

Singapore Management University

Institutional Knowledge at Singapore Management University

Research Collection Lee Kong Chian School Of Business

Lee Kong Chian School of Business

12-1999

From Austria to the United States and from Evaluating Therapists to Developing Cognitive Resources Theory: An Interview with Fred Fiedler

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 Austria to the United States and from Evaluating Therapists to Developing Cognitive Resources Theory: An Interview with Fred Fiedler. (1999). *Leadership Quarterly*. 10, (4), 653-665. Research Collection Lee Kong Chian School Of Business.

Available at: https://ink.library.smu.edu.sg/lkcsb_research/1737

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 AUSTRIA TO THE UNITED STATES AND FROM EVALUATING THERAPISTS TO DEVELOPING COGNITIVE RESOURCES THEORY: AN INTERVIEW WITH FRED FIEDLER

Robert Hooijberg*
Jaepil Choi

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

The following interview represents the start of a series of interviews with researchers who have had a major impact on the field of leadership. Through these interviews we want to obtain a sense of the person behind the researcher, a few comments on the person's research ideas, and some insights on the state of the field. In addition, we have asked some of the people who worked with Dr. Fiedler to comment on what it was like to work with and for him. We will try to do this for other interviewees as well. We believe this interview is timely as Dr. Fiedler is this year's recipient of the James McKeen Cattell Award of the American Psychological Society.

PERSONAL BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Question: When and where were you born? And what did your parents do“?

Fiedler: I was born July 13, 1922 in Vienna, Austria, where my parents owned a textile and tailoring supply store. I emigrated to the United States shortly after Germany invaded Austria in 1938. I lived for one year with distant relatives in South Bend, Indiana. and after they left South Bend for reasons of health, I stayed

*Direct all correspondence to: Robert Hooijberg, Department of Management, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, 180 University Avenue, Newark, NJ 07102-1895; *e-mail:* hooijbrg@andromeda.rutgers.edu.

Leadership Quarterly, 10(4), 653-665.
Copyright © 1999 by Elsevier Science Inc.
All rights of reproduction in any form reserved.
ISSN: 1048-9843

on by myself and graduated from high school in 1940. My parents emigrated to China and lived in Shanghai, until 1946 when they also emigrated to the United States. After graduation I worked in about 20 different jobs in Indiana, Michigan, and San Francisco. returned to Indiana. and got a job for promising students at the Indiana and Michigan Electric Company.

Question: Did anything happen during your youth that set you on the path towards leadership research?

Fiedler: I have always been interested in exploring and investigating. (For a while, when I was a child, I wanted to become an explorer or a detective.) I became interested in psychology when I was about 11, after reading some of my father's books on psychology. I was an onlooker rather than a doer, but definitely expressed my intent to study industrial psychology while in high school and spoke to my counselor about psychology as a career. She didn't think much about it, because I had rather mediocre grades. Apparently this did not discourage me too much because I took several extension courses while I was in the army, and intended to study industrial psychology at the University of Chicago. I got involved in research very shortly after I was admitted to the psychology department, and this has really remained my major interest throughout life.

Question: Did you serve in the military?

Fiedler: I served in the army from 1942 to 1945. After basic training, the army assigned me to a medical battalion, then the army sent me to Indiana University to study Turkish Area and Language Study. After just three months the unit was discontinued because a war with Turkey became unlikely. After a short stint in an infantry battalion, I was assigned to Military Civilian Affairs, later Military Government. I served in England for training, and then in Germany. I served as interpreter, telephone communications chief, and for one month I was the public safety NCO, or *de facto* sheriff of Landkreis (county) Bitburg. (Along with keeping Polish displaced persons from looting and rioting, theft, et cetera. I had one murder case, which I dismally failed to solve.) All in all. I had an interesting time in the army.

Question: You received your university education at the University of Chicago in psychology, receiving your MA in 1947 and Ph.D. in 1949. Who were your key advisors during that time? What was it like to be in a Ph.D. program at that time? Were you actively involved in research projects as a Ph.D. student? How many faculty and students were there in the program?

