© *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 2015, Vol. 14, No. 4, 625–647. http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/amle.2014.0201

Can Business Schools Humanize Leadership?

GIANPIERO PETRIGLIERI
JENNIFER LOUISE PETRIGLIERI
INSEAD

This article examines how and why business schools might be complicit in a growing disconnect between leaders, people who are supposed to follow them, and the institutions they are meant to serve. We contend that business schools sustain this disconnect through a **dehumanization of leadership** ***that is manifested in the reduction of leadership to a set of skills and its elevation to a personal virtue. The dehumanization of leadership, we suggest, serves as a valuable defense against, but a poor preparation for, the ambiguity and precariousness of leadership in contemporary workplaces. We propose ways to humanize leadership by putting questions about the meaning of leadership—its nature, function, and development—at the center of scholarly and pedagogical efforts. Reflecting on our attempts to do so, we argue that it involves revisiting not just theories and teaching methods, but also our identities as scholars and instructors.***

> *"In any world, I think you need to balance two kinds of sanity: A sanity of reality by which you connect your actions to their consequences; and a sanity of identity by which you connect your actions to a sense of proper behavior. Reality gives only limited justification to an intelligent leader. But a socially embedded sense of self, an identity, can keep a leader resolute."*
>
> —James March (In Podolny, 2011: 505)

Not long ago we joined students and colleagues for a cherished ritual at business schools such as ours. A *Fortune*-500 CEO had come to speak about leadership. The venue was full and the speaker compelling. His flair animated a somewhat standard script for corporate leaders' personal epics: persistence in the face of setbacks, openness to opportunity, regret for not having spent more time with an ailing spouse, the wish that future leaders would not need to sacrifice as much of their personal lives as he had. His advice was sensible: Deliver, keep learning, show integrity, care. Clichéd as it may sound, he concluded, "leadership really is all about the people."

Students clapped, professors nodded, and a few skeptics rolled their eyes. One could almost be excused for ignoring that the kind of leadership he stood for has lost most people's trust—as have the institutions that host its celebration. A decade of corporate scandals, financial meltdowns, and growing inequality has consolidated a discontent with business and political leaders that is as evident in systematic surveys (Edelman, 2014; World Economic Forum, 2014); as it is in the protests on streets and squares around the globe (Haque, 2011). Such leaders' leadership, popular sentiment goes, is hardly about and seldom for "the people." Most people are, at best, resources for and, at worst, casualties of their maneuvers—which benefit restricted, impermeable, and self-serving elites of fellow leaders by title only. No longer serving as role models and stewards of the common good (Mizruchi, 2013), these so-called leaders are often viewed as rapacious, disconnected plutocrats who profit disproportionately from globalization, rent seeking, and lenient if not subservient regulatory systems (Freeland, 2013).

By ignoring the rift between people in leadership positions and their potential followers, however, one

Both authors contributed equally to this article and are listed alphabetically. We are grateful to Robin Fryer for her dedication to helping us improve the article, as well as to Associate Editor Carolyn Egri and three anonymous reviewers for their encouraging and insightful feedback throughout the review process.

can easily become complicit in sustaining it. This is the essence of critiques of business schools, the standing of which mirrors that of their alumni in high offices. As those executives' values, motives, methods, and allegiances have been brought into question, so have those of their *almae matrae*. Business school critiques are a burgeoning literature. Some reject the focus on leadership (Mintzberg, 2004) and lament educators' excessive reliance on abstract, analytic models that neither prepare students for the work of managing (Datar, Garvin, & Cullen 2010; Rubin & Dierdorff, 2009), nor make a difference to their careers (Pfeffer & Fong, 2002). Others express concerns that business schools may develop leaders whose values and actions reflect amoral ideologies (Ghoshal, 2005), lack of concern for society (Khurana, 2007), gender bias (Ely, Ibarra, & Kolb, 2011), and positive attitudes toward greed (Giacalone, 2004; Wang, Malhotra, & Murnighan, 2011) that are implicit in management research and pedagogy.

Either by doing too few of the right things or too many of the wrong ones, critics argue that business schools do a disservice to students, organizations, and society by churning out graduates who are ill-prepared to lead (Bennis & O'Toole, 2005). And they have argued it for a while. At the turn of the century, Gioia (2002) warned that unless they shook off their complacency and challenged the dominance of economics in faculties and curricula, business academics should not be surprised if cynics believed that they trained executives "bereft of socially responsible values" (p. 143). In the aftermath of the financial crisis, Podolny (2009) noted that those warnings had not been heeded: "So deep and widespread are the problems afflicting management education," he wrote, "that people have come to believe that business schools are harmful to society, fostering self-interested, unethical, and even illegal behavior" (p. 63). Four years later, concluding an evidence-based book on the state and prospects of business schools aptly titled *Disrupt or Be Disrupted,* Dierdorff and Holtom (2013) warned that unless business schools overcame their inertia, they were doomed to irrelevance.

"Either by doing too few of the right things or too many of the wrong ones, critics argue that business schools do a disservice to students, organizations, and society by churning out graduates who are ill-prepared to lead."

In this article, we employ a systems psychodynamic perspective to examine why in the face of such analyses, authoritative critiques, and evident urgency little appears to have changed. This perspective endeavors to reveal the covert motives underpinning the persistence of dysfunctional structures, conventions, and practices in groups, organizations, and societies. It is particularly well-suited to circumstances in which available evidence and sensible advice are overtly applauded and covertly resisted. This is the case in many business schools, whose curricula ignore even their own faculty's research on learning (Brown, Arbaugh, Hrivnak, & Kenworthy, 2013) and leadership (Klimoski & Amos, 2012). In such circumstances, a systems psychodynamic perspective posits that members' investment in practices that fulfill their emotional needs may distort the way a system performs its task and undermine its ability to adapt to changes in the environment (Fotaki, Long, & Schwartz, 2012; Gould, Stapley, & Stein, 2004).

We build on the systems psychodynamic notion of business schools as *identity workspaces,* that is, as holding environments for identity work (Petriglieri & Petriglieri, 2010). Resting on a view of learning as becoming (Lave & Wenger, 1991), this conceptualization highlights that business schools are venues where students (and faculty) craft, revise, or affirm who they are, where they belong, and who they might become. During their time there, students do not just acquire knowledge and skills through study and practice. They also address existential and cultural questions, such as "Who am I?" "What do I care about?" "What does success look like?" and "What does it take to lead well?" (Khurana & Snook, 2011; Petriglieri, 2011). Answers to these questions are refined in interactions informed by institutional discourses and norms, and they ultimately shape graduates' identities and orient their actions (Scott, 2010).

In this article, we are concerned specifically with the production and development of leader identities in business schools. That is, the recursive process through which theories and images of what leadership is and what leaders do serve as templates for the kind of leaders students aspire, work, or struggle to become. Looked at through a systems psychodynamic lens, we argue that the persistent shortcomings of business schools exposed by the aforementioned critiques are not the result of negligence, incompetence, or malevolence, rather they are manifestations of the commitment of business schools to a process that we term the *dehumanization* *of leadership*. This process involves a narrowing of our understanding of leadership to a goal-focused activity that can be broken down into a set of skills, on the one hand, or an expansion of it into a virtue, a kind of resolute equanimity unaffected by the pulls of incentives and the push of emotions, on the other. This reduction to a means to instrumental ends or expansion into a virtue dehumanizes leadership by disembodying and disembedding it, that is by severing its ties to identity, community, and context. Doing so ignores the nature of leadership as a form of personal expression and social stewardship (Selznick, 1957), and it denies the ambiguity (Alvesson & Spicer, 2010), emotional dilemmas (Bolden & Gosling, 2006), and relational dynamics (DeRue & Ashford, 2010b) that the experience of leading entails.

The dehumanization of leadership, we contend, serves a defensive purpose that suits the interests and assuages the concerns of several parties invested in it. These include faculty concerned with academic legitimacy and practical relevance, administrators concerned with economic viability, students concerned with acquiring portable skills, and prospective employers concerned with socializing employees. Dehumanizing it makes leadership easier to capture within the functionalist frame that is most valued by scholars (Glynn & Raffaelli, 2010), or within the inspiring and cautionary tales of the gurus who work alongside them (Clark & Salaman, 1998). It makes leadership models and leadership development methods easier to trademark and sell (Wood & Petriglieri, 2004), and it sustains the belief that leadership can be acquired or revealed once and for all and then deployed across contexts (Bolden & Gosling, 2006). Doing all of this reduces the uncertainty and anxiety that might accompany the acceptance of leadership as ambiguous, contextual and dynamic, something that can neither be clearly defined nor fully owned. This is particularly valuable, psychologically speaking, for those whose identities and careers are predicated on teaching, selling, and demonstrating leadership.

We do not claim that the dehumanization of leadership is intentional or ubiquitous. Treating leadership as a skill set or as a virtue that can be studied, refined, and revealed at business school may serve a defensive purpose, but it is not a deliberate, conscious strategy. We do, however, argue that it is prevalent, if not dominant, and hence those who defy it are likely to face resistance (Raelin, 2007) and experience the uncertainty and anxiety that it is meant to defend against. This is evident from accounts of instructors who set out to help students examine, rather than flee, the emotional and social facets of leading and following (Nicholson & Carroll, 2013; Sinclair, 2007). Their stories point to the consequences of dehumanizing leadership.

The first is that the theories, images, and practices that sustain this dehumanization become impervious to change. The identity affirmation and emotional protection that they afford make those to whom these benefits accrue likely to collude—that is, unconsciously cooperate—with keeping them in place. The second is that these benefits come at the cost of learning and leading. Dehumanizing leadership reduces its development from an existential and cultural enterprise to an intellectual and commercial one. It distances aspiring leaders from followers, casting the latter as simply targets of the former's influence; from institutions, which are reduced to being a backdrop for the leader's deeds; and from themselves, leaving them unprepared to acknowledge, learn from, and work with their experience in an ongoing way. In short, it reinforces, rather than counters, the disconnect between leaders and their inner and social worlds. Like the defensive splitting of leadership and management (Krantz & Gilmore, 1990), the dehumanization of leadership is not sustained by business schools alone. We focus on these institutions here because, as identity workspaces, the leadership images and practices they cultivate reflect and influence those of other institutions in which their graduates work and lead.

The rest of this article unfolds as follows: We first expand our analysis of how and why the production and development of leadership in business schools has become complicit with the growing disconnect between people in leadership positions from their own selves, people around them, and institutions. Our argument incorporates descriptive and normative statements. We build on existing scholarship and our own experience and contend that business schools must humanize leadership—that is, help to build, strengthen, or repair the connections just described—if they wish to reclaim and enhance their own social value. In keeping with a systems psychodynamic perspective, however, our intent is primarily interpretive. We make inferences about why the dehumanization persists, who benefits from it, and what its consequences are.

In the second part of this article, we turn to what humanizing leadership entails. Rather than offering universal answers to questions about the nature and function of leadership, we suggest that it may be more useful to raise questions that help aspiring leaders examine the meaning of leadership in their own lives and contexts and work with a broader range of emotional and social experiences while leading and following. We supplement our interpretive reflections with short illustrations from our own attempts to humanize leadership in MBA and executive education courses and conclude that only when we embrace our inability to fully understand—let alone theorize about—leadership are we, perhaps, able to begin humanizing it.

