ILA Honors Margaret Wheatley with Lifetime Achievement Award

On October 30th at ILA’s 2014 global conference, Meg Wheatley was presented with ILAs Lifetime Achievement Award in honor of her significant and diverse contributions to the field of leadership. Wheatley shifted the field of leadership in 1992 with the publication of her book, *Leadership and the New Science*. The book was a revelation to scholars and leadership professionals, utilizing systems thinking, quantum physics, and chaos theory to create a new paradigm of organizational change and development. A bestseller, *Leadership and the New Science* has been translated into 17 languages and is currently available in its third edition.

At the same time, she co-founded, in 1991, The Berkana Institute, a global charitable foundation that worked for 20 years applying the principles of living systems to organizations around the world and creating healthy and resilient communities. Currently in hibernation, Berkana continues to blaze new organizational paths by experimenting with what happens when an organization purposefully enters a reflective period of stillness.

Wheatley’s recent books all address, from different entry points, the darkness that exists in the world and how humanity can rediscover hope, learn perseverance, and strengthen our communities to meaningfully contribute and make a difference. In her newly released *How Does Raven Know: Entering Sacred World | A Meditative Memoir*, she utilizes poetry and photography to invite readers to experience the world anew and “discover the support, confidence, and companionship we need to meet this time.”
I will begin our collective weaving with a question, a pattern of practice I have observed throughout this Conference. What is the measure of success for ILA?

Is it having legal status, a strong governing board and competent staff? Is it having over 1300 conference attendees, over 2600 members from more than 70 countries? Might it be the more than 200 concurrent workshop sessions, a record number of pre-conference offerings, symposia, presentations, panels, poster sessions, round tables, luncheons, and networking meetings? We know that the answer is yes to all of these, and we also know that there is more than these usual measures of success.

Over the past several days we have become even more aware of how profoundly we all are connected. We have been invited and led into a deeper knowing, a new level of consciousness about what it means to be a global organization of scholars, practitioners, and researchers inextricably linked together in a web of discovery. The seemingly random choices of where we sit would often turn into finding new colleagues with shared interests and questions or with different and provocative perspectives that expanded and enriched our intellectual territory and our practice maps.

The immersion into discovery began with Paul Cuero’s lyrical prelude of prayer, preparing us for what he called “the long journey ahead.” “Wake up! Get up!” he implored. Then he placed his hand upon his chest and offered what felt like a benediction: “Both heart and head are required for the journey, but remember everything starts from the heart.”

Cheryl Getz, our 2014 Conference Chair, warmly welcomed us and gave us a glimpse of the enticing events that lay ahead. She invited us into a space much like the vision quest she had experienced – an experience of being intentionally open to the possibility of seeing solutions “far beyond our consciousness.”

Our horizon of understanding was widened through the words of ILA President, Cynthia Cherrey, as she grounded us in the telling of ILA’s founding story, its vision of the future and the reality we are living in today. She described the kaleidoscopic nature, the organic growth, and power of our network of connectedness. Her invitation to us was “to keep learning, not just for ourselves but for the sake of the world.”

This invitation was issued again and again in the writings, work, and lives of this year’s ILA Leadership Legacy Awardees Peter Drucker (posthumous), James G. Hunt (posthumous), and Margaret J. Wheatley. In accepting her award Margaret left us with this haunting question: “How will we use our power and influence to create spaces where the human spirit can flourish?”

Our first keynoter, A.T. Ariyaratne, has created such spaces over the last 50 years in more than 15,000 Sri Lankan villages. His life’s work serves as a testament to the transformational impact that a fully conscious leader can have on individuals and communities regardless of the oppressive circumstances in which they live and work. While reminding us that a leader who is not mindful will do more harm than good, he also elaborated on the power of grassroots community organizing to make lasting change.
Otto Scharmer’s powerful presentation echoed this belief and was explicit in stating that transformation of systems begins with self-transformation. His model invited us to connect to our internal labyrinth – the place of intricate paths and “U” turns that took us on a journey of answering his question: “What does it take to apply the power of mindfulness on the collective?” His incisive and somewhat sobering diagnosis of current reality – of ecological, social, and spiritual divides, of living in a time of disruption—in which something is dying and something is waiting to be born—was not a message of despair, but one of hope, call, and connection. He acknowledged that we are all doing this work in the in-between space of possibilities where the journey of transformation begins. For those of you who like me have labored in this space for decades, engaging leaders in their inner work, his words were music to our ears! His showing of the video of Zubin Mehta and Placido Domingo accompanied by his masterful explanation of its relationship to conscious leadership was one of those unforgettable ILA magic moments. He invited us into the deep listening he believes is the ground for social change.

Our third keynote speaker, Connie Matsui, exemplifies conscious leadership with notable skills in social and entrepreneurial activities that impact and improve the lives of others. Her story is the story of so many – of being born into the reality of being placed on the margins by a society unable and unwilling to see her true value. Her triumph in overcoming obstacles and barriers, and not internalizing others’ limiting projections of who she is, is inspiring. The values instilled by her parents—humility, trust, empathy, listening, resilience—comprise a set of gifts that continue to be given today and that continue to transform the culture that attempted to deny her very existence.

As we encountered, connected, and engaged with one another in and through and in-between the rich array of opportunities to learn, we have created space for the human spirit to flourish, for our individual and collective consciousness to grow. But consciousness is not always a giver of solace – it can be, in the words of Robert Greenleaf, a disturber and an awakener. In it and through it we discover the heart, the passion of what we do and why. We connect with the unquenchable fire within to do what the mind may say is impossible. In it we find the courage to speak our truth and to listen to the truths of others. We discover in our collective consciousness the power to change the planet.

We are connected. The fate of the world is dependent on our acknowledgement of this. We must liberate ourselves from self-imposed silos and divisions that persist even though we know they no longer work, even though we know they will lead to irrelevance. In the face of possibilities where the human spirit can flourish and in which conscious leadership is essential, we will see the intersection of research, scholarship, and practice.

ILA’s unique heritage and lasting legacy is in remembering that we are the space and place for this connectedness. If we will claim this calling not only in words but in our actions we will mobilize a movement that will shift our consciousness and the current axis of leadership from what is dying to what is waiting to be born.

The words that were invoked in the beginning continue to resonate as we end this 16th global conference and prepare for the 17th in Barcelona. “Wake up! Get up! There is a long journey ahead. Our hearts and heads are needed, but remember everything starts with the heart.” All of you - all of us - are the heart of ILA and the heart of conscious leadership for global change. This is the measure of success!
What Did You Like Most About ILA San Diego?

The concurrent sessions were wonderful.
Chuck Rose, Owner, Hose & Hound Neighborhood Pub, Canada

The diverse range of sessions on offer; enough gaps in the schedule to allow for networking, coffee top-up’s, etc.
Emma Watton, Senior Teaching Fellow, Management School, Lancaster University, United Kingdom

Range of people attending and speaking.
Suzanne Henwood, Associate Professor, Community and Health Services, Unitec, New Zealand

The opportunity to meet folks from all over the world!
Lissa Pohl, Assistant Director, Community & Leadership Development, University of Kentucky, U.S.A.

It had diversity of participation. Hon. Cosmas Nzili, Member of County Assembly, Makueni County Government, Kenya.

