

Singapore Management University

Institutional Knowledge at Singapore Management University

Research Collection Lee Kong Chian School Of Business

Lee Kong Chian School of Business

6-2000

From Selling Peanuts and Beer in Yankee Stadium to Creating a Theory of Transformational Leadership: An Interview with Bernie Bass

Robert Hooijberg
Rutgers University - Newark

Jaepil CHOI
Singapore Management University, jaepilchoi@smu.edu.sg

Follow this and additional works at: https://ink.library.smu.edu.sg/lkcsb_research

 Part of the [Business Commons](#)

Citation

Hooijberg, Robert and CHOI, Jaepil. From Selling Peanuts and Beer in Yankee Stadium to Creating a Theory of Transformational Leadership: An Interview with Bernie Bass. (2000). *Leadership Quarterly*. 11, (2), 291-306. Research Collection Lee Kong Chian School Of Business.
Available at: https://ink.library.smu.edu.sg/lkcsb_research/1736

This Journal Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Lee Kong Chian School of Business at Institutional Knowledge at Singapore Management University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Research Collection Lee Kong Chian School Of Business by an authorized administrator of Institutional Knowledge at Singapore Management University. For more information, please email liblR@smu.edu.sg.

FROM SELLING PEANUTS AND BEER IN YANKEE STADIUM TO CREATING A THEORY OF TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP: AN INTERVIEW WITH BERNIE BASS

Robert Hooijberg*
Jaepil Choi

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

This issue's interview is with Bernard Bass. He started in academia in 1946 and began teaching 52 years ago. When he publishes in the year 2000, he will have published in seven different decades. Besides all of his work in the area of leadership, Dr. Bass is also the co-founder (with Bob House and Henry Tosi) of *The Leadership Quarterly*.

PERSONAL BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Question: When and where were you born? And what did your parents do? Did you serve in the military?

Bass: I was born on June 11, 1925, in the Bronx, New York City, where I lived until I was 16 years old and attended DeWitt-Clinton high school. We moved to Manhattan after my mother died. By age 14, I was selling popcorn, hot dogs, soft drinks, and beer in Yankee stadium and the Polo Grounds. I saw a lot of important baseball games, including the 1941 World Series (the so-called "subway series") between the New York Yankees and the Brooklyn Dodgers. At age 18, I joined the U.S. Army Airforce (USAAF) to become a navigator-bombardier and ended up in B-29 flight engineering school. Then, the atomic bomb was dropped. I never flew in combat and was discharged in November 1945.

* Direct all correspondence to: Robert Hooijberg, Institute for Management Development, Chemin de Bellerive 23, P.O. Box 915, CH-1001, Lausanne, Switzerland.

My father was a piano player who played in clubs, for weddings and bar-mitzvahs, and other kinds of events. He also played as a musician in a few silent movies and in the pit of the theatre for vaudeville shows. He was out of full-time work during much of the Great Depression, and, during that time, my mother worked as a salesclerk.

Question: You received your university education at The Ohio State University. What was it like to be in a Ph.D. program at that time?

Bass: In 1941, I started at the College of the City of New York in chemical engineering, because I had a great chemistry teacher in high school. My grades were fine, but I didn't like the six-hour chemistry lab which seemed disconnected from the lectures. In my third semester, I changed to history as a major, and then was vocationally counseled to switch to psychology in the fourth semester. My studies then were interrupted by my military service. After being discharged from the USAAF in November 1945, I hitchhiked to Columbus, Ohio to attend Ohio State University (OSU). I chose to attend Ohio State University because it had a good reputation for its industrial psychology program, a good football team, and because it was the closest Big Ten University. At that time, one with a Ph.D. in industrial psychology was expected to be a general psychologist and knowledgeable in personnel psychology, statistics, motivation to work, human factors research, advertising and consumer psychology. I started there in January 1946, and by studying four quarters each year, I finished my undergraduate, MA and Ph.D. studies in under four years. I had to go fast because the GI Bill (one of the greatest of social innovations) only provided support for four years. In addition to getting my degrees from Ohio State, I also met my wife there and married her in 1946.

Question: What drove you to be involved in leadership research?

Bass: Cal Shartle was a faculty member in the industrial psychology department at Ohio State and Ralph Stogdill was a research associate there. Later, Stogdill became a professor in the School of Commerce. Shartle had received his Ph.D. at Ohio State in 1932 and then left to work for the Department of Labor where he was a key figure dealing with occupational information, manpower and job analysis, and developing the *Dictionary of Occupational Titles*, which first came out in 1939. He came back to OSU in 1945 and created the Personnel Research Board, or PRB. Instead of talking about the personality traits of leaders, he wanted to focus on better understanding what leaders do. Shartle's work led to the development of many of the behavioral instruments such as the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. His emphasis on military, educational, and industrial survey research about what leaders do, fit with Ohio State's reputation for "sawdust empiricism."