Fiedler: After World War II started in 1942, I enrolled for a summer quarter in the engineering program at Western Michigan College of Education (now Western Michigan University. in Kalamazoo), but soon decided that I was not cut out to be an engineer and that the University of Chicago was the place for me. Applicants must have been scarce at that time because I was admitted almost immediately. While I knew I would be drafted within a few months, I figured that getting admitted then would get me in after the war was over. (I wish my predictions of the stock market were equally good.) I was discharged from the army in November of 1945, and was readmitted to the University of Chicago in January of 1946. Since I was

eligible for four years tuition from the GI Bill, I figured I had to get through in that time. I took examinations over various undergraduate course areas, skipped most undergraduate classes, and, in fact, got my Ph.D. four years later in 1949—probably a record of some sort, and my only academic achievement. I also met my wife at the University of Chicago before entering the army and we got married shortly after I got out. After 53 years we are still happily married.

The University of Chicago was a fascinating place right after World War II. Robert Maynard Hutchins was president, and the place was in ferment all through the years I was there. Many of the students had just **gotten** out of the military services and were eager to make up for lost time. The faculty was of star quality. Among the professors of the psychology department were the Thurstones, Lee Cronbach, Donald Fiske, William Stephenson. Carl Rogers, David Shakow. Sam Beck, Donald Campbell, Morris Stein, Ward Halsted, D.W. Neff, Wolfgang Koehler, to mention **just** a few. In sociology and related departments were Louis Wirth, William Foote White, Herbert Bloomer, Herbert Thelen, W. Lloyd Warner, Bruno Bettelheim, Robert Redfield, and Paul Douglas, among others.

School was demanding and we did not see much of our families. As an undergraduate, you did not have to go to class, but you did have to take very difficult 6 hour comprehensive exams at the end of the year. (Although German was my native tongue, I only got a B in **the** German foreign language exam.) I was actively involved in research most of the time. as were most other students.

Question: Based on the title of your dissertation “A Comparative Investigation of the Therapeutic Relationships Created by Experts and Non-Experts of the Psychoanalytic, Non-Directive, and Adlerian Schools” you seem to have been focused on clinical psychological topics. How did your interest shift from clinical psychological topics to an interest in leadership?

Fiedler: I had always intended to major in industrial (now I/O) psychology, but since there was no active industrial program at Chicago at that time, I did my masters thesis under Carl Rogers on “The efficacy of preventive psychotherapy for alleviating examination anxiety.” This was actually an adaptation of non-directive therapy to a non-clinical setting. During my second year at Chicago, I was offered a well-paying Veterans Administration (VA) traineeship, which was an opportunity not to be missed. In the course of this program. I was invited to become a research assistant in a large VA research program on selection of clinical psychologists for the U.S. Veterans Administration. The program was headed by Lowell Kelly at the University of Michigan and Donald Fiske and James W. Miller at the University of Chicago. The Chicago part of the project had a strong I/O component, namely the development of criteria for identifying clinicians. In **the** course of this project, and while still a VA trainee in addition, I became interested in measuring psychotherapeutic relations and their effect on success of psychotherapists, and this became my dissertation. My committee, which consisted of James G. Miller, Donald Fiske, Elias Porter, Carl Rogers. and Jack Butler reluctantly agreed to my proposal. Since it was the first dissertation using the Q-technique, its originator. William Stephenson, also became active on my committee. My dissertation was an instant hit, and was

cited in James McV. Hunt's presidential address at APA. It may still be my most cited paper. Why, then, did I not become a clinical psychologist? The answer is simply that I did not feel I would be a very good clinician. And I believed then, as I do now, that "if you avoid situations in which you are likely to fail you are bound to be a success."

Question: You started your first job at the University of Illinois-Urbana-Champaign in 1950. What was it like to be an assistant professor at that time? How much pressure was there to publish? Who were some of the other faculty there at that time?

Fiedler: After getting my Ph.D., I served as instructor and as research associate in the VA project at Chicago for one more year, and then spent a summer at Randolph Field at the Human Resource Research Center. Lee Cronbach then invited me to the University of Illinois's College of Education as Associate Director of an Office of Naval Research contract on leadership. Our first major study on the leadership of high school basketball teams was wildly successful and I was hooked on leadership. I might add that I really consider my time with Don Fiske as an internship and my two years with Cronbach as a residency. Both of them taught me a great deal that I never would have learnt in class.