I liked the ability to investigate member interest groups and affinity groups. I felt like the small group experiences made the conference more meaningful.
Vicka Bell-Robinson, Associate Director, Residence Life, Miami University, U.S.A.

Well organised through careful planning and coordination.
Omololu Olusanya, Managing Director, Hamolink Nigeria Limited, Nigeria

Very well coordinated.
Geetartha Darshan Barua, Private Secretary to Chief Minister, Arunachal Bhawan, Government of Arunachal Pradesh, India

The culture of ILA is always so collegial and affirming, with its unique space for practitioners and scholars to engage and collaborate.
MaryJo Burchard, School of Business and Leadership, Regent University, U.S.A.

The final plenary event was exceptional and was one of the best I’ve attended in the past ten years.
Vern Ludden, Professor, Graduate Studies in Leadership, Indiana Wesleyan University, U.S.A.
Africa was relatively well represented at the 16th Annual Global Conference of the International Leadership Association held in San Diego, CA from October 30 - November 2, 2014. During the course of the conference, I met delegates from Kenya, Uganda, Benin, and South Africa as well as a critical mass of African scholars based in United States colleges and universities. In addition to the two panels on African leadership I organized, “African Leadership: Theory and Practice” and “Public Leadership in Africa”—which were well-attended by both African and non-African participants—there were panels and presentations on “Building New Leadership in African American and South African Communities,” “Transforming African Leadership,” “Conscious Leadership in Governing Special Needs Education in Western Cape, South Africa,” and “Entrepreneurial Leadership: An African Approach,” among others.

As the organizer of the panels on “African Leadership: Theory and Practice” and “Public Leadership in Africa” I had the opportunity to relate how some of us Africans in the U.S. academy have been working over the past year to promote the study of African leadership in the United States. Participants in both panels were informed of the groundbreaking Palgrave Studies in African Leadership book series that is being launched as a direct result of our efforts at promoting African leadership studies. The series will be launched with my two edited volumes, Leadership in Colonial Africa: Disruption of Traditional Frameworks and Patterns and Leadership in Postcolonial Africa: Trends Transformed by Independence both forthcoming in December 2014. My colleague Faith Ngunjiri at Concordia College, who co-edits the Palgrave series with me and chaired the panel on “African Leadership: Theory and Practice,” also spoke about our endeavors. The feedback we received and continue to get is very encouraging.

The Palgrave series seeks to promote scholarly research and publication of books on all aspects of African leadership. The series editors believe that Africa’s biggest problem is that of bad leadership. At the same time, we realize that while Africa has the biggest leadership problems in the world, African leadership is almost entirely absent from the vast literature that has been produced by leadership studies scholars over the past decade or so. The good news is that a new generation of African and Africanist scholars is becoming increasingly involved in leadership studies, has recognized Africa’s visible absence in the field, and is doing something about it. Membership in ILA and participation in its activities is proving very useful in sensitizing the global leadership studies community about Africa’s leadership crises and the need to study African leadership as a way of helping remedy the crisis. To play on Edward Said’s formulation on traveling theory, we are making the case that leadership studies theory needs to travel to Africa, and African leadership needs to travel to Europe, North America, and elsewhere around the world.

With the new Palgrave African leadership series, and as more Africans and Africanists get involved with leadership studies and the ILA, things are likely to change for the better. We are determined to promote the production of knowledge on African leadership and to stay actively involved and engaged with the ILA by, among other things, proposing papers and panels for future ILA conferences. We are determined to focus the attention and sharp minds of leadership scholars—African and non-African—on the vast, untapped wealth of leadership theory and practice in Africa as well as to promote greater understanding of Africa’s seemingly insurmountable challenges through leadership studies. If the African presence at the 2014 ILA conference is anything to go by, the signs are pretty optimistic.

The Palgrave Studies in African Leadership book series will publish both edited volumes and monographs. To propose a book for the series, contact Baba Jallow at babajallow@creighton.edu or babajallow26@gmail.com
The Young Leaders Networking Dinner was replete with energy and enthusiasm. Students, scholars, and practitioners of leadership gathered for an evening of synergy, collaboration, and partnership. Over 90 attendees from more than 20 countries filled the main dining room at the quaint Harbor House Restaurant. The leaders of the Youth Leadership MIG, Karan Saggi and Angel Acosta, hosted a dynamic gathering that fostered profound conversations focused on the 2014 ILA conference theme.

The evening’s keynote speaker, Dr. J.W. Wiley, inspired attendees with a powerful speech on the development of an enlightened consciousness. As the Director of the Center for Diversity, Pluralism, and Inclusion for State University of New York-Plattsburgh and a Lecturer in Philosophy & Interdisciplinary Studies, Dr. Wiley shared his perspectives on leading while keeping in mind the multiple identities of others. Everyone applauded and celebrated his speech with a standing ovation.

It is evident that more people are attending this dinner each year. The main goal of the Youth Leadership Member Interests Group is to sustain this rate of participation while also increasing its membership. With much effort, this next year will prove to be fruitful and successful in light of great connections made at ILA 2014.

By Angel Acosta, Leadership exCHANGE
Followership: What Is it and Why Do People Follow?
Laurent Lapierre & Melissa K. Carsten, Eds. (2014, Emerald)

IRA: I’m here with Laurent Lapierre, co-editor with Melissa Carsten of the recent book *Followership: What is it and Why Do People Follow?* First, let me congratulate you on this book. As you know, there is still a serious scarcity of published work in the field of followership. This is a much needed addition.

LAURENT: Thank you very much.

IRA: I noticed on your LinkedIn page that you state that your professional goal is to advance the knowledge and practice of two things; one, how individuals can better balance their work and personal lives—which, as a coach, I see people struggling with that all the time—and two, how leadership can be maintained or even strengthened by effective followership. As both of those goals involve a balance of roles, I’m curious, is there some underlying philosophy or value that you hold, which bridges these areas of interest for you?

LAURENT: Let me begin by congratulating you on drawing that parallel. I have actually never, at least consciously, drawn a parallel between both of my research interests. So, I’ve never thought about a bridge between both areas, in terms of an underlying philosophy. That being said, in terms of role balance, one’s goals can be interdependent. The way that a person performs one role can influence how one performs the other regardless of whether each role

Laurent Lapierre is Professor and Telfer Research Fellow at the University of Ottawa’s Telfer School of Management where he was awarded an Excellence in Education Prize. His research focuses mainly on two topics: work-family conflict and leadership. Work-family conflict refers to the incompatibility between one’s work and family obligations. In his work on leadership, Laurent has been giving particular attention to the influence that followership can have on leadership. Laurent’s research has been published in various journals, such as the *Journal of Management*, *Personnel Psychology*, the *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *The Leadership Quarterly*, and the *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, where he currently serves as Associate Editor.

