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The Series in Applied Psychology offers publications that emphasize research and its applications to important issues of human behavior in a variety of social settings. The objective is to bridge both academic and applied interests.

This book, Inclusive Leadership: The Essential Leader-Follower Relationship, is an important addition to our series and represents a valuable contribution to the ever-expanding field of leadership research and its application in organizations. It represents a capstone work by Professor Edwin Hollander, one of the major figures in social psychology and in leadership research, in particular. During his stellar academic career, over a 50-year period, Ed Hollander has made lasting contributions to the field of leadership. His work has provided a strong theoretical and empirical foundation for guiding leadership development. This book offers a compendium of new chapters, together with chapters that include many of his key original papers, combined with reflective commentary. This approach gives the reader a depth of understanding of the topic and provides a demonstration of how a field develops over time in relation to a researcher’s career goals, opportunities, and the status of the field at particular times in the history of the discipline.

A notable feature of the book is its frankly autobiographical aspect. Ed Hollander has provided us with details about his evolution as a social psychologist, intrigued by the questions about effective leadership. The reader will get to know Ed Hollander as a person and to appreciate the network of professional, institutional, family, collegial, and social relationships, which shaped his career and influenced his research. In this sense, the book really lays out Hollander’s rich research legacy with a Who’s Who of the American and international community of intellectuals who were his teachers, peers, colleagues, and students.

The book focuses on what Hollander termed “Inclusive Leadership,” which highlights the role of followers as a key to effective leadership. Leadership is seen as an interpersonal process that entails mutual relationships with shared goals and a common vision for the future. The characteristics of talented leaders are seen as very much the same as those of committed followers. The book identifies and integrates for us the key constructs that influence this relationship. Although these ideas have evolved over a long career, they are still fresh and pertinent. The new chapters integrate the material with up-to-date references and concepts that have developed as the field has emerged. Hollander writes from a broad perspective, with
many examples of issues that take into account the interdependence of leaders and followers in a wide variety of organizational settings.

Hollander’s persistent focus on understanding “followership” in the study of leadership makes this book distinctive and unique. Through the force of his programmatic work over these many years, he helped transform our view of leadership. The book should be a basic addition to anyone’s library on leadership. The primary audiences include students of leadership, those in graduate courses on leadership and organizational psychology, and students in nonacademic leadership development programs. The book’s audience should not be confined to required reading for those in the psychological study of leadership; students and faculty in business, sociology, education, and political science should also find this book very useful in their courses.
“Not another book about leadership!” These were among the first words from a colleague when asked to comment on part of my manuscript. I rapidly made two points about why this book is unusual: It emphasizes the role of followership far more than most previous leadership books, and it combines elements of the scientific and autobiographical nature of the career of one individual.

Major portions of my body of work, spanning over 50 years, are represented in this book’s nineteen representative chapters. Six chapters are newly written or largely recast to cover additional applications regarding such topics as “College and University Leadership” (Chapter 9) and “Presidential Leadership” (Chapter 10), as well as two introductory chapters that provide an extensive “Overview of Inclusive Leadership” (Chapter 1) and the “Historical Background of Modern Leadership Study” (Chapter 2).

Among these new chapters is “Applications and Implications of Inclusive Leadership” (Chapter 3), which concludes with the development and application of an Inclusive Leadership Scale (ILS-16) appropriate for evaluation and training purposes. Its technical analyses are presented in the Appendix. It was developed from the actual words of respondents in our critical incidents research on good and bad leadership. It has utility in group discussions for identifying and encouraging Inclusive Leadership behavior. In the concluding chapter more conceptual and applied issues about Inclusive Leadership are offered. In the other thirteen chapters works are reproduced here with a newly written commentary to update them as related to some current concerns.

A reasonable question is why the older material is worthwhile, since it is usually the newest that is sought. My view, shared by others, is that there is still persistence of interest, as revealed by the “old wine, in new bottles” phenomenon identified by Gordon Allport (1985), regarding the history of psychology. Many issues from the past, such as the role of “leader traits,” still exemplify lively points of concern. That is so despite their reconsideration in light of the current cognitive/attributional view, which I favor. This approach sees follower perceptions of the leader as key, rather than traits “possessed” by the leader.

My two previous books about leadership (Hollander, 1964, 1978a) were designed to be relevant and applicable for their time. The first emphasized theory and methodology, and the second applications to leader-follower relations, though each had some of both. This book carries these intentions forward, but with new and reproduced material from a larger expanse of time, permitting comparisons that can be instructive within that perspective.

Added to this collection is an autobiographical Afterword on my research career in leadership, from my undergraduate days and early military service. Then, I was a soldier in an army hospital doing psychological testing and interviews of mental patients after World War II had ended. Later, as a naval aviation psychologist, I did psychological research with aviation cadets during the Korean War. In giving these accounts, I have tried to remain as objective as possible, while recognizing the potential for memory and “social desirability”
effects, which I believe were limited. All in all, I consider it of potential interest and educational value to tell others, especially younger people, about different times and situations. These are important functions of written biographies.

I came into psychology with a desire to help improve the human condition, on a larger scale than I thought was possible, by aiding individuals one by one. Though I know and respect colleagues who do both, I chose not to become a clinician soon after my service in neuropsychiatry at an army hospital. It was not a good fit for me. In teaching for over 50 years, and after writing a textbook (Hollander, 1967) on social psychology, among others, I found major fulfillment. The textbook has gone through four editions and has been translated into other languages, including Chinese and Spanish. I more than attained my early hope of reaching a larger part of humanity, and perhaps making a difference, for which I am continually grateful.

As a leadership scholar, I remained open minded on most issues, but I still gave special attention to learn generally about “good” and “bad” leadership, from a follower’s perspective. The focus of my work was on the primary importance of the leader-follower relationship as a two-way influence process. I called this the “transactional,” then “relational,” approach. Unfortunately, these terms were open to distortions, such as “tit-for-tat,” and the mistaken view that I was only concerned with the social aspect of leadership, rather than the task demands and performance. That is not true, as I hoped to make clear in my writings about the importance in leadership of competence and ethical-moral behavior. This means taking seriously the task to be performed and goals to be attained through supportive group processes and coalition building.

I pursued this relational line of research and publications with three lectures at the New York Academy of Sciences (1996, 2000, 2004), which led to this book’s “Inclusive Leadership” theme. I also presented this concept at a seminar discussion with colleagues at the Center for the Advanced Study of Leadership, of the Burns Academy of Leadership at the University of Maryland in 1999, and St. Francis College of Brooklyn in 2000 (see Hollander, 2006, 2007). A useful discussion also ensued after a lecture about the concept and its implications at the 2007 Eastern Psychological Association annual meeting held in Philadelphia.