What really got me started on my dissertation was a visit by Richard Urbrock, a staff psychologist for Proctor and Gamble. He had just returned from England where he had observed the British Country House technique, the forerunner of assessment centers. A leaderless group discussion (LGD) was one of the techniques. I became curious about who assumed leadership positions in leaderless groups. From 1948–1954, I studied leaderless groups and wrote several papers on the topic, including pieces in the *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *Personnel Psychology* (my dissertation), and a summary piece in *Psychological Bulletin*. I reported on the construct and predictive validity of the LGD for criteria of esteem, status, rank,

and success as a leader in organizations. I also found that those participants in this unstructured situation who talked a lot earned high ratings for leadership. I shifted from further LGD research because I did not think anyone was paying attention to it. I then went on to study small group behavior. Two years later, Doug Bray began AT&T's assessment center in which a form of the LGD was included.

Question: What was your first job? Did you go to SUNY-Binghamton right away? How much pressure was there to publish?

Bass: After getting my Ph.D., I worked in a federal agency for about six weeks and was getting really bored with the 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. routine. I then received a telegram from Bill Hurder to come to Louisiana State University (LSU). In those days, students were not as career oriented. There were not that many jobs available, nor advertisements of available jobs, and you waited for someone to write or telephone your major professor or the department head about a job opening. I was considered for three. That is how the job market worked at the time. Before the call from LSU, our department chair got a recruiting letter from Berkeley, and they picked Ralph Kanter. So I could have ended up spending my life at Berkeley.

I joined LSU in 1949, which was rebuilding the psychology department with Paul Young as department chair. The department had had a lot of turnover because of altercations with the dean of Arts and Sciences and was able to recruit a strong faculty. The other young faculty included Don Lewis, Brendan Mahar, and Bill Hurder (a physiological psychologist). The first two ended up moving on to University of Southern California and Harvard, respectively. Bill Hurder became superintendent of a mental hospital. I was the only industrial psychologist in the small department. The term "organizational psychology" was not introduced until Harold Leavitt used it in a speech in 1962, and I did the first hardcover textbook of organizational psychology in 1965. That same year, Ed Schein came out with a paperback by the same name. Shortly after that, everything that had been called industrial psychology came to be called industrial and organizational psychology.

While I published regularly during my graduate student days and at LSU, I never felt pressure to publish nor did I think much about my career or attaining tenure. It was just something that was fun to do. I never looked at how many publications I had, and I never really knew what the concept of tenure was. It was not until 1953 when someone said "we are going to give you tenure and promotion to associate professor," that I really thought about it. I was then promoted to full professor in 1956, when I was 31 years old. That same year I attended an American Psychological Association (APA) convention where someone gave a talk on people's motivation after they get tenure. He said that if you get tenure before 33, you never publish or do anything again. I was only 31 at the time. I think I published 400 articles and books since. The tenure process was not nearly as elaborate as it is now. While I had to hand in a CV, I did not have to do much else.

At LSU, I often taught 15 hours each semester (one class of which was an evening class to make an extra \$300 for the semester). I taught classes in industrial, educational, clinical, and other fields of psychology, as well as a yearlong course in statistics. That was a great education for me. The usual complaints you hear these days about "I have two classes and can't do any research" sound like nonsense to me. Because the faculty was so small, each of us had two research assistants,

who were master's students. There was no Ph.D. program for the first few years. The assistants were mostly engaged in research and a great help to us. In those days, we did not have PCs. At Ohio State, we spent a whole course just learning how to wire up an accounting machine to calculate sums of cross-products, sums of squares, and so on. To do a factor analysis took about six months, and then it was likely to be fraught with errors in arithmetic. In 1961, I went to Berkeley for a year as a visiting professor and then moved to the Graduate School of Business (GSB) at the University of Pittsburgh the year after. Again, this happened through word of mouth, not through a formal application process. In this case, it was Harold Leavitt, who was at Carnegie Mellon, who knew that Pittsburgh was looking for someone and suggested that I apply. The Graduate School of Business had a very charismatic dean by the name of Marshall Robinson, who later became a vice president of the Ford Foundation. By joining the GSB, I got more colleagues to talk to, more emphasis on content and problems, and the opportunity to teach in an international executive development program. I located about 200 psychologists in schools of management and thought about initiating a professional organization of them. I then found out about the Academy of Management, but did not join it until the early 1980s. My major association was with the American Psychological Association. At Pittsburgh, I started the Management Research Center, where I got a good group of faculty working on leadership research.

In 1968, I moved to the University of Rochester, because I would have more control over admissions, standards and curriculum, and because there was more reciprocity between the psychology department and the business school. The University of Rochester also allowed me to bring five assistant professors from the Management Research Center with me on the basis of a five-year deal. The university paid them to teach one class a semester, and I supplemented their salaries with grant money. This was important to me, because I felt responsible for those faculty members. The university then, in essence, hired an entire department of OB faculty.