After two years, Cronbach left the project, and I was invited to join the psychology department at the University of Illinois, where I started the Group Effectiveness Research Laboratory and remained until 1969. It was a great department, with an outstanding and very sociable faculty. Among the members of the faculty at Illinois were four APA presidents: O. Hobart Mowrer, J. McV. Hunt, Charles Osgood, and Lee Cronbach. In all, the department had a faculty of about 120, including among others. Lyle Lanier, Lloyd Humphreys, Ledyard Tucker, Raymond Cattell, Harry Triandis, Joe McGrath, Martin Fishbein. Ivan Steiner. Henry Kaiser, Charles Hulin, Lawrence Kelly, Uriel Foa, Jack Adams, and Jerry Wiggins.

The Group Effectiveness Research Laboratory (GERL), which I started and directed, had a number of government sponsored research programs in Social and I/O Psychology. Harry Triandis, and later Joe McGrath. were Associate Directors. At one point, we had 33 faculty and staff on the payroll. and I got ulcers.

Most of the contracts dealt with leadership and group performance problems. One large project, sponsored by ARPA, was co-directed by Triandis, Osgood, Stolurow. and me. It resulted in the development and validation of cultural training programs (Culture Assimilators). These provided self-paced programmed instruction in other cultures, namely Iran. Central America. Greece, and Thailand. The programs became the model for other culture training programs in use today.

During the later years at Illinois, I headed one of the department's three divisions, namely the social, differential, personality and industrial psychology division. Illinois was a very tough place for students and junior faculty. You were expected to teach well and to produce good research and good PhDs. The students were excellent and still about 50 percent of the entering students did not make it.

Question: In 1969 you took a position at the University of Washington. Why did you decide to change jobs? You seemed to be running a highly successful research laboratory at the University of Illinois.

Fiedler: My wife and our four children enjoyed living in Champaign-Urbana, but after 19 years I felt I needed a change. Champaign-Urbana was known as a good place to raise children and where nothing distracted you from your work. My wife, who worked as a research sociologist in the Survey Research Center, was reluctant to leave, but we did finally decide to move to the University of Washington in 1969 where I established the Organizational Research Group and taught until my retirement in 1993.

By my reckoning, more than 100 research associates and students were associated or employed by the Group Effectiveness Research Laboratory and the Organizational Research Group at the University of Washington at one time or another. I would consider my biggest accomplishment during these years the graduate students who got all or part of their research training in my research programs. Among the students in my laboratories who later were appointed to distinguished professorships were Martin Chemers, Terence Mitchell, James G. Hunt, Richard Hackman, and Daniel Ilgen, and there may be still more from whom I have not heard. Among the students who became deans are Martin Chemers, IJC Santa Cruz. Earl Potter, III, Leslie College, Bilha Mannheim, The Technion, Israel. D. Bhathumnavior, Thailand. Charles Morris. Michigan, and Delbert Nebeker. Others became officers in major corporations and research organizations and a number became department heads. Seventeen military officers, 14 army, 1 Coast Guard, 2 Air Force, got their PhD or MS degrees under my direct or indirect supervision. Most of them taught at military academies at one time: a few later went on to the Army War College, the Army Research Institute, the Industrial War College, and the Command and General Staff School. One became a general. and most others retired as colonels or with equivalent rank. I am told that I was not an easy boss. On the other hand, many of my former students volunteered that their time in my labs was the most important educational experience in their career.

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?

Fiedler: Right after WWII, and well into the 1970s, the graduate students were more academically inclined-and mot-e academic jobs were open. In recent years, more and more students have gone into consulting or practicing psychology, and fewer into research. During the last five or six years I was active at the llniversity of Washington, I can think of no fewer than five who got their PhD with me or on my projects and who have yet to publish their eminently publishable dissertation studies. This would have been unheard of before 1970 or 1980.

RESEARCH PROGRAM AND TRENDS IN THE LEADERSHIP FIELD

Question: What is the relationship between Cognitive Resource Theory (CRT) and the Contingency model?

Fiedler: I see these two theories as closely related. Both are concerned with the moderating effect of the leadership situation on the effect of leader personality and other attributes on leader behavior and performance. Our research suggests that

stress or anxiety producing conditions cause less mature responses, and these, in turn, result in a fall-back to the primary motivation, insofar as the Contingency Model is concerned, and a fall-back to a less rational, more intuitive reaction, as far as CRT is concerned.

Question: You have shown very interesting data regarding the relationship between leader intelligence, experience, stress, and performance. You seem to find that intelligent leaders perform well under low stress conditions and that experienced leaders perform better under high stress conditions. Have you ever assessed the interaction between leader intelligence and leader experience and performance?

