Followership and Student Leadership: Exploring the Relationship

Todd J. Foley
University of Cincinnati

The existence of followership in a postindustrial paradigm of leadership is highly contested and seldom taught through leadership programs and courses. This study was conducted to determine if a relationship exists between students' leadership attitudes and beliefs, their leadership identity, and their perspective on followers. The study found that that there is a significant relationship between students' negative perception of followers and an industrial paradigm of leadership and students' positive perception of followers and a postindustrial paradigm of leadership. Implications for teaching followership to students and a suggested curriculum are provided.

INTRODUCTION

What would the outcome be if we taught college students how to be effective followers rather than how to be effective leaders? Is the perception of following so remarkably negative that even mentioning the concept detracts from what would otherwise be a successful leadership development program? What if teaching college students how to be effective followers was coupled with teaching them how to be effective leaders? What would the program look like? How different would the curriculum actually be?

Kelley (1988, 1992) asserts a majority of us will serve as followers eighty percent of the time, whereas we will serve as leaders only twenty percent of the time. If this is true, and if this is how students generally will experience the work they will do post-graduation, then why are there no significant portions of the leadership education curriculum devoted to being an effective follower? One reason may be the negative association with the term. As many authors have pointed out, the word follower is generally seen as a negative, even a pejorative term (Banutu-Gomez, 2004; Bennis, 1999; Chaleff, 1995, 2009; Hollander, 1992b; Kelley, 1988, 1992; Lundin & Lancaster, 1990; Thody, 2003). Followers often are seen as mindless sheep that simply follow the herd (Kellerman, 2008; Kelley, 1988; Thody, 2003). In the American context, there is a notion that one should never be a follower, always be a leader. Being number two is counterculture to American society (Kellerman, 2008).

Essentially, there are two, simplistic viewpoints on what it means to be a follower. Being a follower can sometimes mean being someone without power, influence, or authority, as in a subordinate (Kellerman, 2008), or can also mean the other group of individuals involved in the leadership relationship that has as much power and authority as leaders (Kelley, 1988, 1992; Chaleff, 1995, 2009).

Focusing more on a positive definition of followers, Kelley (1992) defined followers as "the people who know what to do without being told—the people who act with intelligence, independence, courage, and a strong sense of ethics" (p. 12). On the other hand, Kellerman (2008) offered, "followers are subordinates who have less power, authority, and influence than do their superiors and who therefore usually, but not invariably, fall into line" (p. xix). Differentiating the two, Chaleff (2009) argued the

"follower is not synonymous with subordinate. A subordinate reports to an individual of higher rank and may in practice be a supporter, an antagonist, or indifferent. A follower shares a common purpose with the leader, believes in what the organization is trying to accomplish, wants both the leader and organization to succeed, and works energetically to this end" (p. 15).

Followership

The construct of followership is a key component of this study. The term is highly contested, as the edited volume by Riggio et al. (2008) would attest. In their guiding book, they include authors who believe followership is a worthy area of study and a discipline (Chaleff, 2008; Kelley, 2008; Stech, 2008), authors who refute followership altogether (Rost, 2008), and authors who see followership as a means for developing effective leadership (Adair, 2008; Carsten & Bligh, 2008). Adair (2008) defines followership as "a follower [who] shares in an influence relationship among leaders and other followers with the intent to support leaders who reflect their mutual purpose. This would mean that collaborative employees (followership) would be the very support system leaders need to lead effectively" (p. 139).

Often, when scholars discuss followers it is with regard to how they relate to, are influenced by, or are controlled by a leader (Banutu-Gomez, 2004). Very little of the research today emphasizes the role of followers and their contribution to the leadership process (Crossman & Crossman, 2011). Moreover, in most leadership literature, especially managerial leadership, followers are most often referred to as subordinates and are discussed only when analyzing power dynamics and how leaders retain and use power (Yukl, 2010). Organizational and managerial leadership trainings are still largely focused on how leaders can manipulate, influence, motivate, or persuade followers to follow their leaders and carry out the tasks their leaders have developed.

The most prevalent understanding of followership stems from the highly cited article, *In Praise of Followers*, written by Robert E. Kelley (1988) and published in the *Harvard Business Review* as the first work truly focused on the role of followers. Kelley brought to light how emphasizing the great work followers do was not only important, but also essential to the study of leadership. The article stands now as one of the most downloaded and cited articles published by the *Harvard Business Review* (Kelley, 2008), thus demonstrating that followership, to many, is a significant and worthwhile area for research and study.