THE GREAT DISCONNECT

In last few decades the distance has grown between individuals in leadership positions and the majority of people within and around their organizations. Since the 1990s, scholars have chronicled the erosion of social contracts based on long-term commitments between people and organizations (Miller, 1999; Robinson, Kraatz, & Rousseau, 1994) and the loosening of social bonds in local communities (Putnam, 2000). Economic pressures brought about by globalization and technological innovations are often described as drivers of this shift (Gratton, 2011; Kanter, 2010). Recently, however, public and scholarly attention has shifted to the role of political and business elites as architects and beneficiaries of these changes.

A string of corporate scandals at the turn of this century cast doubt on the ethics of those elites, whom we are accustomed to calling leaders. As the economic and social distance between them and the rest of us grew in the years that followed the 2008 financial crisis, those doubts have hardened into widespread disaffection, resentment, and outright protest (Haque, 2011). At the time of this writing, corporate profits in the United States had long surpassed their pre-crisis highs, whereas average family income had yet to recover (Galston, 2014). CEO compensation was 204 times that of average employees, 20% more than it had been just 4 years previously (Smith & Kuntz, 2013). Inequality was at a 50-year peak in OECD countries (OECD, 2014), and a scholarly tome on its increase and consequences (Piketty, 2014) topped the Amazon best-sellers list (Lopez, 2014). Research showing that countries with higher inequality have lower cross-generational social mobility (Corak, 2013), popularized as the "Gatsby Curve" (Greeley, 2013), had become a staple of political debate (Obama, 2013) and led to assertions such as "the American dream is leaving America" (Kristof, 2014).

Distance between leaders and followers is not a new phenomenon. Grint (2009) argued that it is a defining feature of leadership—as is sacrifice. It is a leader's ability to protect followers from anxiety and a willingness to pay the price when things go wrong that sustains the perception that inequality is legitimate. In recent years, however, the perception that "the powerful sacrificed taxpayers to the interests of the guilty" (Wolf, 2014) and the most fortunate "provided nothing but anxiety and insecurity" (Stiglitz, 2012: xvii; see also Mukunda, 2014) to everyone else has turned distance into disconnect. As elites become more impermeable, it is harder to view their members as stewards of public interest and role models—in short, as leaders.

Mizruchi (2013), for example, showed that through the last 3 decades of the 20th century, American corporate leaders abdicated their traditional role as statesmen. Whereas they once spent their political clout in favor of moderate, pragmatic, and prosocial causes on the basis of an understanding that their privileges and the fate of their corporations depended on the well-being of society, they are now less likely to do so. Globalization, shareholder capitalism, the rise of financial services, and the fall of CEO tenure have meant that corporate profits and executive fortunes "aren't tied to the state of the nation the way they once were" (Surowiecki, 2014). Not only are business elites less likely to act on behalf of society at large, they also lead lives that are increasingly separate in style, locales, and prospects from the rest of the population. As Freeland (2013) documented, they are members of a "transglobal community of peers that have more in common with one another than with their countrymen back home" (p. 5). This disconnect is not just economic and social but psychological as well. In a series of field and laboratory studies, Piff and his colleagues (2012) showed that members of the upper class were more likely to break the law, lie, cheat, and endorse unethical behavior at work. Most tellingly, they demonstrated that these tendencies were mediated by positive attitudes toward greed. Such attitudes, they speculated, might be shaped by educational institutions and workplaces that celebrate self-interest and affirm independent self-images.

It is perhaps not surprising then that after collapsing in 2008, public trust in political and business leaders remains at historic lows. A World Economic Forum (2014) survey of nearly 2,000 experts from different fields and countries found 86% agreeing that one of the world's most pressing issues is a crisis of leadership. Moreover, Edelman's (2014) annual survey of public attitudes found that "CEOs and government leaders remain at the bottom of the list" of trusted figures (p. 6). The disconnect between leaders and others in organizations and the erosion of trust in leaders make leading and following harder in practice, a predicament that concerns anyone who claims to lead as much as those who profess to help develop leaders.

Business schools have been publicly implicated in this disconnect. Building on the premise that any institution that claims leadership development as its mission (Snook, 2007) needs to examine its responsibility for leaders' (mis-)demeanors (Adler, 2002; Podolny, 2009), prominent members of the Academy have questioned the role of business schools' purpose (Khurana, 2007; Pfeffer & Fong, 2002); values (Giacalone, 2004; Gioia, 2002); research (Ghoshal, 2005; Pearce & Huang, 2012); curricula (Rubin & Dierdorff, 2009); and teaching methods (Ferraro, Pfeffer, & Sutton, 2005; Gosling & Mintzberg, 2004) in fostering the behavior of leaders that contributed to, and benefited from, global economic collapse and betrayed public trust. These critiques can be grouped into two camps. One argues that business schools were negligent in that by privileging disciplinary research that has little relevance to management practice, business academics neglected their educational calling. The result is abstract curricula that leave students unprepared to deal with the dilemmas and challenges that leadership entails (Bolden & Gosling, 2006). The other camp argues that business schools were harmful in that by endorsing theories and pedagogies that measure success primarily in financial terms, business academics betrayed their social duty. The result is curricula that justify selfish elitism, promote narrow definitions of value, and give students the skills to capture it at the expense of others (Ghoshal, 2005; Giacalone, 2004; Wang et al., 2011). Extensive reviews have pointed out that leadership research (Glynn & Raffaelli, 2010) and leadership development (DeRue & Myers, 2014) put far more focus on the traits, skills, and contingencies that bolster people's career advancement and corporate financial performance. The function of leaders as shapers and custodians of the culture and values of institutions receives less attention (Besharov & Khurana, 2014). In summary, either by negligence or by design, "the emphasis in business schools on an economic narrative of management that privileges a relatively narrow view of how leaders should think and act" (Starkey & Hall, 2011: 82) is widely regarded as dysfunctional.

These critiques of business schools, casting them as detached and self-serving, mirror those of their alumni in leadership positions. Just as leaders have become disconnected from the people they are meant to lead, it appears that business schools, in general, and leadership models and pedagogies, in particular, have become disconnected from the experience of leading and from the context in which it occurs. And even though these shortcomings have been exposed for years and the arguments for change have been authoritative and compelling, actual change appears limited (Holtom & Dierdorff, 2013). Thus, it behooves us to examine why change remains elusive before suggesting what substantive change might look like and what achieving it would entail. We employ a systems psychodynamic perspective to do so here.

SYSTEMS PSYCHODYNAMICS

A systems psychodynamic perspective is well-suited to revealing the "function of dysfunction" (Ashforth & Reingen, 2014), that is, the covert rationales that sustain seemingly irrational arrangements. Borne of a group of scholars who combined systems theory and psychoanalysis to study the structure and dynamics of organizations (Miller & Rice, 1967); leadership (Rice, 1965); and change (Trist & Bamforth, 1951); this perspective focuses on the interplay between psychological and social forces that shape organizations and the experiences of people within them (French & Vince, 1999; Gould, Stapley, & Stein, 2004). It builds on the assumptions that individuals create, join, and accept structures, discourses, conventions, and practices for aims that are rational as well as emotional, functional as well as expressive, developmental as well as defensive—to get things done and to feel, or avoid feeling, in certain ways—and that those aims are neither always coherent nor often all conscious (Gabriel, 1999).

Scholarship in this tradition highlights how people exploit groups and institutions, and vice versa, to deal with tensions and contradictions in their inner and social worlds (Ashforth & Reingen, 2014; Hirschhorn & Gilmore, 1980); how power differences relate to divisions of emotional labor (Voronov & Vince, 2012); and how there is often more than habit or inertia behind resistance to change (Fotaki & Hyde, 2014). It views resistance as a form of active, if not conscious, immunity against attempts to question or undo arrangements that sustain not only what we do, but also what we believe, how we feel, and who we are (Kegan & Lahey, 2009).

Defensive routines are widespread in organizations (Argyis, 1990), and systems psychodynamic theories are concerned with how they bolster individual defenses (Jaques, 1955; Menzies, 1960). They postulate that people join or shape institutions that help them stave off undesired versions of the self and hold on to clear and desired ones (Petriglieri & Stein, 2012). Therefore, organizational processes may be deemed valuable because they help members avoid disturbing affect and affirm their identities, even if those processes distort the way the organization pursues its tasks. Systems psychodynamics is thus a theory of how dysfunction crosses levels of analysis (Smith, 1989) and organizations become debilitated not because but, more precisely, instead of their members. Seen from this perspective, an organization that fails to change is succeeding at protecting the status quo. What moves its members to protect it, what they get out of it, and what price they pay is the question system psychodynamic scholars ask.[1]

In this article, we build on the systems psychodynamics notion of institutions as identity workspaces as applied to business schools (Petriglieri & Petriglieri, 2010). Identity workspaces are holding environments (Winnicott, 1975) for identity work, that is, venues where people question, craft, revise, or affirm who they are and who they might become. In our first conceptualization of business schools as identity workspaces (Petriglieri & Petriglieri, 2010), we tied the rise in popularity of management education to the erosion of traditional social contracts and the emergence of careers that unfold across organizations (Arthur, 2008) and render crafting and sustaining a stable identity problematic (Alvesson & Willmott, 2002; Sennett, 1998, 2006). The more transactional the bond between people and employers becomes, we argued, the less likely the former are to entrust the latter as holding environments for their long-term identity projects and the more likely they are to entrust business schools to serve that function instead.

The trend is evident in studies reporting that managers attend business courses as much for personal as for professional reasons (Ibarra, 2003; Long, 2004; Petriglieri, Wood, & Petriglieri, 2011). It is evident in business schools' promise of personal transformation as well as access to remunerative employment (Kets de Vries & Korotov, 2007) and in the popularity of courses focused on helping students discover themselves and overcome sensitivities and barriers to change (Boyatzis, Stubbs, & Taylor, 2002; George & Sims, 2007; Kaiser & Kaplan, 2006). It is also reflected in employers' demand that business schools graduate managers sensibly socialized for the office environment (GMAC, 2014) and in expectations that business schools promote broadly shared values (Augier & March 2011; Giacalone, 2004; Khurana, 2007).

All these point to the recognition, implicit in the critiques mentioned earlier, that business schools should and do fulfill, more or less deliberately, a function broader than the creation and transmission of relevant knowledge and the codification and diffusion of requisite skills, a function that is existential and cultural in nature (Khurana & Snook, 2011; Petriglieri, 2011; Sturdy, Brocklehurst, Winstanley, & Littlejohns, 2006; Scott, 2010). That is, business schools help students deepen their understanding of who they are and what citizenship in the business world entails, and strengthen their resolve and ability to act accordingly. The conceptualization of business schools as identity workspaces highlights their role in reflecting and (re)producing workplace culture and implies that even when such schools put little deliberate emphasis on identity development, they still affect it (Anteby, 2013a).

To argue that business schools serve as identity workspaces is not to say that they shape identities from scratch. One does not need to espouse the grandiose view that business schools create leaders, for example, to acknowledge that these institution's instruction and socialization efforts might enhance and legitimate, or question and temper, narcissistic (Bergman, Westermann, & Daly, 2010) and unethical (Giacalone & Promislo, 2013) tendencies that students bring to class as a result of temperament or prior socialization. Or to wonder if the leadership models that business schools promote, once adopted by companies, may facilitate the emergence of leaders who demonstrate narcissistic (Maccoby, 2007) or psychopathic (Babiak & Hare, 2007) traits.