Awareness of what followers know and need is of course essential to leadership, as this book emphasizes, starting in Chapter 1. However, it does not mean giving up judgment as a leader. In a representative government, though, being informed about the will of the electorate is basic to public service, in the best sense. A popular misconception is the belief that a leader “keeping a finger to the wind” is usually bad, which it can be, if taken to the extreme. Said disparagingly, it suggests always trying to do what the populace wants. However, the alternative is not to bother at all, but to do whatever the leader wants and asserts as “doing the right thing.”

Committed as I am to the scientific method, with the need for testing hypotheses and revising ideas, I am not stuck with what I wrote more than 50 years ago. For instance, one of my professors from Columbia, Paul Lazarsfeld, told me that my Idiosyncrasy Credit (IC) Model, was a “Good concept, bad term.” He said that in a friendly way among a group of colleagues, in about 1960 when I was an associate professor at Washington University in St. Louis, where he came to speak at a social science conference. I took little offense, given my high regard for him, and a sense that he was probably correct on the latter element. Indeed, I have heard misstatements and seen misprints of the term as “Idiosyncratic Credit.” But that is less a source of concern than a misconception about the model allegedly urging conformity. In fact, the IC Model is non-normative, describing what seems to occur as people rise in their accorded status, or “esteem,” in groups and larger entities. The term “conformity” was not the best way to describe sufficient displays of loyalty to the group, rather than a slavish adherence to a norm, called “conformism.” What I meant is hopefully better understood by the Sociological Review excerpts in Chapter 16, much of 17, and especially 18. Indeed, Chapter 18 emphasizes the contribution of “independence” to freedom of thought.
and testing of ideas, vital to a free society. I also give an updated critique of the IC concept in Chapters 1 and 16.

Finally, special gratitude is extended to the many people who have helped me with this book, in various ways. I much appreciate the assistance of Benjamin Elman and Rachel Pascall, who greatly aided in the book’s preparation, particularly with the voluminous bibliography. I am grateful also to Jacqueline Harris, who typed many of the early drafts of the manuscript, and for the further assistance of Keisha Peterson, Anthony Friend, and Linda Santana. My thanks to all of them.

There are many others to whom I am grateful, beginning with my wife Pat for her splendid support and forbearance, as I invested as much time as needed to complete this book on schedule. I also am appreciative of the strong encouragement of my Editor, Anne Duffy, Senior Editor at Routledge/Psychology Press/Taylor and Francis, and Series Editor, Edwin Fleishman, a long-time, steadfast friend. My colleagues at Baruch College of City University of New York (CUNY), who showed heartening interest and provided intellectual stimulation, are too numerous to name, but I want them to be aware of my great gratitude.

Among colleagues who read and commented on portions of the manuscript are these to whom I am indebted: David Birdsell, Jan Cleveland, Richard Couto, David Day, Edwin Fleishman, Gwendolyn Gerber, Al Goethals, Manuel London, Robert Lord, Charles McClintock, Wilbert McKeachie, Susan Murphy, Douglas Muzzio, Paul Nelson, Patricia O’Connor, Susan Opitow, Ronald Riggio, Ralph Rosnow, Georgia Sorenson, Janice Yoder, Steven Zaccaro, and John Zipp. They provided me with the basis for improvements to the work, but bear no responsibility for the outcome, which is my own.

Edwin P. Hollander
New York City
May 2008
INTRODUCTION

Inclusive Leadership (IL) is about relationships that can accomplish things for mutual benefit. Reaching leadership at this next level means “doing things with people, rather than to people,” which is the essence of inclusion. Improving decision making and achieving desired ends are among its goals, without relying on one person’s capabilities alone. It also provides an atmosphere that promotes fairness of input and output to all.

Inclusive Leadership respects competition and cooperation as part of a participative process. In the political sphere, it is serious about the “consent of the governed” and taking responsibility as well as being accountable to them. More leader-centric conceptions of leadership continue to emphasize traditional leader qualities such as character and charisma. These have their effects, but often neglect the essential relationship with followers.

The major point of this book is to show how followers can be included actively in leadership, with a role in a mutual process. The overarching goal is to improve the understanding and practice of effective leadership. Leaders usually do have greater initiative, but followers are vital to success, and they too can become leaders. Leadership benefits from active followers, in a unity, including “upward influence” on a two-way rather than a one-way street (Hollander, 1992a, 1992b, 2004a).

This two-way operation of leadership and followership depends upon Respect, Recognition, Responsiveness, and Responsibility, both ways. These are the four Rs of Inclusive Leadership that are vital to successful practice. A leader’s “vision,” or cognitive skill, alone will not do. A *Fortune* magazine article (Byrne, Symonds, & Siler, 1991) dubbed the phenomenon “CEO Disease” for failings associated with power and insularity. A headline “CEO Evolution Phase 3,” in the Business Section in the *New York Times* (Schwartz, November 10, 2007, p. 1), recently proclaimed the need for CEOs to create a team sense. Enabling people to work well together was emphasized in the article, which the article considered lacking in the style of two recently deposed CEOs, Citigroup’s Charles Prince and Merrill Lynch’s Stanley O’Neal. Both of them reportedly received nine-figure departure payouts, despite disappointing performance, and the loss of top executives during their tenure, who might have been successors. Many CEOs do accomplish much for their organizations by a team effort and through their cognitive skills, drive, and stamina (see for example, Bennis & Nanus, 1985; DePree, 1989; Harman, 2003). They are inclusive leaders, with followers, even if not stated as such.

Followers can and do “play a more active role in constructing the leadership relationship, empowering the leader and influencing his or her behavior, and ultimately determining the consequences of the leadership relationship” (Howell & Shamir, 2005, p. 97). There is
good reason to recognize that an active role for followers is essential for attaining group, organizational, and societal goals, not least because their inclusion usually improves the likelihood of achieving desired outcomes. Yet, followers often are mistakenly left aside when the attention focuses on the leader. The quote in the epigraph of this chapter from John Gardner recaptures an important early distinction between “headship,” from imposed authority, and leadership that engages others in a program of action (Cowley, 1928). Freud (1921) similarly saw dominance as different from leadership (Hollander, 1985, p. 487). This does not mean that leaders need to indulge followers by “stroking” them, with the aim of gaining their compliance, or votes, but instead to include them in the tasks of leadership.

PASSIVITY, COMPLIANCE, AND INDEPENDENCE

Nevertheless, passivity is often signaled to “subordinates” in organizations. They may be treated at best as silent partners. Individuals can in fact be made silent when discouraged by an autocratic leader and an unresponsive situation. Bad things can happen to those breaking out of this pattern of keeping silent, although a willingness to speak up has productive features. Solutions to problems do not come from the leader alone. As a wise saying put it, “Even the brightest among us can benefit from criticism.”

