2013

# Leadership and Followership

Robert H. Jerry II
*University of Florida Levin College of Law*, jerryr@law.ufl.edu

# LEADERSHIP AND FOLLOWERSHIP

*Robert H. Jerry, II**

"[B]etter followers beget better leaders."[1]

THROUGH the years, I have been fond of a set of expressions I
sometimes use to underscore the importance of an idea or a cause I
believe important and worthy of personal or institutional investment, or both.
The expressions fit together like this: our society has a particular problem that
needs attention; our colleges and universities, being institutions broadly
representative of our society, also have this problem (as we should expect); we
need to work on this problem in our colleges and universities; if we cannot solve
this problem in our institutions of higher learning, then I have little hope that our
society will be able to solve it; our law school needs to set an example for the rest
of the university as to how we can work together to solve the problem.

When I articulate this message in a speech, conversation, essay, or dean's
column, my goal is invariably to persuade the listeners or readers to action—not
just to join me in supporting a cause, but to join together to make change happen
in our own community, with the hope that when we improve ourselves, our
example will spread outside our immediate community and influence even
broader change. On most occasions when I present this message, I direct my
comments toward the importance of valuing diversity, respecting others and
rejecting intolerance, and preserving and promoting human rights and dignity. In
that context, the implications of the appeal are obvious: promoting these values
in our community makes us better, which is important in its own right; however,
it is even more important that our society make progress on these values, too. If
our institutions of higher learning are unable to progress, then it is hard to
imagine how our larger society will find a way to improve. This message is
appropriate in many other contexts as well, simply because many issues to be
addressed within a law school community are also present in the broader
university and the larger society outside it.

Most discussions of leadership focus on the desired characteristics and
behaviors of the individual who sits at the top of an organization and leads its
articulation of a mission, the goals to be achieved to fulfill the mission, a plan for

1. BARBARA KELLERMAN, FOLLOWERSHIP: HOW FOLLOWERS ARE CREATING CHANGE AND
CHANGING LEADERS, at xxii (2008).

pursuing the goals, and strategies for implementing the plan.[2]  Obviously, the traits and behaviors of the individual who provides institutional leadership are extremely important for reasons that need little elaboration here.  After all, institutional leadership is important to the success of any organization in fulfilling its mission and achieving its goals; through the expression of individual leadership an organization finds its direction and moves forward.

This notion is the core of James MacGregor Burns' classic definition of leadership as "leaders inducing followers to act for certain goals that represent the values and the motivations—the wants and needs, the aspirations and expectations—of both leaders and followers."[3]  Successful leadership inspires the members of the organization to embrace shared values and to move together toward shared objectives.[4]  Rowing a boat is sometimes offered as the metaphor: if several individuals try to row a boat while out of sync and with each attempting to steer in a different direction, much energy will be expended with little progress made.  A successful leader (in the metaphor, the coxswain), however, inspires the rowers to stroke in sync in support of a common direction, which will cause the boat to go farther and faster toward the desired destination.

---

2. The literature on leadership, both academic and "self-improvement," is now voluminous. A few of the classics in the field include JAMES MACGREGOR BURNS, LEADERSHIP (1978); JOHN WILLIAM GARDNER, ON LEADERSHIP (1990); PETER F. DRUCKER, THE EFFECTIVE EXECUTIVE: THE DEFINITIVE GUIDE TO GETTING THE RIGHT THINGS DONE (2006); JAMES M. KOUZES & BARRY Z. POSNER, THE LEADERSHIP CHALLENGE: HOW TO MAKE EXTRAORDINARY THINGS HAPPEN IN ORGANIZATIONS (5th ed. 2012); JOHN C. MAXWELL, THE 21 IRREFUTABLE LAWS OF LEADERSHIP (1998); JOSEPH C. ROST, LEADERSHIP FOR THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY (1991). My interest in this literature has led me, in my occasional comments on leadership, to focus on the role of the individual in influencing organizational and societal process.  See, e.g., Robert H. Jerry, II, Reflections on Leadership, 38 U. TOL. L. REV. 539 (2007); Robert H. Jerry, II, Defining and Achieving Excellence, in LAW SCHOOL LEADERSHIP STRATEGIES 145 (Kristen Skarupa ed., 2006).

