiencing transition enter an in-between state filled with uncertainty and anxiety. Mergers and acquisitions, as well as executive transitions, are times when such anxiety may run especially high in organizations. Stakeholders are uncomfortable with uncertainty and tend to want to rush through this phase. However, spending time in the neutral zone is essential to successful transition, allowing new creativity to flourish as well as providing time for necessary planning and development of future direction.
- New beginnings. Following the processes of letting go and moving through the discomfort of the neutral zone, organizations and individuals are able to welcome and celebrate the next phase without clinging to old methods or assumptions. In an executive transition, this phase marks the opportunity for successful new leadership.

Bridges' model provides a useful frame through which to view issues related to interim executive leadership.

It is not surprising, given both the complexities and opportunities of executive transitions, that more organizations are turning to the use of interim executives. Citing the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Frase-Blunt (2004) noted that 11% of the country's temporary workers are serving in executive or professional capacities. Adams (2004) noted that a number of major foundations and funders around the country are encouraging and providing support for the use of interim executives as a best practice in successful leadership transition. Needleman (2008) noted in *The Wall Street* Journal that more and more organizations are turning to the use of interim executives. The process of seeking new leaders has changed in keeping with new organizational leadership practices that encourage a more participatory process for Board and staff members, rather than the appointment of an heir apparent by an outgoing chief executive (McKee, 2008). The search for a new leader may be lengthy and an interim executive is required to keep the organization moving forward during that search. Providing opportunities for stakeholders to be a part of the transition process is crucial to building and maintaining trust, an important factor in paving the way for success for the eventual new leader (Ballinger, Schoorman & Lehman, 2009; Bunker, 2008).

Researchers and practitioners cite numerous advantages to building an interim leadership period into a transition process. Gilmore & Ronchi (1995) suggested that an interim period is needed to allow stakeholders to dispel the shadows of predecessors. Without time for this processing, the memory of former leaders may continue to influence staff or Board members well beyond the executive's departure. Discussing the concept of interim leadership as a best practice, Mayer (2005) and Wolfred (2005) pointed to the longstanding example of many Protestant denominations, which require an interim pastor for a year or longer, depending on the length of the predecessor's service, in order for the congregation to reflect and consider goals and strategic issues before hiring a replacement. Mayer (2005) noted the similarity between churches and arts organizations as having a mission of tending the spirit. This could be said of many other types of organizations as well. Experienced interim presidents of colleges and universities have stated that communities need time before they are fully ready to accept the arrival of a new leader (Anyaso, 2009). Goler (2003) cited the need for organizations to undergo a period of self-assessment in order to lay the groundwork for a successful leadership transition. Stock (2008) cautioned that if Boards act too fast, they will tend to hire the wrong replacement without considering organizational needs, and the result will be a failed transition, which can further destabilize the organization.

Many organizations appoint an existing staff member as interim, partly to provide continuity but often to save salary budgets during the period of executive vacancy. While this practice may be fiscally prudent, especially for smaller organizations, a number of authors point out the disadvantages of internal appointees (Farquhar, 1991; Farquhar, 1995; Goler, 2003; Gordon & Rosen, 1981; Wolfred, 2005). These authors note that internal appointees tend to be more risk averse than external interims. Internal

interims may be candidates for the permanent job and therefore lack the independence necessary to take difficult actions, or they may be concerned about relationships with former peers. An internal interim may have difficulty relinquishing their former duties when the permanent executive arrives, resulting in further departures and instability.

Interim executive directors must fulfill complex, specific tasks, including a thorough institutional assessment, financial audits, crisis management, review or initiation of strategic planning, turnarounds, layoffs, or restructuring in order to leave the organization stronger and prepared for new leadership (Farquhar, 1991; Goler, 2003; Knight, 2000; Mayer, 2005; Osse, 2009; Wolfred, 2005). The cadre of professional external interim executives includes individuals who have specific skills and experiences as former executives themselves and who may even be considered overqualified for the permanent executive position for which they are laying the groundwork (Knight, 2000; Shaw & Chase, 2006). Internal staff appointed as interim executives may find themselves unprepared, overwhelmed or ill-suited for some of the duties they will be called upon to carry out (Wolfred, 2005).