This theme of showing initiative through free expression is another important facet in leader-follower relations, considered in this book as independence. It is dampened or limited severely by the exercise of power, which often rejects outspokenness. This norm is revealed in the bitter “advice” in some places to “Check your head at the door,” and “Don’t disagree at meetings.” Two noted motivational psychologists have addressed such control by authority. In the extremity of slavery, which demands ultimate compliance, David McClelland said that it is “the most inefficient form of labor ever devised. … If a leader wants to have a far-reaching influence, he must make his followers feel powerful and able to accomplish things on their own.” Mattina Horner said authoritarian leadership encourages “apathy or resistance on the part of others, while in a situation of democratic leadership, one finds more originality, less aggression, and more productivity” (both cited in Viorst, 1998, p. 201).

LISTENING IS RESPECTFUL

Within these pages, the judgments and activities in leader-follower relations are revealed to go beyond such obvious and less satisfactory features as creating images and using and abusing power. A desired goal is an “inclusive process” that others are truly involved in, as partners making inputs, with persuasion preferred over coercion, whenever possible. Its paramount values are respecting and involving others, with listening. An analogue has similarly been called an “inclusive culture,” central to a training program for managers at the J.P. Morgan Chase Bank (Quinn, 2006). Peter Vaill (1996) has a sequence that starts with listening and puts the order like this: Listen, Learn, Help, Lead. Operationally, Inclusive Leadership refers to prompting activity by asking questions that require thought, such as, “Could we do this in a better way?” Whether in creating teams, treating crises, attending
to inequities, reducing conformist pressures, or managing change, it starts with Respect for others, Recognition of their input, and Responsiveness to them. The necessary quality of Responsibility in both directions is also enduring as a basis for leader-follower relations, which engenders approval. The case often cited is that of President John F. Kennedy accepting responsibility for the failed invasion of Cuba, at the Bay of Pigs incident, which illustrates a leader’s approval from followers by taking responsibility.

FOUNDATIONS OF INCLUSIVE LEADERSHIP AND THE CONTENT OF THIS BOOK

Inclusive Leadership evolved as a major modern theme drawn from my debt to others’ pioneer work. Among contributors to my development were John Hemphill, Fillmore Sanford, Alvin Gouldner, Ralph Stogdill, Kurt Lewin, Jacob Moreno, Helen Hall Jennings, Alex Bavelas, and George Homans. Their early influence became clearer as my own views evolved. For the present book, I brought together a selection of my previous research and theoretical papers. For each I wrote a new, accompanying commentary, with needed updates.

Over many decades, my own research and writing has sought balance in studying the way followership is interdependent with leadership. An early study I did with Webb researched “followership” and its relation to leadership and friendship. The term may have been used in the literature before, but it was new in psychological research. Our study was evidently a first, and it employed naval aviation cadets as our respondents (Hollander & Webb, 1955). We found a high overlap in desired qualities for those chosen by peer nominations as leaders or followers for a special unit. Other work has affirmed this symmetry of such qualities as dependability, responsiveness, and clear communication.

Furthermore, leader attention to the interests and needs of followers is essential to achieve effective leadership. In the political realm, Burns said that “only the followers themselves can ultimately define their own true needs … [given] an informed choice” (1978, p. 36).

From the outset, followers perceive and respond to a leader’s qualities, including his or her recognized legitimacy, as well as motivation, and performance. In this vein, Gary Wills stated that “Followers judge leaders. Only if the leaders pass that test do they have any impact” (1994, p. 21). Although his latter point may not prevail in the face of someone in a determining position of authority, Wills says in his conclusion that “so much of leadership is the projection of an image that will appeal to followers” (p. 274). Therefore, “reality” is projected by a leader through perceptual manipulation (Gray & Densten, 2007).

The aphorism “An ounce of image is worth a pound of performance” may not be taken literally, but such perceptions by followers can obscure their awareness of actual deficiencies in a leader’s performance. However, perception guides behavior, influenced by motivation. Changes can occur in perception, when enriched by experience. The prospect for trust or mistrust may thereby grow. If positive, there will likely be loyalty and solidarity of purpose, and the reverse is also likely. Trust and loyalty are among those qualities needed to bind relationships. Two-way communication, including listening, is also significant for recognition and responsiveness. Listening also facilitates communication and influence and is therefore vital to effective leadership and critical when absent. These features are elements of the “consideration” dimension of leader behavior, identified in the earlier empirical research of Hemphill (1950) and Fleishman (1953).

Granted again that those identified as leaders usually have greater potential for action and influence, followers can and do exert upward influence, whether through their initiatives or
by resistance. Therefore, the traditional dichotomy between leader and follower is wrong on at least three grounds. First, it overlooks this influence potential in interdependent roles. It also is the case that those who rise to leader positions may have shown such qualities as dependability and communication skills. As just mentioned, these are among qualities likely to be valued in followers, as well as in leaders, in most settings and institutions. Finally, especially in hierarchies, individuals are expected to be responsive to those in charge and directive to those who require it, even who are simply less senior.

This state of looking both ways is an obvious feature of middle management, although it clearly exists at upper levels, too. However, the dichotomy is artificial. Hackman and Wagaman underscore this point in stating that “Leaders are also followers, and followers also exhibit leadership. … Each boss also is a subordinate—even chief executives who lead entire organizations invariably report to some higher-standing person or group” (2007, p. 45). Hierarchy is not essential to leadership. Wheatley (1992), for example, adopts a systems approach and sees leadership as an interactive influence process. She proposes a view of leadership from a biological standpoint that is much more creative and adaptable than the more typical top-down model.

**DETECTION MAKING AND POWER SHARING**

Encouraging follower involvement in decision making and power sharing is evident in the team emphasis in such practices as group-based management. This is an important benefit to organizations presented in Hollander and Offermann (1990a), which is presented in Chapter 11 in this book. However, effectiveness of participation is not always found (e.g., Ciulla, 1998; Locke & Schweiger, 1979; Mulder, 1971; Schweiger & Leana, 1986). As Vroom and Jago assert, variability in the effectiveness of participation is dependent on specific situational variables (2007, p. 21). Hence, there is a need for a contingency approach that takes account of variables that may enhance or diminish participation, yielding successful outcomes. Although leaders and their qualities are a central focus in leadership study, it is in engaging followers that these qualities become especially relevant to good leaders and their willingness to involve followers authentically in such matters as decision making (see Hollander, 2007b).

At the other end of the scale, poor leaders make for a lack of success, as Hackman (1998) has pointed out. In leading groups, he specifies several factors that can operate to cause this. Prominent among these are: assigning a task to a group that could be done by an individual; failing to let the group function as one in terms of its judgments; managing by being dictatorial or laissez-fare; and depriving the group of needed resources and structure.

**ETHICS AND MORALITY**

Also significant for leader-follower relations are ethical conduct and considerations of moral values. Chapter 14 in this book examines the ethical challenges in these relations. From a critical standpoint, Rost emphasizes that leadership is an influence relationship that reflects
mutual purposes (1991, p. 102). His view extends to the avoidance of coercion to effect change. In most instances, Drucker says, change is not necessarily planned, but rather the result of a variety of factors: an unexpected success, failure, or sudden event; an incongruity between what is expected and what occurs; a process need that produces an invention; a market and industry condition; shifts in perceptions and meanings; and new knowledge (1985, pp. 34–35).