Such work urges us to acknowledge that embedded in our theories; in our pedagogical practices; in our case studies and illustrations; in our stance as researchers and our demeanor as instructors; in the attitudes and behaviors we celebrate, discourage,

[1] While its roots reach back more than half a century, systems psychodynamic scholarship has recently burgeoned in organization studies as evidence mounts that individual and collective behavior in organizations is often motivated by unconscious affect (Barsade, Ramarajan, & Westen, 2009) and calls proliferate for researchers to account for interactions between levels of analysis (Kreiner, Hollensbe, & Sheep, 2006) and to problematize organizational phenomena rather than fill theoretical gaps (Alvesson & Sandberg, 2011).

or tolerate in our student bodies are images of who leaders are; what they do and care about; and on whose behalf they lead (Alvesson & Spicer, 2010). The development of leaders in business schools, in other words, is inextricably tied to the production of portraits of leadership—authoritative images that help students "develop a shared understanding of who they might become" (Anteby, 2013a: 86).

PORTRAITS OF LEADERSHIP

While reviewing the vast academic literature on leadership is beyond the scope of this paper, it is important to highlight the images that permeate it and explore how they inform the pedagogical materials and curricula that guide students' development as leaders. Recent reviews of leadership research (Alvesson & Spicer, 2010; DeRue & Myers, 2014; Glynn & Raffaelli, 2010; Mabey, 2013) have all reported that hierarchical, individualistic, and functionalist perspectives dominate the field. DeRue (2011) identified four persistent biases: conflating leadership with hierarchical supervision; focusing on the influence of leaders on followers; treating leadership as a function of a person's traits, ability, or behavior; and treating the environment as exogenous to the leadership process. Between 2003 and 2008, for example, 84% of the leadership research that appeared in management journals consisted of studies of individuals in positions of formal authority, assumed to be leaders (Ancona & Backman, 2008; see also Heifetz, 1994). Glynn and Raffaelli (2010) coded all the leadership studies that have appeared in three elite management journals (*Administrative Science Quarterly, Academy of Management Journal, Organization Science*) since their founding. Studies that focused on the behavior of leaders were by far the most common (44.74%) followed by studies examining leaders' contingencies (26.87%), dyadic relationships (17.76%), and traits (17.11%). Theories of meaning making made up only 11.18% of published articles. Leaders were modeled as agentic actors in 82.89% of the studies, 49.34% of studies focused on how leaders affected group and organizational performance, and only 9.87% were concerned with values, beliefs, or meaning. When the authors conducted a path analysis, they found that researchers focused either on the effect leaders had on performance or values but never on both, a split to which we shall return.

When it comes to research, in other words, the image of leadership that predominates is of an individual ascending to, or occupying, a position of hierarchical power, competently adapting to his or her environment, and wielding his or her influence to achieve financial (or otherwise measurable) results and, in so doing, rising further up the ladder. This "heroic" leader (Raelin, 2004, 2007) who populates the majority of academic articles is much like the one that headlines the most common pedagogical artifact: the business case study. In an analysis of the cases in the Harvard Business School core MBA curriculum, for example, Anteby (2013a) noted that the majority portrayed leaders as "crafters of their own fortunes" (p. 82) in a world where success—usually defined as promotions and profits—hinges on making the right decisions in high-stake situations. Students' identification with such protagonists, he noted, inducts them into a worldview in which "individualism and heroism prevail" (p. 82). A cool heart and sharp mind are central traits of such leaders at their best. Conversely, strong feelings and poor analyses usually spell trouble. Besides being heroic, leaders in case studies are most often male. Symons and Ibarra (2014) analyzed all 53 award-winning and best-selling case studies from The Case Centre during 2009–2013 and found that only 9% of them featured women protagonists. Women were absent altogether from 45% of these popular cases.

These images of leadership also transpire in the overall structure of MBA curricula. In a review of five large studies of core curricula, Rynes and Bartunek (2013) documented a systematic and consistent overemphasis on functional and analytic courses at the expense of courses focused on people skills, ethics, and globalization. These curricula, recruiters lament (GMAC, 2014), do not put enough emphasis on leadership. It would be more accurate to say, however, that their emphasis is consistent with the portrait of leadership described above. The same is true in executive education. Mabey's (2013) analysis of the literature on leadership development in organizations found that a functionalist perspective dominates, with 82% of the studies showing a preoccupation "with enhancing the qualities of individual leaders, as if they are personally capable of turning organizations around" (p. 6; see also DeRue & Myers, 2014). In a study of two leadership development programs, Gagnon and Collinson (2014) found that similar images served as normative templates for participants' identity work. Leaders were portrayed as "special and deserving, pressure loving and on edge, hyperrational and decisive, and English speaking and western" (p. 663). There is evidence that these portraits are indeed internalized by students who then enact them. Wang et al. (2011), for example, showed that business school students who major in economics have more positive attitudes toward greed and demonstrate greedier behavior than do those with other majors. Ely et al. (2011) argued that covert gender bias in leadership courses replicates and reinforces that in corporations.

The attention that scholars give to leadership; the consistency between images of leadership in research articles, pedagogical materials, and course design; and the evidence that these are internalized by students lead us to suggest that unlike what critics have argued, business schools have hardly abdicated the task of developing leaders and leadership. The much criticized shortcomings of business schools, then, may best be viewed as results of a commitment, however unconscious, to fulfill this task in a certain way.

THE DEHUMANIZATION OF LEADERSHIP

It is striking how far contemporary portraits are from traditional scholarship that, going back to seminal works by Freud (1922) in psychology and Selznick (1957) in sociology recognized the dual nature of leadership as both an instrumental and a symbolic performance. According to these views, leaders operate at the boundary between a collectivity and its environment (Rice, 1965), and their job entails both *influencing* and *representing* their groups. Influence involves helping the group adapt to and make the most of its circumstances, whereas representation involves embodying the values, principles, and aspirations of the group.

The recursive process of giving shape and voice to a group, holding it together and making it move, is conveyed in Burns' classic definition of leadership as "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*" (Burns, 1978: 19, *italics in original*). The means that leaders use are illustrated in March and Weil's (2005) metaphor of leadership as plumbing and poetry. The former refers to the ability to skillfully advance the group's task. The latter refers to the ability to express shared concerns and aspirations with compelling imagery. In these views, the function of leadership is to articulate identities and goals that orient a collective. These, in turn, give the group's actions direction and meaning.

These views tie leadership to both the inner and the social world of leaders and followers, suggesting that individuals emerge and are most effective as leaders when their deeply held values, concerns, and aspirations resonate with those of their followers. They also suggest that the processes of introjecting a group and projecting oneself into it are ongoing. Leadership, in essence, cannot be understood or practiced without regard for—and does not exist independently of—psychological experience and social context (Fitzsimons, 2012). It is not a function of what leaders do but who they are and the groups in which they emerge and operate. Paradoxically, over the past decades, just as business schools have become identity workspaces for a larger portion of their students, scholars moved away from these rich, socialized conceptualizations of leadership (Besharov & Khurana, 2014) and in so doing contributed to a dehumanization of leadership. This dehumanization[2] consists of reducing leadership to a disembodied set of skills and romanticizing it as a virtue that is disembedded from any group, institution, or society.

The reduction of leadership to a set of skills is evident in models of leadership development based on the assumption that the essence of leadership is influence (Bass & Bass, 2008; Cialdini, 2007). This assumption is captured in Bryman's (1986) description of leadership as "a social influence process in which *a person steers members of the group* toward a goal" (p. 2: *italics ours*). Within this paradigm, the vector of influence goes out from the leader, who is usually in a position of formal authority (DeRue, 2011; Heifetz, 1994). It is the leader's imagination that creates a vision, his or her commitment and communication skills that spread it. And it is the leader's abilities to direct and motivate the group that help it progress (Hosking, Dachler, & Gergen, 1995). Success is defined as the achievement of instrumental aims, preferably measurable ones, such as launching a new product, increasing market share, winning a client, and, for the leader, promotion or salary increase (Holton & Naquin, 2000; Yeung & Berman, 1997). Failure is interpreted as a manifestation of the leader's incompetence.

[2] Our use of the term *dehumanization* is consistent with its use in social psychology. We use it here, however, to encompass both what social psychologists have traditionally referred to as dehumanization (for a review, see Haslam, 2006), and what has recently been described as superhumanization (Waytz, Hoffman, & Trawalter, 2014). Both refer to the defensive development of distorted perceptions of out-group members, often minority ones, who are portrayed in terms that lack depth and complexity and treated as objects rather than fellow humans. We apply the term here to the defensive transformation of an experience into an image.

Courses built on this paradigm focus on teaching aspiring leaders the best, newest, most appropriate tools and techniques by which to exert influence over others. Even when they advocate the holistic and emotional development of students, these courses break the work down into discrete competencies that can be taught and assessed by oneself and others through observation and questionnaires (Boyatzis et al., 2002). Their underlying philosophy remains "utilitarian and practical" (Mirvis, 2008: 175). Self-awareness is defined as the ability to accurately predict and conform to the expectations of others as demonstrated through 360-degree feedback instruments. Mirroring this view of leadership, successful instructors are knowledgeable, passionate, and preoccupied with presenting relevant insights that teach leaders *what they need to do* to succeed. Their courses combine concepts and prescriptions, leaving little room for students' experience or reducing experience to practicing what academic evidence and corporate competency models demand (Finch-Lees, Mabey, & Liefooghe, 2005; Iles & Preece, 2006). In doing so they cast leadership as a set of disembodied skills that can be acquired and deployed across contexts (Houghton & Yoho, 2005; Kriger, 2005).

The elevation of leadership to a virtue is most apparent in models of leadership based on the assumption that its essence is self-expression (George, Sims, McLean, & Mayer, 2007; Kets de Vries, 1994). In this view, leadership is the resolute manifestation of one's values and the pursuit of one's passion. The leader's inner world takes center stage (Kets de Vries, 2006). The leader's clarity allows a vision to emerge, and his or her courage allows the leader to face challenges to it. And the leader's authenticity—his or her ability to remain loyal to a true self—makes him or her appealing and trustworthy. Success is usually defined as the achievement of expressive, and not always measurable aims (e.g., upholding an ethical stance, shaping a creative culture, or starting a firm), and, for the leader, a sense of passion and purpose (Coleman, Gulati, & Segovia, 2011). Failure is often interpreted as a manifestation of the leader's neurosis or his or her surrender to external demands (Kilburg, 2004).

The focus of leadership courses within this paradigm is on helping leaders discover their true self and gather resources that will enable them to stay true to it. Assisted soul-searching helps students discover and reveal the unique leader within (Shamir & Eilam, 2005). Self-awareness is defined as clarity about one's values and beliefs, fears and aspirations. These courses extol the virtues of servant (Greenleaf, 1977), and transformational leaders (Bass, 1990), who are "almost saint-like in their qualities of being authentic, putting their followers first, and so on" (Alvesson, 2010: 53). Such a state of selfless self-absorption is obtained through hard, often painful self-examination that transforms perspective, generates hope, and allows the leader to command the trust of others, who are, in turn, transformed by his or her work (Bennis & Thomas, 2002). Successful instructors are shepherds and role models of equanimity, preoccupied with helping aspiring leaders discover and hold on to who they are, even in circumstances in which hiding it may be safer or more convenient. Their courses artfully combine inspiring examples and personal introspection (Gagnon & Collinson, 2014). In doing so they cast leadership as a virtue that can be revealed and demonstrated across contexts.