Farquhar wrote that interim leadership is a "legitimate subfield" (1991, p. 68) of executive leadership, rejecting the widely held notion that interim executives are merely placeholders. Interim executives are likely to need a range of skills and experiences as broad as those of a permanent executive. Anyaso (2009) noted that interim periods can be considered either transitional or transformational depending on the organization's situation. A transitional interim serves to maintain the status quo, while a transformational interim will seek to bring about change in order to prepare the organization for permanent new leadership. Frase-Blunt (2004) stated that interim executives must be able to take charge quickly while remaining sensitive to the emotions the staff is undergoing. Skills that are important for new leaders taking charge include emotional intelligence, empathy, and active listening (Bunker, 2008; Eisinger, 2000; Manzoni & Barsoux, 2009; Stock, 2008). Wagstaffe (2009) cited calmness, problem-solving ability, and the capacity to smooth over disturbances as essential skills. McKee and Driscoll (2008) found that successful leadership transition requires team building and mentoring within the organization. Mayer (2005) stated the most important role of an interim executive is communication, in order to "reassure all the stakeholders that the organization is moving forward with a clear vision of the future" (p. 4).

At least three leadership styles and theories seem relevant to better understanding interim executive leadership. Situational leadership (Northouse, 2018) provides for four different styles that a leader employs flexibly, depending on the level of competence and commitment of the followers. The four styles of situational leadership are high directive/low supportive (telling), high directive/high supportive (selling), high supportive/low directive (coaching), and low supportive/low directive (delegating). It is likely that during a period of executive transition, an interim executive might find a situational leadership style to be beneficial, because of varying levels of competence and commitment.

Elements of transformational leadership may also be applicable to interim executives. Northouse (2018) states "transformational leadership fits the needs of today's work groups, who want to be inspired and empowered to succeed in times of uncertainty" (p. 163). An interim executive supports transformation by stabilizing and shaping an organization to prepare it for new leadership.

The servant leadership model (Northouse, 2018) is also highly relevant to nonprofit interim executives. Servant leadership is concerned with the needs of followers, which is consistent with the mission and values of many nonprofit organizations. Further, the servant leader places the needs of followers ahead of their own. Unlike a permanent executive, who may focus on building personal reputation and image in the community, an interim executive more often than not remains in the background and does not focus on long-term visibility (Mayer, 2005).

LESSONS FOR ORGANIZATIONS

Based on what researchers have gleaned over the years from leadership transition issues, there are several "lessons learned" to consider, among them:

1. Organizations, especially smaller ones, need to be abundantly aware that the possibility of a leadership transition is real.
2. There are risks in whatever happens, scheduled or unscheduled.
3. There needs to be some sort of plan in place to react to the need for leadership transition.
4. The issues related to leadership transitions are complex and convoluted, meaning that they cannot be ignored or addressed superficially.
5. Internal candidates being considered for an interim executive position must be made aware of issues they may confront as well as boundaries they must navigate during their provisional role. If they will not be considered as a permanent replacement, this must be expressed up front.
6. Organizations may wish to look to the ranks of external executives who may be available to fulfill an interim role, thus bypassing issues related to internal candidates.
7. A variety of leadership styles can help an interim executive be successful, depending on organizational context and history.

PERSONAL TAKEAWAYS

While the limited existing literature enabled the author to recognize there was no established process for assuming a role as an interim executive, a decision was made to accept the organization's offer. Then a personalized planning process was initiated.

- An overall timeline with key activities to accomplish by certain deadlines was established.
- An enumeration of internal issues in which the author had limited experience and/or knowledge was made, and those gaps were filled.
- Various stakeholders inside the organization were consulted, and their articulation of issues that needed to be addressed as priorities during the interim year were noted.
- Strategic initiatives for the interim year were listed and prioritized, and confirmed with organizational superiors. The data that was required to gauge the success of strategic endeavors was negotiated.
- A communication plan was crafted to inform stakeholders of the efforts that would be undertaken and in what order, along with regular updates about progress. Weekly messages kept all stakeholders informed.
- A personal plan was also a key component of the author's preparation. Clear and critical thinking, demonstrating visible leadership behaviors, and being authentic were paramount. The author's vision was based on four personal pillars: collaboration, transparency, process improvement, and mission fulfillment.
- Maintaining awareness of the organization as a system was a key component to the interim leadership plan. The outcomes of any organization are a result of collective efforts, and recognizing that individuals in an organization are independent as well as subject matter experts meant that aligning efforts around the central mission of the parent organization was vital.
- With constant change the major bellwether of context, a central question was how the organization might best manage innovation so as to stay abreast of change if not ahead of it. Would status quo be maintained, or was there a need for launching new initiatives? It was decided that the organization would seek to improve the way it handled its responsibilities within the parent organization, to seek out and incorporate new technology into operations, to eliminate administrative redundancies, and in general find ways to enhance existing processes.
- An external view revealed that there were numerous partnerships that needed to be maintained and cultivated, even though the interim appointment was only for a year.