Chapter 8 in this book examines the way a leader’s self-concept affects relations with followers. There also are cultural differences in the way that followers perceive leaders and respond to them, regarding follower expectations. In that regard, the Globe Research Program (House, Javidan, Hanges, & Dorfman, 2002) is an international study of leadership across many cultures. Its goal is to learn what is considered effective leadership, regarding criteria of psychological welfare and international competitiveness. How that may vary worldwide was determined by a study involving 17,000 respondents to questionnaires administered in over 900 organizations. The researchers found 21 leader attributes (e.g., integrity) that were universally positive and eight impediments (e.g., irritability) that were negative. Another 35 were found to vary in different cultures; sensitivity, for example, was seen as a positive leader attribute in the United States and a negative one in Russia. Some of the main propositions from the program’s integrated theory resonate with this book’s approach. Several significant ones are as follows:

Whether or not the leader is accepted depends on how well the leader’s attributes and behaviors fit with the culturally endorsed implicit leadership theories. The better the fit, the more accepted the leader will be.

How effective a leader is depends on how well the leader’s attributes and behaviors fit with the strategic organizational contingencies. The better the fit, the more effective the leader will be.

Leaders who are accepted by their followers are more effective than leaders who are not. An effective leader will, over time, be increasingly accepted because a leader’s demonstration of competence improves follower’s attitudes toward the leader, resulting in increased acceptance.

THE CONTEXT OF INCLUSIVE LEADERSHIP

The IL approach departs from the long tradition of focusing largely on the leader as a means of understanding leadership. By contrast, IL looks at what is needed in the context to help in such ways as improving problem solving and attaining mutual goals. Exemplifying this is Chapter 9 on college and university leadership and the campus presidency, a multiple-role and multiple-constituency position. As an example, it requires dealing with competing issues and participants, shown in that chapter. Some of the concepts that represent an IL orientation are summarized here.

Leadership is vital to the well-being and maintenance of a group, organization, or society, and interacts to affect other processes such as conformity, independence, and cohesiveness, as shown in Figure 1.1.

Leadership occurs throughout society and is basic to many significant features of life. The quality of leadership can affect the successes or failures of a group, organization, or nation. It also affects “social health,” in regard to the well-being of others.
Leadership is not just about the leader, nor is studying leaders and their ability to exert influence and power all that understanding leadership involves. Leadership is a process, not a person, as McGregor (1944) put it, although the leader is usually seen as central to the process. Leadership does not exist without followership. More needs to be known about followers and their relationship with leaders, including their needs and expectations and how they may come to be leaders. Leadership involves much more than direction of activity, but requires informing and supporting followers and their necessary activities, as well as representing and standing up fairly for their interests. Followers feel they are entitled to good leadership, aimed at these ends, rather than bad, dysfunctional leadership. Trust and loyalty are two binding elements in the leader-follower relationship that spring from and nurture good leadership practices. Leadership often refers to gaining direct action from individuals in an interdependent relationship. Whether that is achieved is seen to be central to a leader’s role. However, active followers also are needed to achieve mutual goals. Much of the literature on the study of leadership focuses on the leader, and his or her effects on followers, with far less attention given to follower effects on a leader’s decisions and actions.
Effective leaders build and bolster leadership practices that encourage bonding elements such as loyalty and trust. These help an enterprise by involving followers in shared processes. It is exemplified by having a role in decision making, which then can yield greater success of decisions and in their implementation. This illustrates a distinctive feature of IL: doing things with people rather than to people. It departs from the long-standing tradition of focusing on the leader’s qualities, instead of giving attention to the followers and theirs, including perceptions, such as fairness regarding both tangible and intangible rewards. Significantly, IL is oriented more toward the involvement of followers rather than to the manipulation of followers by those in power.

James McGregor Burns, in his book on leadership, has put it starkly: “Leadership, unlike naked power-wielding is … inseparable from followers’ needs and goals” (1978, p. 19). Although I subscribe to it, this moral position may be overly optimistic when compared to practice. Furthermore, the dichotomy he presented between transforming (TF) and transactional (TA) leadership always seemed artificial given the different motives and tactics at work in relationships. Various possibilities can occur over time between a leader and those who are followers, and Burns has altered his view on this matter. Recently he wrote:

I think my book [1978] is overly dichotomized. There is a stronger connection between transforming and transactional leadership than I led readers to believe. I think we have a spectrum. A few leaders operate wholly on the transforming side, but most work on both sides of that spectrum and combine transforming and transactional leadership. (2007, p. viii)

Illustrating this process is the research of Bensimon (1993). She studied new college presidents regarding their use of TA and TF leadership and with what effect. Those found to be successful showed adaptability in behaving as needed, usually building a constituency by a TA pattern, and only then when change was required using a TF pattern. Similarly, Wallace (1996) found, in her research with executives, that those perceived to be successful were more able to show a parallel pattern of flexibility in being neither TA nor TF. They used what was appropriate for the situation and their relationships there. No one leadership style is always “correct” and certain to be successful if it does not allow for flexibility.

In his insightful analysis, Yukl (1999) challenges the assumption that TF is beneficial for followers and their organization, regardless of situations, especially as it derives from charismatic leader qualities. Furthermore, he cites a “heroic leader bias” in the conception underlying this type of leadership and also sees rewards as often in TF as in TA leadership, although TF leadership is supposed to be less inclined in that direction. In concluding, Yukl says that TF leadership may be unnecessary and have negative consequences, in some situations, such as complying with the leader’s request and making self-sacrifices in an extra effort to please the leader. In extreme cases, he says the follower’s primary self-identity may come in serving the leader, rather than larger goals, and other parties, as considered in Chapters 8 and 14.

Bass and Riggio (2006) state that TF leadership has been criticized for being too positive as a portrayal of leadership by both Beyer (1999a, 1999b) and in the analysis by Yukl (1999). In providing an approving overview of the considerable volume of work on TF leadership, Bass and Riggio make their case, while acknowledging circumstances when TF leadership is less effective than other forms. Specifically, they treat negative occurrences with TF leadership as inauthentic and personalized (p. 235). This is a way to present TF leadership as
a superior form of leader behavior. What about a leader who appears “authentic,” in TF terms, in gaining a following, but later shows dictatorial behavior? In the political realm, the phenomenon is recognized in the supposed reformer who demands an election, which is likely to be the last one, once power is attained. Bass indicates that TF leadership can be effective, even if the situation requires autocratic behavior (1997, p. 132). Therefore, “attention to followers,” appealing as it sounds, may mean their manipulation for the benefit of leaders who wish to control them, rather than to serve the broader good. The history of dictators, such as Hitler, Stalin, and Pol Pot, suggests that their charismatic/transformational qualities, initially with a few dedicated followers, led to disastrous consequences for the broader good.