Kelley's (1988) work was significant because it was one of the first to depict followers as an active, interdependent and effective agent of the leadership process. This positive view of followers was essentially akin to the current view of leaders, as Kelley noted many of the qualities and characteristics that make effective leaders, also make effective followers. This single notion is a theme found in many studies and works on followership (Bass & Stogdill, 1990). Kelley described effective followers as equal to leaders and "...what distinguishes followers from the leader is simply the role they play" (p. 146). Further, effective followers are committed to some cause, project, organization or idea, similarly to the leaders they follow. Effective followers, according to Kelley, share many of the same characteristics and traits as effective leaders, a concept often explored by other scholars of followership (G. R. Gilbert, 1985; Hollander & Offermann, 1990). They are enthusiastic, intelligent, self-reliant, self-aware, self- starters, independent problem solvers, honest, credible, and have an ambition to move up. However, Kelley points out the one distinction between effective leaders and effective followers is effective followers choose to follow and not lead.

Teaching Followership

The final piece in understanding the construct of followership is in how followership is taught, or rather not taught, in training and development programs. Many authors have called for more training on what it means to be effective followers and how best to serve as followers (Agho, 2009; Brown & Thornborrow, 1996; Campbell & Kinion, 1993; Chaleff, 1995, 2009; Johnson, 2009; Kelley, 1988, 1992; Lundin & Lancaster, 1990). In many companies and private industries, leadership training is made available to employees who wish to get promoted or take on additional responsibilities (Kelley, 1988). However, as previously noted, effective followership is a prerequisite for effective leadership (Hollander,

1974, 1992a; Kelley, 1988, 1992). By infusing more strategies to develop employees as effective followers, trainers could enhance followers' abilities as leaders as well (Brown & Thornborrow, 1996). In fact, there may even be a danger in a continued emphasis on leaders' self-development at the expense of followers' self-development and assisting people in learning how to function within that role (Collinson, 2006).

Burns (2003) claimed "students of leadership" (p. 170) put individuals into categories of leaders and followers. Colleges and universities do a great deal to train students as leaders so they will be successful in participating in the leadership process and use leadership to tackle tough problems. However, it is clear that people tend to understand and see leadership as holding the two distinct parts, which include leaders and followers (Kellerman, 2008; Rost, 1991). However, Wills (1994) points out that no college or university is claiming to teach students to be good followers. This concept seems highly un-American and does not appear to resonate with people (Chaleff, 2009; Kelley, 1992). However, as Kelley (1992) so boldly claims, most people tend to be followers more often than leaders, therefore it stands to reason that a significant part of leadership training for college students should contain some understanding of followership and its effects on the leadership relationship, as well as its potential effect on social change.

Two Schools of Thought on Leadership

To understand the debate of whether followership should be taught, it is important to understand the two perspectives on leadership theory. Rost (1991) explains that there are two eras of understanding leadership theory. The first he called an industrial era. This perception, or paradigm of leadership, was simply good management. An industrial paradigm categorizes leadership theory and research as "rational, management oriented, male, technocratic, quantitative, goal dominated, soft-benefit driven, personalistic, hierarchical, short term, pragmatic, and materialistic" (Rost, 1991, p. 94). The second era he called postindustrial. A postindustrial paradigm categorizes leadership theory and research as "beyond, or more than, or different from the present, industrial era" (Rost, 1991, p. 100) and includes the process of leaders and followers in a dynamic relationship together where they achieve some common purpose (Rost, 1991).

Burns (1978) explored what he referred to as a leadership continuum where both leaders and followers existed simultaneously either within a "transactional leadership" relationship (p. 19) or a "transforming leadership" relationship (p. 20). A transactional relationship is a logistical transaction of valued wants and needs between leaders and their followers. Such a transaction would constitute a power differential between both parties, with little to no emphasis on the wants and needs of followers. The transaction could be of a politician exchanging favors for votes, a manager exchanging extrinsic reward for project completion, or a doctor issuing orders to save a patient's life. In all of these relationships there is an authority dynamic, which can be seen in any organization at multiple levels.

The antithesis of a transactional relationship, the transformational relationship focused more on the leader-follower dynamic, whereby both parties engage in order to "raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality" (Burns, 1978, p. 20). The essential nature of these types of relationships is the common purpose for which both parties are invested and power is used to support this common purpose. A unique component of the relationship is the concept of morality, where these relationships produce a positive change for the common good. While Burns' work is largely considered to be the impetuous for a greater movement toward a more relational form of leadership, this notion of an equal partnership between leaders and followers has been slow to be adopted by the management and corporate/industrial community.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

If effective leadership is rooted in a postindustrial era, that is to say that effective leadership is transformational, collaborative, and relational, and effective followership is a prerequisite for effective leadership (Hollander, 1974, 1992a; Kelley, 1988, 1992), then it is possible by teaching students to be effective followers, then they may become more effective leaders. Therefore, this study intended to either confirm or disconfirm that a relationship exists between college students' leadership attitudes and beliefs,

their leadership identity, and their construction of a followership ideology. The study sought to answer the question, would teaching effective followership positively impact student leadership development?