Our guest interviewer, Ira Chaleff, is president of Executive Coaching & Consulting Associates in Washington, DC ([www.exe-coach.com](http://www.exe-coach.com)). He was named one of the “100 best minds on leadership” by *Leadership Excellence* magazine. Ira is the author of *The Courageous Follower: Standing Up To and For Our Leader* and co-editor of *The Art of Followership: How Great Followers Make Great Leaders and Organizations* and conducts seminars on leader-follower dynamics ([www.courageousfollower.net](http://www.courageousfollower.net)). He is the founder of ILA’s Followership Learning Community and he serves on the ILA Board of Directors. Ira is chair emeritus of the non-partisan *Congressional Management Foundation*, which conducts research, training and consulting for the U.S. Congress. His book, *Intelligent Disobedience: Doing Right When You’re Told to Do Wrong* will be published by Berrett-Koehler July 2015.
is performed by the same person, which is the case of work/family balance, or whether each role is performed by a different person, which is the case of leadership and followership. I suppose that finding the best ways of ensuring the complementarity, if one can use such a term, of such roles is my goal.

IRA: Well said. There is no question of its value to me. In my personal life, I see how a better balance is a foundation for my work. Conversely, my work gives me a certain grounding from which to take a stance in my personal life. I get that interdependence. Certainly, in the case of leading and following I get it. In the video I produced on Leading and Following Through Tango that really comes through. Partner dancing absolutely requires it.

What led you to take on the project of co-editing this book?

LAURENT: I took on this opportunity to co-edit this book because, as you said yourself, there is just so very little on followership out there. I wanted to get some good ideas out, as quickly as possible, to provide a solid basis for empirical research to follow. Relying on peer reviewed journals as outlets for ideas can be overly time-consuming. There is something to be said for choosing other outlets for a particular reason. I wanted to co-edit this book as a means to an end; namely, I wanted to get interesting ideas out there as soon as possible in order to fuel research that could eventually be published in peer-reviewed journals.

IRA: That is very interesting. Once you had that vision and clarity on the faster way to get the ideas out, did you approach Melissa? What was the sequence there?

LAURENT: What happened there was that Emerald, the publisher, contacted me. At the outset, I was to be the sole editor. However, having looked at what I had on my plate in terms of other commitments for the foreseeable future, I was questioning whether I would be able to do a good enough job on my own. I had previously met Melissa and we had a nice personal and working relationship. I knew that she had contacts that were different than mine, which could provide the basis for a very fruitful co-editing partnership. So, I invited her and she responded favorably.

IRA: You are a very wise man. It goes back to the values you are holding, of balancing your work life with your personal life, and recognizing that you might be taking on something that would throw that balance off. So, instead, you reached out to someone who could help you enrich the work and also manage the workload. What did you find?

LAURENT: Working with Melissa was very collegial, exactly as I had hoped and, frankly—based on our previous relationship—expected. We both readily agreed on who would do what and we maintained that level of collegiality throughout the project. Best of all, our friendship grew as a result. It was really a lot of fun.

IRA: It sounds like a very productive relationship. Once you started working together, what were some of the overarching questions that you and Melissa wanted this book to address?

LAURENT: We started by thinking about what we did not want the book to address. We definitely knew that we did not want the book to posit that followership is simply a product of leadership. As you well know, the great majority of writings on leadership echo that idea over, and over, and over. Instead, what we first wanted to look at is, do we know what followership—or the follower role, if you will—actually is? There have been just smidgens here and there about what followership is. We wanted to devote at least part of the book to look at what exactly do we mean by followership? By being a follower?

The other thing we knew we wanted to look at was why do people follow? We wanted to look beyond what we already know, namely that followership can be a response to leadership. Beyond that, why would people display qualities and behaviors of a follower? Those are the two thrusts of the book, which we summed up in the title: Followership: What is it and Why Do People Follow?

IRA: Excellent. Having struggled in the past and currently with getting titles to actually reflect what’s in a book, I know that can be quite challenging. My compliments to you for doing it so very well.
LAURENT: Thank you.

IRA: I’m a practitioner, as you know, and very much an advocate for the ILA’s mission of bringing together scholarship, education, and practice. So, I was particularly pleased to see that several of the very scholarly papers in the book addressed potential applications of the research. Your own chapter was a very good example of this. I’d like to talk a bit about your model of passive and active followership, and how developing consciousness about these styles—being aware of when we’re using which style and when it would be best to use which style—can improve both followership and leadership practice.

LAURENT: I’d love to talk about that. It’s something that I’m quite impassioned about. This really stems from my fascination with, well, what can you do to take at least some responsibility for how your boss—your leader, if you will, if you consider this person your leader—behaves with you. Employees often complain that their boss is not a good leader, or is not leading very well. I want to encourage people to think about the possibility that maybe they, themselves, have been a determining factor in the downfall of their manager, in terms of their manager’s leadership.

In the chapter I built on the notions of passive and proactive followership that Melissa, Mary, and others came up with. They were the first to come up with those appellations - those labels - for those styles of followership, though certainly not the first to think about those kinds of behaviors with regards to how people relate to a leader. Being the first to use those types of expressions, they brought concreteness to their distinction. Building off of that, I asked myself, “Is one necessarily better than the other?” First, let me just remind our readers what the distinction is between passive and proactive followership.

A passive follower is somebody who essentially does their best to follow their leader’s direction and instruction, with very little, if any, pushback on the ideas expressed by the leader. They really strive for excellence in terms of quality and timeliness and so on in how they carry out the leader’s direction.

Whereas the proactive follower is somebody who is not as—it’s always relative—but they are not as concerned with following the leader’s vision, direction, instructions to the letter so much as they are interested in making sure that whatever decisions the leader makes are the best possible decisions that could be made for their group. That’s why you would find a proactive follower much more likely to challenge a leader’s assumptions, ideas, or even decisions. They offer alternatives and essentially develop a partnership with the leader. They share the leadership responsibility with the leader without necessarily removing the leader from his or her leadership position. The idea is not to usurp or replace the leader; but rather to support the leader by providing ideas, alternative things to consider, and so on, so that the leader can be the best in that role as possible.

IRA: I’m very glad you clarified that. Many, if not all readers will be aware of Robert Kelley’s work. He was the first, in a significant way, to put the value of followers and followership into our consciousness. Robert’s model also uses the word “passive” but he uses it in a somewhat different way. I think the distinction is important, here, especially for our ILA audience.

LAURENT: Indeed, it is. Yes.

IRA: In his model, in the passive quadrant there is the label, “sheep” which has, of course, a judgmental quality to it.

LAURENT: A very negative connotation.

IRA: Yes. But you are using it very differently and I think it’s critical for readers to understand the difference. When you say, “They strive for perfection in carrying out the leader’s direction,” that’s a very honorable and self-accountable kind of a stance.

LAURENT: Thank you for raising that and drawing that comparison. Robert Kelley’s work really presents one or more types of followership as better or more effective than others. Whereas in Melissa’s and Mary’s work, and the work I’ve done that has built upon that work, I am not looking at one type of followership
being better than another. I am looking at one type of followership being a better fit for a situation than another.

When I wrote this chapter, I did not want it to be just for academics. I geared it toward the layperson because it has very practical applications. When you choose to support somebody as your leader and therefore choose to be a follower, the question should be, “How best can I provide that support?” Well, it depends on the particular circumstance. Essentially, what I was thinking is analogous, to some degree, to situational leadership theories, which fundamentally answer the question, “When is it more appropriate or useful to use this particular style of leadership versus that style of leadership?” Those models consider characteristics of the employee, characteristics of the nature of the task, and so on. Similarly, I ask, what are the characteristics of your boss? What are the characteristics of the situation? For example, is it a situation where you have enough time to actually be proactive and challenge ideas, and present alternative notions that may or may not be retained by the leader?