In 1966, I organized something called ERGOM with European colleagues and money from the Ford Foundation. This organization collected data from managers in many different countries who participated in 15 management exercises and provided data about how managers in different countries dealt with simulations of budgeting, supervision, negotiating, compensation, decision-making, planning, and communicating, as well as their attitudes toward life goals, technology, obsolescence, and learning. Subsequently, operations were set up in North and Latin America, India and Japan. I had 20,000 cases from 20 countries collected into the 1970s. They were all funneled into the International Institute for Organizational Development in Louvain, Belgium for processing. Leopold Vansina was the head of the organization, and we published many articles on similarities and differences between countries, and between more or less successful managers on life goals and leadership. We finally ran out of money and Bob Doktor and Phil Burger, who were at Binghamton, suggested that I bring all the data to Binghamton for further data analyses. This resulted in a book called *Assessment of Managers: An International Comparison* (Bass, Philip C. Burger, Robert Doktor, & Gerald V. Barrett, 1979). This made Binghamton very attractive to me.

In 1977, I moved to SUNY-Binghamton. I had found that most of my colleagues

in GSM at Rochester primarily believed that all human motivation was economic in nature. At SUNY-Binghamton, I found that most of the faculty including the MIS and accounting faculty, had behavioral interests, and you could work jointly with people. I was very energized by the move and published five books in the first five years I was at Binghamton.

RESEARCH IN THE LEADERSHIP FIELD

Question: How did you become interested in transformational leadership?

Bass: In 1979, I read Burns' book on transformational leadership, and I was hooked. In 1980, I had my first chance to collect data on transformational leadership at a senior executive program at the University of South Africa in Pretoria. One of these managers brought up the notion that the transformational leader got him to go beyond even his own expectations. This led directly to the title of my 1985 book *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations*. In 1987, I started the Center for Leadership Studies where we have focused a lot of our attention on transformational and transactional leadership. I retired (theoretically) in January of 1993 and the Directorship of the Center in May, 1999, but still remain active in the center's research and its global network.

Question: You see charismatic leadership as a component of transformational leadership. The statistical results of your studies seem to indicate that charisma is the core component of transformational leadership and many people do not really distinguish between the two concepts. What do you see as the biggest distinction between charisma and transformational leadership?

Bass: For me, charismatic leadership is seen as one of four components of transformational leadership. The others are inspirational leadership, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. The components are intercorrelated. House and Conger and Kanungo and others include all four in the one concept of charismatic leadership. Charisma includes an extraordinary talent which elicits emulation from followers. In addition, any leader who has two or three components of the five components that Trice and Beyer require, may be a charismatic leader, but not necessarily intellectually stimulating or individually considerate. Although inspirational leaders are usually charismatic sources of emulation, it is possible to be inspirational without followers wanting to emulate the leaders.

Question: How did you become involved in writing the *Handbook of Leadership*? How do you organize yourself to write such a book? Is there another one forthcoming for the year 2000?

Bass: In 1978, Ralph Stogdill asked me to work with him on the second edition of the *Handbook of Leadership* (1981), and then he died before we could begin. In 1990, I expanded it substantially for the third edition. I have been collecting the literature published on leadership since 1990 in preparation for the fourth edition. I will have to cut out a lot from the third edition because the publisher does not want the book to become any bigger. This edition should come out in the year 2003. It is a labor of love for me, because the greatest satisfaction for me comes from seeing the connections among many of the different works. In preparing for the next edition, by myself, I have been organizing the material in categories

commensurate with the chapter headings and the main subheadings of the 1990 edition. I realize that I may need to create a few new chapters and add new subheadings or delete old ones. That is basically how I am preparing for the next edition. I have 15 file drawers filled with reprints organized into 38 categories. Two chapters that I think I will add are a chapter on ethics and a chapter on transformational leadership. In addition, my wife, Ruth, will scan in all pages from the third edition so that I can add, modify, or delete material from the third edition.

Question: As you have spent more than 50 years in academia, what are some of the most significant changes you have seen, both negative and positive?

Bass: In 1948, the American Psychological Association had about 2,000 members and we met on college campuses. Today, the APA has something like 160,000 members, and its annual conference can only be hosted in the biggest cities in North America. The growth led to the development of the divisions and separate conventions of many of the divisions. I think this growth reflected the expansion of psychology into new areas and reflected more concern for diverging interests. It also reflects more focused study and research. Another major change is that Ph.D. students now need to be computer literate, but no longer need to pass a foreign language exam. When I started I had to be a psychologist first and an industrial psychologist second, as we had to study most of the major areas of psychology to prepare for the general exams. I spent about six months with a small group of classmates studying for the exams. Now there is so much work in each area that would be difficult, if not impossible, to cover.