This study was predicated on the idea that in order to ascertain if a student comprehends leadership from a postindustrial, relational, collaborative point of view, then their thoughts, beliefs and attitudes of both how they perceive leadership and how they perceive followers should be aligned. Thus, these constructs must be measured in a simultaneous investigation. The study of leadership development among college students should no longer exclude their thoughts and beliefs on followership.

Rost (1991) claims that if we want the world to be postindustrial, then we need leaders to lead that way. This study contends that if we want students to lead in a postindustrial framework, then we need to prepare them to lead through multiple perspectives. Studying followers ultimately improves our understanding of leadership (Hollander & Offermann, 1990). The significance of this study lies in a holistic model that incorporates empirically tested measures of college student leadership beliefs, leadership identity and followership. They are then presented in a way that forms a foundation for a developmental sequence for the design of a comprehensive college student leadership development curriculum that includes followership.

METHODOLOGY

This study was a non-experimental, quantitative analysis using a self-report survey instrument consisting of three empirically tested and reliable scales. Specifically, this study used a correlational approach that analyzed the direction and strength of a relationship between six dependent variables. The data obtained for this study were obtained from an electronic, online survey distributed to first-year, freshmen students who were in their spring semester enrolled at a Midwestern, mid-sized, religiously affiliated, research university. The total target population consisted of N=1,610 students. The power for this study was set at .80, as is common for social science research (Cohen, 1992). According to Cohen (1992), the sample size needed in this study for use of a zero-order, or Pearson Product-Moment Correlation analysis was n=85 for a medium (.05) effect size and an alpha score of .05.

The study used three primary instruments, the LABS-III (Wielkiewicz, 2000), Implicit Followership Theory (Sy, 2010), and an exploratory instrument using components of the Leadership Identity Development model (Komives et al., 2005). Combined, the three primary instruments produced six dependent variables.

The first of three instruments used in this study was Wielkiewicz's (2000) leadership attitudes and belief instrument (LABS-III), which was based on the ecology of leadership theory (Allen et al., 1998) and measures a student's current thoughts and understanding of leadership within two dimensions, a Hierarchical Thinking dimension and a Systemic Thinking dimension. Hierarchical thinking is associated with attitudes and beliefs that leadership is best in a structured, top-down manner where information flows from the top and there are clear delineations on who is a leader and who is a follower. Systemic thinking is associated with attitudes and beliefs that leadership is a process involving members who are working together toward a common purpose.

The second instrument was developed by Sy (2010) and measures an individual's implicit followership theory. An implicit followership theory, or IFT, is an "individual's personal assumptions about the traits and behaviors that characterize followers" (p. 74). Sy proposed that understanding your implicit followership theory may determine how you will treat people you perceive to be in the role of follower, or in some cases, how you would even understand the existence of followership. The IFT identifies an individual's prototypic and antiprototypic perception of followership. Prototypic is a more positive IFT, and includes such factors as industry, enthusiasm, and good citizen. Antiprototypic is a more negative IFT, and includes such factors as conformity, insubordination, and incompetence.

The third instrument was an exploratory scale and only used items to measure two of the six stages within the Leadership Identity Development grounded theoretical model (Komives et al., 2005). The LID instrument analyzes student perceptions of their own leadership experiences. The exploratory LID instrument consists of two scales, both corresponding to a stage within the LID. The first scale is Leader

Identified and is represented by Stage 3 of the LID. Students in this stage believe that leadership means position, and the person in the leadership position was a leader. There are two essential roles in this stage, leader and follower. If you are not the positional leader, you are a follower. The second scale is the Leader Differentiated scale and is represented by Stage 4 of the LID. Students in this stage are able to recognize that leadership was happening with a positional leader, but also distributed throughout the group.