- There is ample time within even a relatively short-term interim executive assignment for a leader to "get out of balance." Consequently, a personal plan for health, diet, exercise, sleep, continuing education, and relaxation also became a driving force.

In the unique experience of the interim year that precipitated this grounded reflection, it was discovered that instead of shock and instability, the change actually energized all who were affiliated and involved. Engagement was public and collaborative and optimistic. This "change at the top" was seen as an opportunity to move visibly into a different kind of future. As a result, the interim year went well. The organization maintained, sustained and even started some new projects.

After a national search, when the new leader began a year later, the transition was value-added, supportive, and the entire organizational system was primed to take the next steps forward toward the vision of the new leader.

As more and more Baby Boomers retire; as the natural progression of individuals through their careers results in them leaving one position for another; as someone gets burned out with the intensity of an executive role; as the parent organization encourages rotation of executives—the need for interim leaders will increase.

The author encourages anyone who works in an organization where there is a change in leadership and who is either given the opportunity to become an interim or who works for a person who is in an interim appointment to think about that change as broadly as possible and to capture the story so as to add to the developing literature about interim leaders. Much of the existing literature is about planning *for* interim appointments, not being thrust into them and then reflecting on the experience. That's an area worth some continued attention.

REFERENCES

Adams, T. (1998). Executive transitions: How boards and executives create their futures. *Nonprofit World*, 16(3), 48-52.

Adams, T. (2004). *Capturing the power of leadership change: Using executive transition management to strengthen organizational capacity.* Baltimore, MD: The Annie E. Casey Foundation

Adams, T. (2010). *The nonprofit leadership transition and development guide: Proven paths for leaders and organizations.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Anyaso, H. (2009). Interim expertise. *Diverse: Issues in Higher Education*, 26(20), 14-15.

Ballinger, G. A., Schoorman, F.D., & Lehman, D.W. (2009). Will you trust your new boss? The role of affective reactions to leadership succession. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20(2), 219-232.

Balser, D. B., & Carmin, J. (2009). Leadership succession and the emergence of an organizational identity threat. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, 20(2), 185-201.

Bartram, P. (2012, March). 8 ways to a successful succession planning. *Financial Management*, pp. 36-37.

Bell, J., Moyers, R., & Wolfred, T. (2006). *Daring to lead 2006: A national study of nonprofit executive leadership.* CompassPoint Nonprofit Services. Retrieved from www.compasspoint.org/research

Berkshire, J.C. (2010). More and more charities hire interim leaders. *Chronicle of Philanthropy*, 22(14), 16.

Bridges, W., & Mitchell, S.M. (2000). Leading transition: A new model for change. *Leader to Leader*, (16), 30-36.

Bridges, W. (1991). *Managing transitions: Making the most of change.* New York, NY: Perseus Books.

Bunker, K. A. (2008). In focus/responding to change: Helping people manage transition. *Leadership in Action*, 28(5), 15-17.

Chapman, T., & Vogelsang, J. (2005). Executive director transitions: An organization development approach. *Journal for Nonprofit Management*, 9(1), 2-8.

Charan, R. (2005). Ending the CEO succession crisis. *Harvard Business Review*, 83(2), 72-81.

Charan, R. (2008). *Leaders at all levels: Deepening your talent pool to solve the succession crisis.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cornelius, M., Moyers, R., & Bell, J. (2011). *Daring to lead 2011: A national study of nonprofit executive leadership.* Oakland, CA: CompassPoint Nonprofit Services.