Common to both kinds of courses, which are popular in business schools worldwide, are a focus on the individual as the locus of leadership and the promise to make students able to lead in a wide variety of contexts. Either by reducing leadership to a set of skills or elevating it to a virtue, dehumanizing leadership reduces leaders' development to the pursuit of knowledge—either about skills or about the self. It downplays the dilemmas, contradictions, doubts, and changes of mind that are part and parcel of the experience of leading or pretends that they can be resolved (Alvesson & Spicer, 2010; Bolden & Gosling, 2006; Raelin, 2007). It ignores the social nature of leadership and the self or pretends that both can be held on to and acknowledged universally if they are clear and strong enough. The dehumanization of leadership, in short, turns leadership development from an existential and cultural enterprise into an intellectual and commercial one. In doing so, it leaves aspiring leaders little motivation and capacity to recognize, tolerate, and work with, let alone celebrate, the idiosyncrasies within and around them from which leadership ebbs and flows. It leaves them more focused on influencing others and expressing themselves than on representing others and seeking permission to lead. And it replicates, if it does not reinforce, the disconnect between leaders and (not) led.

DEHUMANIZATION AS A DEFENSE

Looked at through a systems psychodynamic lens, the segregation of instrumental and expressive aspects of leadership and the severing of leadership from its social ground may be considered as two related forms of splitting. *Splitting* is an unconscious defense mechanism that involves compartmentalizing complex experiences to protect oneself from the cognitive ambiguity or emotional ambivalence that these experiences provoke (Fairburn, 1952; Klein, 1959). The simplest form of splitting is dividing objects, people, or groups into good ones, to whom all favorable attributes are assigned, and bad ones, to whom all unfavorable attributes belong. Other forms involve splitting off aspects of one's identity and experience as a way to make either more intelligible, valuable, or manageable (Petriglieri & Stein, 2012).

We contend that splitting instrumental and expressive aspects of leadership is a defense against the struggle to reconcile them, or the impossibility of doing so at times, and that splitting leadership from its social context is a defense against the anxiety of not knowing where and when one's leadership claims may be granted—and for how long—in increasingly diverse, fluid, and fragmented workplaces. Making leadership portable keeps leaders disconnected from the precariousness of leading. By keeping aspiring leaders and those who develop them preoccupied with the question of how to lead, the dehumanization of leadership allows them to avoid more difficult questions of why, where, and on whose behalf they may lead. Hence, leadership courses become not preparation for but protection against, not familiarization with but compensation for the experience of leading. Several parties, we argue, benefit from this, including managers in leadership development courses, faculty, and administrators.

"Making leadership portable keeps leaders disconnected from the precariousness of leading. By keeping aspiring leaders and those who develop them preoccupied with the question of how to lead, the dehumanization of leadership allows them to avoid more difficult questions of why, where, and on whose behalf they may lead."

The benefit of dehumanizing leadership is perhaps most evident for those managers who seek identity workspaces that afford them a sense of coherence and continuity while they move around. The dehumanization of leadership may be, in fact, what enables such managers to experience business schools as identity workspaces (Petriglieri & Petriglieri, 2010). Several scholars have suggested that the images and pedagogies that sustain the dehumanization of leadership help managers affirm precarious identities and avoid disturbing affect attendant to the experience of leading. Giacalone (2004), for example, argued that "teaching students to assume that only economic goals matter helps them ignore feelings and to discount the pain a decision may cause" (p. 416). Starkey and Hall (2011) noted that management students often harbor concerns that being more human in the workplace could make them appear weak, and therefore, "more vulnerable targets for their rapacious colleagues" (p. 86). This, they argued, pressures students to join a "culture of pretense" (p. 91) in which managers publicly conform to heroic imagery while privately harboring feelings of inadequacy. Sturdy et al. (2006) reached similar conclusions in a study of identity work within an MBA program. "What is neglected in studies of the 'travels' of management ideas or discourses generally," they wrote, "is how they transform not only the discursive form or content of [managers'] identity, but also the related existential or emotional experience of it" (p. 842). They found that students valued the self-confidence the MBA afforded. However, that self-confidence only disguised but could not resolve managers' "fragility of knowledge and identity" (p. 844) as it was predicated on conforming to normative ideals. Alvesson (2010) also suggested that virtuous ideals of leadership may serve as compensation for ignorance about the substance of the work or as reassurance against the possibility of being cast, like many leaders these days, as "immoral and short of virtue" (p. 68).

Students are not the only ones whose identities are affirmed and whose anxiety is kept at bay. The instrumental image of leadership as a set of skills that, if faithfully employed, will lead to predictable and measurable results is congruent with the functionalist research paradigm that is prevalent in business schools, as noted earlier. How this paradigm came to prevail had much to do with concerns about academic legitimacy. In his sociological analysis of the evolution of business schools, Khurana (2007) noted that the rise of disciplinary perspectives and quantitative research methodologies, economic ones in particular, were a response to the criticism raised by the influential Ford Foundation report (Gordon & Howell, 1958) as well as long-standing questions about the place of management schools in research universities. Knights and Clarke (2014) found the selves of management academics to be just as fragile and subject to performance pressures as those of students. These selves can be thought of as elite identities that elicit status anxiety and induce conformity pressures (Gill, 2015). Khurana (2007) suggested that the effort to stave off anxieties about rigor and worthiness to belong to the university led management academics to retreat to the ivory tower and away from the field. In his much-cited critique, Ghoshal (2005) argued that this was particularly problematic: "A precondition for making business studies a science has been the explicit *denial* of any role of moral or ethical consideration in the practice of management" (p. 79, *italics added*). Alvesson and Spicer (2010) used the same word, *denial,* to describe the state of mainstream leadership research. The denial they are concerned with, like Bolden and Gosling (2006), is a denial of the ambiguity of leadership and the uncertainty it provokes among those who try to explain or exercise it.

Images of leadership as a virtue—a resolute expression of one's inner self—are congruent with the tales of leadership gurus who operate alongside traditional academics in this field. Those stories, too, like prescriptions based on functionalist studies, affirm the identities and affect the emotions of those who tell and use them. Clark and Salaman (1998) argued that these tales "help constitute the identity of the modern senior manager as an heroic, transformative leader" (p. 137). Jackson (1996) noted that they induce "a sense of hope and purpose" (p. 571). In short, their translation of research insights and field experiences into actionable and hopeful tales is what makes gurus valued. The illusion that leadership can be acquired or revealed and then taken elsewhere also makes leadership more easily trademarked, marketed, and sold. This suits the interest of administrators concerned with claiming that their schools develop leaders, ensuring that those schools remain viable (Wood & Petriglieri, 2004). Finally, it serves the interest of employers who see business schools as "providers of services" (Starkey & Tempest, 2009: 379) and who use leadership development strategically as a form of socialization (Gagnon & Collinson, 2014). For all these parties, what is at stake, and therefore, needs defending against, is the precariousness of identity and the potential disorientation and anxiety that we might experience if we accepted leadership as an ambiguous, if not mysterious, phenomenon, something that can never entirely be captured, whether through research methods or compelling tales, let alone be enacted consistently across time and space.

Although the work just mentioned suggests that the dehumanization of leadership is prevalent and purposeful, in keeping with a systems psychodynamic perspective, we are not arguing that it is intentional, conscious, or ubiquitous. The accounts of those deviating from it, however, provide more evidence of its dominance and defensive nature. Systems psychodynamic theory predicts that those who challenge a defensive arrangement will face resistance and be exposed to the uncertainty and anxiety that the defense protects against (Menzies, 1960). This may result, at times, in being marginalized and deskilled and, at other times, in being hailed as innovators for attempting what others, within the dominant narrative, could not even imagine.

"In the age of student as consumer," argued Raelin (2007), "there could be extreme resistance to methods that do not give students the answers that they are paying for" (p. 513). Thus, instructors who attempt to help students examine the ambiguity that dominant images of leadership are meant to avoid report an experience that is "thrilling yet full of risk" (Sinclair, 2007: 646). They often describe their courses as intense and fulfilling, but also special, unusual, and sometimes suspicious in the eyes of students and colleagues (Mirvis, 2008; Petriglieri et al., 2011) as well as hard to sell to corporate clients concerned with measurable outcomes (Waddock & Lozano, 2013). Rynes and Bartunek (2013) noted, for example, that one of the main forces that keeps functional and analytic courses at the center of MBA curricula is that recruiters hire candidates for those very skills, and students who have them succeed. Dehumanizing leadership, in other words, is as useful in business as it is in business schools.

This observation also calls for a statement about the scope of our arguments. Although we have focused here on business schools, the phenomenon we are concerned with is clearly found in other contexts. Like the splitting of management and leadership (Krantz & Gilmore, 1990), the clinging to leadership as a skill set and virtue to protect oneself from the anxiety of not being good, or good enough, is not confined to business schools. We have focused on their contribution because they are centers of production and dissemination for leadership images and stories and serve as identity workspaces in which such stories are embodied in graduates.

While serving the interests of multiple parties, the identity affirmation and emotional protection that dehumanizing leadership affords comes at a price. Ideas and practices that sustain it become difficult to question and change. This may help explain, for example, why literatures bolstering popular leadership images such as that of the transformational leader appear impervious to challenge, despite such flaws as defining leadership by its outcomes (van Knippenberg & Sitkin, 2013). It may also help explain why business schools "pay meager attention, resources and respect to educational research" (Brown et al., 2013: 230) and often ignore evidence in the teaching of leadership (Klimoski & Amos, 2012). Defensive mechanisms, especially socially constructed and upheld ones such as those we are concerned with here, also generate secondary anxieties (Gill, 2015; Menzies, 1960). These anxieties are more acceptable ones, somewhat like foils, they are side effects of the arrangements that keep the original anxieties at bay. In the case of splitting the instrumental and expressive facts of leadership, we suggest these anxieties take the form of a felt lack of meaning and connection with others as well as a dwindling sense of institutional stewardship. That is, the very challenges leadership development has been called on to address but will be unable to unless it foregoes its defensive purpose.

The vested interests some have in dehumanizing leadership make it more likely that any changes to leadership development practice and pedagogy will largely consist of reshuffling competency and role models, that is, changing the topics, skills, and exemplars of virtue presented to students. That, however, is hardly enough. Such efforts will make leaders more disconnected, more competently and mindfully perhaps, rather than fostering the connections with themselves, others, and institutions that make leadership meaningful and that allow leaders to serve communities rather than the other way around. Doing the latter, we suggest, requires humanizing leadership by deepening and broadening both its meaning and its development, so as to help people recognize and manage the ambiguity, uncertainty, and anxiety that leading entails, especially in the fluid and precarious contexts in which most leaders find themselves today.

HUMANIZING LEADERSHIP

A starting point for the task of (re-)humanizing leadership may lie in a burgeoning body of scholarship—encompassing functionalist, interpretive, and critical perspectives—that is rediscovering the ties between leadership and identity and recovering traditional conceptualizations of leadership as embodied in history, physicality, relationships, and culture (for a recent review, see Ibarra, Wittman, Petriglieri, & Day, 2014). This view of leadership acknowledges that becoming a leader is both a psychological and a social process through which a person develops, internalizes, and receives interpersonal and institutional validation for a leader identity (DeRue & Ashford, 2010b). It highlights the idiosyncratic and localized nature of leadership, noting how individuals who emerge as leaders are those members of a group who best embody and give voice to the principles and ambitions that the group values (Haslam, Reicher, & Platow, 2011; van Knippenberg & Hogg, 2003). This returns gaining—and losing—leadership to being an ongoing, relational, and dynamic process (DeRue, 2011).