RESULTS

TABLE 1
INTERCORRELATIONS, RELIABILITIES, MEANS, AND STANDARD
DEVIATIONS OF ALL DEPENDENT VARIABLES

Factors		Y^1	Y^2	Y^3	Y^4	Y^5	Y^6
Y^1	Systemic Thinking	(.90)	.416**	**.284****	-.036	-.018	**.463****
Y^2	Hierarchical Thinking		(.89)	.070	**.285****	**.420****	.017
Y^3	Prototypic			(.93)	-.379**	-.086	**.434****
Y^4	Antiprototypic				(.89)	**.361****	-.233**
Y^5	Leader Identified					(.67)	-.268**
Y^6	Leader Differentiated						(.78)
M		59.28	48.99	64.85	37.95	8.08	29.25
SD		6.60	8.88	14.70	15.68	2.44	3.61

Note: Numbers in parentheses represent reliabilities. N = 260
*   Correlations in bold-face font type are for emphasis*
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Postindustrial Paradigm

There were n=260 students who participated in the survey, about 16% of the target population. Overall, the six-way correlation (Table 1) showed all three scales that corresponded to a postindustrial paradigm of leadership (Systemic Thinking (DV1), Prototypic (DV3), and Leader Differentiated (DV6)) had a weak to moderate, positive relationship. A postindustrial paradigm of leadership emphasizes the collaboration of the group and most indicatively, that groups can be both followerless and leaderless. Students who have a postindustrial paradigm of leadership believe leadership is a process that deemphasizes the roles of followers and leaders, and focuses more on the process of leadership, the common purpose that exists between members, and the multiple perspectives provided by members who all play essential parts in the leadership process (Komives et al., 2007).

The Leader Differentiated (DV6) scale had a stronger relationship with the Prototypic (DV3) scale than did the Systemic Thinking (DV1) scale. This may suggest that students' leadership identity is more closely associated to their assumptions about followership than is their attitudes and beliefs of leadership. In other words, how a student personally identifies as a leader may influence or may be influenced by their perception of followers.

Industrial Paradigm

The six-way correlation showed all three scales that corresponded to an industrial paradigm of leadership (Hierarchical Thinking (DV2), Antiprototypic (DV4), and Leader Identified (DV5)) had a weak to moderate, positive relationship. An industrial paradigm of leadership emphasizes the traits,

characteristics, behaviors, and situational components of leaders and leadership (Komives et al., 2007). Rost (1991) referred to this paradigm as "rational, management oriented, male, technocratic, quantitative, goal dominated, soft-benefit driven, personalistic, hierarchical, short term, pragmatic, and materialistic" (p. 94).

Similarly to the postindustrial scales, the Leader Identified (DV5) scale had a stronger relationship with the Antiprototypic (DV4) scale than did the Hierarchical Thinking (DV2) scale. This may further suggest students' leadership identity is more closely associated to their assumptions about followership than is their attitudes and beliefs of leadership.

Predicting Implicit Followership Theory

To test these assumptions, a series of hierarchical regression analyses were conducted to determine whether students' attitudes and beliefs on leadership and their leadership identity were able to predict a significant portion of their implicit followership theory while controlling for social desirability, demographic and co-curricular involvement variables. Hierarchical regression analyses of Prototypic (DV3) and Antiprototypic (DV4) revealed that the LID subscales of Leader Identified (DV5) and Leader Differentiated (DV6) had the greatest power in predicting students' characterization of followers over any other variable used in this study.

The first hierarchical regression analysis (Table 2), using the LABS-III Systemic Thinking (DV1) scale and the LID Leader Differentiated (DV6) scale as predictor variables of the IFT Prototypic (DV3) scale, showed only the LID Leader Differentiated (DV6) scale had a statistically significant impact on the IFT Prototypic (DV3) scale (*beta* = .443, *p* < .000). Leader Differentiated (DV6) was able to predict 12.2 percent of the variance in the dependent variable. In other words, students' belief that leadership is a transformational, collaborative relationship between and among participants has no predictive value of students' positive characterization of followers. However, students' identity as relational leaders can predict some of their positive characterization of followers.

The second hierarchical regression analysis (Table 3), using the LABS-III Hierarchical Thinking (DV2) scale and the LID Leader Identified (DV5) scale as predictor variables of the IFT Antiprototypic (DV4) scale, showed that both the LABS-III Hierarchical Thinking (DV2) scale and the LID Leader Identified (DV5) scale had a statistically significant impact on the IFT Antiprototypic (DV4) scale. Hierarchical Thinking (DV2) (*beta* = .143, *p* = .033) was also only able to predict 1.6 percent of the variance in the dependent variable, while LID Leader Identified (DV5) had the highest beta value (*beta* = .287, *p* < .000) and was able to predict 6.1 percent of the variance in the dependent variable. In other words, students' belief that leadership should be structured in a top-down leadership fashion with power and control at the top and their identity as positional leaders has some predictive value of their negative characterization of followers.