A major event was Stogdill's 1948 review article of 128 studies of leadership traits. He said that traits, situations, and their interaction were important. His article was greatly misinterpreted to mean that the individual was not important and that the situation was all important. In 1984, Kenny and Zaccaro reanalyzed Barnlund's 1962 data where task groups were recomposed several times. Barnlund concluded erroneously that most of the variance was due to the changing tasks and situations. Kenny and Zaccaro showed that most of the variance was due to individual differences in traits. This was affirmed with new data in the early 1990s. Situationalism, I think, was a lot of wishful thinking by social psychologists and sociologists. Now, we are seeing a swing back to personality, as you can see from the recent (May 1999) symposium at the Kravis Institute on Leadership and Multiple Intelligences, where I presented a paper on multiple intelligences and transformational leadership. I think that this is a swing back in leadership studies to trait approaches.

Question: What is the relationship between your early work on leaderless groups and your current work on transformational leadership?

Bass: Basically, we still use the ideas for studying leaderless groups in our training and development work on transformational leadership. For example, in a training program for Fiat, the auto manufacturer, we asked the peers in the program to provide anonymous feedback to other managers on their transformational and transactional behaviors, based to some extent on unstructured small group discussions of the preceding days of the workshop. We found that the peer feedback of members correlated .35 with the feedback of the managers' subordinates at the home organization.

Question: You have shown great interest in the military. You served in the

military and you have been commissioned by them to conduct research, but is there also additional personal motivation?

Bass: From 1954 to 1973, the Office of Naval Research supported much of my research. The Office of Naval Research was a strong supporter of research on small groups, organizations, and leadership. In 1952–1954, I received grants from the Army and the Air Force and, after 1973, grants from the Army Research Institute. Even after the NSF came into being, it was still mainly the military that continued supporting leadership research. Currently, I am interested in the readiness of military leaders for peacekeeping as well as war fighting and do continue to read a lot of military history.

Question: In your 1960 book, you proposed a complex contingency model of leadership, and then in your 1997 piece in the *American Psychologist*, you seem to suggest that transformational leadership has universal application. Have you shifted from a contingency perspective to a universal perspective?

Bass: Yes. As researchers, we pay so much attention to small differences, while so much of the data support similarity. For example, finding statistical significance when samples are large leads researchers to focus on the small differences instead of the large similarities. Universality here refers to universality of means and of variances. We have to pay more attention to the similarities.

I also got interested in the genetics issue. So much of personality research now shows strong effects of genes on, for example, shyness. Studies of fraternal and identical twins show heritable personality effects, and, recently, self-rated transformational leadership is showing heritability effects of 50 to 60%. We almost got a NSF grant to further examine this. The idea of heritability of leadership has a lot of face validity with people and is consistent with the notion of universality. That is, some aspects of leader behavior may be programmed from conception in some humans, everywhere.

Question: You have also found an augmentation effect for transformational leadership over and above transactional leadership. Most training programs today seem to emphasize primarily transformational leadership. Based on your study results, would you then recommend that training program first make sure that the participants know transactional leadership?

Bass: Yes, indeed. Passive and laissez-faire leadership has a downright negative impact on effectiveness. Leaders may think they are empowering followers, but followers may see leaders trying to avoid work and not really caring about what followers do. Management by exception sometimes is necessary, but usually it is not effective. According to some metaanalyses, management by exception has almost zero relationship with effectiveness, except in the military, where it may be of some consequence. Contingent reward tends to be strongly associated with effectiveness. However, the transformational factors of individualized consideration, charismatic, and inspirational leadership, as well as intellectual stimulation are likely to be more highly correlated with effectiveness. Then, we find the augmentation effect in regression analyses. Transformational leadership adds to transactional leadership in multiple regression in predicting effectiveness and satisfaction, but the reverse does not occur.

Question: In most of the writings on transformational leadership, authors empha-

size the positive effects. Do you see a dark side to transformational leadership?

Bass: Yes, I have an article recently published in *The Leadership Quarterly* on ethics, authenticity, and transformational leadership. In my 1985 book *Leadership and Performance beyond Expectations*, I introduced the concept of pseudotransformational leadership. That is, it looks like a transformational leader, it acts like a transformational leader, but in fact it is not. A typical example would be the executive who cries crocodile tears when downsizing, but then gives himself a big bonus. I even developed a series of charts contrasting the authentic and pseudotransformational leaders. However, assessing it in reality is hard because you do not know exactly what people's intent is. I think that authenticity and ethical behavior are closely associated with transformational leadership. I think there are great differences between transformational leaders who have a dark side and those who do not. Transformational leaders with a dark side will not upgrade the moral level of their followers.

Question: Recently you have worked on Within and Between Analyses (WABA). The results seem to suggest that individual relationships with the leader are the only ones that matter and that we should not aggregate data.