3. BURNS, supra note 2, at 19.  Many definitions of leadership exist, but most describe the traits, styles, and behaviors of one person who gets others (usually understood as followers) to act in a particular manner encouraged by the leader.  See, e.g., MARTIN M. CHEMERS, AN INTEGRATIVE THEORY OF LEADERSHIP 1 (1997) ("[L]eadership is a process of social influence in which one person is able to enlist the aid and support of others in the accomplishment of a common task."); R.M. Stodgill, Leadership, Membership and Organization, 47 PSYCHOL. BULL. 1, 3 (1950) (leadership is "the process (act) of influencing the activities of an organized group in its efforts toward goal setting and goal achievement"); Bruce Winston & Kathleen Patterson, An Integrative Definition of Leadership, 1 INT'L J. LEADERSHIP STUD. 6, 7 (2006) ("A leader is one or more people who selects, equips, trains, and influences one or more follower(s) who have diverse gifts, abilities, and skills and focuses the follower(s) to the organization's mission and objectives causing the follower(s) to willingly and enthusiastically expend spiritual, emotional, and physical energy in a concerted coordinated effort to achieve the organizational mission and objectives.").

4. What is referred to as "functional leadership theory" focuses on the traits and behaviors that a leader needs to produce organizational, institutional, or unit effectiveness.  See, e.g., Steve W.J. Kozlowski et al., Developing Adaptive Teams: A Theory of Dynamic Team Leadership, in TEAM EFFECTIVENESS IN COMPLEX ORGANIZATIONS: CROSS-DISCIPLINARY PERSPECTIVES AND APPROACHES (Eduardo Salas et al. eds., 2006), available at http://iopsych.msu.edu/koz/Kozlowski%20et%20al%20%28in%20press%29-Leadership%20&%20Team%20Dev.pdf; Frederick Morgeson et al., Leadership in Teams: A Functional Approach to Understanding Leadership Structures and Processes, 20 J. MGMT. 1 (2009).

As Joseph Rost put it, leadership is "an influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes."[5]

Whether our interest is business, government, education, or almost any other entity that organizes humans in some way, it seems that we are perpetually in need of more individuals who can lead organizations effectively. But we also live in an era when we need institutions—*i.e.*, the organizations that have formed, and that we have formed, to regulate and improve our lives—*that are willing and able to be led.* I have long felt, and have been heard to say from time to time, that "the dean can cause problems all by himself, but the dean by himself cannot make progress happen." More recently, I have connected this comment to this idea: just as there are characteristics and behaviors that a leader must have if he or she is to be effective in creating the conditions for and facilitating progress, there are also characteristics and behaviors that constituents in organizations must have if the organization itself is to be susceptible to being led by an effective leader. Discussion about leadership characteristics and behaviors is common; discussion about "followership" characteristics and behaviors is much less so.[6]