If the situation requires a very quick decision, if much would be lost if a decision was made too late, then it’s time to be a passive follower and not a proactive follower—unless, of course, in a particular circumstance proactive followership would help prevent an absolute catastrophe. But short of that, maybe it’s—for lack of a better expression—time to shut up, get the job done, and support the leader’s efforts in that way. But, in many situations there is time to discuss. For example, if there’s a complex decision that has to be made for the group, like are we going to terminate this account and invest our budget in this other type of account, and the person in the follower role is particularly convinced that he or she has valuable knowledge that would help the leader make the most informed and best decision for the future of the group, then yeah, now it’s time to be a proactive follower.

IRA: What you’re talking about resonates with my own model. We’re using different language, but in my model there is “supportiveness” and “willingness to challenge.” In my workshops, when I talk about being in the partner quadrant I tell folks that most of the time you are supporting. It’s not that half the time you’re supporting and half the time you’re challenging, but that there is an equal willingness to do either, based on the context of the situation. You assume equal accountability for the best outcome in the situation.

LAURENT: Right. Right.

IRA: Robert Kelley would applaud the style in which you wrote this, because he’s very concerned about scholarship that just talks to ourselves [both laugh]. We should really all be concerned with how do we make a difference in the world with this work we’re trying to do? In your chapter you certainly make a good, solid step in that direction. So thank you for that.

LAURENT: I appreciate that. Thank you.

IRA: Now, let’s look at Melissa’s chapter, which she co-wrote with Peter Harms and Mary Uhl-Bien. They start off with, sort of, a 30,000 foot look at how followership has been conceived from the Homeric age to our present day. They show the range of follower roles that really have always existed—whether we named them or not—and how certain forms of followership have been more acceptable than others in different periods. I’m wondering, from your examination of this is there evidence that we’re entering an era in which proactive followership is a more common and valued role orientation than what we will call the traditional followership, which is more response or reaction to leadership?

LAURENT: Yes, I’d say it’s compellingly clear that the times, they are a changin’. I see this in terms of what the media has to share with us, as well as what my numerous MBA students in different parts of the world have to share with me. It’s interesting. I’ve taught in North America, Western Europe, Eastern Europe, and China. There is seemingly more acceptance of and more value of the passive followership style in mainland China—not in Hong Kong, necessarily. Yet, even within the classrooms that I’ve had in China, you can see that there is a burgeoning contingent of Chinese people who are much less accepting of the natural tendency to be a passive follower. They’re not necessarily thinking that it’s never appropriate, but
they are challenging its status as the default form of followership. It is quite compelling.

There is an indisputable truth, I think, that the world has become far too complex, calling for such rapid change that managers can no longer be the sole decision-makers. More than ever, I think that managers and leaders need and actually depend upon subordinates to proactively challenge their assumptions, their ideas, and their decisions in order to ensure that the best leadership decisions are made. The all-knowing manager whom subordinates must strive to obey is becoming pretty much a thing of the past in many work contexts. I don’t want to contradict myself in saying that passive followership has no place whatsoever; I think it does, in certain circumstances. But, I’m also seeing, from various channels, compelling evidence that it is the proactive form of followership that is becoming much more valued.

IRA: In terms of China, I am fascinated by the fact that competitiveness itself requires the best thinking from the subordinates. Yet, once that becomes a way of being that is acceptable and valued by the positional leaders—valued because it does help them make better decisions—it is then hard to shut that valve off so it becomes part of the cultural norm. It’s interesting that Chinese leadership is starting to rehabilitate, if you will, Confucianism in China because they are more comfortable with Confucianism, than some of the other religious movements that are taking hold. And, while we know that Confucianism values stability and honoring ancestors, etcetera, there is also the element, in Confucianism, of questioning authority. It’s going to be very interesting to watch how that plays out in Chinese culture.

LAURENT: Absolutely. Actually, I think their economy depends on it.

IRA: The influence of the media is also interesting. In English, at least, the negative connotation of the word “follower” has softened a lot, in part due to social media where everyone has followers and everyone is a follower.

LAURENT: Or, at least has the opportunity to be a follower and be followed.

IRA: Yes, that’s right. I want to touch on, at least lightly, some of the other chapters that you chose to include. Let’s start with the chapter on authentic followership, by Rhonda Rodgers and Michelle Bligh. They take an interesting look at the flip side of authentic leadership, which is very popular right now. In the chapter they cite W.L. Gardner, who suggests that authentic followership follows the same developmental path as authentic leadership. Both involve a higher degree of self-awareness and self-regulation. To me this suggests that both the authentic leader and the authentic follower are more psychologically mature individuals. I wonder if you could talk a little about what you think about psychological maturity being part of the equation of changing the relationship between followers and leaders.

LAURENT: It’s a very good point. I very much share the idea that to be an effective follower you need to be psychologically mature. Psychological maturity means, first of all, that you are aware of your own insecurities, and that you are able to manage them. I fundamentally believe that to be an effective follower in different situations and different contexts, you need to be able to adapt yourself to the needs of the situation. This includes adapting yourself, not only to the needs of the type of work or project, but, fundamentally, to the needs or interests of the person that you want to support as leader. To do that, you really have to be able to very consciously govern your actions and govern the way in which you display followership as opposed to simply displaying followership as a response to how your boss is behaving, or letting your inner demons or natural way of doing things—your comfort zones, if you will—dictate the style of followership that you will display.

If you think about the classic example of Hitler, here is this very charismatic leader who was able to garner a heck of a lot of followership that, at least initially, was very passive. His followers were very rah-rah-rah, we will do what you say, and so on. Obviously I’m simplifying matters, but it’s for the sake of conversation. Many historians and those who are students of the history of leadership would argue that
it was the great insecurities that were experienced by a contingent of the German population that supported that. We have to be aware of, not victims of, our insecurities. In doing so, we can consciously choose how we should behave in the interest of our group. That really, really requires a great deal of psychological maturity. To abandon or curb a natural tendency or behavior stemming from an insecurity we have, takes a lot. It takes a lot of courage and self-awareness.

IRA: What you’re saying is really important. That kind of maturity is what will make the difference between truly responsible followership and the kind of dangerous followership that too often emerges.

LAURENT: Right. And the same argument has been made with respect to leadership. The people who—in different types of situations and in different work roles—display outstanding leadership are the people, by and large, who have a significantly high level of psychological maturity.

IRA: Absolutely. I want to use this thread of our conversation to bridge over to Deanna de Zilwa’s chapter on authentic followership, where she takes another perspective on this. If I’m reading her right, she posits that a follower can’t be authentic if the leader doesn’t create a safe environment in which to be authentic. While I know there is a certain amount of practicality about that, I also find that to be a problematic statement because it places too much power with the leader. Her assertion seems contrary to what you’re trying to do, if I’ve understood you correctly, which is to really look at how followership can be done without it being a response to the leader. And, in my own work, it is particularly when the leader does not create a safe environment for candor on the part of the followers, that that’s where the maturity and the skill is needed in order to help the leader understand the impact of that style and to, frankly, save the leader of the group from some of the ill effects or even catastrophes that can result from that.