For people to lead a group, then, to see themselves and be seen as a leader, they must engage in identity work (McAdams, 1999; Snow & Anderson, 1987; Sveningsson & Alvesson, 2003) to craft, experiment, and revise their identity in accordance to their group's identity (Carroll & Levy, 2010; Ibarra & Barbulescu, 2010). However, their identities must reflect their personal history and aspirations as much as the needs and expectations of the groups they represent (Petriglieri & Stein, 2012). Recognizing leadership as "acquired and sustained (or lost) through constant social interactions shifts power away from the leader and transfers it to the relationship between leader and followers, and the latters' identification with the former" (Ibarra et al., 2014: 290). It also suggests that although leadership may never be permanently acquired at any single institution, preparing people to conduct that work, especially in novel and anxiety-provoking circumstances, may enhance their capacity and broaden their opportunities to lead.

Rather than evoking the need for disruption and reinvention, this new body of scholarship suggests that humanizing leadership requires recognizing, tolerating, and respecting, if not celebrating, ambiguity and tension in lieu of the splitting described earlier. Akrivou and Bradbury-Huang (2015) have argued that business schools need to balance instrumental and humanistic aims to fulfill their promise of transforming students. We contend that leadership courses, in particular, need to honor the potential conflict between instrumental and expressive aims. They need to foster the recognition that clarity, resolve, and skills are not enough to make those conflicts disappear but that the commitment to honor both sides generates learning and growth (Shotter & Tsoukas, 2014; Weick 2004; Wood & Petriglieri, 2005).

Courses that aspire to humanize leadership, in our view, need to focus less on leaders and leadership—what great leaders do and what models of leadership prescribe—and more on lead*ing* and follow*ing*. As much as they emphasize transmitting knowledge, they must focus equally on helping students "own and value their experience" (Kolb & Kolb, 2005: 207) where experience is not defined as the practice of what models suggests but as the historical and immediate sense of oneself in a place, with others, at a point it time, with all its richness and contradictions (Dewey, 1938; Knowles, 1970; Kolb, 1984). That entails helping students find echoes of the past in their present experience and much more. It requires surfacing the assumptions and norms that shape their reactions and habits; that sharpen, embolden, amplify, and silence their voice; that make them forge or lose connections. Ultimately, such courses still help students pursue the self they aspire to, but not at the expense of their ability to encounter, learn from, and work with the "other" within and around them (Berkovick 2014).

To help students uncover and learn to work with (rather than be worked up by) the psychological and social dynamics that sustain or hinder their emergence and effectiveness as leaders, we build our courses around three questions: "What does it mean to lead?" "Why, toward what, and on whose behalf does one lead?" "How does one get to lead?" These questions, we argue, can only be answered personally, in context. They are, therefore, most usefully offered to students as instruments to use in making sense of their endeavors, rather than answered for them. At the same time, they are questions that we must answer for ourselves as instructors.

We define *leading* as being willing, able, and entrusted to articulate, embody, and help realize a story of possibility for a social group at a given point in time. This definition summarizes the key message from the literature we have just reviewed. First, motivation and ability to lead matter as much as the endorsement and trust of others. Second, leaders articulate and embody, influence and represent what their followers hold dear, uphold shared values, and help realize shared aspirations. Third, those values and aspirations are encoded in a story of possibility, a shared narrative of who we are, where we come from, and where we are going, that binds leaders to followers. Fourth, such stories are always located in place and time. Hence, leaders who represent possibility and inspire a devoted following among a group's members may well be considered dangerous lunatics and mobilize resistance by members of another group.

Our efforts are on behalf of three constituencies: students, organizations, and society at large. As we claim to help leaders develop, we cannot simply free individuals up and equip them to do as they please or as employers expect or only indoctrinate them to fulfill collective demands. Our aim is to balance liberation and socialization, that is, to help individuals find their voice as much as honor the institutions and communities they serve. Regarding the question of how one gains leadership, we endeavor to balance personalization and contextualization. *Personalization* is a process through which people "examine their experience and revisit their life story as part and parcel of learning to lead" (Petriglieri et al., 2011). It prompts students to examine the influence of their context, social interactions, and personal identities on their habits and competencies, that is, on the ways they think, feel, and act (Dominick, Squires, & Cervone, 2010). It is through this process that people come to incorporate their personal identities into their identity as a leader and to familiarize themselves with the discomfort that leading and learning often entail (Coutu, 2002; Hackman & Wageman, 2007). *Contextualization* is a process through which people examine the needs and aspirations of the groups on whose behalf they lead and acquire—or resolve to change—the language, skills, and scripts that are expected in that context (Mintzberg & Gosling, 2002; Raelin, 2007; Starkey & Tempest, 2008).

The processes of personalization and contextualization are intertwined. Just as understanding oneself cannot be pursued independently of one's social context (Fitzsimons, 2012), understanding one's group and culture is always achieved through one's personal perspective (Raelin, 2007). How we foster these processes varies depending on the program architecture in which leadership development is embedded and the resources available. In the following sections we provide illustrations from one MBA and one executive course.[3]

[3] Providing a how-to guide for designing and delivering a course that humanizes leadership is not the aim of this paper and would be antithetical to our argument about the usefulness of such guides. After all, we are neither the first nor the only ones to chronicle the challenges and argue for the value of putting emotion and experience, person and context, at the center of the learning process, as the literatures we draw on in this paper attest. That said, we would be happy to share syllabi and more detailed notes for both courses with readers who are interested in them. Our contact information is at the end of the paper.

Psychological Issues in Management

Psychological Issues in Management (PIM) is an MBA elective course that focuses on the psychological forces that influence the exercise of management and leadership. Its stated purpose is to enhance participants' personal and professional ability to lead and live mindfully, effectively, and responsibly in a range of contemporary workplaces, that is, workplaces characterized by frequent change and a diverse and mobile workforce. It starts from the assumption that leading involves one's whole self, not just knowledge and skills, and invites students to learn about how their history and aspirations, as well as the people around them, shape who they are and whether and how they lead.

The elective unfolds over 14 sessions during the fourth or fifth of five 2-month periods in an international MBA program. It follows two required courses in organizational behavior. The first draws on social psychology to cover the foundations of micro-organizational behavior and involves cases, lectures, role-plays, and exercises. The second draws on sociology to cover topics related to politics, structure, and culture and involves cases, lectures, and a simulation. While PIM incorporates concepts from clinical psychology, social psychology, and microsociology, these ideas are used to help students inquire about their own experiences. Case studies and short lectures are used to stimulate and frame a stream of reflective activities.

The experiences that the course encourages students to examine, reflect on, and learn from are not only induced through exercises or recalled from their life before the MBA, but are drawn from their everyday experience of living, leading, and following in the MBA community within and outside the classroom. The course is framed as a collective endeavor in which students and the professor are responsible for their own and each other's development and for the culture of the system in which they live. Rather than viewing the intensity, diversity, and bounded space of the MBA environment as unreal and artificial, PIM draws on how they are actually similar to what can be found in many work environments and communities, thus casts the environment as well-suited for practicing reflective engagement.

A focus on the connection between identity and leadership runs through the PIM course. The notion of a leader as someone who embodies and represents a group's identity is introduced early through theory and examination of current and historical leaders. The emphasis, however, shifts quickly to questioning the way students construct their own identities, how they enable or deny each other's leadership within the MBA system, and how their personal identities impact the groups in which they are more or less likely to emerge as leaders. Typically, this reflection begins at the individual level, is then shared in groups, and culminates in a class discussion. The purpose is to provide a safe space in which students can revisit not just the sources and consequences of their personal identities—what about their pasts have made them who they are today and what desired selves are fueling the life paths they pursue—but also their personal assumptions and collectively held images of what living and leading well means. In short, PIM endeavors to provide an identity workspace both for the students in it and for the MBA culture.

As students begin reflecting on their identities, they are required to write a personal reflection paper on a development goal. Rather than being invited to devise a plan for improvement, however, they are encouraged to explore how their development goals tie in to their identities. For example, a student working on his wish to become more self-confident explored how his shaky confidence emerged from growing up in a highly competitive environment and was kept in place by a strong desire to please those around him. His talent assured that he could often please, and he then interpreted others' approval as a sign that unless he kept doing so he would fail. Through this exploration he came to realize that his expression of low self-confidence, which compromised his capacity to lead others, was critical to keeping him safe. This understanding enabled him to question whether he or others would truly be threatened if he took an assertive stance.

The focus on understanding experience and identity in the present, in the MBA, helps students contextualize their learning. It also translates into considering where, outside of business school, they might be more or less entrusted to lead and what it would take to do so. Because PIM takes place in an international school with no more than three students from the same nationality in any section of 50 students, the diversity provides a broad set of cultural understandings from which to draw and a rich trove of experiences of living in diverse contexts.

One instructor teaches the PIM course. The professor takes a different stance vis-à-vis the students and the learning than is traditionally adopted in a classroom. First, rather than working through a functionalist lens—that is, providing evidence for the effectiveness of certain leadership tools and techniques—he or she works through an interpretive lens, challenging students to understand how leadership is lost and found in social contexts and to question the meanings that underpin their actions. Second, the professor is an active participant in the learning, exploring his or her identity in the class and role in the group, just as he or she encourages the students to do. Important to the pedagogy of the course is that the professor models reflective engagement by sharing his or her relationship to the course material and his or her own history and the learning task in the here and now. Doing this requires that the professor reveal herself or himself as puzzling, puzzled, and as in need of development as the students.

The Executive Leadership Journey

The Executive Leadership Journey (ELJ) is an 8-day executive education program for executives in a global company we shall call GlobalCo. The ELJ program was launched 2 years after GlobalCo was born out of the merger of two parent companies with global aspirations and ambitious plans for growth. It was designed to meet GlobalCo's wishes to (1) develop the leadership skills of its senior managers; (2) shift toward a culture that involves cross-functional and cross-cultural collaboration; and (3) become an employer of choice for current and prospective employees. Enabling all three became the purpose of the program.

The ELJ includes a residential module, the centerpiece of which is an experiential Leadership-in-Action workshop followed up by virtual coaching. It is built on the assumption that leadership development needs to foster an attitude of personal responsibility and a discipline of reflective engagement that binds people to their organization as well as freeing them up to find their voice and thereby influence that organization. Accordingly, it is customized to GlobalCo's context, although within it, participants articulate and pursue their own agendas. The program's first aim is to deepen and clarify participants' understanding of leadership and followership—why, when, and how they lead and follow, formally or informally—and to increase their capacity to exercise both mindfully, effectively, and responsibly. The second aim is to help forge a leadership community, that is, a group of people who feel ownership of and shared responsibility for GlobalCo's fate and culture and whose members speak openly and act decisively.

To honor the commitment to giving the organization and participants equal chances to shape the learning agenda, the program design balances contextualization and personalization of the learning process as follows: Contextualization encompasses asking participants to involve their managers in crafting learning goals before the program; using a customized 360-feedback instrument based on those values; inviting top executives in at the start and end of the program; and debriefing activities with a focus not just on individuals' style and skills, but also on how their behavior reflects GlobalCo norms. Personalization focuses on linking the learning to individual participants' history, experiences, and aspirations. This involves inviting participants to reflect on their life and career trajectories through writing a Personal and Professional Identity Narrative to share with their coach as a context or centerpiece for individual sessions; receiving personalized feedback from the 360-feedback instrument and from participants in the program; and participating in the Leadership-in-Action workshop.