Also, in treating TF leadership as the ultimate standard for good leader behavior, there is a commitment to change as a necessarily desirable end to be achieved. Circumstances may require that stability and continuity are better goals to seek. Moreover, Salas, DeRouin, and Gase (2007, p. 183) question the contention that TF leaders have attributes of confidence, dominance, and trust, which they say may result from an ongoing exchange that already exists. In addition, there remains the structural effect of the power differential that often exists between the leader and those who are led, with severely limited power, to which we turn now.

POWER DISTANCE

The concern about the ethical and practical consequences of what Mulder (1971) called “power distance” is illustrated by the growth in CEO compensation relative to the average worker pay in their firms. Although largely unchecked, statements of concern about this massive gap have not abated. This is exemplified by the report of the heightened ratio in compensation of 350 to 1 in a New York Times (April 9, 2006, p. 1) Sunday Business Section article. Later in the week, many media outlets ran a story of the $400 million retirement package given to the departed CEO of Exxon Mobil. Other instances of record payouts involved pharmaceutical firm Pfizer’s departing CEO Hank McKinnell receiving $200 million (New York Times, December 24, 2006, Sect. 3, p. 8), and retailer Home Depot’s head Robert Nardelli getting at least that much, after being ousted by the board, following 6 years of disappointing performance. He most recently was appointed as the CEO of the Chrysler Corporation, which was purchased by an investment firm. As a private entity, it is without stockholders, who would otherwise need to be satisfied. The stockholders were a major source of discontent toward him when he served at Home Depot, most notably when he severely restricted their participation at a stockholders’ meeting, resulting in some angry protests.

In a rare switch from Nardelli’s standard, Home Depot’s new CEO Frank Blake requested that his initial year compensation be set at a level comparable to that of the CEO of its main rival, Lowe’s, reportedly $8.9 million (New York Times, February 8, 2007, p. C1). Although quite substantial, the story states that Nardelli was receiving an annual compensation of $39.7 million at Home Depot before his dismissal. The article says Blake also abolished Nardelli’s “catered lunch for … top deputies, served daily on the 22nd floor of the company’s headquarters in Atlanta … telling senior executives to take the elevator down to the first floor [to] eat with the company’s rank and file in the cafeteria, according to an employee.” What effect this will have is yet to be revealed, but its intent was to remove a particular “perk” that isolated top leaders from their employees.
Another problem of inequities in organizations resides in employee give-backs. These are sacrifices they must agree to accept for the firm to survive in a time of financial crisis. A recent report in the *New York Times* (Bailey, March 27, 2007, p. C1) publicized stock bonuses of $21 million to be given to American Airline’s top executives. The largest bonus of $7.5 million was set for CEO Gerard J. Arpey. The pilots’ and flight attendants’ unions protested that their give-backs in salary and benefits, made to save the airline from bankruptcy in past years, had resulted in selective benefits paid only to already well-compensated managers. A spokesman for the pilots said, “When the ship was sinking, it was ‘We’re all in this together,’” but now, he added, “the executives are benefiting while those flying the airplanes continue to get reduced wages.”

Thomas and Anderson (2007) report on the recent failure of Merrill Lynch’s CEO Stanley O’Neal to inform the board of his activities, including the extent of substantial losses and secret dealings with Wachovia Bank regarding a merger/acquisition. His noninclusive operating style led to a push for his removal, but, nonetheless, with a departure sum reported in excess of $150 million.

Marvin Bower, a founder and longtime head of McKinsey, a major consulting firm, said regarding CEO compensation, “Excessive pay will make people in the company feel that the chief executive … is not putting the business ahead of personal interests. These attitudes are demotivating to people in any company” (1997, p. 127). The thrust of his point concerns challenges to concepts of “team” and the “social contract” of playing fair, which can short-circuit successful leadership. However anticipated, the evidence for this is equivocal. One reason proposed is that of identification with those who succeed in making a great deal of money, in hopes that you will be able to get there, too. Another, on the pragmatic side, is that with corporate layoffs and generalized downsizing, a sense of threat to their job opportunities makes employees grateful for having a job at all. This may be so despite their dissatisfaction with working conditions, including pay. Eric Wanner (interviewed on Public Broadcasting Service’s *Open Mind* program, in January 2007), head of the Russell Sage Foundation, a leading U.S. social science research organization, said the high value placed on individual initiative in U.S. society makes Americans less bothered by inequality than their European counterparts.

The question still remains why leader centrism prevails and is often imbued with a conception of dominance in directing others’ actions and thoughts. At least part of the answer is associated with the matter of who is responsible, which is seen as fundamental to the nature of the role of leader. It is captured in a statement attributed to the French existential philosopher John Paul Sartre: “To be a leader, is to be responsible.” A ready counter to this is that such responsibility requires awareness of “the territory,” meaning access to information from those “in the know,” on the working line, and in the boardroom (Murray, 2007). Letting these others “speak truth to power” is often needed for successful leadership.

My former colleague from State University of New York–Buffalo Warren Bennis put it succinctly in an op-ed piece in the *New York Times* in an article titled “Good Followers Make Leaders Look Good” (1989, Sec. 3, p. 3). As a major leadership scholar, he had interviewed and published about top leaders (Bennis & Nanus, 1985). One of his inferences is to learn from bad experiences. Failing to listen to those who know is often the cause of fatal outcomes.

Peter Vaill (1996) says that “Leadership is learning.” The actuality of dangers from not attending to information from those on the working front is revealed in Karen Cerulo’s (2006) recent book *Never Saw It Coming*. She makes the general point that American optimism tends to override warnings to be concerned about disasters that might befall us. In a related way, she recounts the case of the FBI leaders in Washington headquarters repeatedly disregarding warnings of the signs of a possible terrorist assault in the United States by air, including the significant alert in the noteworthy “Phoenix Memo” from FBI field agents before the September 11, 2001, attacks. She says that the institutional leader centrism that prevailed kept information, even such warnings, from being encouraged to flow from the
field. The FBI’s dominant pattern was to have information flow down from headquarters as directives, rather than to foster a two-way or even multiparty interchange of such material.

Ancient Chinese Taoist philosophy lays a strong claim to valuing a followership position. Exemplifying this emphasis is Lao Tzu’s view that “The wise leader settles for good work and does not take all the credit for what happens. When the work is done, let them say with pride, we have done this together” (as cited in Heider, 1982, p. 34). That was in the sixth century B.C.

But even in the 20th century, Max Weber, who furthered the concept of the charismatic leader, stated that if the leader was “long unsuccessful, above all if his leadership fails to benefit followers, it is likely that his charisma will disappear” (1946, p. 360). In short, followers accord this quality, rather than having the leader possess it independently of them, as is more usually portrayed. There also is the downside of charisma in that it is associated with leader narcissism and self-serving behavior (Post, 1986). More on this topic is considered later in this book. For now, remember: Leadership is not just about the leader; and, studying leadership involves more than just leaders and their powers.