TABLE 2
HIERARCHICAL REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF IFT PROTOTYPIC (DV3)
(STANDARDIZED COEFFICIENTS)

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
Social Desirability	0.159		0.155		0.000	
	(0.029)		(0.029)		(0.000)	
Gender	1.712		1.288		-0.918	
	(0.053)		(0.040)		-(0.028)	
Religion	2.173		1.245		-2.509	
	(0.050)		(0.029)		-(0.058)	
Employed On-Campus	0.086		-0.037		0.213	
	(0.002)		-(0.001)		(0.006)	
Employed Off-Campus	4.610		5.382		4.946	
	(0.099)		(0.116)		(0.106)	
Community Service			2.112		0.951	
			(0.046)		(0.021)	
Positional Leadership Involvement			-0.834		-0.151	
			-(0.076)		-(0.014)	
Club Membership Involvement			1.088		-1.040	
			(0.079)		-(0.076)	
Formal Leadership Training			-0.267		-1.253	
			-(0.009)		-(0.043)	
Total Club Involvement			0.284		0.297	
			(0.034)		(0.036)	
Systemic Thinking (DV1)					0.195	
					(0.083)	
Leader Differentiated (DV6)					1.864	***
					(0.443)	
Constant	59.953	***	56.151	***	3.538	
R^2	0.017		0.028		0.227	***
$\Delta R2$	0.017		0.011		0.199	***
F-Statistics	0.803		0.668		5.63	***
ΔF	0.803		0.541		29.617	***

*$p < 0.05$; **$p < 0.01$; ***$p < .001$
Gender: Male = 0, Female = 1; Religion: No = 0, Yes = 1; Employed On-Campus: No = 0, Yes = 1;
Employed Off-Campus: No = 0, Yes = 1; Community Service: No = 0, Yes = 1.
Note: Unstandardized coefficient values (B) are provided. Standardized coefficient values (Beta) are listed in parentheses.

TABLE 3
HIERARCHICAL REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF IFT ANTIPROTOTYPIC (DV4)
(STANDARDIZED COEFFICIENTS)

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
Social Desirability	-0.326		-0.253		-0.153	
	-(0.057)		-(0.044)		-(0.027)	
Gender	-4.746	*	-4.242		-1.934	
	-(0.138)		-(0.123)		-(0.056)	
Religion	-1.241		-0.974		1.010	
	-(0.027)		-(0.021)		(0.022)	
Employed On-Campus	2.083		1.670		1.369	
	(0.052)		(0.042)		(0.034)	
Employed Off-Campus	1.384		0.686		-0.113	
	(0.028)		(0.014)		-(0.002)	
Community Service			-7.173	*	-7.154	*
			-(0.147)		-(0.146)	
Positional Leadership Involvement			1.840	*	1.081	
			(0.157)		(0.092)	
Club Membership Involvement			1.017		1.849	
			(0.070)		(0.128)	
Formal Leadership Training			-0.509		-0.545	
			-(0.106)		-(0.017)	
Total Club Involvement			-0.649		-0.522	
			-(0.075)		-(0.060)	
Hierarchical Thinking (DV2)					0.252	*
					(0.143)	
Leader Identified (DV5)					1.849	***
					(0.287)	
Constant	43.978	***	43.989	***	11.041	
R^2	0.027		0.067		0.192	***
$\Delta R2$	0.027		0.041		0.124	***
F-Statistics	1.336		1.725		4.682	***
ΔF	1.336		2.085		18.225	***

*$p < 0.05$; **$p < 0.01$; ***$p < .001$
Gender: Male = 0, Female = 1; Religion: No = 0, Yes = 1; Employed On-Campus: No = 0, Yes = 1;
Employed Off-Campus: No = 0, Yes = 1; Community Service: No = 0, Yes = 1.
Note: Unstandardized coefficient values (B) are provided. Standardized coefficient values (Beta) are listed in parentheses.

CONCLUSIONS

The most significant finding of this study was from the six-way correlation analysis, which explored the relationship between the six dependent variables described above. A correlational analysis was appropriate for this study because when analyzing constructs that have never before been associated, such as these six dependent variables, first determining if an association exists is critical to determining any outcome (Creswell, 2009).

This study found the two measures of Systemic Thinking (DV1) and Leader Differentiated (DV6), which are both established in the postindustrial paradigm, correlated positively with Prototypic (DV3), which is students' positive characterization of followers. Similarly, this study found the two measures of Hierarchical Thinking (DV2) and Leader Identified (DV5), which are both established in the industrial paradigm, correlated positively with Antiprototypic (DV4), which is students' negative characterization of followers.