IRA: It’s interesting that you’re using the word “mutiny,” which, of course, is a very loaded word that implies a power grab and taking over of the formal invested power of the positional leader. Of course, in most of the organizations in which we work there are levels of positional formal leadership above the leader that we’re dealing with. So, it’s not really mutiny. It’s alerting the more senior levels of leadership that something is seriously amiss, and that it needs addressing.
LAURENT: Yeah, I agree with you. The only thing I’d add is that in those kinds of situations, the employee has chosen to no longer follow the immediate boss and is, instead, focusing his or her followership efforts on the boss’s boss.

IRA: Good point. Each of the chapters in your book looks—in its own way and from different perspectives—at how we can, to some degree, turn these hierarchical relationships into partnerships. I was particularly impressed by the chapter by Susan D. Baker, Susan A. Stites-Doe, Christopher J. Mathis and William E. Rosenbach, which places an emphasis on encouraging an organization’s teaching of partnership, rewarding of partnership, and hiring of partners as suggested by Rosenbach, Pittman, and Potter in their work. From your own studies, observations, and work in organizations, what have you found supports developing partnership in leader/follower relationships?

LAURENT: That’s a good question. My default frame of reference is the writing that has been published on leader-member exchange, or LMX. George Graen and others have done some fascinating work there. It impassioned me to ask, what are the follower contributions to the relationship? To answer your question, it has got to come from both parties. If you are in a follower role, you have to ask yourself, “I want to develop a strong trust-based relationship with my leader. What does my leader need?” You put yourself in your leader’s shoes and ask, “What are his or her pressures? Is there something that I can do to help? What would essentially boost my leader’s sense of confidence in his or her role, and would invariably help me in my career path as well?” It has to be a win-win situation.

LAURENT: That’s a question. My default frame of reference is the writing that has been published on leader-member exchange, or LMX. George Graen and others have done some fascinating work there. It impassioned me to ask, what are the follower contributions to the relationship? To answer your question, it has got to come from both parties. If you are in a follower role, you have to ask yourself, “I want to develop a strong trust-based relationship with my leader. What does my leader need?” You put yourself in your leader’s shoes and ask, “What are his or her pressures? Is there something that I can do to help? What would essentially boost my leader’s sense of confidence in his or her role, and would invariably help me in my career path as well?” It has to be a win-win situation.

The same goes for the person who is in the leader role. The leader needs to say to his or her self, “I want to be able to depend upon my employee, who I hired on the basis of this very high potential. I want to be able to show this employee that it’s okay to take risks, that it’s okay to challenge me, and that I’m looking out for his or her best interests. I will not react in anger when I am being challenged, if it is clearly done for the right reason, and not just challenging for the sake of challenging, which some employees can do.”

Going back to the notion you brought up earlier in the interview, it really takes a great deal of psychological maturity on both sides to be able to not only be aware of their own shortcomings and their own comfort zones, and their own insecurities, but to also have the ability to put themselves in the other’s shoes. This is just fundamental, and it’s what I talk about with my MBA students over and over again.

IRA: That’s a great, great perspective. Inevitably I think this comes back, in part, to maturity and the ability to recognize that the other party is not going to be perfect, any more than you are going to be perfect. You have to be willing to cut them some slack, and nevertheless being willing to do your part in bringing out the best that you can in them, regardless of their imperfections.

LAURENT: Absolutely. I would completely agree with that. Nobody is going to be perfect. Everybody should be allowed to screw up sometimes. Everybody should be allowed to make mistakes. It’s when those “screw ups” become habitual that you start wondering. Communication and a focus on incidents are key. For example, “I noticed that this happened. Can I assume that you were in a bad mood that day? Did I do something to offend you, or to frustrate you? If so, please let me know, because that certainly was not my intention.” That kind of conversation is going to help build mutual trust and motivation to put oneself in the other person’s shoes.

IRA: That’s excellent. Clearing the air through those kinds of conversations on an ongoing, as-needed basis is a really great practice because for lack of that, people carry around images of the other that then impedes the trust that is needed for partnership.

LAURENT: Absolutely. And not just communicating to clear the air when there may have been some hurtful miscommunications or misunderstandings, but also communicating to the other person when one appreciates how the other person behaved, for example, “When you did this I felt… and that made my day, because… blah blah blah.” Communication that emphasizes how the other person makes us feel, in my view, contributes to a strengthening of the bond.
IRA: Giving positive, explicit reinforcement for what the leader is doing that is helpful to them is a tremendously powerful tool that people in a subordinate role don’t always sufficiently appreciate. It feels like a million bucks, and it helps the leader be aware of what is helpful to their people, so they can do more of it.

I want to move on to Kim and Andrew Hinrichs’s chapter on the effects of hierarchy. There is a line in it that I particularly liked, “Hierarchical subordination is not a relationship between people; it’s a relationship between positions.” I think that’s a great encapsulation of the danger in hierarchy. Yet, most of humanity’s large endeavors are organized hierarchically. The world is changing somewhat. We now have some crowd-sourced endeavors like Wikipedia, but even they eventually identify some need for hierarchy to referee issues. An important question to ask then, is what are we learning from leader/follower scholarship about how to get the best from hierarchy, and eliminate its worst features?

LAURENT: It’s interesting what Kim and Andrew brought in with their chapter. I thought it was a very strong contribution to the book. It made clear what the distinction is between subordination and followership. Early LMX research was called vertical dyad linkage research. That really made it clear to me that a supervisor/subordinate relationship—which is really what Kim and Andrew are referring to, when they talk about the relationship between positions—would be limited to the contractual or formal role obligations. I was hired to do this, so I need to do that. Or, I’m this person’s manager, so I need to complete this sheet and log this, and are they doing their job, and have they crossed their T’s and dotted their I’s? The relationship between supervisor and subordinate is just the basic contractual obligation of both parties inherent in their formal positions.

The leader/follow relationship involves behavior that goes beyond formal work requirements. It doesn’t mean that they no longer perform those formal work requirements, but it does mean they are embedded in a context, created by both parties, of, “Hey, you know what? I’m going to go beyond what I actually have to do.” If I’m the follower then, I want to volunteer for additional responsibilities because I know it will help the group and support you. I love working here, and I know it’s going to be of benefit to you.” If I’m the manager then, “I want to offer you my time, beyond what I have to do. I want to offer you my resources. I want to introduce you to people in my personal network and help you in your career, and so on.”

So how do we—to come back to your question—ensure that we can eliminate the worst features of hierarchy and make sure that the hierarchy of supervisor/subordinate transcends into a leader/follower relationship? I think it comes back to what we were discussing earlier. It is knowing that both parties have a role to play in showing the other that they care about the other. It’s putting themselves in each other’s shoes and giving each other a break.

IRA: I appreciate the clarity of distinction you’re making between the contractual relationship of the manager/supervisor, and the, let me call it the “aspirational” nature of the relationship between leaders and followers. I think that’s very helpful.