Traditionally, the leader is seen as the main actor in leadership. A newer emphasis has broken away from this “leader-centric” model and opened the way for participation by followers in such processes as shared decision making. Their increased participation has been justified on grounds of higher-order values, democratic process, and effectiveness, all of which are seen to improve the quality and success of the decision and its implementation.

A source of resistance to this development is the argument that there are “prerogatives” that belong to those in charge, the “formal leaders.” This view overlooks the reality that organizations at every level require active followership, although credit, by tradition, goes to the leader. Further, the quality of being effective as an active follower will call attention to someone who then may gain a higher position as a leader. There also is the role played by informal leaders, which may be disregarded or obscured by the tendency to focus on the leader who is appointed, the so-called formal leader. A view of followership as both active and critical (Kelley, 1992) presents a considerable contrast to this more usual view of the leader as the center of attention and power, as with the sun in our solar system. Correspondingly, followers are too often seen as “sheep,” which Kelley rejects in his analysis of the various ways they contribute to the goals achieved. Bennis (1998) conveys this point by asking, “Did Michelangelo paint the Sistine Chapel all by himself?” His answer is no because the master reportedly had 13 artists and a crew of 200 to help him.

Still, leader centrism continues to hold much allure. Even the old “Great Man” theory, better known as “Great Person,” remains alive, seen for instance in the “corporate savior” who goes from one firm to another “slashing” jobs with his proverbial chain saw. The qualities of leaders are obviously important, but an equally important point is that “We need to honor our teams more, our aggressive leaders and maverick geniuses less” (Reich, 1987, p. 78). In particular, leaders need the skills to engage followers in productive and satisfying mutual pursuits. This view departs from the usual way of seeing leader qualities as possessions, rather than as interpersonal links to others involved in shared activities.

The relationship of leaders to followers has a small but enduring place in the study of leadership. Chester Barnard’s (1938) “acceptance theory of authority” exemplified this process.
It centered on the follower’s pivotal role in judging whether an order is authoritative. Followers, Barnard suggested, make this judgment according to whether they understood the order; believe it is not inconsistent with organizational or personal goals; have the ability to comply with it; and see more rewards than costs in complying and remaining with the organization or group (Hollander, 1978a, p. 47). Mary Parker Follett, in the 1920s and 1930s, has proposed similarly that attention be paid to who gives orders and how they are received by the persons to whom directed (see Graham, 1995).

Followers’ needs are satisfied not only in tangible ways but also through such intangible rewards as support, fairness, and being heard. As part of good business practice, a founder of organizational studies in France, Henri Fayol (1916), long ago advocated attention to worker well-being, in addition to satisfying remuneration, bonuses, and profit sharing. Yet, the focus on just such tangible rewards left a significant gap in understanding the role of intangible rewards in leadership (Hollander, 2006). To enrich this conception, we need to turn to the actual experiences of followers with leaders.

A body of research shows how inattention to leader-follower relations can produce dysfunctional outcomes, or what Drucker (1988) has called “misleaders.” For instance, Hogan, Raskin, and Fazzini (1990) found that organizational climate studies from the mid-1950s onward showed 60 to 75% of organizational respondents reported their immediate supervisor as the worst or most stressful aspect of their job. From a 10-year perspective, DeVries (1992) estimated the base rate for executive incompetence to be at least 50%. Marilyn Gowling, who was a director of personnel research in the U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM), reported that a similar figure was found in a survey conducted in the Federal Civil Service (personal communication, March 2006).

Lord and Maher (1990) say that these perceptions are checked against prototypes held by followers and their related expectations of how leaders should perform, called “implicit leadership theories” (ILT). How leaders and followers mutually perceive and respond to each other’s personal qualities and actions is crucial to their relationship. Argyle and Henderson (1985) stated their findings in these terms:

[The] superior-subordinate relationship at work is seen by most people as full of conflict and as providing little satisfaction. On the other hand supervisors can have a considerable effect on health and satisfaction, if the right skills are used. Supervisors have power to reward and punish.

(p. 262)

All of this has a redounding effect on a sense of purpose and well-being. This theme, regarding self-identity, is emphasized in the recent work of Lord and Brown (2004).

LEGITIMACY AND CREDIT

A following can come about in various ways. The consideration here is on two primary ways. Legitimacy is the more usual way of signalizing an acknowledged occupant of the leader role and how he or she attained that status. Credit is a less formal way of considering the leader-follower bond, in regard to positively disposed perceptions. By their role in accepting a leader, followers can affect the strength of a leader’s influence, behavior, and the performance of the group or larger entity. In short, influence and power flow both from legitimacy and those extras affected by followers through their perceptions, attributions, and judgments. Neustadt (1960), similarly, considers follower perceptions of legitimacy as
one of two main sources of presidential power, the other being sentiments of loyalty, which can be considered to be credits accorded by followers.

As already indicated, legitimacy plays a pivotal part in the leader-follower relationship because it is the base on which followers perceive and respond to the leader. Among its manifestations, legitimacy implicates such qualities as credibility, trust, loyalty, and the leader’s ability to be effective in exercising power and influence.

Whatever power is imputed to a leader, actualizing it depends on its perception by followers. Power becomes real when others perceive it to be so and respond accordingly. But an emphasis on traditional “power over” others tends to dominate the field, at the expense of empowerment and resistance to unwanted power assertions, which have been called “power to” and “power from.” They deal respectively with giving individuals opportunities to act more freely within some organizational realms, through “power sharing,” and to fend off others’ power demands (Hollander & Offermann, 1990a, p. 179). In that paper, we reviewed and assessed research on organizational leadership and power. Among other things we considered the benefits of, and sources of, resistance to delegation and empowerment of followers. On balance, we found that by sharing power and allowing followers to influence them, leaders foster leadership skills in others, as well as achieve other gains through their greater participation and involvement. But a major question posed is how a return to leader-centered approaches can be reconciled with this trend toward greater follower empowerment and influence.

Rather than be separate, leadership and followership exist in a reciprocal, interdependent system as a unity (Hollander, 1992a). Fundamental to this system is a relationship “in which the leader both gives something and gets something. The leader provides a resource in terms of adequate role behavior directed toward the group’s goal attainment with status, recognition, and esteem [contributing to] ‘legitimacy’ in making influence assertions and in having them accepted” (Hollander & Julian, 1969, p. 388, appearing here in Chapter 5). To varying degrees, a leader’s legitimacy can be altered by his or her approval by followers.

The usual expectation of the follower role as essentially passive is therefore misleading when considering followership as an accompaniment to leadership. Leaders do command greater attention and influence, but followers can affect a leader’s activity significantly, not least because followers are usually the leader’s most attentive strategic audience. Support is an essential element in the leader-follower bond. It can be considered as credit followers can accord or withhold from their leaders, as part of a personal bond that extends to loyalty and trust.