These findings indicate if students' characterization of followers is negative, they are likely to have an industrial perspective on leadership, and if students' characterization of followers is positive, they are likely to have a postindustrial perspective on leadership. The reverse of this could also be claimed. Figure 1 summarizes these relationships.

FIGURE 1
A COMPARISON OF THE PARADIGMS OF LEADERSHIP AND THE HOW EACH DEPENDENT VARIABLE PAIRING IS ASSOCIATED

	Industrial Paradigm	**Postindustrial Paradigm**
Rost's (1991) Definition	*"Rational, management oriented, male, technocratic, quantitative, goal dominated, soft-benefit driven, personalistic, hierarchical, short term, pragmatic, and materialistic" (Rost, 1991, p. 94)*	*The process of leaders and followers in a dynamic relationship together where they achieve some common purpose (Rost, 1991)*
Leadership may be described as…	*Transactional*	*Transformational / Relational*
Leadership Attitudes & Beliefs	Hierarchical Thinking (DV2)	Systemic Thinking (DV1)
Implicit Followership Theory	Antiprototypic (DV4)	Prototypic (DV3)
Leadership Identity Development	Leader Identified (DV5)	Leader Differentiated (DV6)

These results may suggest a dual nature of leadership and followership. That is, when students' paradigm of leadership is rooted in an industrial framework, their perspective on followership is generally negative. Once their paradigm of leadership shifts to a more postindustrial framework, their perspective on followership becomes more positive. Indeed, how students identify as leaders, whether it is positional (industrial) or relational (postindustrial) may impact how they see themselves or others as followers.

Students who tend to identify more as relational leaders are more likely to associate positive behaviors to followers in their organizations. Similarly, they will likely see serving as followers to be positive and advantageous. Students who tend to identify more as positional leaders are more likely to associate negative behaviors to followers in their organizations. Similarly, they will likely see serving as followers to be negative and less advantageous.

Understanding how students' leadership identity is more predictive of their characterization of followers than their attitudes and beliefs about the leadership process can likely be best understood by examining the transition phase between Leader Identified (DV5) and Leader Differentiated (DV6).

IMPLICATIONS

Above all else, this study demonstrates students' implicit followership theory and their leadership identity are intertwined. Perhaps the most vital implication from this study is the recommendation that followership, and the role followers play in the leadership process, be introduced to student leadership development curricula. If in fact there is a need for enabling students to develop a balanced approach to leadership, and research has suggested there is (Komives et al., 2009; Wielkiewicz & Stelzner, 2005), then it would stand to reason that including a curricular approach to infusing followership into what is being taught to students about leadership is imperative. If leadership educators are to prepare the next generation of leaders to tackle the difficult challenges the world is facing, then providing them with a road map to how to be effective followers is essential.

Remembering Kelley (1988, 1992) claimed that a majority of people would serve as followers eighty percent of the time, while only leading twenty percent of the time, the negative connotations that come with being followers must be removed by teaching students that following is as important and critical as leading.

The balanced approach to leadership described by Wielkiewicz and Stelzner (2005), suggests there is a tension between a hierarchical perspective on leadership and a systemic, or ecological, perspective. This tension is perhaps the most palpable when it comes to following and followership. Further, Komives et al. (2009) suggest that in order for students to develop as relational, collaborative leaders they must first experience leadership as hierarchical and positional. Johnson (2009) remarked how students will often go back and forth between following and leading and suggested that infusing followership into the leadership curriculum was necessary to enable students to understand the full perspective of the leadership process.

Essentially, this means teaching students about effective followership may also aid in their development as effective leaders within a transformational, collaborative, postindustrial paradigm. If you want to encourage students to develop as leaders in a holistic, ethical, and relational manner, then educators must change how they perceive followers and followership. By removing the negative connotations of followers, infusing followership into the leadership development curriculum, and giving students the opportunity to explore their identity as effective followers, students may become more aware of the positive and critical role of the follower in organizations. This may also lead to a greater generation of individuals who are unafraid of following and more willing to challenge unethical, unproductive, or inefficient practices in their organizations.

APPLICATIONS

Followership and the role that followers play in the leadership process should be introduced to the student leadership development curriculum. A first step for educators would be to begin examining their own thoughts and feelings around following and followership, so that they may be prepared to address these concepts themselves and with their students. Several authors have developed followership curricula that could on its own be a standalone followership development model, while others have suggested ways to incorporate followership into an already established leadership development course.