---

5. ROST, *supra* note 2, at 119-20.

6. The title of this Essay in its initial draft was "Institutional Leadership and Leadership by Institutions." In the course of trying to explain what I meant by "leadership by institutions" as distinct from "individuals leading the institutions," I came to the realization that I was actually attempting to describe a concept of "followership" as distinct from leadership, and that leadership by institutions comes from a partnership of leadership and followership. Wondering who else might be using the term "followership," my research quickly revealed that a growing literature on "followership" already exists. Professor Kellerman, who has already written two excellent books on followership, states that an article by Robert Kelley in 1988 in the *Harvard Business Review* was the path-breaking work recognizing the important role of followership in the success of an organization. Robert E. Kelley, *In Praise of Followers*, HARV. BUS. REV., Nov./Dec. 1988, at 142 (discussed in BARBARA KELLERMAN, FOLLOWERSHIP: HOW FOLLOWERS ARE CREATING CHANGE AND CHANGING LEADERS 235 (2008)). In addition to the Kellerman work just cited, leading texts on followership include: BARBARA KELLERMAN, THE END OF LEADERSHIP (2012) (discussing how the balance of power between leaders and followers has shifted, with leaders becoming weaker and followers stronger); RONALD E. RIGGIO, THE ART OF FOLLOWERSHIP (Ira Chaleff & Jean Lipman-Blumen eds., 2008). Before these books appeared in the 2000s, Kellerman indicates that there were two books in the 1990s that, in the course of discussing the empowerment of subordinates, introduced a conversation about the importance of followership: IRA CHALEFF, THE COURAGEOUS FOLLOWER: STANDING UP TO AND FOR OUR LEADERS (1995), and ROBERT E. KELLEY, THE POWER OF FOLLOWERSHIP: HOW TO CREATE LEADERS PEOPLE WANT TO FOLLOW AND FOLLOWERS WHO LEAD THEMSELVES (1992). Followership is now a subject of more frequent discussion in academic literature in the field of management. Examples include: David Collinson, *Rethinking Followership: A Post-Structuralist Analysis of Follower Identities*, 17 LEADERSHIP Q. 179 (2006); S. Alexander Haslam & Michael J. Platow, *The Link Between Leadership and Followership: How Affirming Social Identity Translates Vision into Action*, 27 PERSONALITY & SOC. PSYCHOL. BULL. 1469 (2002); Jane M. Howell & Boas Shamir, *The Role of Followers in the Charismatic Leadership Process: Relationships and Their Consequences*, 30 ACAD. MGMT. REV. 96 (2005). In the genre of self-improvement literature is one book with a particularly striking title: TRACEY ARMSTRONG, FOLLOWERSHIP: THE LEADERSHIP PRINCIPLE THAT NO ONE IS TALKING ABOUT (2010). The term "followership" appears in some other works as well. *See, e.g.*, Gordon Curphy & Mark Roellig, *Followership*, CURPHY CONSULTING, http://www.leadershipkeynote.net/articles/article-followership.pdf; Phillip S. Meilinger, *The Ten Rules of Good Followership*, *in* CONCEPTS FOR AIR FORCE LEADERSHIP (Richard I. Lester & A. Glenn Morton eds., 2001),

*UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO LAW REVIEW*                    [Vol. 44

If an institution is understood as the composite whole of constituent parts, then the institution must acquire and embrace characteristics and behaviors that make it possible for the leader and the followers *together* to move the institution forward. An organization is highly unlikely to move forward without effective leadership that inspires the followers to be led. For the leader to inspire and lead, however, *the followers must be willing and able to be inspired and be led.* In fact, followership may be viewed as a form of leadership; followers must adopt some characteristics of leadership when embracing the role of follower, and, furthermore, the institution, viewed as the totality of all of its constituent parts, must itself be able and willing to become a leader.

The early twenty-first century in the United States is a particularly difficult time for leaders of institutions, and the impediments to institutions emerging as leaders are especially severe. Commentaries on polarization in national, state, and local political discourse are frequent,[7] and the diffusion of power among a variety of interest groups that have organized in support of conflicting political values has led some to claim that America has transitioned from "democracy" to "vetocracy," meaning, as Thomas Friedman has put it, moving from "a system designed to prevent anyone in government from amassing too much power to a system in which no one can aggregate enough power to make any important decisions at all."[8]

Francis Fukuyama points to the failure of the congressional supercommittee to reach a budget deal in 2011 as reflecting this polarization, but he ultimately places the blame in the nature of the U.S. political system where authority is fragmented among institutions in a manner that makes interest group politics powerful and decisive government impossible. For Fukuyama, the need is for "not only strong leadership, but changes in institutional rules," yet he sees "no chance" for the acceptance of change proposals in "the current climate of

---

http://www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/au-24/meilinger.pdf. In addition, there are a handful of legal academics and some lawyers who have thought about followership and have commented on it in published works. *E.g.*, Jean M. Holcomb, *New Perspectives on Following the Leader*, 100 LAW LIBR. J. 779 (2008); Michael Diamond & Aaron O'Toole, *Leaders, Followers, and Free Riders: The Community Lawyer's Dilemma When Representing Non-Democratic Client Organizations*, 31 FORDHAM URB. L.J. 481, 502-04, 531 (2004); Neil W. Hamilton, *Ethical Leadership in Professional Life*, 6 U. ST. THOMAS L.J. 358, 392 (2009); William B. Lytton, *The Organization Lawyer*, 33 VT. L. REV. 729, 734-35 (2009); Kingsley R. Browne, *Women at War: An Evolutionary Perspective*, 49 BUFF. L. REV. 51, 133-41 (2001). Despite this body of work, the relative attention given to what is necessary to create effective leadership is overwhelming when compared to the attention given to the same question in followership.