**IDIOSYNCRASY CREDIT**

The idiosyncrasy credit (IC) model of innovative leadership deals with the latitude that followers provide a leader to render change beyond that accorded by legitimacy of authority (see e.g., Hollander, 1958, 1960, 1961, 1993, 2006). The model describes a dynamic process of interpersonal evaluation in which the effects of leader authority are not fixed but determined significantly by the support of followers. It is nonnormative since it does not tell how things ought to be, but reflects how they seem to operate in relatively noncoercive situations where power is not absolute but relative to the context and persons there.

Essentially, the model postulates credits to be positive perceptions of someone, earned by their showing competence in helping to achieve the group’s task goals and conformity to the
group’s norms, as a sign of loyalty. Credits may then be drawn on to take innovative actions in line with expectations associated with the leader role. Therefore, it becomes possible that early signs of competence and conformity will permit later nonconformity to be better tolerated. This formulation was first verified in a set of experiments with groups involved in a joint decision task and has subsequently been supported in various ways (see for example, Estrada, Brown, & Lee, 1995), with some qualifications and refinements. Alvarez (1968), for instance, found that the credit loss, in terms of “esteem,” was significantly less for a leader’s nonconformity where the organization was successful rather than failing.

The idea of credit is embedded in everyday language in such general terms as “receiving credit,” “taking credit,” and “being discredited.” On the “input” side of this refinement, the IC model illustrates how credits accumulate and then on the “output” side have operational significance in permitting innovations that would be perceived to be “deviations” if introduced by another person with less credit. Seniority can contribute to the accumulation of credits, but without uniform impact. A person may also benefit from having “derivative credit,” as in a favorable reputation from another group, or from society, as in high socioeconomic status. Most usually, however, a new member of a group is in a poor position to assert influence, especially in the direction of change, unless he or she has a unique qualification. An example would be providing a solution to a major group problem or having needed knowledge or a skill. In these circumstances the new member’s credit is gained by maximizing on the competence factor. However, credit may not accrue as readily to those who are perceived to be different, as in the case of a woman in an otherwise male group (see Wahrman & Pugh, 1974).

A new leader, whether appointed or elected, must still build credit by establishing a following. In the organizational sphere, as noted in Gardner’s view in the epigraph of this chapter, there is the need to gain followers, not just subordinates. Katz and Kahn made the point that leadership is the “influence increment above compliance with organizational authority and directives” (1966, p. 304). This increment can be seen as representing credits that are part of a leader’s informal following (Heifetz, 1994). In the realm of politics, this is especially evident where the legitimacy of one’s authority is weak, as in a narrow election victory. This condition seemed obvious when President Bill Clinton had 43% of the vote when elected in 1992 in a three-way contest. There was clear difficulty in getting major parts of his program approved in 1993, attributed to that consideration, among others. Long before, the political scientist Verba (1961) offered the idea of “acceptance capital,” built up through conformity to constituent expectations. However, such capital did not include inputs or outputs from the perception of a leader’s competence, as the IC model does.

How credits are expended is of considerable importance. In Clinton’s case, as in others’, he took impulsive early actions that squandered the relatively little credit he had, even before he had begun to build a larger fund to work with. Furthermore, since failing to live up to followers’ expectations for leader action can lose unused credits, the drainage was compounded by overpromising, and then apparent inaction in the face of stated need. Not least, the leader’s self-serving and other negatively viewed behaviors can drain credits, as can perceptions of weak motivation, incompetence, and the responsibility for failure.

Underlying the IC model is the fundamental point that accepting influence involves a process in which attributions are made about the influence source. The same behavior seen to be nonconforming if shown by one person may not be so perceived when shown by another. Therefore, leaders may initiate change, even in seemingly nonconforming ways, as part of their accepted innovative role. Although there may be greater tolerance of nonconformity for the legitimated leader in some ways, there are restrictions regarding particular expectancies, which can be thought of as role behaviors expected by followers. At least two reasons explain why these restrictions may be imposed: first, higher status is usually perceived to carry with it greater self-determination for one’s actions; second, such status usually means
more possible influence on important outcomes for group members (Hollander, 1964, chap. 20). Because of these and other constraints, leaders are therefore still vulnerable to a loss of standing for evident infractions in their role, such as betrayal.

THE DYNAMICS OF LEADER LEGITIMACY

As indicated, legitimacy depends on followers perceiving the leader’s source of authority and then responding accordingly to that leader. The evidence indicates that a major difference exists in the realm of appointment or election as sources of a leader’s authority (Hollander & Julian, 1970, 1978). In both cases, the possibility of being perceived to be, and acting as a leader, depends somewhat on those who are to be followers.

The election case is of course an obvious instance of emergence, which more closely approximates the IC model. Moreover, election usually creates a heightened psychological identification between followers and the leader, with followers having a greater sense of responsibility for and investment in the leader. One explanation is to view this as a social exchange in which the group gives the leader a “reward” in advance, by electing him or her, and then group members feel a claim on him or her to “pay back” by producing favorable outcomes (Jacobs, 1970).

Correspondingly, it is also true that the support of followers exacts a higher demand on the leader. Elected leaders who fail to perform well have been found to be more vulnerable to criticism than appointed leaders, particularly if they are seen to be competent in the first place (Hollander & Julian, 1970, 1978). Although election and appointment may create different psychological climates between leaders and followers, this leaves the prospect for even appointed organizational leaders to attain a “following” by doing more than exercising authority, as Katz and Kahn (1978) have observed. Nonetheless, the main thread running through results on leader legitimacy is the difference in support and involvement that have been found in comparing the two major sources of leader legitimacy: appointment and election.

Proponents of a perceptual/attributional perspective say that leaders also are credited or blamed for outcomes with which they may have had little input, such as the economy picking up with oil prices down under Ronald Reagan or faltering when they had been raised by Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries under Jimmy Carter. This is seen to be a perceptual pattern that reflects the “romance of leadership,” as Meindl and Ehrlich (1987) term it. They found that in perceiving group and organizational performance, positive or negative outcomes are more likely to be attributed to the leader than to other factors. Because leaders are symbols, Pfeffer (1977) says that if something goes wrong, the whole staff or entire team cannot be fired, but firing the manager can convey a sense of rooting out the basis for the problem. Obviously, it is less simple to dismiss an officeholder, especially in midterm, after formal election or appointment, although it can occur. Recent research by Gray and Densten (2007) studied the “idealized” images of leadership that leaders held of themselves.