Cornwall, D. (2001). Leadership due diligence: Managing the risks. *Corporate Board*, 22(129), 1-8.

Eder-Van Hook, J., & Van Hook, R.T. (n.d.). Understanding leadership transitions. Retrieved July 18, 2011, from http://www.transitionceo.com/article.php?id=3

Eisinger, J. (2000). Suddenly CEO. *Association Management*, 52(3), 59.

Farquhar, K. W. (1991). Leadership in limbo: Organization dynamics during interim administrations. *Public Administration Review*, 51(3), 202-210.

Farquhar, K. W. (1995). Not just understudies: The dynamics of short-term leadership. *Human Resource Management*, 34(1), 51-70.

Favaro, K., Karlsson, P-O., & Neilson, G.L. (2014). The lives and times of the CEO. *strategy+business*, (75), cover story.

Frase-Blunt, M. (2004, June). Short-term executives. *HR Magazine*, 49(6), 110-114.

Gilmore, T.N., & Ronchi, D. (1995). Managing predecessors' shadows in executive transitions. *Human Resource Management*, 34(1), 11-26.

Gilmore, T.N. (1988). *Making a leadership change: How organizations and leaders can handle leadership transitions successfully.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Goler, R. I. (2003). Making the most of the internal interim directorship. *Journal for Nonprofit Management*, (7), 56-66.

Gordon, G. E., & Rosen, N. (1981). Critical factors in leadership succession. *Organizational Behavior & Human Performance*, 27(2), 227-254.

Karlsson, P-O., Turner, M., & Gassman, P. (2019, Summer). Succeeding the long-serving legend in the corner office. *strategy+business*, (95).

Knight, C. (2000). Transition exec bridges gap during change. *Nonprofit World*, 15(5). Retrieved from http://www.snpo.org/publications/sendpdf.php?id=1078

Latif, M. (2010). Succession planning – another look. *Journal for Nonprofit Management*, 14(1), 2-7.

Manzoni, J-F., & Barsoux, J-L. (2009). The interpersonal side of taking charge. *Organizational Dynamics*, 38(2), 106-116.

Mayer, D. Y. (2005). *Filling the gap: The interim executive director solution.* Chicago, IL: Illinois Arts Alliance Foundation.

McKee, M.C., & Driscoll, C. (2008). Creating stabilizers and safety nets for successor executives' high-wire act. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, 18(3), 341-357.

Messersmith, J.G., Lee, J., Guthrie, J.P., & Ji, Y. (2014). Turnover at the top: Executive team departures and firm performance. *Organization Science*, 25(3), 776-793.

Moran, T., & Greene, R. (2009, November). Career wise. *Best's Review*, 11(7), 16.

Needleman, S. (2008, May 13). Employers tap executives for temporary jobs. *The Wall Street Journal*, p.B1.

Northouse, P.G. (2018). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (8th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Osse, J. (2009, October 19). Change agents. *Modern Healthcare*, 39(42), 26.

Santora, J.C., Caro, M.E., & Sarros, J.C. (2007). Succession in nonprofit organizations: An insider/ outsider perspective. *SAM Advanced Management Journal*, 72(4), 26-31.

Saporito, T.J., & Winum, P. (2012*). Inside CEO succession: The essential guide to leadership transition.* Hoboken, N.J.: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Schepker, D.J., Nyberg, A.J., Ulrich, M.D., & Wright, P.M. (2018). Planning for future leadership: Procedural rationality, formalized succession processes, and CEO influence in CEO succession planning. *Academy of Management Journal*, 61(2), 523-552.

Shaw, D., & Chase, S. (2006). Director's guide: Report on interim management. *Directors & Boards*, 30(2), 48-51.

Stock, B. (2008). Emotional intelligence and CEO succession. *Corporate Board*, 22(128), 11.

Wagstaffe, J. (2009, Autumn). Interim management: Bringing creative instincts to the management role. *Manager: British Journal of Administrative Management*, (69), 20-21.

Wolfred, T. (2005). *Interim executive directors: The power in the middle.* San Francisco: The Evelyn and Walter Haas, Jr. Fund.

Wolfred, T. (2008). *Building leaderful organizations: Succession planning for nonprofits.* Baltimore, MD: The Annie E. Casey Foundation.