Six to seven participants are assigned to groups that serve as the main learning vehicle. The group work generates data for reflection, provides opportunities for giving and receiving feedback, and offers a context for experimentation. A professional leadership consultant works with each group in the experiential workshop and later serves as the individual coach for its members. The workshop offers participants the opportunity to examine how their thoughts, feelings, and actions as leaders and followers are shaped both by their history and ambitions and by the dynamics of the groups to which they belong. Such insight is essential for learning to manage the influence of such forces. Before and after the experiential portion, the program includes sessions based on lectures, case discussions, and questionnaires.

As in the PIM course, strong emphasis is placed on learning to make sense of and work with experiences that unfold within the program. Unlike the MBA, in which students are facing uncertain and diverse futures, all participants in the ELJ come from and return to the same company. The program activities make it possible to examine how their organization's culture manifests itself and shapes participants' experience of and in it, as well as to invite participants to take responsibility for that culture's maintenance or change. The experience of the first cohorts, for example, provided rich opportunities to experience and examine the tension between the open culture that GlobalCo aspired to and the one to which participants were accustomed. They interpreted the invitation to explore differences and voice dissent as countercultural and felt resentful and misunderstood. Through reflection, it became possible to recognize how their invitations to others to be more open might also be experienced as threats, and to consider the need to contain and speak to those threats to facilitate change.

What distinguishes the ELJ from other executive programs that employ similar activities, however, is not the aim, approach, design, or objectives. It is the people in it, which includes the managers who attend it, the faculty and consultants who work on it, and the way they work together. As in the PIM elective, the professors and consultants embrace a commitment to be as reflective and engaged in their own development, individually and collectively, as they ask participants to be.[4] Staff members engage in frequent meetings during the program to reflect on their experiences and to share the leadership and responsibility for the community's learning.

When we started, this approach was new and unconventional for GlobalCo and the business school that hosted the program. It required leaders from both to make the same commitment as faculty and participants, to not shy away from their experiences but to voice, make sense, and learn from them. This involved honoring participants' confidentiality, giving enough time for learning to manifest itself, and relying on leadership judgment to assess its impact. The purpose of the program itself is purely developmental, and no assessment is conducted during it.[5] Following an employee survey that made a quantitative and qualitative assessment of the program's impact on the company and its executives, the head of Learning and Development for GlobalCo recalled, "Delegates spoke about how it had helped them and the organization. And we could see the difference. Things were going in the direction we wanted, and we felt confident that we needed to continue. The quantitative data confirmed that later" (Personal communication, March 2013).

THE QUESTIONS WE ASK

At this point, academic convention would normally call for us to outline general prescriptions in addition to the ones we offered in the prior section. A list of recommendations, however, would be inconsistent with the spirit and argument presented here. Therefore we outline the implications of our argument in the form of three questions.

Can we all (not) get along?

We have argued that to reclaim their social value, business schools need to help aspiring leaders acknowledge, approach, work with, and learn from tension and contradictions, ambiguity and anxiety. Helping them do so would set them on a learning journey that in the long run leads to the development of wisdom (Hackman & Wageman, 2007; Shotter & Tsoukas, 2014; Weick & Putnam, 2006). Before we can help students honor creative tensions within themselves, however, we must be able to honor those between us. Our work here joins extant calls to restore the tension between instrumental and humanistic aims in our institutions (Akrivou & Bradbury-Huang, 2015); between instrumental and expressive aims in our theories and images of leadership (Besharov & Khurana, 2014); between functional and managerial courses in our curricula (Rynes & Bartunek, 2013); between offering evidence and examining experience in our pedagogy (Raelin, 2007); and between calculation and imagination in the attitudes we seek to foster among future leaders (Starkey & Tempest, 2008).

Our contribution to these calls for pluralism, balance, and integration is to suggest that courses and faculty who espouse different perspectives and advocate different aims may need to coexist without pretending that their views are complementary or their prescriptions easily reconcilable. Unless we do, we will continue making instrumental cases for humanistic aims (think of the business case for ethics or the productivity benefits of mindfulness). This resigns humanism to a subordinate plane and deprives business schools of the opportunity to host and hold real pluralism and to prepare leaders to do so as well. Scholars of experiential learning and adult development, for example, have long positioned their pedagogies as progressive, innovative, and better suited to a changing world (Dewey, 1938;

[4] All the professional consultants have formal qualifications in fields related to counseling, coaching, consulting, group dynamics or organizational development; undertake ongoing personal and professional development work; and hold participants' experiences in strict confidence.

[5] A clause in the program contract shared with participants holds faculty and consultants to confidentiality about students' experiences. No reports are made to the company or school about individuals. No observers are allowed in the experiential portions. Executives interested in "experiencing the program" are invited to do so as participants.

Knowles, 1970). They have made a straw man of traditional pedagogies and the authorities whom they sustained and instead called for disruption. Their dissent, in some way, has helped define the mainstream. It is easy to say that we need both traditional and experiential pedagogies to equip students with the tools to make predictions about, and the freedom to imagine, the future. It is harder to structure curricula in which both have equal weight, not only in rhetoric but in practice, and in which contradictions are treated as learning opportunities. Looked at in this way, where the wishes to humanize *and* dehumanize leadership coexist and can be examined is where we may learn the most.

Can we live without answers?

We have argued that raising more and better questions will not be enough if endeavoring to disseminate universal answers is all we do next. The issue is not just the questions we (do not) ask but what we do with those questions. We suggested that attempting to answer those questions in reassuringly universal terms dehumanizes leadership and voids answers of meaning. Rather, we need to help those who aspire to lead to keep asking questions of themselves and those around them in an ongoing way and to create hospitable spaces in which to do so. This is consistent with the idea that while leadership is learned through experience (DeRue & Wellman, 2009; Kolb, 1984; McCall, 1988), courses are valuable because they help those who aspire to lead to examine their experience and learn from it (Portnow, Popp, Broderick, Drago-Severson, & Kegan, 1998; Raelin, 2007). As Hackman and Wageman (2007) noted, good leadership development helps people remain present to and learn from their experiences, and from others, even when pressure and intense affect tempt one to disconnect.

Business school courses—with their frantic pace, diverse perspectives, and questions about the future—provide no shortage of pressure and anxiety, ambiguity, and doubt. They mirror and amplify the features of work organizations that fuel the dehumanization of leadership. This presents an opportunity to help students during their time in school to learn how to reflect-in-action (Schon, 1984); remain mindfully engaged (DeRue & Ashford, 2010a); and practice reflective engagement (Petriglieri et al., 2011) under pressure. Business schools could become identity workspaces dedicated to the examination, rather than the replication, of personal habits and workplace norms. They could help students recognize the pressures that make defensive structures and discourses so appealing and point out their dysfunction. That would go a long way toward developing more connected leaders. Whether business schools would be so popular were we to raise more questions than we answer, and to surface rather than cater to the need for protection, remains an open question. The answer, in all likelihood, depends on our ability to contain the anxieties that such an approach might stir up, at least temporarily. That is, it depends on our skills and inclinations. Many have noted that few professors have the skills and sensitivity to facilitate reflective and experiential courses, a significant hurdle for institutions seeking to introduce more such courses into their curricula (Brown et al., 2013; Spender & Khurana, 2013).

Can we make leadership development, really, all about the people?

Helping students question the norms of their institutions as well as their own identities requires that we are able to question our own institutional norms and professional identities. For this reason, in the illustrations of how we attempt to translate these considerations into practice within MBA and executive education courses, we have highlighted the role of the executives who sponsor them and the instructors who teach them. Unless they are willing and able to surface, contain, and interpret emotional tensions and cultural contradictions, leadership development courses cannot serve as identity workspaces in the way we advocate, regardless of how elegant their design, relevant the material, and potent their methods. This is one more important change needed in our research and practice of leadership development. While it remains a cliché that leadership is all about the people, and much focus has been put on the inner world of leaders, the people hardly seem to matter in most descriptions of leadership pedagogy and methods.

"While it remains a cliché that leadership is all about the people, and much focus has been put on the inner world of leaders, the people hardly seem to matter in most descriptions of leadership pedagogy and methods."

Spender and Khurana (2013) have suggested that to understand the narrow focus of most business schools and the difficulty they have in fostering contextualized learning, the real issue that needs to be addressed "is how faculty preparation shapes the development of business schools" (p. 135). In their history of the development of doctoral programs in management, they chronicled how these programs progressively moved away from a focus on rich, culturally situated examinations of organizational phenomena that demanded exploration of the researcher's involvement and sensibility toward a strong emphasis on quantitative functionalist methodologies. Discussions of scholars' personal involvement and investment in their research, once common in PhD programs, have become taboo in the most prestigious ones (Anteby, 2013b; Spender & Khurana, 2013). Scholars trained to value a detached, impersonal stance may have some difficulty checking it at the classroom door. This is not because they have no interest in or potential for teaching in a way that calls for the kind of public reflection and emotional risk taking that we ask of students. It is because such a vulnerable, tentative stance may feel like a betrayal of the epistemology on which their professional identity and productivity rest—unless they have been trained and socialized to view it as enrichment. Our ability to humanize leadership, in short, hinges on our willingness to humanize teaching and scholarship. This entails accepting some risk, defying conventions and expectations, and learning from the anxiety and isolation that defiance entails. When working with students, we strive to create safe enough spaces for them to take those risks—through boundaries of professionalism and confidentiality—and to learn from rather than stave off those anxieties. Those are the risks, we contend, through which leaders hone their connections to themselves and others. What kind of spaces business school faculty and staff need to humanize their work, and what risks we may run when those spaces are absent or do not hold, is an important question for scholars to explore further.

CONCLUSION

This article employed a systems psychodynamic perspective to examine dissatisfaction with the ability of business schools to develop leaders. Reframing these critiques as an acknowledgment that such schools serve as identity workspaces (Petriglieri & Petriglieri, 2010) and as an exhortation to serve this function deliberately, we have argued that the questions we need to ask *of* business schools are not only how they develop leaders but for what purpose and on whose behalf. We have suggested that the production and development of leadership—the ways leadership is theorized and portrayed and managers are trained and socialized—serves a defensive purpose aligned with the vested interests of students, faculty, administrators, and employers. This sustains, rather than ameliorates, a growing disconnect between leaders and followers and a widespread deficit of trust in leaders in society at large.

We have drawn on scholarship about the bond between identity and leadership to argue that for business schools to carry out their function as identity workspaces in a deliberate and developmental fashion rather than in an inadvertent and defensive one, populating courses with different theoretical and role models is necessary, but not sufficient. What is most needed is to deepen the questions we ask *in* business schools to include motives, purpose, and beneficiaries of leadership. We also need to broaden the questions business schools ask of students and their employers to enable change in the way leading and following are understood, internalized, and enacted in organizations, that is, what leading means, who gets to do it, and how.

We have endeavored to examine what makes humanizing leadership difficult and to illustrate what it might entail. We have also sought to demonstrate it in our writing by building on both scholarly and popular sources without using either to conceal our own voices. The format of an essay allows and even demands that authors articulate a personal, provocative stance toward a phenomenon and body of work. And yet, as we drew from a broad range of sources, used a personal tone, and offered tentative interpretations rather than airtight arguments, we often feared confusing or disappointing readers. Or, more honestly, we feared being misunderstood and dismissed. It is of some consolation that these are the very fears that we contend leaders must live with, rather than defend against, if they are to acknowledge and honor their dependence on others. This special section acknowledges that our questions may be at least as valuable as our findings. In keeping with its spirit, we never meant to draw conclusions here. We rather hoped to start a conversation.