Fiedler: You asked about the possible interaction between intelligence and experience. Susan Murphy, now Associate Director of the Kravis Leadership Institute at Claremont-McKenna College, and I have been particularly interested in the mutual interference between leader intelligence and experience. Murphy's research makes it quite clear that intelligence interferes with experience and experience interferes with intelligence. You cannot act on the basis of automatic processing based on overlearned behavior (i.e., experience) at the same time that you engage in analytic, creative, or deliberative thinking.

Field studies of fire department officers, coast guard and army officers, as well as others, as well as controlled laboratory experiments suggest that intelligence and experience interfere with one another. This makes good sense. When you want to change long-established work procedures, it's wise to call in a consultant who can bring a fresh point of view to the problem. Everybody knows that thinking about how you hold your tennis racket ruins your game, and concentrating on your feet while you dance gives your partners sore toes. Stress exacerbates this problem. When you have stress with the boss, you concentrate on the relationship and not the job. As a result, your intellectual abilities cannot contribute to performance, and you fall back on what, in your experience, has worked before. The more experience you have had, the more likely it is that the solution to a particular problem will be in your repertoire.

The interference between intelligence and experience has important implications. First and foremost, the leadership situation can impede or block how well the leader is able to utilize intellectual abilities. Our data suggest that you cannot create new ideas, plan, or develop strategies because stress with the boss diverts your intellectual focus from the task to the hostile relationship. You therefore react on the basis of what you have learned before, that is, by automatic processing. Conversely, an old, experienced hand is likely to tell you that he knows all the answers, and "we don't need another study or more talk."

This hypothesis was tested experimentally in a study by Susan Murphy. She divided the leaders of 60 randomly assembled groups into high and low thirds on their intelligence score, and high and low thirds on previous leadership experience. She found that experience correlated highly with performance only when the leaders had relatively low intelligence, but it did not correlate for leaders with high intelligence. Conversely, intelligence correlated highly with performance only for leaders with low experience, but it did not correlate for leaders with high experience. In

other words, high intelligence interfered with the effective use of experience: high experience interfered with the effective use of intelligence. Basically, we can't be creative and plan well while rushing to a fire.

Question: We now see a resurgence in interest in charismatic and transformational leadership. These theories seem to require leaders to be both task and relationship motivated. Is there any room in your thinking for leaders who are both task and relationship motivated?

Fiedler: I find transformational and charismatic leadership very interesting and worthy topics for study. They and the contingency model are related insofar as they both consider the relationship between leader and group members a key element in the leadership situation. They are certainly not contradictory in my opinion. Charisma implies devoted, unquestioning followers. This means that poor or unscrupulous leaders can lead followers into disaster. Recall the Reverend Jim Jones causing 800 followers to commit suicide or Napoleon's march to Moscow with 300,000 men of whom only 15,000 returned.

The charismatic theories by House and transformational theory by Bass have given us better insight into these phenomena, which are clearly real. Second, the Contingency Model as well as Charismatic and Transformational Theories predict leadership performance. I suggest that transformational leadership works well in situations where the leader is motivated to do the right thing. Charismatic and Transformational theories obviously don't work well in all situations. For example, General Patton, surely a charismatic leader, was not a big success as a garrison commander. And General Ulysses Grant, who was instrumental in winning the Civil War, was a washout as a president. I can easily believe that transformational leaders, as a group, outperform those who are not transformational.

My question would be, how much variance does transformational leadership account for under various conditions? Do transformational leaders have to be intelligent? That depends on how you define intelligent. More intelligent than who? We have found zero correlations between leader intelligence and performance. If transformational leaders are supposed to be intelligent as well as being more effective, there would have to be a correlation between intelligence and effectiveness. The much quoted correlation of .22 reported by Stogdill is undoubtedly inflated because nonsignificant correlations don't often get into print. I would be more inclined to think that Sternberg's theory of tacit intelligence or knowledge might be an important factor.

Finally, you cite Bass as saying that crises call for transformational leaders, and, therefore, this seems at odds with the contingency model. I don't have any empirical evidence for my response, but I suspect that the majority of transformational leaders are task-motivated (they are decisive, directive, etc.) and crisis situations call for decisive leadership, task-focused leadership. As to the point that transformational leaders' activities provide intellectual stimulation, let me suggest that task-motivated leaders can be intellectually stimulating as well. My prime example would be Admiral Rickover who directed the nuclear submarine program. One of my acquaintances and friends who worked with him told me that he was a very tough task-master, and certainly not cuddly, and that he drove people hard, including those in R&D.