    7. *See, e.g.*, Matthew A. Baum & Tim Groeling, *New Media and the Polarization of American Political Discourse*, 25 POL. COMM. 345 (2008); Delia Baldassarri & Andrew Gelman, *Partisans Without Constraint: Political Polarization and Trends in American Public Opinion*, 114 AM. J. SOC. 408 (2008); Morris P. Fiorina & Samuel J. Abrams, *Political Polarization in the American Public*, 11 ANN. REV. POL. SCI. 563 (2008); Fareed Zakaria, *Why Political Polarization Has Gone Wild in America (and What to do About It)*, CNN WORLD (July 24, 2011, 2:15 PM), http://globalpublicsquare.blogs.cnn.com/2011/07/24/why-political-polarization-has-gone-wild.

    8. *See* Thomas L. Friedman, *Down With Everything*, N.Y. TIMES, Apr. 22, 2012, at SR11, *available      at*      http://www.nytimes.com/2012/04/22/opinion/sunday/friedman-down-with-everything.html.

polarization."[9]  In this conundrum, individuals are needed to lead institutions, but the collection of individuals who decide the future of institutions need to join together to enable our institutions to pursue shared values.  In other words, there are needs for leadership and followership, both of which are indispensable conditions to effective institutional performance.

No one reading this Essay needs to be reminded that the prevailing political climate of polarization, fragmentation, and gridlock contributes to and creates major challenges for higher education.  These challenges exist in almost every level and sector of higher education, including legal education, in almost every state.  My purpose here is not to explore these complex problems and their possible solutions, although they are certainly urgent and desperately in need of robust analysis.   Nor is my purpose to add to the growing weight of commentaries on the challenges facing legal education specifically, which are connected to rapid changes occurring in the legal profession, which in turn are related to problems and changes in the economy in which all of us, as institutions and individuals, must participate.  My narrow point is that confronting these complex problems requires not only effective institutional leaders—college presidents, provosts, vice-presidents, and deans—but also effective institutional followers—faculty and staff in particular, plus students and alumni for some purposes—who are able and willing to work with the leader to achieve shared values.  Effective leaders and effective followers working together create an institution that itself becomes effective as a leader.  Just as we need to discuss and understand the elements of effective leadership and have individuals who possess those characteristics and behaviors, we need to discuss and understand the elements of effective followership and have constituents in organizations who embrace those characteristics and behaviors.

Developing and establishing effective leadership linked to an institution that is able and willing to be led is very difficult.  In the law school setting, the interests of faculty, students, alumni, employers, law school administrators, university administrators, college and university governing boards, state system governing boards and legislatures (in the public arena), and accrediting agencies are certainly not uniformly aligned, and in many respects they are in tension with one another. *Within* many of these cohorts, various subgroups with contradictory interests exist.  It is extremely difficult for the chief executive officer of a higher education institution, or of a department within it, to direct the organization on a path significantly different from the *status quo* without incurring significant pushback from one or more important constituencies.  The dean (or, substitute for "dean" virtually any chief executive title in higher education) interacts with crosscurrents that are pressurized in ways analogous to what Friedman and Fukuyama have described in our national politics, and these compromise the ability of our institutions of higher education, including our law schools, to change or innovate, in response to a rapidly changing environment.  Indeed, the reality is that deans—and the same point can be made about chancellors,

---

9. Francis Fukuyama, *Oh For a Democratic Dictatorship and Not a Vetocracy*, FIN. TIMES (Nov. 22, 2011, 5:27 PM), http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/d82776c6-14fd-11e1-a2a6-00144feabdc0. html#axzz1zg7rjoNs.