I want to talk now about Micha Popper’s chapter. We’ve talked a lot about the first part of your title, “Followership: What Is It?” The second part is “Why do people follow?” Popper’s chapter looks in on that. Here you have an author who is an Israeli scholar. He was a former head of the Israeli defense forces school for leadership development, which has got to be a pretty interesting perspective with the stakes that are involved. He asks a particularly poignant question. He says, “What are the sources of yearning for a leader?” Yearning suggests a very deep drive, and perhaps not even a fulfillable drive. Why do we yearn for a leader?

LAURENT: I definitely agree that there is a yearning for a leader in many situations. I see myself as a person who, at different points in my life, has yearned for a leader. I have yearned for a person who would provide the direction that I needed. Who would clarify goals. Who would provide encouragement. Who would give me hope. I think, as Micha Popper does, it’s just a natural drive.
I guess my own fascination with followership, though, invokes the following question: can we consciously choose to follow a leader in such a way that he or she will more easily give us what we yearn for? Do we have a yearning for a leader, or do we yearn for what the leader offers? I would argue we have a yearning for what the leader offers, which is hope, which is direction, which are goals, and so on. And if that is what we need, if that is what we are looking for, then maybe the manner in which we support or follow this leader will help us to achieve those goals of ours.

IRA: With that statement you have just demonstrated your true commitment to examining followership as not just a response to leadership. I very much appreciate that formulation of, how do we create leadership, rather than just be at the effect of it when we are in the follower role.

LAURENT: I really like that sentence, “How do we create leadership?”

IRA: I think this may be a way to bridge into the chapter that Thomas Sy and Tara McCoy contributed to the book, in which they talk about the leader and follower roles switching. They assert that each of us carries a schema for what it means to lead and what it means to follow. Of course, these schemas aren’t necessarily conscious. They have an interesting four-quadrant model of how likely a person will appropriately and adaptively switch between the leader and follower roles, based on the schemas we carry. I’m wondering what the parallels are to your own model on active and passive followership.

LAURENT: That’s a good question. I have to admit that I would have to give that more thought in order to give you a very useful answer.

IRA: Very good. That is one of the outcomes I appreciate in interviews like this. We walk away with some material to think more deeply about and to research further.

LAURENT: Exactly so. Of course, I found all of the chapters interesting, but theirs was unique in that it was the only chapter that raised the issue that people themselves can fluctuate between leader and follower roles. This makes a great deal of sense, particularly in terms of thinking on who one’s audience is, or who one is dealing with in the organizational context. I don’t know to what extent passive and proactive followers parallel that.

IRA: I see a fair amount of coherence between your model and their model, here. If a person only carries the schema of following, that would be more like the Robert Kelley sense of passive sheep. If they only carry a schema for leading, then they would have a very hard time subordinating their own preferences. But, if they carry both schemas in a healthy way that attunes them to when they should move between each role, that would wind up being very supportive of the model of healthy leading and following that your work represents.

LAURENT: That’s an interesting parallel. I hadn’t thought about it in that way.

IRA: I think the only chapter we haven’t touched on yet is Kimberly Jaussi’s and Amy Randel’s, on developing effective followers. I think they offer some good, solid tools and examples of how leaders can encourage the skill of disagreeing credibly and create the kind of culture in which effective followership can emerge more easily. For example, they suggest using leadership language such as saying, “Your job is to tell me why my approach is wrong, or not the best that it could be.” What I’m seeing here is a very healthy bridging between scholarship and some prescriptive application. I imagine that you and Melissa applauded that. I’m wondering if you found yourself needing to encourage that bridging between the research and the application?

LAURENT: It’s an interesting question you ask, but we actually did not have to do that. That was each author’s own choice. It wasn’t in response to our encouragement.

IRA: The fact that so many of the authors created those bridges on their own gives me hope that this is indicative of how people in the field are thinking about followership. In the book I co-edited on the Art
of Followership, Robert Kelley effectively challenged us all in his chapter by laying down what I consider to be an agenda for followership research. Followership research needs to connect very clearly to the significant problems we face in the world. It needs to enable us to better understand the dynamics of followership and the development of healthy followership to help us address and improve some of the very problematic dynamics we see all around us on leading and following.

We are getting toward the end of our time together and I’m wondering if you would like to take a few minutes to sum up how you see the particular contributions of your book to the field of leadership and followership?

LAURENT: Sure. I would sum it up by saying that I think the book does a fine job of further clarifying, first of all, what it means to follow. It really brings attention to this more novel conceptualization of followership that we’ve been discussing. When I wrote my chapter, in part, my focus was my reaction to what I saw in the rest of the book. As such, I just wanted to make it clear that it is possible to choose the particular style of followership one wants to manifest, and that that choice could be more or less driven by particular circumstances. The book, as a whole, provides some very interesting avenues for further research, which should test the extent to which the various ideas put forth in this book are actually true. And I’ve got to say, speaking only for myself, that I am very excited at the possibility of doing that.

IRA: That’s terrific. I think you are wonderfully positioned to add value to this field, in that you are both a researcher and someone who—because you chose to work within business administration, a more applied field—can use both your language and your way of thinking about things to easily bridge from the deeper scholarship to the application.

In closing, I’m wondering if you would participate in a little thought exercise with me? And this may be another way of me planting a seed for future research. Let’s assume that three years from now, or five years from now, you chose to write or edit another book on followership. What would you hope is different in the field by then? What kinds of issues should we be exploring? What is your vision of how followership studies could make a difference in the world?

LAURENT: That’s a really good question. I honestly only have one hope. My hope is that there will be enough compelling research that will have been sufficiently shared with non-academics—in a very easy-to-digest, very pragmatic language—that the ideas will be embraced by lay people. My hope is that the idea of followership is not only okay, but an absolute must. My hope is that the goal of being an effective follower will be embraced by a significantly larger contingent of the non-academic population, than today. As evidence of this, when I teach my leadership course at the MBA level and we get to followership and I ask people to think about the common traits or characteristics of followers, I will see much less negative qualifiers and much more positive ones.

IRA: That’s a great metric. Your vision, your hope, is highly consistent with the ILA’s vision for bringing research and education and practice together, as I’m sure our readers will agree. This has been a fascinating dialog. Thank you.

LAURENT: I would like to extend my very sincere thanks for this opportunity to exchange with you on this topic that I equally consider fascinating. It has truly been a pleasure. Ira, you have been a wonderful interviewer, and I really hope that we can work together in some capacity in the future.
How to Launch an Interdisciplinary Leadership Journal: The Process and Experience of the Creighton Journal of Interdisciplinary Leadership

By Isabelle Cherney (pictured), Creighton University; William Leggio, King Saud University; and Jennifer Moss Breen, Creighton University & Chair-Elect, Business Leadership MIG

The Creighton Journal of Interdisciplinary Leadership, CJIL, officially launched November 1, 2014 at the ILA global conference in San Diego, California. After much discussion and refinement, the theme for CJIL’s first edition is Social Justice: Building Bridges Through Applied Leadership Practice and Scholarship.