Bass: The results from the research using Within and Between Analysis seem to indicate indeed that we should focus on the relationship between the leader and each individual follower. However, before we argue against aggregation of data by group (such as subordinates), we should have at least another five to six studies that confirm the early results using the WABA technique. If the results hold up, it would certainly simplify life and increase *N*-sizes threefold or more. In a sense, it is further support for the concept of individualized consideration.

Question: What do you consider some of the major contributions to leadership research in the 20th century?

Bass: Max Weber's theory of charisma, the Ohio State Leadership studies, Michigan's survey research on organizational leadership, WABA analyses, James MacGregor Burns' book on transformational leadership, Bob House's 1976 theory of charismatic leadership, J. L. Moreno's introduction of sociodrama and role-playing, Chester Barnard's functions of the executive and the nature of leadership, Fred Fiedler's contingency theory, and Ed Hollander's idiosyncrasy credits.

Question: What should leadership researchers focus on in the 21st century?

Bass: WABA research. I would like to see lots of replications cementing the acceptability of individual level data in the study of groups and organizations. Second, I would like to see more research on what leaders think when they take actions and make decisions. I have seen people use some interesting techniques such as stimulated recall and protocol analysis. For example, you could videotape someone leading a discussion. Then, you take the formal leader aside, show him/her the videotape, and ask what he/she was thinking when this action was taking place. You record along with a re-recording of the original tape so that you have a running record. Third, I would like to see more research on virtual teams and leadership. We just completed a leadership study of the military for which we conducted a lot of our collaboration via e-mail. When you use e-mail, you really have no chance to correct what you were saying, so you get more cautious about what you are

saying. You also miss a lot of the nonverbal cues. Finally, I would like to see researchers “triangulate” quantitative and qualitative approaches to the study of leadership.

FINAL THOUGHTS

Question: Which leader, in your opinion, best represents and embodies transformational leadership?

Bass: I would say the Dean at the University of Pittsburgh when I joined there. His name was Marshall Robinson. He was an ex-marine officer, which must have given him his poise and inspired a feeling of faculty trust in him. I would also mention Lieutenant-General Walt Ulmer, who, after he retired from 38 years of service in many command positions in the U.S. Army, headed up the Center for Creative Leadership. He was clearly a transformational leader and is still very active as a consultant for the military.

Question: How have you kept up the energy to be active over five decades? What drives you?

Bass: First of all, I am reasonably healthy and come from a long-living family on my father’s side. My brother, who is five years older than me, still jogs two miles every other day. The story in my family is that my great-grandfather lived until he was a 104. My father killed himself smoking at 79. A car hit my grandfather when he was close to 90. I am a type A personality, but have a blood pressure of 120 over 65 and exercise almost daily. I am good about setting and meeting deadlines. The ideas and the research pull me along. I also am a person who does not like to loaf and, in a sense, research is my hobby. My wife has every hobby and is kind of a Renaissance woman. I have been married for 53 years now and have an old-fashioned and symbiotic marriage. My wife takes many responsibilities. This means I have a lot of time to work. Again, the greatest satisfaction comes from seeing connections among all the different pieces of research. This is also why I like to do the *Handbook of Leadership*.

Question: Please give some advice to doctoral students and faculty in general and to those with an interest in leadership in particular.

Bass: I feel sorry for the newly graduated people, because it has come increasingly difficult to get published in first-tier journals and to get grants. When I started out, it was easier to publish and to get grants. Now, journal editors brag about their 92% rejection rates. I think a lot of good stuff ends up in the wastebasket. Journals started because, in the 17th century, scientists just wrote letters to each other that nobody first reviewed. Now, we have gone the other way, and that is why it is so nice to write books, because you get to say what you want to say. For every time someone rejects the null hypothesis, reviewers can generate three or four alternate hypotheses, and so a lot of good papers never get published. There ought to be a journal of alternate hypotheses.

I also think there are lots of problems with the relationship between publishing and promotion decisions. There is a rush by committees to count publications. Not enough of the publications are read by committee members. Some of the evaluators

are less competent than those they are evaluating. As for research grants, there are many more applicants chasing fewer dollars.

As far as suggestions are concerned, I think doctoral students and young faculty should be fluent in the new technologies and data analysis techniques. They almost should be able to teach a MIS class. I also think they should triangulate their research in terms of qualitative interviews and observations in parallel with quantitative research. Yair Berson's dissertation is a good example of that.

There also should be more emphasis on generalizations from case studies, rather than each case study being a stand alone. You need to be focused, to concentrate on a line of investigation, and to surround yourself with people who are brighter than yourself, including students. When we first wrote the mission statement for the Center for Leadership Studies in 1987, we said that we wanted the center to become a global leader in leadership studies, and everybody laughed. However, I think we have done it. Finally, and most importantly, you have to stay in a state of learning. Keep in mind also that writing two pages a day adds up to 730 pages in a year.

Question: You must have educated many doctoral students over the years. Who are the three to five students you are most proud of?