presidents, and other senior administrative leaders—who engineer dramatic change in response to a changing environment, generally must spend large sums of political capital to do so and, in the current higher education calculus, the rate of capital expenditure is generally inversely related to longevity in the position.[10] This precariousness is ultimately why Peter Drucker wrote that "public service institutions find it far more difficult to innovate than even the most 'bureaucratic' company.... Most innovations in public-service institutions are imposed on them either by outsiders or by catastrophe."[11]

When pressures in an institution's environment increase, and there are no reasonable prospects that the institution's *status quo* is sustainable absent a significant change of direction, the institution has no choice but to change. Such change begs a simple question: will the leader and the followers working together produce internal change, or will external bodies design and impose change, or will the organization chaotically yield or even succumb in a nonresponse to the pressures? All things being equal, it is usually better to have some control over one's future than not; thus, enhancing our understanding of the dynamic interplay of leadership and followership, along with the elements of what makes them both effective, better prepares us to plan our future in times of stress.

Although there are many ways to frame a conversation about followership, I believe a useful starting place for a discussion of the elements of followership is the concept of "team." This is not a foreign concept to leadership studies, as the connection between the characteristics and behaviors of an effective leader and the performance of a team is obvious and significant.[12] But what the members of the team must do to work effectively together is also a useful way to phrase the question of what constitutes effective followership in an organization.

Being an admirer of Duke University (but not a fan of Duke basketball),[13] it is unlikely I would have looked for Duke basketball coach Mike Krzyzewski's

---

10. *See* BRIAN TAMANAHA, FAILING LAW SCHOOLS 7 (2012) (referring to his own interim deanship that lasted only 18 months and the difficult choices made during that time, which he described as "a miserable time for all," and stating "No dean who wants to remain the dean would have done these things.").

11. PETER F. DRUCKER WITH JOSEPH A. MACIARIELLO, DAILY DRUCKER: 366 DAYS OF INSIGHT AND MOTIVATION FOR GETTING THE RIGHT THINGS DONE 221 (2004).

12. *See, e.g.*, Shelley Dionne et al., *Transformational Leadership and Team Performance*, 17 J. ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE MGMT. 177 (2004); JON R. KATZENBACH & DOUGLAS K. SMITH, THE WISDOM OF TEAMS: CREATING THE HIGH-PERFORMANCE ORGANIZATION (HarperBusiness Essentials 2003) (1993); Seokhwa Yun et al., *Leadership and Teamwork: The Effects of Leadership and Job Satisfaction on Team Citizenship*, 2 INT'L J. LEADERSHIP STUD. 171 (2007).

13. On February 20, 1988, I observed a Duke-Kansas basketball game in Allen Field House at the University of Kansas, where I served as a member of the law faculty from 1981 to 1994, and as dean from 1989 to 1994. It was not the only KU loss I saw in Allen Field House (Duke won this meeting 74-70 in overtime), but my wife and I sat one row in front of the Duke visitor section in an upper corner of Allen, and I remember those particular Duke fans as being among the most spirited (and obnoxious) I have encountered at a sporting event. Although this single experience will probably make it impossible for me to ever become a Duke basketball fan (notwithstanding the result of the Duke-KU rematch that season on April 2, 1988), I have a great deal of respect for Coach Mike Krzyzewski and his accomplishments, and I hope to one day attend a game in Cameron Fieldhouse as part of my ongoing quest to attend one game in all the great sport stadiums and arenas in the United States.

book *Leading With the Heart*[14] were it not for the remarks of Gwynne Young at her installation as president of the Florida Bar Association on June 22, 2012.[15] Predominantly a book about how to coach basketball effectively, its entertaining chapters contain, as one would expect, a collection of Coach Krzyzewski's insights on leadership. Of particular interest are his comments on the elements of an "unbeatable team," which essentially articulate the core characteristics and behaviors that followers must possess and express in order to build a successful organization: "There are … five fundamental qualities that make every team great: communication, trust, collective responsibility, caring, and pride. I like to think of each as a separate finger on the fist. Any one individually is important. But all of them together are unbeatable."[16]  As I listened to Gwynne Young discuss these qualities, when explaining her agenda for the Florida Bar Association during her term as president, the relevance of these ideas to the operations of a college or college department was instantly recognizable.