The Seeds of an Idea

The idea for creating our interdisciplinary leadership journal grew from the practicum project of a student enrolled in the Interdisciplinary Leadership Doctoral (ILD) program at Creighton University. The student, Matt Besmer, surveyed faculty, students, and alumni of the program and discovered an abundance of support and encouragement to create a peer-reviewed interdisciplinary leadership journal. The positive results from the survey made clear the interest for an academic journal that publishes articles from a variety of disciplines, which was and still is, reflective of the ILD program that would serve as the journal sponsor. Besmer, deciding to hand off his idea and focus on his studies and upcoming dissertation, met with ILD program director Isabelle Cherney and William Leggio, ILD program alumni, in December 2013 to discuss how to move forward from a highly supported idea into an actual journal.

Researching Open Access Journal Best Practices

From the beginning, we planned on CJIL being a double-blind online open-access journal with a mission to publish leadership articles from a variety of disciplines and uphold the values of Jesuit education. Leggio took the initial lead on identifying best practices for starting an open-access journal, conceptualizing how the journal would function, and identify resources available at Creighton University. The initial search to identify best practices ranged from a typical literature review to reading blogs, but a clear concise path for how to start a journal was not found.

We reached out to colleagues at Creighton. For some time, the School of Law at Creighton has published a student run law review and a law journal. Professor Craig Dallon, the faculty sponsor of the law review expressed his support and agreed to discuss how their journals are managed. This connection led to a similar meeting with the Editor-In-Chief of the law review. Both shared their experiences, insights into how their printed journals are managed, and what they have learned along the way.

Although these dialogues, experiences, and support from the law journals were beneficial, there were differences in focus and distribution of the journals. We next met with Julia Cronin-Gilmore, affiliate ILD faculty, who had created an open-access academic journal focused on excellence in business education. Her journal, hosted by her university, utilized Open Journal Software (OJS) produced by Public Knowledge Project and a creative commons copyright. This fruitful meeting in combination with the others provided enough information on how to proceed in structuring CJIL. Leggio finished examining author guidelines, descriptions of journal roles, and article formats found within various journals related to healthcare, business, and higher education and put together a proposal.

The proposal was presented to the ILD faculty. Enthusiastic feedback and acceptance of CJIL were given along with nominating Cherney as editor-in-chief and Leggio as managing editor. From this first meeting, the way forward was discussed and CJIL continued in
selecting a copyright agreement, finding solutions for hosting and management, and recruiting individuals to be part of the board and reviewers.

**Copyright – Liberal Use and Standard Citation Requirements**

The use of a creative commons copyright was reviewed, and Prof. Dallon, a copyright lawyer, provided input including permission to adopt the copyright used by the law journals. Cherney took the lead on finalizing the copyright for CJIL, a process that required edits and approval from the University’s legal counsel. The final copyright stays with CJIL, but in the nature of being an open-access journal allows for liberal use of published articles while keeping with standard citation requirements.

**Open Journal Software**

How to host, manage and archive the journal required several meetings with leaders from the library and information technology at Creighton. Commercial solutions were reviewed, but we decided to utilize OJS because it is free, reliable, and would integrate with current IT infrastructure and digital repositories. Richard Jizba, health sciences librarian, diligently worked to create the OJS test server and test its function. Jim Martin, assistant ILD program director, took the lead on working with the library and IT leaders to install OJS. After approximately two months, Jizba had OJS fully operational and serving not only as the solution for CJIL but other journals and publications at Creighton as well.

**Putting the Last Pieces in Place**

Cherney and Leggio finalized journal documents and started to recruit: a section editor for each discipline, a copy editor, assistant copy editors, a layout editor, and a marketing manager. We recruited from ILD program faculty, associated faculty, current students, or alumni. The first board meeting was organized to form our editorial board. Responsibilities were assigned, which included constructing article layouts, copyeditor instructions, and a matrix to assist in reviewing articles. Reviewers were recruited. Over the summer months, Martin and Leggio completed the journal website and tested the process of submitting an article.

CJIL marketing editor and ILD student, Pat Chadd, worked with the University’s marketing department to create the CJIL logos. A torch design was created to symbolize the idea of Jesuit pillars holding a fanning flame that represents spirit, spirituality, and learning enlightenment. Social justice, practice, and scholarship fan the flame, which are central to the mission and vision of CJIL.

**Interdisciplinary Leaders and Teams = Success**

The collaborative process of creating CJIL was not always clear, was exhaustive at times, and presented new challenges. Regardless, the creation of CJIL showed the capabilities and strengths of interdisciplinary leaders and teams. Those involved with CJIL knew the launch was a moment to relish, but it also served as the beginning of a commitment to ensuring the journal’s mission and the start of another journey of working towards the vision of CJIL.

ILA members are invited to submit their work to this new journal. Visit [www.creighton.edu/cjil](http://www.creighton.edu/cjil) for further information, to submit research, and to register for updates.

CJIL also hosts an open group on [LinkedIn](https://www.linkedin.com).
Suze Wilson Wins 2014 Jablin Award at ILA San Diego

Suze Wilson, a Lecturer in the School of Management at Massey University in New Zealand, was presented with the 2014 Fredric M. Jablin Doctoral Dissertation Award on Saturday November 1st at ILA’s 2014 global conference for her chapter, “Contingency, Change, and Continuity in the Truth about Leadership” from her dissertation, “Thinking Differently about Leadership: A Critical History of the Form and Formation of Leadership Studies.”

The chapter examines notable changes and continuities when comparing Classical Greek, 16th century European, and modern scholarly accounts of leadership in order to gauge what progress has and has not been made in our understanding of leadership. It examines change and continuity in how leadership emerges as a focus of scholarly interest; how ‘the leader’, ‘the follower’ and their relationship have been understood; the social function of leadership discourse; and the epistemological and methodological predilections of leadership scholars. It suggests that important continuities exist between ancient and modern understandings of leadership and that in many ways we continue to rework old ground.

The award, which includes a $1000 prize, one-year membership in ILA, travel expenses, complimentary registration to and an opportunity to present at the ILA global conference, is given annually to a scholar whose doctoral dissertation research, on any topic and from any discipline, demonstrates substantial insights and implications for the study of leadership. The award was established to honor and celebrate the life of Dr. Fredric M. Jablin (1952-2004). The ILA is pleased to partner with the Jepson School of Leadership Studies at the University of Richmond on this award.

According to Joanne Ciulla at Jepson there were 92 applicants this year. After narrowing the pool down to 3 finalists, Suze’s was selected because it, “modeled the Jepson School’s approach to leadership studies. It addressed the leadership studies literature from the perspective of the liberal arts.” The other two finalists were Gerald Burch, who received his Ph.D. is from Virginia Commonwealth University, for “Interactive Empathy and Leadership,” and Rita Gardiner, who received her Ph.D. from Western University in Ontario, Canada, for, “Thinking with Arendt: Authenticity, Gender and Leadership.”

We asked Suze to share with us her experience at ILA’s 2014 global conference, how she will spend her prize money, and her upcoming plans.

Suze on ILA San Diego: I really enjoyed the conference for its diversity of perspectives on leadership. In that regard it is much broader than what I’ve seen at the Academy of Management where quantitative social sciences studies really dominate. Because I am interested in how ideas about leadership develop over time, it was great to find so many sessions examining the history of leadership theory and practice. I think the wider perspective that history can give us really helps us to make sense of the life and times we live in. It was exciting to listen and meet some of the big names in the field whose work I’ve been reading and to discover people whose work I’d not come across before.