The same has been said of Bill Gates, and various others who head research and development driven enterprises. My answer is, of course, speculative. but I don't see any great conflict of the type that Tichy and others seem to allude to.

Question: How does your theory handle issues of increasing demographic diversity and globalization?

Fiedler: We find that culturally diverse and heterogeneous teams are more difficult to handle since there are more uncertainties. We do not find that they are necessarily less effective, though they tend to create more anxiety and stress arousing situations.

FINAL THOUGHTS

Question: What is your LPC score?

Fiedler: No idea, though I think it would be socio-independent (middle LPC).

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

Fiedler: I have always been intensely curious, and research was as addictive as a partly completed picture puzzle. I found doing research always engaging and deeply satisfying.

Question: Do you still teach'?

Fiedler: No, I do not teach any longer. I have a severe eye problem. which makes a lot of reading difficult.

Question: You have used Fulbright Fellowships to spend a year in Amsterdam, the Netherlands (1955/1956) and in Louvain, Belgium (1963/1964). What did you learn from those fellowships? Would you advice current faculty to seek out such opportunities?

Fiedler: I spent one year at the University of Amsterdam. one year at the University of Louvain in Belgium, and about 8 months at Oxford's Templeton College. What did I learn: I gained a great deal at the Universities of Amsterdam and Louvain. What you get out of sabbaticals depends on your own initiative to do something there as well as the degree to which you get support from the host institution. The better known the institution. the more likely it is that your colleagues will be bored with foreign scholars. and the less likely you are to get much social or professional support.

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

Fiedler: Bromide number 1: Get into research as early as possible if that's your inclination and talent. Bromide number 2: Do not touch research that does not really interest you. It becomes tedious, boring, and sterile if your heart is not in it. If I were looking for a research problem, I would of course look for one that fascinates me. My own predilection would be to find out how we can help people

to maximize their abilities, skills, and knowledge by taking a pro-active role in shaping their environments. This is by far the most cost-effective method for getting more for our money. We are simply making effective use of what's already there. Our research shows the big effect which stress has on how people use their intelligence and experience. But we need to know more about under what conditions they would use their creativity. their mathematical abilities, their personal skills, and knowledge they have. Why do we find such differences between fluid and crystallized intelligence. and how do our findings mesh with Sternberg's triarchic theory of intelligence, and his findings related to tacit knowledge? I would also explore how various specific factors in the work environment facilitate or impede mental and physical performance. We see **some** tantalizing hints that such functions as decisionmaking are highly affected by stress while others. e.g., administrative performance, are apparently unaffected. What is the taxonomy of functions which are and which are not affected by stress and by other elements of situational control'?

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

SUMMARY OF DR. FIEDLER'S ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Fiedler is an internationally recognized scholar in the area of leadership and managerial performance and the author of eight books and over 200 scientific papers. He has directed numerous research grants and contracts from government agencies and private foundations, including the National Institute of Mental Health, US Office of Education. Office of Naval Research, Army Research Institute. Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, and the US Bureau of Mines. He has consulted for various federal and local government agencies and private industry in the United States and abroad. and lectured in the United States, many countries in Europe, Australia and Asia-most recently in Thailand and Hong Kong.

Professional Positions

- Fred E. Fiedler (Ph.D., Chicago, 1949) was Professor of Psychology and of Management and Organization, and Director of the Organizational Research Group at the University of Washington from 1969 to 1993.
- From 1951 to 1969 he was Professor of Psychology and Director of the Group Effectiveness Research Laboratory at the University of Illinois.
- Instructor and Research Associate at the University of Chicago in 1950–1951.
- Past President of the International Association of Applied Psychology's Division of Organizational Psychology.

Visiting Appointments

- Fulbright Research Professor at the University of Amsterdam. 1958–1959.

- Ford Research Fellow and Guest Professor, University of Louvain in Belgium, 1963-1964.
- ‡ Visiting Research Fellow, Templeton College, Oxford University, 1986-1987.
- ‡ Alon Professor, The Technion, Haifa, Israel.
- ‡ S. L. A. Marshall Chair, Army Research Institute. 1988-1999.