One consequence of the attributional approach is to make more explicit the significance of followers’ and others’ perceptions of the leader, not least regarding expectations about leader competence and motivation. Imagery and self-presentation may still obscure the truth about the leader’s intentions and dealings, yet there remains the basic question of the basis on which followers are able to evaluate the leader’s performance.
Followers are the ones who experience the actuality of a leader’s approach to leadership and are uniquely able to evaluate it and its effects. The research program my colleagues and I have conducted over a decade (see for example, Hollander, 2006) used critical incidents to study these relationships further. These were supplemented by open-ended questions and rating scales to study followers’ perceptions of actual leader behavior in good or bad leadership situations, and followers’ perceptions of ideal leader behavior. As with previous results, we found that such relational qualities as supportiveness and trustworthiness, along with effective communication, delegation/empowerment, and taking needed action, were emphasized in distinguishing good from bad leadership. We also found that characteristics reported for good leadership closely corresponded to those independently described for ideal leadership—honesty/trustworthiness and competence/confidence—irrespective of respondent gender.

These results are based on a total sample of 293 respondents, about half male and half female, drawn primarily from working master’s degree students enrolled in evening courses on organizational behavior or leadership. Two-thirds held professional and/or administrative positions, and the great majority (80%) were employed full time. Although the findings are largely based on the work setting, they have wider implications for expectations of political leadership. This was revealed, for instance, in the weight attached to personal qualities of trustworthiness and fairness.

Charisma poses an intriguing case in evaluating a leader’s performance. Recent decades have seen a revitalization of interest in the concept of the “charismatic leader.” Max Weber (1946), the eminent sociologist of bureaucracy fame, promoted it from the Greek word charisma for divine gift. Such a leader, he said, has considerable emotional appeal to followers and great hold over them, especially in a time of crisis when there are strong needs for direction. Weber contrasted this mode of leadership with the traditional kind, which is handed down, and the legalistic kind, which can be considered constitutional. Charisma provides a “personal authority” that evokes awe in followers, less likely to be so in the other forms. It can be seen as a vast amount of idiosyncrasy credit at the leader’s disposal.

Burns makes the point that charisma “is so overburdened as to collapse under close analysis” (1978, p. 243). In this vein, Corry (1995) reports on the acknowledged appeal of John Lindsay, republican mayor of New York City several decades ago. If anything, he raised excessively high expectations so that “there was no way he could meet them. Charisma,” says Corry, “is the most attractive but least substantive of political qualities and is useless as a guide to predicting what a candidate will do after he is elected. By the end of Lindsay’s first term as Mayor, New York was having second thoughts” (p. 111). His charisma seemed to have run out. Nonetheless, Lindsay managed reelection by expressing contrition for the things he said “had gone wrong” and by running as an independent after losing the Republican Party endorsement.
Interest in charisma is now mostly associated with TF leadership (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978) and reveals the importance of the followers’ perspective in understanding such phenomena. Weber originally presented charismatic leaders as attracting others because of their strong appeal and extraordinary determination, especially in time of crisis. However, he also stated its dependence on follower affirmation and success, as in a quote from him that said charisma disappeared if the leader was long perceived as unsuccessful.

There is also a need to take account of the ethical distinction Burns (1978) made between the self-serving and socially responsible kinds of TF leaders. In the world of organizations, as well as in politics, charismatic leaders are still sought as saviors. But they also may present serious difficulties, such as tendencies toward narcissism (e.g., Post, 1986) and unethical behavior. For example, Howell and Avolio (1992) cite the dubious ethical standards associated with such business leaders as Robert Campeau, John DeLorean, and Michael Milken, all of whom were acknowledged to have charisma for many of their followers. Unethical leaders are more likely to use their charisma for power over followers, directed toward self-serving ends, usually in a calculated manipulative way. Ethical leaders are considered to use their charisma in a socially constructive way to serve others.

Charisma and TF leadership are frequently linked in the literature, as Yukl (1999) finds in his coverage and analysis. TA leadership refers to a fair exchange in which the leader gives something to followers and receives esteem and latitude for action in return, as noted earlier here by Jacobs (1970) and Homans (1961). Indeed, the TF leader may provide intrinsic rewards in heightened follower arousal and potentially elevated self-concept, which is reciprocated by greater esteem and influence accorded the leader. This process is an evident exchange, and now a “spectrum” linking the two has been proposed by Burns (2007, p. viii), instead of a dichotomy, as noted here. Earlier, Bass had said that “Since 1980, general findings have been assembled that the best of leaders are both transactional and transformational. Again, for many situations the circumstances may not make that much difference” (1997, p. 132). However, TF leadership centers in the leader, and not with active follower involvement, reciprocal influence, and rewards. All of these are central features of the IL conception. This difference is of major importance.

Although charisma need not be part of TF leadership, it is routinely imputed to the TF leader, for example, as in Bass’s first aspect of TF and in House and Shamir’s (1993) work. However, the research by Ehrlich, Meindl, and Viellieu suggests that “more transactionally oriented activities by a leader may also contribute to a leader’s charismatic appeal” (1990, p. 242). At its heart charisma is attributed to a leader by followers, as indicated in the earlier cited Weber point. This is a clear parallel to the essence of idiosyncrasy credit theory, insofar as it emphasizes the pivotal role of how followers perceive and then respond to a leader.

Here we see that credits are inevitably transitory, inconstant, as in “what have you done for us lately,” and therefore in need of replenishing. This is less so regarding legitimacy, which has more stability, usually signalized by a public rite. Yet, legitimacy may still need to be reaffirmed, as is obviously the case in the electoral process. As to the fundamental question of the relationship between legitimacy and credits, they can and do bolster each other. Those granted legitimacy may then exercise their authority to say and do things that gain credits for subsequent actions. Such actions, evaluated positively by enough constituents, then create the basis for relegitimation. This cycle is one way of seeing the ascent and decline of a political leader in a mainly open participatory process.
CRITIQUE OF IC MODEL

As a critique of the IC’s model relevance to the political process, I recognize three restrictions that have occurred in my thinking about it that do not include other points of criticism. There is, first, a “statute of limitations” that may limit a leader’s latitude for influence and innovation after the passage of time from some approved action. Second, a leader may lack perceptiveness in being aware of the availability of credits and the need to use them for appropriate action. Third, followers may represent a variety of interests that are incongruent and even antagonistic to each other so that leader actions that earn credits from one subgroup or constituency may lose them from others. In short, there are mixed motives regarding desired leader behavior, in addition to what the leader may see as in his or her own self-interest. Also relevant is the basic assumption that these relationships exist in an “open system” that is not constrained by authority pressures, such as those found in top-down organizations. The scientific method means a commitment to testing hypotheses and revising ideas, including my own, written as a young person more than 50 years ago.

On balance, the IC model nonetheless does show a way that individuals may attain more independence, insofar as they gain credit to free themselves from some group pressures (Stone & Cooper, 2008, and Chapter 18 here). Nothing is perfect, and there is no “magic bullet” regarding leadership, in its many manifestations. Therefore, even within limits, the IC model has explanatory value as a basic heuristic. It tells about interpersonal evaluation and achieving influence, and resistance, as well. Also, it provides an understanding of how followers can affect a leader’s standing and his or her potential for influence and innovation.