Bass: I would name Wayne Cascio who became a department chairman at CU-Denver, John Miller, who has been an important player in the area of behavioral simulations and undergraduate education and who is now at Bucknell University, Dick Franke at Loyola College, Baltimore, and, more recent graduates, John Sosik at Penn State, Yair Berson, who will probably end up at Hebrew University, and Dong I. Jung at San Diego State University.

Thank you very much for taking the time to talk with us.

REFLECTIONS FROM FORMER STUDENTS AND LONG-TIME COLLEAGUES ON BASS AS A SCHOLAR AND PERSON

John Miller
Bucknell University

My work with Bernie Bass started in the late 60s, when he served as a consultant to a top management team learning project I was working at the American Management Association's Learning Center in Hamilton, New York. When we shared some ideas about leadership and management education, mine were so obviously ill-informed that Bernie suggested I might benefit from spending a couple of years with him and colleagues at Rochester's Management Research Center.

1969–1973 were right in the middle of the era that all of Bernie's colleagues at MRC call "Camelot." Bernie pushed all of us graduate students into management development, survey research, textbook editing, and classroom teaching roles as if we *were* indeed "professional colleagues." In addition, we all worked together on the survey research contracts that Bernie got for us and in the T-groups that characterized that Age of Aquarius. We became a *clan*—and still think of ourselves as holding family reunions when we see each other at professional meetings.

I was (and remain) most excited about the ideas that got shaped in our discus-

sions—in seminars and in our survey research projects—around leadership and management styles. Bernie encouraged me to pursue an expansive, perhaps even overly ambitious, exploration of relationships among organizational, environmental, and leadership variables in my dissertation, sharing the conviction that a Ph.D. thesis ought to build foundations for long-term professional and scholarly identities, not just jump a short-term hurdle. I'm delighted to think that the work I'm doing now, some 30 years later, is still anchored in that foundation.

For me, the single most characteristic link to Bernie was in his kind acknowledgment of my suggestions to him about a (then) newly developing line of thinking about leadership theory and research. Apart from the satisfaction of seeing how Bernie's energies and skills have led to the flourishing of work in that line, my gratitude is for Bernie's unending openness to the ideas of others. At the most fundamental level, I regard Bernie's many contributions to the field as the result of a scholarly life committed to respect for the ideas of others.

Wayne Cascio
University of Colorado at Denver

I was a graduate student in industrial/organizational psychology at the University of Rochester from 1970–1973. During that time, I worked extremely closely with Dr. Bass. His work ethic and dedication to his field inspire me even to this day. He is, without a doubt, the most creative individual I have ever met. We would regularly talk about research questions and different strategies for approaching them. Dr. Bass had the uncanny ability to see research strategies and alternative ways of attacking a problem that never even occurred to most people. I would be writing furiously while he spoke, and then I would work with him to carry out many of his ideas. As a result, we published several papers together during my studies and after I finished at Rochester. On one occasion, he was driving as we returned from a day of skiing. As usual, we were chatting away about important research questions in our field. He got so excited talking about the subject that he actually drove off the road. What's worse, I did not even notice, because I was doing what I always did in his presence—writing furiously!

The man's productivity was (and is) amazing. He is the most prolific researcher and writer that I've ever met. He has had a profound impact on my career through his constant encouragement and mentorship. His influence has affected my teaching, my research, and my consulting activities. I was truly blessed to have had the opportunity to work with him, and I continue to admire both him and his work.

Richard Franke
Loyola College Maryland

You should know by now that Bernard Bass is an exceptionally bright and versatile scientist. Although tough and challenging, he is 100% open to criticism and professional behavior by his colleagues and students. I don't think he is rivaled in this by anyone. He does not insist upon his own interests being followed, so that he does not have a clear pattern of work in the work of his students. Still, he has contributed by example to a great deal of later work, including the focus on

fundamental examination shown in my own research on the Hawthorne studies (*American Sociological Review* 1978, 1979, 1980) and the democratic orientation of my work since 1973 (Pusic's volume in Yugoslavia).

Others such as Wayne Cascio found freedom under Bass's wing to depart from both Bass and Ed Deci to build his own important set of work. When we were graduate students at Rochester (and I also was an MBA student of Bass's earlier, at Pittsburgh), we called our Management Research Center "Camelot." It was far too good for an ordinary place like Rochester and suffered the fate of most such excessively good, honest, and productive enterprises.

Applied psychology had its beginnings at Leipzig in 1879, begun by Wundt. In terms of truly productive work, besides maybe Taylor, the next and maybe last major impulse was in the empirical research of the Ohio State studies. Bass was a graduate student there, and the work of his students can be seen as a continuation of the empirical and open focuses of, first, Wundt, and then, Stogdill, Bass, etc., and their emulators.