*Communication* is almost always noted on lists of important leadership behaviors, but members of the organization effectively communicating with each other is no less important.  Communication throughout the organization is essential if individuals in the organization are to optimize their ability to perform their jobs and help others in the organization react to opportunities and avoid threats.    Also,   compliments   and   encouragement   transmitted   through communication instill confidence, which is important to success, just as shared norms that define the boundaries of acceptable conduct transmitted through communication can deter destructive behavior.

Coach Krzyzewski writes that "[i]n leadership, there are no words more important than *trust*,"[17] but he follows this statement with the point that, in an organization, "trust must be developed among every member of the team if success is going to be achieved."[18]  If members of an organization are going to pull together in the same direction, then the need for reciprocal and mutual trust is obvious.  Without trust, individuals in the organization cannot rely on each other, cooperate toward shared goals, take thoughtful risks, or experience effective communication.[19]

The implications of *collective responsibility* with a sports team are relatively straightforward, given the singular objective of winning the athletic

14. MIKE KRZYZEWSKI WITH DONALD T. PHILLIPS, LEADING WITH THE HEART: COACH K'S SUCCESSFUL STRATEGIES FOR BASKETBALL, BUSINESS, AND LIFE (2000).

15. *See* Jan Pudlow, *Gwynne Alice Young: President of the Florida Bar,* 86 FLA. BAR J. 7, 8 (July/Aug.   2012),   *available   at*   http://www.floridabar.org/DIVCOM/JN/JNJournal01.nsf/ 8c9f13012b96736985256aa900624829/274e6a0a3ab2922d85257a2800638e29!OpenDocument. President Young is a graduate of the University of Florida College of Law, but because she did her undergraduate work at Duke University and has a continuing, though not exclusive, affinity for Duke University, she took special interest in Coach Krzyzewski's book.

16. KRZYZEWSKI, *supra* note 14, at 71 (emphasis omitted).

17. *Id.* at 74 (emphasis added).

18. *Id.*

19. Clayton Becton et al., *Building Teamwork and the Importance of Trust in a Business Environment,* U. FLA. INST. FOOD & AGRIC. SCI. (rev. Oct. 2008), http://edis.ifas.ufl.edu/pdffiles/ HR/HR01800.pdf.

contest. When the organization in question is itself more complex, its goals more subjectively measured and perhaps less easily articulated, and its methods of achievement more open-ended, collective responsibility becomes a more nuanced element of followership. At a basic level, collective responsibility means that each member of the organization has a responsibility to contribute to the success of the whole, which translates to shared responsibility to contribute one's efforts toward the welfare of the collective body. But collective responsibility has a deeper layer that exceeds a shared obligation to contribute; it also embraces the principle that the organization's results—*i.e.*, its successes and failures—are to be owned by all. Yet collective responsibility has tighter boundaries than an element like trust, which would not be something that would be pursued halfway. For example, it does not follow that each member of an organization should bear responsibility for immoral or criminal acts of individual members; thus, collective responsibility has limits in a way that a value like trust does not. When a group is organized around a mission or vision, the working assumption is that members of the group will pursue the mission or vision together and the emerging group solidarity will create an understanding that the organization's leader and members will together "own the results."

*Caring* also has multiple aspects. At one level, it involves members of the organization having compassion and empathy for each other, which translates into mutual encouragement for collaborative efforts toward shared goals. At another level, it involves caring for the organization—specifically, caring for the organization's performance, its progress toward goals, and the excellence of its achievements. Caring for the organization also encourages articulation of shared goals and motivates individual achievements in pursuit of those goals. A culture of caring adopts some measure of reciprocal loyalty, in the sense of duty and devoted attachment to others and to the organization. Loyalty is not, and should not be, absolute; but in the successful organization it is strong enough to create a shared sense of obligation among the members to support each other and the organization's purpose and goals.