For example, Johnson (2009) includes a description of a course that infuses both theoretical constructs of leadership and followership. Johnson uses an integrative approach to present followership

material in order for students to develop a more complete picture of the dynamic relationship between leaders and followers. Johnson's model includes categorizing major leadership theories within a context of how followers are or are not emphasized within the theory. Stressing the changes in the global culture, Johnson challenges leadership educators to introduce followership in the leadership classroom, or otherwise risk a disservice to students who are entering a world where they will serve as followers more often than leaders.

Leadership educators who utilize the Social Change Model of Leadership Development (Higher Education Research Institute, 1996) may explore the idea of the *first follower*, a term made popular by Derek Sivers' 2010 TED Talk. Sivers (2010) dissects the anatomy of a social movement by examining a video of a crowd of people, who by all accounts are encouraged to join what he refers to as a movement, not by the lone leader who began the process, but by the first follower who established the credibility of the leader.

Educators who are interested in developing a more substantive followership curriculum could begin by examining the work of Ira Chaleff (2008, 2009), who calls for a complete separate curriculum for teaching what he calls, *Courageous* Followership. Starting with defining and developing a more positive perception of followers, Chaleff refers to followership as courageous because "courage is so antithetical to the prevailing image of followers and so crucial in balancing the relationship with leaders" (p. 4). The curriculum highlights a need to have participants create a new awareness around followership and the role of leaders and followers. Chaleff (2008) uses a graphic to demonstrate that leaders and followers form a reciprocal relationship around a common purpose. This notion is similar to Komives et al.'s (2007) relational leadership model in which the diagram also has leadership concepts circling a common purpose.

After participants are comfortable acknowledging the courageous follower they learn of the ideal behaviors of followers as well as the four styles of followership. Participants then review the power that can be held by followers, including a commitment to the organizational purpose, specialized technical knowledge, professional reputation, and personal networks within the organization (Chaleff, 2008). According to Chaleff (2008), "the goal is to change followers' own internal estimations of their ability to influence leaders and generate an increased sense of agency and responsibility" (p. 77).

Next in Chaleff's (2008) curriculum for courageous followership development is the use of hypotheticals, "this type of exercise helps participants come to grips with the elements of courageous followership and successful upward influencing" (p. 77). Chaleff continues with a discussion on risk and courage, fear, cautionary tales, skill development, and a note on taking moral action. Finally, the curriculum wraps up with concluding on the right note, making sure to leave the participants with the reasons why they are there in the first place, to learn to be effective and courageous followers.

No matter what the approach, leadership development among college students should no longer exclude their thoughts and beliefs on followership. This study contends that if we want students to lead in a postindustrial framework, then we need to prepare them to lead through multiple perspectives. This includes the full inclusion and adaptation of followership and what it means to be an effective follower. This will not only assist students in developing a postindustrial perspective on leadership, it will also help prepare them for their professional lives after graduation.

REFERENCES

Adair, Robert. (2008). Developing great leaders, one follower at a time. In R. E. Riggio, I. Chaleff & J. Lipman-Blumen (Eds.). *The art of followership: How great followers create great leaders and organizations* (pp. 137-153). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Agho, Augustine O. (2009). Perspectives of senior-level executives on effective followership and leadership. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 16*(2), 159.

Allen, Kathleen E., Stelzner, Stephen P., & Wielkiewicz, Richard M. (1998). The ecology of leadership: Adapting to the challenges of a changing world. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 5*(2), 62.

Banutu-Gomez, Michael B. (2004). Great leaders teach exemplary followership and serve as servant leaders. *Journal of American Academy of Business, Cambridge, 4*(1/2), 143-151.

Bass, Bernard M., & Stogdill, Ralph M. (1990). *Bass & stogdill's handbook of leadership : Theory, research, and managerial applications* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Free Press.

Bennis, Warren. (1999). The end of leadership: Exemplary leadership is impossible without full inclusion, initiatives, and cooperation of followers. *Organizational Dynamics, 28*(1), 71-79.

Brown, Andrew D., & Thornborrow, W. T. (1996). Do organizations get the followers they deserve? *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 17*(1), 5-11.

Burns, James MacGregor. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Burns, James MacGregor. (2003). *Transforming leadership*. New York, NY: Atlantic Monthly Press.

Campbell, J. M., & Kinion, E. S. (1993). Teaching leadership/followership to rn-to-msn students. *Journal of Nursing Education, 32*(3), 138-140.