Of course, there are other branches of applied psychology, in testing, criminology, etc. I am referring to the main, deeper stream of behavior in organizations and attempts to understand and improve human social behavior and the performance of organizations and societies. To call Bass's work just "leadership," as he himself might do, is a vast understatement. One might call the applied social sciences the true current frontier of mankind (maybe together with the bio/genetic revolution). It is, maybe even more than bio/genetics, inherently dangerous and politically incorrect. It requires brave and capable people, but finds only a few of them. Bass is fearless (probably by ignoring the political problems, and just going on). He is open to anything that can be supported.

John J. Sosik
Penn State–Great Valley

When I was a doctoral student at SUNY-Binghamton, I was fortunate to work with Bernie Bass at the Center for Leadership Studies. Bernie's extensive knowledge of leadership research, his dry sense of humor, and his "quiet" but constant form of mentoring were great sources of motivation for me. He always provided keen insights into how we might design a study, what literature might inform our research, and what implications our work might have for managers. He oftentimes provided his expertise along with a good "war story" that made our struggles seem bearable. For example, our quest to learn statistics seemed simple when we learned that Bernie used to do ANOVAs by hand (back in the "good old days"). Bernie made learning how to do research enjoyable and memorable.

Bernie's seminal work on transformational leadership has helped shape my work in this area. His thinking has not only influenced me, but also my colleagues and my students. I also have witnessed firsthand the positive impact his work on transformational leadership has had in several organizations. Perhaps, this is what our work is ultimately about—making a positive difference in organizations. It was truly an honor to work and study with Bernie Bass, who has made such a significant impact in the leadership field and in organizations around the world.

Dong Jung
San Diego State University

When I was a doctoral student, I felt so fortunate to be able to work with someone who had a major impact on the field of leadership such as Dr. Bass. It was such a great setting for a doctoral student to learn about transformational leadership, since Bernie's office always was right around the corner—wide open. Even if he always had a demanding schedule, I had the privilege of swinging by his office anytime I wanted to and giving him numerous hard-to-make-sense-of types of questions. He was such a down-to-earth person (I believe he still is) that, even when a young doctoral student tried to have a big argument with him, he tried his best to cover up my nonsense. If I went too far, he just kept smiling, until I finally realized my foolishness and decided I needed to read some more articles for the next round of discussion.

Apart from actual knowledge I gained from Bernie, I also learned what it took to be a good researcher from him. I had several chances to visit his home and had a nice dinner with Mrs. Bass. Whenever I visited his home, I was impressed by his collection of books in his home library, wondering whether he actually read all the books he had. However, it was not until Mrs. Bass said that he read and wrote 24 hours a day that I fully understood what it took to be able to write a comprehensive book called the *Handbook of Leadership*. Mrs. Bass added that when a good idea struck him, Bernie did not hesitate to wake up even at two o'clock in the morning and go to his library to develop the idea. It is not just a coincidence that Bernie is the one who wrote the *Handbook* (even without the aid of a computer!). He certainly is a man with intelligence and incredible memory (he used to give me references with names of the authors, journal title, and accurate publication year—usually the 1940s, 1950s, right off the top of his head), but what really made him who he is, are his persistence and devotion.

Retrospectively speaking, I feel I was very lucky to have someone like Bernie around me when I was developing as a scholar. He led me during my doctoral student days by setting a high standard of what a good scholar should be (Idealized Influence), by sharing what is really important for me to consider during the early stage of professional development, by providing mentoring and coaching (Individualized Consideration) and by showing me several different ways (not just one way) to conduct solid scientific research (Intellectual Stimulation). Best of all, Bernie didn't say much or didn't ask me to do a lot to learn these invaluable lessons. He made himself available and just kept smiling until I realized them by myself. I had a suspicion that he was not only a master of transformational leadership theory, but also a master of Zen! Even now, several years after I have graduated from the doctoral program at the State University of New York at Binghamton, I feel that he still is in my office smiling at me whenever I am trying to write a lousy paper.

Yair Berson
Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute

Working with Bernie Bass has given me many chances to learn about leadership much beyond the scope of organizational behavior. My introduction to Bernie's

work was far from an academic setting. As an officer in the Israeli Army, I was trained at the Military Leadership School using a variation of the transformational leadership model. Throughout my Ph.D. program, studying leadership with Bernie meant long discussions of the leadership of Netanyahu, Clinton, and other politicians. During an independent study course with him on military leadership, we have discussed history maybe more than OB. Bernie is a man of renaissance and this is a fascinating aspect about working with him.

Bernie serves as an example in the way he is ready to accept criticism of his own work. When I suggested that the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), that he had developed, could be improved using qualitative data, he endorsed my ideas and changed a survey that was part of a major research project that he had been conducting with the U.S. Army. After so many years and grants, Bernie is still involved in all the details of this Army project and is enthusiastic about findings more than many younger researchers. Although he can easily cite articles from the 1940s (and does so frequently), he is neither cynical nor critical of new ideas.