REFERENCES

Adler, P. S. 2002. Corporate scandals: It's time for reflection in business schools. ***The Academy of Management Executive***, 16: 148–149.

Akrivou, K., & Bradbury-Huang, H. 2015. Educating integrated catalysts: Transforming business schools toward ethics and sustainability. ***Academy of Management Learning & Education***, 14: 222–242.

Alvesson, M. 2010. Leaders as saints: Leadership through moral peak performance. In M. Alvesson & A. Spicer (Eds.), ***Metaphors we lead by: Understanding leadership in the real world***: 51–75. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

Alvesson, M., & Sandberg, J. 2011. Generating research questions through problematization. ***Academy of Management Review***, 36: 247–271.

Alvesson, M., & Spicer, A. 2010. ***Metaphors we lead by: Understanding leadership in the real world***. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

Alvesson, M., & Willmott, H. 2002. Identity regulation as organizational control: Producing the appropriate individual. ***Journal of Management Studies***, 39: 619–644.

Ancona, D., & Backman, E. V. 2008. ***Distributed, shared, or collective leadership: A new leadership model for the collaborative era?*** Paper presented at the 68th annual meeting of the Academy of Management, Anaheim, CA.

Anteby, M. 2013a. ***Manufacturing morals: The values of silence in business school education***. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Anteby, M. 2013b. Relaxing the taboo on telling our own stories: Upholding professional distance and personal involvement. ***Organization Science***, 24: 1277–1290.

Argyis, C. 1990. ***Overcoming organizational defenses: Facilitating organizational learning***. London: Prentice Hall.

Arthur, M. B. 2008. Examining itinerant careers: A call for interdisciplinary inquiry. ***Human Relations***, 61: 163–186.

Ashforth, B. E., & Reingen, P. H. 2014. Functions of dysfunction: Managing the dynamics of an organizational duality in a natural food cooperative. ***Administrative Science Quarterly***, 59: 474–516.

Augier, M., & March, J. G. 2011. ***The roots, rituals, and rhetorics of change: North American business schools after the second world war.*** Stanford, CA: Business Books.

Babiak, P., & Hare, R. D. 2007. ***Snakes in suits: When psychopaths go to work***. New York: Harper Business.

Barsade, S.G., Ramarajan, L., & Westen, D. 2009. Implicit affect in organizations. ***Research in Organizational Behavior***, 29: 125–162.

Bass, B., & Bass, R. 2008. ***The Bass handbook of leadership: Theory, research and managerial applications***. New York, NJ: Free Press.

Bass, B. M. 1990. From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. ***Organizational Dynamics***, 18: 19–31.

Bennis, W. G., & O'Toole, J. 2005. How business schools lost their way. ***Harvard Business Review***, 83: 96–104.

Bennis, W. G., & Thomas, R. J. 2002. ***Geeks and geezers: How eras, values and defining moments shape leaders***. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business Review Press.

Bergman, J. Z., Westerman, J. W., & Daly, J. P. 2010. Narcissism in management education. ***Academy of Management Learning & Education***, 9: 119–131.

Berkovick, I. 2014. Between person and person: Dialogical pedagogy in authentic leadership development. ***Academy of Management Learning & Education***, 13: 245–264.

Besharov, M. L., & Khurana, R. 2014. Leading amidst competing technical and institutional demands: Revisiting Selznick's conception of leadership. ***Research in the Sociology of Organizations***.

Bolden, R., & Gosling, J. 2006. Leadership competencies: Time to change the tune? ***Leadership***, 2: 147–163.

Boyatzis, R. E., Stubbs, E. C., & Taylor, S. N. 2002. Learning cognitive and emotional intelligence competencies through graduate management education. ***Academy of Management Learning & Education***, 1: 150–162.

Brown, K. G., Arbaugh, J. B., Hrivnak, G., & Kenworthy, A. 2013. Overlooked and unappreciated: What research tells us about how teaching must change. In B. Holtom & E. Dierdorff (Eds.), ***Disrupt or be disrupted: Evidence-based strategies for graduate management education***: 219–258. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley & Sons.

Bryman, A. 1986. ***Leadership and organizations***. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Burns, J. M. 1978. ***Leadership***. New York: Harper & Row.

Carroll, B., & Levy, L. 2010. Leadership development as identity construction. ***Management Communication Quarterly***, 24: 211–231.

Cialdini, R. B. 2007. ***Influence: The psychology of persuasion***. New York: Harper Business.

Clark, T., & Salaman, G. 1998. Telling tales: Management gurus' narratives and the construction of managerial identity. ***Journal of Management Studies***, 35: 137–161.

Coleman, J., Gulati, D., & Segovia, W. O. 2011. ***Passion and purpose: Stories from the best and brightest young business leaders***. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business Review Press.

Corak, M. 2013. Income inequality, equality of opportunity, and intergenerational mobility. ***The Journal of Economic Perspectives***, 27: 79–102.

Coutu, D. L. 2002. The anxiety of learning: An interview with Edgar Schein. ***Harvard Business Review***, 80: 100–106.

Datar, S. M., Garvin, D. A., & Cullen, P. G. 2010. ***Rethinking the MBA: Business education at a crossroads***. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.

DeRue, D. S. 2011. Adaptive leadership theory: Leading and following as a complex adaptive process. ***Research in Organizational Behavior***, 31: 125–150.

DeRue, D. S., & Ashford, S. J. 2010a. Power to the people: Where has personal agency gone in leadership development? ***Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice***, 3: 24–27.

DeRue, D. S., & Ashford, S. J. 2010b. Who will lead and who will follow? A social process of leadership identity construction in organizations. ***Academy of Management Review***, 35: 627–647.

DeRue, D. S., & Wellman, N. 2009. Developing leaders via experience: The role of developmental challenge, learning orientation, and feedback availability. ***The Journal of Applied Psychology***, 94: 859–875.

DeRue, S., & Myers, C. G. 2014. Leadership development: A review and agenda for future research. In D. V. Day (Ed.), ***Oxford handbook of leadership and organizations***: 832–855. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dewey, J. 1938. ***Education and experience***. New York: Macmillan.

Dierdorff, E. C., & Holtom, B. C. 2013. Epilogue. In B. C. Holtom & E. C. Dierdorff (Eds.), ***Disrupt or be disrupted: A blueprint for change in management education***: 347–372. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley & Sons.

Dominick, P. G., Squires, P., & Cervone, D. 2010. Back to persons: On social-cognitive processes and products of leadership development experiences. ***Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice***, 3: 33–37.

Edelman. 2014. 2014 Edelman trust barometer annual global study. ***Edelman.*** Accessed online on 10th November 2014, http://www.edelman.com/insights/intellectual-property/2014-edelman-trust-barometer/.

Ely, R. J., Ibarra, H., & Kolb, D. M. 2011. Taking gender into account: Theory and design for women's leadership development programs. ***Academy of Management Learning & Education***, 10: 474–493.

Fairburn, W. R. D. 1952. ***Psychoanalytic studies of the personality***. London: Tavistock Publications.

Ferraro, F., Pfeffer, J., & Sutton, R. I. 2005. Economics language and assumptions: How theories can become self-fulfilling. ***Academy of Management Review***, 30: 8–24.

Finch-Lees, T., Mabey, C., & Liefooghe, A. 2005. In the name of capability: A critical discursive evaluation of competency-based management development. ***Human Relations***, 58: 1185–1222.

Fitzsimons, D. J. 2012. The contribution of psychodynamic theory to relational leadership. In M. Ulh-Bien & S. M. Ospina (Eds.), ***Advancing relational leadership research: A dialogue among perspectives***: 143–174. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Fotaki, M., & Hyde, P. 2014. Organizational blind spots: Splitting, blame and idealization in the national health service. ***Human Relations***, 441–462.

Fotaki, M., Long, S., & Schwartz, H. S. 2012. What can psychoanalysis offer organization studies today? Taking stock of current developments and thinking about future directions. ***Organization Studies***, 33: 1105–1120.

Freeland, C. 2013. ***Plutocrats: The rise of the new global super-rich***. New York: Penguin.

French, R., & Vince, R. 1999. Learning, managing and organizing: The continuing contribution of group relations to management and organization. In R. French & R. Vince (Eds.), ***Group relations, management and organization***: 3–19. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Freud, S. 1922. ***Group psychology and the analysis of the ego***. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

Gabriel, Y. 1999. Beyond happy families: A critical reevaluation of the control-resistance-identity triangle. ***Human Relations***, 52: 179–203.

Gagnon, S., & Collinson, D. 2014. Rethinking global leadership development programmes: The interrelated significance of power, context and identity. ***Organization Studies***, 35: 645–670.

Galston, W. 2014. Soaring profits but too few jobs. (April 1 2014). ***Wall Street Journal***. Accessed online on 10th November 2014, http://www.wsj.com/articles/SB10001424052702304886904579473900839794492.

George, B., & Sims, P. 2007. ***True north: Discover your authentic leadership***. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

George, B., Sims, P., McLean, A. N., & Mayer, D. 2007. Discovering your authentic leadership. ***Harvard Business Review***, 85: 129–138.

Ghoshal, S. 2005. Bad management theories are destroying good management practice. ***Academy of Management Learning & Education***, 4: 75–91.

Giacalone, R. A. 2004. A transcendent business education for the 21st century. ***Academy of Management Learning & Education***, 3: 415–420.

Giacalone, R. A., & Promislo, M. D. 2013. Broken when entering: The stigmatization of goodness and business ethics education. ***Academy of Management Learning & Education***, 12: 86–101.

Gill, M. J. 2015. Elite identity and status anxiety: An interpretive phenomenological analysis of management consultants. ***Organization, 22: 306–325***.

Gioia, D. A. 2002. Business education's role in the crisis of corporate confidence. ***The Academy of Management Executive***, 16: 142–144.

Glynn, M. A., & Raffaelli, R. 2010. Uncovering mechanisms of theory development in an academic field: Lessons from leadership research. ***The Academy of Management Annals***, 4: 359–401.

GMAC. 2014. Corporate recruiters survey 2014. ***Graduate Management Admissions Council***. Accessed online on 10th November 2014, http://www.gmac.com/market-intelligence-and-research/research-library/employment-outlook/2014-corporate-recruiters.aspx.

Gordon, R. A., & Howell, J. E. 1958. ***Higher education for business***. New York: Columbia University Press.

Gosling, J., & Mintzberg, H. 2004. The education of practicing managers. ***MIT Sloan Management Review*** (Summer): 19–22.

Gould, L. J., Stapley, L. F., & Stein, M. 2004. ***Experiential learning in organizations***. London: Karnac.

Gratton, L. 2011. ***The shift: The future of work is already here***. London: Harper Collins.

Greeley, B. 2013. The Gatsby curve: How inequality became a household word. (December 12 Ed.) ***BusinessWeek.*** Accessed online on 10 November 2014, http://www.businessweek.com/articles/2013-12-05/obama-talks-inequality-and-mobility-going-full-gatsby.

Greenleaf, R. K. 1977. ***Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness***. New York: Crown Publishing Group.

Grint, K. 2009. The sacred in leadership: Separation, sacrifice and silence. ***Organization Studies***, 31: 89–107.

Hackman, J. R., & Wageman, R. 2007. Asking the right questions about leadership. ***The American Psychologist***, 62: 43–47.

