



**Remarks by Edwin P. Hollander on Receiving
ILA Lifetime Achievement Award**

Friday - October 29, 2010

(Leadership Legacy Award Luncheon Reception Honoring Edwin Hollander)

I appreciate and am humbled by this legacy honor, not only for the recognition that is gratifying, but because it comes from the ILA, a splendid organization that models good leadership and followership relations. The caring and participation it provides are very much in harmony with the values in leadership of respect, recognition, responsiveness, and responsibility both ways, which are basic in my book on *Inclusive Leadership* (2009), emphasizing doing things with people, rather than to people. These values are evident for its members at ILA meetings, and in the periods between them, through the connections with each other it offers and encourages members to make.

Life is about connections that may bloom into longer-term relationships. Three of the past legacy awardees, Bernie Bass, Warren Bennis, and Jim Burns, have each had a connective role in my life, and coincidentally in that alphabetical order. Bernie and I were young researchers on group processes with ONR support a in the 1950s, often together then and later at meetings here and abroad. Warren was also associated with that group and organizational area, while at MIT. He came from there to SUNY at Buffalo in 1967 as Provost of Social Sciences and Administration, the largest full-time faculty in the largest SUNY unit. I was then co-founder with Ray Hunt, and long-time director, of the doctoral program in social/organizational psychology there. In 1971, I accepted the provost role when Warren's associate, my psychology colleague Ira Cohen, stepped down after initially succeeding Warren, who became vice president for development.

Jim Burns and I were active and held office early in the International Society of Political Psychology (ISPP), beginning in the 1980s. Knowing of and citing his major works on the presidency, I was delighted to get acquainted. He was cordial when we

first met, making a point of having seen research I'd published in 1955 with Webb on followership. He was an excellent role model of a senior statesman, not only as ISPP president, but also engaged in speaking up, as he did in taking issue with my presentation at a session on power, to which I gladly countered. Then, as if on cue, the ISPP president John Mack, a psychiatrist, from the audience spoke up in support of my interpretation, and Jim dropped the matter. It was Jim who asked me early in the 1990s to take an active role in the nascent Kellogg Leadership Studies Program (KLSP). I became the "convenor" (a term I suggested from academic time in Britain) in recruiting, organizing, and working with the leadership-followership focus group, with outstanding contributors. We functioned for almost four years, during the last part of which I was ably succeeded by Lynn Offermann, whose comments today I much appreciate, given her great dedication and leadership over the years. She also participated yesterday in the symposium about my work that Al Goethals and Terry Price put together, and that I gratefully took part in with them and Richard Hackman. Lynn and I had written for and edited the group's KLSP-published report, *The Balance of Leadership and Followership* (1997), among our other collaborations. The KLSP also brought us into an association with valued colleagues like Cynthia Cherrey and Gill Hickman, who are on the platform today with us as leaders of the ILA.

Relationships matter, and leadership is about a basic interdependent one, where a person is "in charge," and others are supposed to respond to his or her directions. I have had little patience with making it too complicated, and therefore admire the clarity of such pioneers of the modern scene as Mary Parker Follett. Starting in the 1920s, she stressed "power with," in giving orders. She asked the question of how orders are received by those to who directed. In her view, the relationship of the leader and the followers was critical to team success, not the leader's ability to dominate his or her followers (Follett, 1949; Graham, 1995). Another early proponent of attention to follower responses to direction was Chester Barnard (1938). His "Acceptance Theory of Authority" centered on the follower's role in judging whether an order was authoritative. Though leadership research had long focused mainly on leader qualities and behavior, Douglas McGregor (1960) provided the helpful distinction that, "Leadership is a process, not a person," which clearly includes followers. Obviously it matters how the "person in charge" is perceived by them, and within which frame of their needs and expectations.

George Homans (1961) emphasized the importance of a “fair exchange,” in which “a leader gives something and gets something.” Ethics deals with these issues, and Terry Price, who spoke here about our relationship, for which I am grateful, authored a commendable book entitled *Leadership Ethics* (2008). He points out that “leader exceptionalism” can account for the acceptance by followers of leader actions that are otherwise not acceptable. That, he says, is the underpinning of my concept of “idiosyncrasy credit,” in which followers accord or withdraw support for a leader, thereby affecting a leader’s latitude for action. He also poses the quandry of conceiving of “...a world in which special people resort to lying and promise-breaking to achieve their ends” (p. 94), thus holding a mirror up to a grim vision.

One of the aspirations I had in coming into psychology and the study of leadership were to make a difference, not knowing precisely how, but maybe having an impact. In that regard, my interests in political psychology extend way back, but especially when I was a member, executive secretary, and then chair in the Kennedy Era of the APA Committee on Psychology in National and International Affairs, dealing particularly with Cold War psychological issues. Recently, I gladly wrote a chapter about the American Presidency, and especially treated President Obama’s circumstances, as he faces unique questions regarding the legitimacy of his election and his religion. It is to appear in a book edited by Michelle Bligh and Ron Riggio on leadership at a distance. I’ve distributed an excerpt here about the situation confronting Obama, even with 53% of the popular vote in 2008, and charisma with some, but disdain and worse from others, who will not accept or give him any credit.

Another means of trying to make a difference was through my books, most of the entire textbook I wrote in social psychology. First published by Oxford in 1967, I put effort into four editions as sole author, all uniquely with leadership chapters, and the important topics of language and of international relations, not usual then in other social texts. It also emphasized culture, as in the textbook I used as an undergraduate, by Otto Klineberg, a mentor I had later at Columbia and great internationalist. That my textbook went into Spanish and Chinese Editions, among others, was particularly fulfilling to my intention to try making a difference and, let me add, two of my three leadership books also have been translated into Korean.

In summing up, I know that whatever I’ve achieved has resulted from the support from others, beginning with my family, especially my wife, Pat. Sheer luck, and the opening up of opportunities that one is prepared to take, are also important.

Serendipity is another factor regarding unexpected coincidences, sometimes having to do with time and place. Yesterday, Jean Lipman-Blumen, a co-honoree and dear colleague, mentioned that her award coincided with a birthday. Permit me to tell quickly about a coincidence with Bill Cooper from Queen's University's Business School, in Kingston, Ontario, who came to visit me at Baruch College in the summer of 2007. He and Tom Stone from Oklahoma State had written a paper reviewing and critiquing 50 years of work on my concept of "idiosyncrasy credit," a draft of which they sent to me previously. He interviewed me, and got my comments before it was published in *The Leadership Quarterly* in the Fall of 2009. Just chatting, after dealing with considerable substance, it turned out that Bill Cooper and I were both originally from Rochester, New York, and that I was born at Highland Park Hospital there, where a sister of his later trained as a nurse. However, there is more, because I've had confirmation that a member of this audience, whose identity is sealed, was also born there, with an annual Lilac Festival.

Let me end by harking back to 1989 when in Salon C of this ballroom, right here, I gave the annual presidential address to the first organization I joined 40 years before as a Columbia graduate student, the Eastern Psychological Association, the largest and oldest regional society in psychology. The title of my EPA address was "Character, Credit, and Charisma: Reconsidering the Leader-Follower Connection." If it has a familiar ring, that is because it is a melody about the importance of inclusion of followership that I sing, whenever given the chance, though adding more research and reflection. It calls to mind the words of a wise elder, "The last of days can be the best of days, as you come to appreciate what has gone before." My thanks to all of you for this honor, and for being here today.



Left to Right: Lynn Offermann, Gill Hickman, Pat Hollander, Edwin Hollander, Cynthia Cherrey, Terry Price at the Leadership Legacy Award Luncheon Honoring Edwin Hollander