Bernie's contribution to my career has been mostly by encouraging me to broaden my interests. He challenges my ideas, but at the same time accepts my arguments, even if they contradict his own ideas. Consequently, while my research interests stem from Bernie's work, they are a result of my critical analysis of his work and the work of Bruce Avolio. I believe that Bernie has set the foundations for the quantitative measurement of charismatic/transformational leadership that was previously measured mostly by qualitative means. I see my work as broadening Bernie's approach and integrating it with the work of previous leadership researchers. For me, being broad in my approach to leadership is the most important wisdom that I could learn from Bernie Bass.

Bruce J. Avolio
Binghamton University

I have now worked with Bernie for nearly two decades. Starting back in 1981, when I first started working with him up to and including yesterday, I have always found him to be one of the most approachable people in our field. From the very beginning of our relationship until today, he was always willing to do the "grunt" work together. On joint research projects, he would grab his part and go off and do it. There was never an indication that he was beyond this or that in his career. I believe this has been one very important element in sustaining our relationship over these many years.

Another element is Bernie's insatiable curiosity. I don't think he has changed a bit, in terms of his lifetime curiosity, in terms of learning about history, psychology, management, philosophy, science, etc. There are some people in the field who are nearly as prolific as Bernie, but few who are as broad and deep in their understanding of other disciplines of knowledge. In 20 years, it has been the rare instance that Bernie could not put his finger on an historical fact, insight, or finding of some relevance to the conversation—regardless of the country or setting we found ourselves in. He knows more about leadership than any other scholar in the world. And, he adds to his specific knowledge about leadership a scholarly level of understanding pertaining to world history and philosophy.

To travel with Bernie, which I have done many times and across many continents, is to learn in great depth the cultures one is going into. Again and again, we have been at dinner with colleagues from some other country, and Bernie will ask or comment on a local tradition, to the amazement of our hosts. If it happened once or twice, it wouldn't be so extraordinary, but it happens every time. And oftentimes our hosts will say, "I didn't know that!"

Before I became interested in leadership studies, I was a life-span psychologist interested in aging and work issues. One of the things that I learned in my work, is that those who are very productive early in life oftentimes continue to be productive until the "physical solution" to life takes over. Bernie is a clear example of a model that I once came across called, "the consistent probability of success model." At a point where many colleagues have taken early retirement, Bernie built on a very distinguished career, already very well established, the beginnings of transformational leadership. And for the next 20 years, he has pursued studying an expanded model of leadership and has done so with such vigor, that at times one would mistake Bernie for a candidate pursuing promotion and tenure to associate professor. I think for Bernie, it is probably "life tenure" he is pursuing, and when his case comes up, he will have my vote!

Francis J. Yammarino
Binghamton University

Although I had "known" Bernie Bass for a number of years through his writings, I first met him in 1985 when I started working at SUNY-Binghamton. Notice that I did *not* meet him on the recruiting trip to Binghamton prior to me being hired. Bernie wasn't there during that trip because he was in Colorado skiing (probably with Wayne Cascio)! The point of this little story is that Bernie trusted and relied on the judgement and expertise of his junior colleagues to make the "right" decision. (Even today, some would say they made the "wrong" decision, but that's not Bernie's fault.)

In my first real meeting with him, not only was he friendly and unassuming, but he was extremely curious and inquisitive. Bernie wanted to know more about my work on levels of analysis and WABA, and how we could do a joint project that merged my work with his work on transformational leadership. Again, he demonstrated to me his belief that junior colleagues have contributions to make—he wanted to learn and join forces, not set the agenda or dictate projects.

For me, the thing that captures best the essence of Bernie Bass is that first and foremost he is a "scientist." He values scholarly work and the process of scientific research. While his work is both praised and subjected to criticism, he always responds positively to scientifically valid data that support or refute his positions. Likewise, he is not averse to pointing out flaws in thought or study designs that can taint the quality of data. Although this scientific orientation stems in part from his early Ohio State mentors, he continually practices and imparts it to others.

Perhaps more than anything, this scientific orientation, one to which I also subscribe, has allowed us to have a positive working relationship over the years. I'm not saying we never disagree on issues. Rather, our shared scientific values

have always offered us a way to resolve (usually by empirically testing) our points of contention.

The other key element about working with Bernie I wish to mention is that his name “opens doors.” He has contacts and access to people, places, and things many of us dream about, *and* he shares them willingly. It is safe to say that a good portion of whatever success and accomplishments I have had, as well as that of many others, is directly due to our working relationship with Bernie. For that, I thank him.

A final comment: Many of us would consider ourselves successful if we left behind one major accomplishment in this business. When the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology honored him with its Distinguished Scientific Contributions Award several years ago, more than a dozen major contributions by Bernie were cited. Clearly, Bernie Bass has been a prolific and outstanding scientific contributor to our field. I am delighted to be counted among his many colleagues and friends.