Awards

- ‡ James McKeen Cattell Award, American Psychological Society, 1999.
- ‡ Award for Outstanding Scientific Contributions to Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology (APA Division 14). 1996.
- ‡ Named "Distinguished Educator in Management", American Academy of Management, 1993.
- ‡ Fourth Annual Claremont McKenna College Leadership Conference: "The Future of Leadership Research-A Tribute to Fred Fiedler," 1991.
- ‡ Distinguished Bicentennial Lecturer at the University of Georgia, 1985.
- ‡ Award for Outstanding Scientific Contributions to Military Psychology. American Psychological Division 19, 1979.
- ‡ Stogdill Award for Distinguished Contributions to Leadership, 1978.
- ‡ Listed as among the 100 psychologists most frequently cited in the scientific literature, 1979.
- Counseling Research Award, APA Division of Consulting Psychology, 1971.
- ‡ Outstanding Research Award, American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1953.
- ‡ Member of Washington State's Gubernatorial Transition Team, 1980.
- ‡ Public Member, Washington State Medical Disciplinary Board, 1981-1985.

REFLECTIONS OF FOUR SCHOLARS WHO GOT THEIR START UNDER FIEDLER'S TUTELAGE

Martin Chemers
UC-Santa Cruz

I am currently Dean of Social Sciences and Professor of Psychology at the University of California, Santa Cruz. Prior to this I was the Henry R. Kravis Professor of Leadership and Organizational Psychology and Director of the Kravis Leadership Institute at Claremont McKenna College. Before that, I was professor of psychology and chair of the department at the University of Utah.

Working with Fred Fiedler as a graduate student was a wonderful and frightening experience. The fear came from Fred's very high and demanding standards. All of us grad students trembled in terror at the inevitable question, "What did you learn today?" This question we were supposed to answer by telling Fred what new analyses and significant findings our research had revealed that day—a heavy expectation.

More seriously, I learned a great deal about being a professor and research supervisor from Fred Fiedler. His integrity was absolutely impeccable. Our research, analyses, and reporting were always consistent with the highest scientific standards. I also learned what it meant to **be** dedicated to a life of scholarship. Fiedler once told me that one of the greatest benefits of being a professor or graduate student at Illinois was that there was nothing to do there but work-and work we did.

Fred also taught me that we had a responsibility that extended beyond publications. His work in the International Association of Applied Psychology was characterized by a concern for scientists in underdeveloped countries and doing whatever we could to enhance their opportunities.

Finally, I learned something about loyalty and friendship. Fred Fiedler has always looked out for me and is concerned about my career-now thirty years after I graduated. His friendships are equally long lasting-with people like Harry Triandis.

I feel very proud and very fortunate that my career was associated with Fred Fiedler's and I am very proud that he mentioned **me to you**. He has been one of the three or four most important organizational psychologists of all time. and I am glad that he is getting the recognition that he deserves.

Jerry Hunt
Texas Tech University

More years ago than I like to believe, I was a doctoral student in the College of Commerce and Business Administration at the University of Illinois. I originally enrolled in the newly formed DBA program, which was superimposed on top of the Ph.D. in Business Program, each with its own separate courses and faculty. When I finally got to the dissertation proposal stage, I presented a leadership proposal and it got shot down by the new young, quantitatively oriented faculty members. It was soon obvious that even with extensive revision, neither this proposal nor related ones would fly. given the orientation of some of these faculty.

I then transferred into the Ph.D. in Business Program, and **took** I/O psychology as one of my fields. At this time I met Fred Fiedler, who had just developed his Contingency Theory. which shortly after would be the **basis** for his book ***A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness***. I modified my original document to propose the first field study of his Contingency Theory. And he and Joe Litterer, my chair, both gave me strong encouragement, and eventually the proposal was approved.

I got my first real taste of behavioral research when I switched programs and emphasized I/O psychology as one of my fields. However, most of all, I got my exposure when Fiedler took me under his wing. He and Joe Litterer helped me in making preliminary contacts with organizations all over Illinois to find sites for my test of Contingency Theory. He also offered me employment in his lab to supplement my teaching in the business school.

None of this did he have to do, I came over from BA and it probably took him about a millisecond to figure out that I did not have the background that psychology students had. It would have been easy for him to reject me. However, rather than rejection, he encouraged me and changed **my** life perhaps more than he knew, or even knows to this day. Without my stint with him, I would not have developed

the research emphasis and modest research skills that have been with me since that time. The Illinois business school, and I am sure most others at that time, simply did not provide comparable training. This is hard to believe today with the numerous strong organization programs at doctoral granting institutions. But it was clearly the case then (i.e., the early to middle 1960s).