Coach Krzyzewski describes *pride* as the desire to do one's best because one's personal signature is on the result.[20] By extension, an organization can succeed when its members each take pride in the results of the organization's efforts: "When *everyone* on our team believes that our own personal signature is on *everything* our team does—then we have a chance to [be great]."[21] Having pride involves incorporating the group's identity into one's own personal identity; when this happens, the pride one takes in being well regarded for one's own work becomes pride in the organization, and vice versa. As Jon Katzenbach argues, feelings of accomplishment, approval, and camaraderie can produce higher performance than can be induced by money or intimidation, both of which usually have only a short-term impact on an organization's performance.[22]

---

20. KRZYZEWSKI, *supra* note 14, at 81.

21. *Id.*

22. *See generally* JON R. KATZENBACH, WHY PRIDE MATTERS MORE THAN MONEY: THE POWER OF THE WORLD'S GREATEST MOTIVATIONAL FORCE (2003). He points to particular companies and

    Embedded in these ideas about what makes an effective team is the recognition that the efforts of followers, together with the efforts of the leader, ultimately determine the success or failure of the organization.[23]  Although each of these "fingers" on the "Krzyzewski fist" may seem linked to an obvious point regarding effective organizations, operationalizing these ideas is much harder than simply stating them.  Just as Brian Tamanaha's point that "[f]or a law school to function at a high level requires that individual professors be self-motivated, responsible, conscientious, and oriented to the common good even when that requires a sacrifice of their own self-interest"[24] seems obvious, the fractionalized interests of competing constituencies in the law school and higher education environment make defining the "common good" and identifying and implementing shared strategies to achieve whatever is the "common good" extremely difficult.  With all respect due Coach Krzyzewski and his colleagues in the coaching academy, the process through which a dean builds a cohesive, well-functioning faculty and staff for the short and long terms is much more complex than the process of building and preparing an athletic team for success.  The larger size of the faculty "team," a college's more complex mission relative to the singular mission of an athletic team, the relative homogeneity of players on an athletic team, the levers possessed by a coach (such as sitting a player down or even kicking him off the team) compared to those possessed by a dean, and the shared governance, tenure-influenced framework in which deans (and faculties) must operate all add up to make leadership in a university college a more complex undertaking than coaching an athletic team.[25]  The basic equation, however, is the same in both situations: the effectiveness of the partnership of leader and followers determines the organization's success.

    Viewed in this light, the challenge for the leader is identifying what specific steps he or she can take to inspire the members of the organization to be effective followers.  The obvious starting place is to model the behaviors that will make the followers effective, and then the leader must proceed to behaviors that will create the conditions for followers to use their own talents and skills to move the organization forward and to be inspired to do so.  Improved understanding of the characteristics of effective followership, as well as the dynamic interplay between leadership and followership, will help all leaders better serve their institutions.

    By the time this Essay is published, I will have talked to my faculty colleagues in a retreat setting about some of this Essay's ideas on followership.  I do not plan to use the word "followership," as I am wary about connotations the

---

organizations like Southwest Airlines, Microsoft, and the U.S. Marines as organizations where employee or member pride has improved the effectiveness of the organization.

    23. *See* KATZENBACH & SMITH, *supra* note 12, at xviii ("The team leader is seldom the primary determinant of team performance.").

    24. *See* TAMANAHA, *supra* note 10, at 8.

    25. I am confident that my friends in the coaching academy will want to debate this point. I do not mean to suggest that coaching an athletic team is simple; indeed, I occasionally remark, only partly in jest, that my experience while in private practice coaching the law firm softball team helped prepare me for deaning.  There are, however, huge differences between coaching and academic leadership, and most of these make the academic leadership position more complex.

audience might attach to this word when encountering it for the first time, but I do anticipate discussing communication, trust, collective responsibility, caring, and pride.  I will also talk about the challenges facing higher education, legal education, and our college at this time in our history, and perhaps in a future essay I will be able to offer reflections on the effectiveness and impact, if any, of my own efforts to introduce a discussion of leadership's dynamic and important partnership into the conversation.