Suze on spending her $1,000 prize: There are a couple of books that I analysed quite closely as part of my research that I have been coveting ever since to own: Thomas Carlyle’s On Heroes and Hero Worship and Justus Lipsius’s Six Books of Politics. With Carlyle, I think a lot of his ideas are quite batty, but I just love how passionate he is as a writer. Lipsius is someone we’ve lost from view. He was incredibly influential in the 16th century, offers a much more balanced view than Machiavelli, and I think he deserves to be resurrected and examined further. A Latinist by the name of Jan Waszink did a modern English translation back in 2004 and that’s what I’m wanting to get and keep my paws on.

Suze on what’s next: I am happy to report I have a contract with Edward Elgar to convert the thesis into a monograph for the New Horizons in Leadership Studies series edited by Joanne Ciulla at Jepson. It should be out in time for next year’s ILA conference in Barcelona. I’m also slicing and dicing the thesis up into journal articles and am working on a co-authored book for Routledge with Stephen Cummings, Sarah Proctor-Thomson, and Brad Jackson. That book will start from where the thesis ends and will set out our ideas on how we can revitalise how we theorise, and hopefully, practice leadership. Nearly everything I’ve written is up on researchgate for anyone who wants to access it. The address is https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Suze_Wilson

Crystal Hoyt (L) from Jepson presents Suze Wilson with the 2014 Jablin Award

Information on the 2015 Jablin Award will be available in early 2015 at http://www.ila-net.org/Awards/Jablin/
Have you cast your ballot yet? Time is running out. The 2014 annual MIG election for new Chair-Elects closes December 5th at 11:59 PM (EST). ILA Members received personal, anonymous election ballots via email (SurveyMonkey) on Nov. 21 and a reminder will be sent on Wednesday, Dec. 3. Please check your spam folder if you did not receive this important email!

View the complete list of candidates.

Each of ILA’s six Member Interest Groups is led by a Chair, Chair-Elect, and Immediate Past-Chair. Entering into the Chair-Elect role is the beginning of a three year term in the MIG leadership of ILA, one year in each position.

What do MIG Chair-Elects Do?

Chair-Elects work closely with the MIG Chair to provide leadership and execute all operations for the MIG. He or she is responsible for assisting with and implementing activities within the MIG as jointly agreed upon with the MIG Chair. The MIG Chair-Elect ensures the MIG’s success by contributing to MIG projects, seeking to expand benefits delivered to members, promoting engagement of members, and through commitment to his or her development as the future MIG chair.

After serving a year as Chair-Elect, the person moves into the Chair role and takes on the primary responsibility for providing leadership to the MIG’s members, volunteer teams, Chair-Elect and Past-Chair. The MIG Chair ensures the success of the MIG’s activities through building and nurturing the MIG’s infrastructure and initiating and executing projects. The MIG Chair serves as the primary liaison with the ILA staff, Board, and other constituencies within the ILA as well as strategic partners outside the ILA.

After completing two-years of service, the person moves into the role of Immediate Past-Chair, providing institutional knowledge and ongoing mentoring. She or he serves as an external ambassador for the MIG to develop partnerships and engage in the recruitment of members.

Thank you to the ILA members standing for election for this important volunteer role. We appreciate your enthusiasm for the association and your dedication to service!

2014 ILA Member Interest Group Election Now Open!

Emotionally Intelligent Leadership: A Guide for Students

an ILA Webinar Featuring

Scott Allen, Paige Haber-Curran, and Marcy Levy Shankman

Wednesday, Dec 3, 2014
12:00-1:00 p.m. EST

Details: www.ila-net.org/webinars/
Registration: www.ila-net.org/webinars/EmotionalIntelligence/
Price: Free for ILA Members; $24.95 for non-members

Join the authors of Emotionally Intelligent Leadership: A Guide for Students for this fast paced and energetic webinar focussing on the Emotionally Intelligent Leadership (EIL) model and how it can be applied to curricular and co-curricular settings. Participants will learn the EIL model (consciousness of context, consciousness of self, and consciousness of others) and explore the 21 capacities that define the emotionally intelligent leader. Now in its second edition, the authors have incorporated their revised EIL model into an engaging text for high school, undergraduate, and graduate students.
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Associate Vice President for Global Learning and Leadership Development
Agnes Scott College
Decatur, GA
Closing Date: Until Filled
View Complete Description

Coordinator, Faculty-Led Study Abroad Programs
Baylor University, Waco, TX
Closing Date: 12/18/2014
View Complete Description

Assistant Professor, Tenure-Track, Community and Civic Engagement
Humphrey School of Public Affairs and College of Extension, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN
Closing Date: Until Filled
View Complete Description

Assistant / Associate Professor, Organizational Science & Leadership
School of Strategic Leadership Studies, James Madison University
Harrisonburg, VA
Closing Date: Until Filled
View Complete Description

Leadership Theory Instructor (online)
City University of Seattle
Closing Date: Until Filled
View Complete Description

Vice President Programs
FOCUS St. Louis
St. Louis, MO
Closing Date: Until Filled
View Complete Description

Assistant or Associate Professor
Department of Agricultural Communication, Education and Leadership
The Ohio State University
Columbus, OH
Closing Date: Until Filled
View Complete Description

Leadership Studies Lecturer/Academic Program Associate
Communication Studies, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS
Closing Date: Until Filled
View Complete Description

Submit Your Listing!

LEADERSHIP EDUCATION ACADEMY
2-5 AUGUST 2015 | ORLANDO

Attend this cohort-based professional development experience to:

- Enhance your knowledge of leadership foundations and theories
- Augment your understanding of leadership education pedagogies
- Practice instructional strategies
- Learn from the experiences of seasoned educators

Designed to meet the specific needs of new leadership educators in both curricular and co-curricular settings!

Learn More at www.ila-net.org/LEA/

Organized by the ILA Leadership Education Member Interest Group
Endorsed by the ILA Leadership Education Deans, Directors, and Chairs Affinity Group
# Calendar of Upcoming Leadership Events

## 2014-2015

Promote your event on the ILA online calendar by logging on to the ILA website and navigating to **Events > Calendar**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 3</td>
<td>28th Australian &amp; New Zealand Academy of Management Conference</td>
<td>Sydney, Australia</td>
<td>Learn more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 3-5</td>
<td>13th Annual International Studying Leadership Conference</td>
<td>Copenhagen, Denmark</td>
<td>Learn more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 14-16</td>
<td>CFP Deadline: ILA’s 2015 Global Conference, Barcelona, Spain,</td>
<td>Barcelona, Catalonia, Spain</td>
<td>Submit Your Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 15</td>
<td>CFP Deadline: Organizational Aesthetics Special Issue on Design Thinking and Social Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Plan Now to Attend These ILA Events

### 7-10 June 2015

**Advancing Women in Leadership: Waves of Possibilities**

2nd ILA Women & Leadership Affinity Group Conference

Pacific Grove, CA, USA

Registration Opens December 15th!

### 2-5 August 2015

**Leadership Educators Academy**

Orlando, FL, USA

### 14-17 October 2015

**Leading Across Borders & Generations**

17th Annual ILA Global Conference

Barcelona, Catalonia, Spain

Call for Proposals Now Open!

Submit by Feb. 1, 2015

Sponsor ILA 2015