Some of my observations from that period concerning Fiedler follow. First, he was a master writer, extremely creative and able to make complex ideas relatively simple. He shared this ability with Joe Litterer, by the way.

Second, he did most of his analysis using a circular slide rule and non-parametric statistics. He worked with well trained psychology doctoral students who sometimes used sophisticated methods on his data, but when the smoke cleared, he was most at home with concepts he could explain using simple analysis.

Third, he was both gruff and supportive at the same time. I tend to remember the supportiveness more; however, I also remember that it was not always sweetness and light. Of course, it shouldn't have been. Am I a better person for it? I hope so, but regardless, his style helped shape me.

Fourth, I remember the insights he provided on my dissertation and on a project or two I did in his lab. Ultimately, I was able to get some extensions of this work published in *ASQ* and other journals.

Fifth, I learned the importance of successful grant writing and the perseverance and skill it took. He clearly was a master at this, and there was very little of it in the business school.

Sixth, and for me extremely important, even though it seems obvious when pointed out, is what he called "the after dinner test." This appears to be a variation of what is now called the "value added" notion. Regardless, he looked over my proposed journal article write-up based on my dissertation (which he and Litterer allowed me to sole author, by the way). After spending some time almost literally plowing through this paper, he told me about the "after dinner test." Most journal reading will take place after dinner. If the reader is not grabbed after the title and first paragraph or so, the author is likely to be in trouble. Readers stop reading, and may even doze, and reviewers start looking for reasons to reject, rather than accept with revisions. That has always stuck with me, even though I may not always have demonstrated my grasp of the concept.

Seventh, I continue to be impressed by the longevity of his research. He personifies one with a programmatic research emphasis. Through the year 2000, he will have been publishing for seven decades! That is truly astounding.

Finally, as reflected in all of the previous points, I continue to be impressed by his mentoring of students. As is obvious from the interview, his students have gone on to have outstanding careers in their own right. Indeed, I have argued elsewhere that this contribution may well be even more important than his research work. Certainly it led to his receipt of the Academy of Management Outstanding Educator award a few years ago.

I can sum up by saying that for me Fiedler personifies the notions of a "gentleman and a scholar." I am proud to have been associated with him and his crew, if only for a little while.

Daniel Ilgen
Michigan State University

Fred Fiedler has certainly had a strong influence on the field and many persons in it, me included. I have always considered it a privilege to have had the opportunity to have worked in his lab. I learned a lot from observing him and gained much from the opportunities he provided for me.

He was a master at maintaining a highly visible research program that was able to attract a great deal of Funding. With that support, he vigorously pursued his research and writing related to the central theme-leadership. Yet, while doing this, he strongly encouraged other people to generate their own ideas, not simply do another study in a research program that he laid out for them. He attracted a large number of graduate students, post docs, and other faculty who worked under the broad umbrella of his laboratory. He created an exciting intellectual climate where graduate students and faculty interacted and were encouraged to pursue their ideas. His own enthusiasm for pursuing his own ideas and untangling the nature of leadership was catching, not just for leadership but for the general nature of the intellectual exercise of scholarship. He was intense about his research and expected you to be about yours. His intensity was, to a new graduate student, intimidating. But once you got beyond the initial impressions, you saw the real Fred; his loyalty and support of those working with him was a lifelong commitment from which many of us have benefited greatly, both directly in terms of opportunities he made for us and indirectly through the role model he provided. Often, when I catch myself trying to squeeze a graduate student's research ideas on a project a little too tightly into the mold that I had in mind. I think of Fred and back off. In that and in many other ways he has had a lasting impact on me.

Terry Mitchell
University of Washington

Right from the time I arrived at Illinois, Fred had an impact on me and my career. He got me involved with research, working with other faculty and students. We had regular weekly meetings and Fred was always teaching and asking questions. He was also happy to have us learn from others so while I was there I worked with Triandis, Foa, McGrath, and lots of students.

After I graduated, Fred was always helping me in my career. He has recommended me for awards, offered research situations, looked at papers and just, in general, always been in the background. I often find myself thinking that if it weren't for Fred, I simply wouldn't be where I am today. I am very thankful for Fred's advice and help and mentoring.