Carsten, Melissa K., & Bligh, Michelle C. (2008). Lead, follow, and get out of the way: Involving employees in the visioning process. In R. E. Riggio, I. Chaleff & J. Lipman-Blumen (Eds.), *The art of followership: How great followers create great leaders and organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Chaleff, Ira. (1995). *The courageous follower : Standing up to and for our leaders*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Chaleff, Ira. (2008). Creating new ways of following. In R. E. Riggio, I. Chaleff & J. Lipman-Blumen (Eds.), *The art of followership: How great followers create great leaders and organizations* (pp. 67-87). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Chaleff, Ira. (2009). *The courageous follower : Standing up to & for our leaders* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Cohen, Jacob. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin, 112*(1), 155-159.

Collinson, David. (2006). Rethinking followership: A post-structuralist analysis of follower identities. *The Leadership Quarterly, 17*(2), 179-189.

Creswell, John W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Crossman, Brian, & Crossman, Joanna. (2011). Conceptualising followership - a review of the literature. *Leadership, 7*(4), 481-497.

Higher Education Research Institute. (1996). *A social change model of leadership development (version iii)*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California Los Angeles Higher Education Research Institute.

Hollander, Edwin P. (1974). Processes of leadership emergence. *Journal of Contemporary Business, 3*, 19-33.

Hollander, Edwin P. (1992a). The essential interdependence of leadership and followership. *Current Directions in Psychological Science (Wiley-Blackwell), 1*(2), 71-75.

Hollander, Edwin P. (1992b). Leadership, followership, self, and others. *The Leadership Quarterly, 3*(1), 43-54.

Hollander, Edwin P., & Offermann, Lynn R. (1990). Power and leadership in organizations: Relationships in transition. *American Psychologist, 45*(2), 179-189.

Johnson, Craig E. (2009). Introducing followership into the leadership classroom: An integrative approach. *Journal of Leadership Education, 8*(2), 20-31.

Kellerman, Barbara. (2007). What every leader needs to know about followers. *Harvard Business Review, 85*(12), 84-91.

Kellerman, Barbara. (2008). *Followership: How followers are creating change and changing leaders*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Kelley, Robert E. (1988). In praise of followers. *Harvard Business Review, 66*(6), 142-148.

Kelley, Robert E. (1992). *The power of followership : How to create leaders people want to follow, and followers who lead themselves*. New York, NY: Currency/Doubleday.

Kelley, Robert E. (2008). Rethinking followership. In R. E. Riggio, I. Chaleff & J. Lipman-Blumen (Eds.), *The art of followership: How great followers create great leaders and organizations* (pp. 5-15). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Komives, Susan R., Longerbeam, Susan D., Mainella, Felicia C., Osteen, Laura, Owen, Julie E., & Wagner, Wendy. (2009). Leadership identity development: Challenges in applying a developmental model. *Journal of Leadership Education, 8*(1), 11-47.

Komives, Susan R., Lucas, Nance, & McMahon, Timothy R. (2007). *Exploring leadership: For college students who want to make a difference* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Komives, Susan R., Owen, Julie E., Longerbeam, Susan D., Mainella, Felicia C., & Osteen, Laura. (2005). Developing a leadership identity: A grounded theory. *Journal of College Student Development, 46*(6), 593-611.

Lundin, Steohen C., & Lancaster, Lynne C. (1990). Beyond leadership . . . The importance of followership. *Futurist, 24*, 18-22.

Riggio, Ronald E., Chaleff, Ira, & Lipman-Blumen, Jean (Eds.). (2008). *The art of followership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Rost, Joseph. (1991). *Leadership for the twenty-first century*. New York, NY: Praeger.

Rost, Joseph. (2008). Followership: An outmoded concept. In R. E. Riggio, I. Chaleff & J. Lipman-Blumen (Eds.), *The art of followership: How great followers create great leaders and organizations* (pp. 53-64). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Sivers, Derek. (2010). Derek sivers: How to start a movement [Video File]. Video File Retrieved from http://blog.ted.com/2010/12/21/how-do-i-cite-a-tedtalk/

Sy, Thomas. (2010). What do you think of followers? Examining the content, structure, and consequences of implicit followership theories. *Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes, 113*(2), 73-84.

Thody, Angela. (2003). Followership in educational organizations: A pilot mapping of the territory. *Leadership & Policy in Schools, 2*(2), 141.

Wielkiewicz, Richard M. (2000). The leadership attitudes and beliefs scale: An instrument for evaluating college students' thinking about leadership and organizations. *Journal of College Student Development, 41*(3), 335-347.

Wielkiewicz, Richard M., & Stelzner, Stephen P. (2005). An ecological perspective on leadership theory, research, and practice. *Review of General Psychology, 9*(4), 326-341.

Wills, Garry. (1994). *Certain trumpets : The call of leaders*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

Yukl, Gary A. (2010). *Leadership in organizations* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.