Haque, U. 2011. The protests and the metamovement. (October 4) ***Harvard Business Review Blog***. Accessed online on 10 November 2014, https://hbr.org/2011/10/the-protests-and-the-metamovem/.

Haslam, N. 2006. Dehumanization: An integrative review. ***Personality and Social Psychology Review***, 10: 252–264.

Haslam, S. A., Reicher, S. D., & Platow, M. J. 2011. ***The new psychology of leadership: Identity, influence, and power***. New York, NY: Psychology Press.

Heifetz, R. 1994. ***Leadership without easy answers***. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hirschhorn, L., & Gilmore, T. 1980. The application of family therapy concepts to influencing organizational behavior. ***Administrative Science Quarterly***, 25: 18–37.

Holtom, B. C., & Dierdorff, E. C. 2013. ***Disrupt or be disrupted: A bueprint for change in management education***. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley & Sons.

Holton, E., & Naquin, S. 2000. Implementing performance-based leadership development. ***Advances in Developing Human Resources***, 2: 104–114.

Hosking, D. N., Dachler, H. P., & Gergen, K. J. 1995. ***Management and organizaton: Relational alternatives to individualism***. Brookfield: Avebury.

Houghton, J. D., & Yoho, S. K. 2005. Toward a contingency model of leadership and psychological empowerment: When should self-leadership be encouraged? ***Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies***, 11: 65–83.

Ibarra, H. 2003. ***Working identity. Unconventional strategies for reinventing your career***. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Ibarra, H., & Barbulescu, R. 2010. Identity as narrative: Prevalence, effectiveness and consequences of narrative identity work in macro work role transitions. ***Academy of Management Review***, 35: 135–154.

Ibarra, H., Wittman, S., Petriglieri, G., & Day, D. 2014. Leadership and identity: An examination of three theories and new research directions. In D. Day (Ed.), ***Oxford handbook of leadership***: 285–301. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Iles, P., & Preece, D. 2006. Developing leaders or developing leadership. ***Leadership***, 2: 317–340.

Jackson, B. G. 1996. Re-engineering the sense of self: The manager and the management guru. ***Journal of Management Studies***, 33: 571–590.

Jaques, E. 1955. Social systems as a defence against persecutory and depressive anxiety. In M. Klein (Ed.), ***New directions in psychoanalysis***: 478–498. London: Tavistock.

Kaiser, R. B., & Kaplan, R. B. 2006. The deeper work of executive development: Outgrowing sensitivities. ***Academy of Management Learning & Education***, 5: 463–483.

Kanter, R. M. 2010. Leadership in a globalizing world. In N. Noria & R. Khurana (Eds.), ***Handbook of leadership theory and practice***: 569–610. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.

Kegan, R., & Lahey, L. L. 2009. ***Immunity to change: How to overcome it and unlock the potential in yourself and your organization***. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business Review Press.

Kets de Vries, M. 1994. The leadership mystique. ***The Academy of Management Executive***, 8: 73–89.

Kets de Vries, M. 2006. ***The leader on the couch: A clinical approach to changing people and organizations***. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.

Kets de Vries, M., & Korotov, K. 2007. Creating transformational executive education programs. ***Academy of Management Learning & Education***, 6: 375–387.

Khurana, R. 2007. ***From higher aims to hired hands: The social transformation of American business schools and the unfulfilled promise of management as a profession***. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Khurana, R., & Snook, S. 2011. Commentary on 'A scholar's quest.' Identity work in business schools: From Don Quixote, to dons and divas. ***Journal of Management Inquiry***, 20: 358–361.

Kilburg, R. R. 2004. When shadows fall: Using psychodynamic approaches in executive coaching. ***Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research***, 56: 246–268.

Klein, M. 1959. Our adult world and its roots in infancy. ***Human Relations***, 12: 291–303.

Klimoski, R., & Amos, B. 2012. Practicing evidence-based education in leadership development. ***Academy of Management Learning & Education***, 11: 685–702.

Knights, D., & Clarke, C. A. 2014. It's a bittersweet symphony, this life: Fragile academic selves and insecure identities at work. ***Organization Studies***, 35: 335–357.

Knowles, M. S. 1970. ***The modern practice of adult education: From pedagogy to andragogy***. Cambridge: Cambridge Book Co.

Kolb, A. Y., & Kolb, D. A. 2005. Learning styles and learning spaces: Enhancing experiential learning in higher education. ***Academy of Management Learning & Education***, 4: 193–212.

Kolb, D. A. 1984. ***Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development***. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Krantz, J., & Gilmore, T. 1990. The splitting of leadership and management as a social defense. ***Human Relations***, 43: 183–204.

Kreiner, G. E., Hollensbe, E. C., & Sheep, M. L. 2006. Where is the me among the we? Identity work and the search for optimal balance. ***Academy of Management Journal***, 49: 1031–1057.

Kriger, M., & Seng, Y. 2005. Leadership with inner meaning: A contingency theory of leadership based on the worldviews of five religions. ***The Leadership Quarterly***, 16: 771–806.

Kristof, N. 2014. The American dream is leaving America. ***New York Times***. October 25, 2014. Accessed online on 10th November, 2014. http://www.nytimes.com/2014/10/26/opinion/sunday/nicholas-kristof-the-american-dream-is-leaving-america.html?_r=0.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. 1991. ***Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation***. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Long, S. F. 2004. Really ... why do *executives* attend *executive education* programmes? ***Journal of Management Development***, 23: 701–714.

Lopez, R. 2014. Thomas Piketty's income inequality tome tops Amazon bestseller lists, outsells romances (April, 23rd 2014 ed.) ***LA Times.*** Accessed online on 10 November 2014, http://www.latimes.com/business/la-fi-mo-thomas-picketty-book-on-income-inequality-capitalism-20140423-story.html.

Mabey, C. 2013. Leadership development in organizations: Multiple discourses and diverse practice. ***International Journal of Management Reviews***, 15: 359–380.

Maccoby, M. 2007. ***Narcissistic leaders: Who succeeds and who fails***. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business Review Press.

March, J. G., & Weil, T. 2005. ***On leadership***. Oxford, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

McAdams, D. P. 1999. Personal narratives and the life story. In L. Pervin & O. John (Eds.), ***Handbook of personality: Theory and research,*** (2nd ed.): 478–500. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

McCall, M. W. 1988. ***High flyers: Developing the next generation of leaders***. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Menzies, I. E. P. 1960. A case-study in the functioning of social systems as a defence against anxiety. ***Human Relations***, 13: 95–121.

Miller, E. J. 1999. Dependency, alienation or partnership? The changing relatedness of the individual to the enterprise. In R. French & R. Vince, (Eds.), ***Group relations, management, and organisation***: 98–111. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Miller, E. J., & Rice, A. K. 1967. ***Systems of organization.*** London, UK: Tavistock Publications.

Mintzberg, H. 2004. The MBA menace. ***Fast Company.*** (June Issue 83). Accessed online on 10th November 2014, http://www.fastcompany.com/50160/mba-menace.

Mintzberg, H., & Gosling, J. 2002. Educating managers beyond borders. ***Academy of Management Learning & Education***, 1: 64–76.

Mirvis, P. 2008. Executive development through consciousness-raising experiences. ***Academy of Management Learning & Education***, 7: 173–188.

Mizruchi, M. 2013. ***The fracturing of the American corporate elite***. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Mukunda, G. 2014. The price of Wall Street's power. ***Harvard Business Review***, 96: 70–78.

Nicholson, H., & Carroll, B. 2013. Identity undoing and power relations in leadership development. ***Human Relations***, 66: 1225–1248.

Obama, B. 2013. Remarks by the president on economc mobility. (December 04, 2013 ed.) ***The White House: Office of the Press Secretary.*** Accessed online on 10 November 2014, http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2013/12/04/remarks-president-economic-mobility.

OECD. 2014. Inequality. ***OECD***. Accessed online on 10 November 2014, http://www.oecd.org/inequality.htm.

Pearce, J. L., & Huang, L. 2012. The decreasing value of our research to management education. ***Academy of Management Learning & Education***, 11: 247–262.

Petriglieri, G. 2011. Identity workspaces for leadership development. In S. Snook, N. Noria, & R. Khurana (Eds.), ***The handbook for teaching leadership***: 295–312. London: Sage.

Petriglieri, G., & Petriglieri, J. L. 2010. Identity workspaces: The case of business schools. ***Academy of Management Learning & Education***, 9: 44–60.

Petriglieri, G., & Stein, M. 2012. The unwanted self: Projective identification in leader's identity work. ***Organization Studies***, 33: 1217–1235.

Petriglieri, G., Wood, J. D., & Petriglieri, J. L. 2011. Up close and personal: Building foundations for leaders' development through the personalization of management learning. ***Academy of Management Learning & Education***, 10: 430–450.

Pfeffer, J., & Fong, C. T. 2002. The end of business schools? Less success than meets the eye. ***Academy of Management Learning & Education***, 1: 78–95.

Piff, P. K., Stancato, D. M., Cote, S., Mendoza-Denton, R., & Keltner, D. 2012. High social class predicts increased unethical behavior. ***Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America***, 109: 4086–4091.

Piketty, T. 2014. ***Capital in the twenty-first century***. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.

Podolny, J. M. 2009. The buck stops (and starts) at business school. ***Harvard Business Review***, 87: 62–67.

Podolny, J. M. 2011. A conversation with James G. March on learning about leadership. ***Academy of Management Learning & Education***, 10: 502–506.

Portnow, K., Popp, N., Broderick, M., Drago-Severson, E., & Kegan, R. 1998. Transformational learning in adulthood. ***Focus on Basics***, 2: 22–27.

Putnam, R. D. 2000. ***Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community***. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Raelin, J. A. 2004. Don't bother putting leadership into people. ***The Academy of Management Executive***, 18: 131–135.

Raelin, J. A. 2007. Toward an epistemology of practice. ***Academy of Management Learning & Education***, 6: 495–519.

Rice, A. K. 1965. ***Learning for leadership***. London: Tavistock Publications.

Robinson, S. L., Kraatz, M. S., & Rousseau, D. M. 1994. Changing obligations and the psychological contract: A longitudinal study. ***Academy of Management Journal***, 37: 137–152.

Rubin, R. S., & Dierdorff, E. C. 2009. How relevant is the MBA? Assessing the alignment of required curricula and required managerial competencies. ***Academy of Management Learning & Education***, 8: 208–224.

Rynes, S. L., & Bartunek, J. M. 2013. Curriculum matters: Toward more holistic graduate education. In E. C. Dierdorff & B. Holtom (Eds.), ***Disrupt or be disrupted: Evidence-based strategies for graduate business school***: 179–218. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley & Sons.

Schon, D. A. 1984. ***The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action***. New York: Basic Books.

Scott, S. 2010. Revisiting the total institution: Performative regulation in the reinventive institution. ***Sociology***, 44: 213–231.

Selznick, P. 1957. ***Leadership in administration***. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Sennett, R. 1998. ***The corrosion of character. The personal consequences of work in the new capitalism***. New York: W.W. Norton & Co.

Sennett, R. 2006. ***The culture of the new capitalism***. New Haven, CT:Yale University.

Shamir, B., & Eilam, G. 2005. "What's your story?" A life-stories approach to authentic leadership development. ***The Leadership Quarterly***, 16: 395–417.

Shotter, J., & Tsoukas, H. 2014. In search of phronesis: Leadership and the art of judgment. ***Academy of Management Learning & Education***, 13: 224–243.

Sinclair, A. 2007. Teaching leadership critically to MBAs: Experiences from heaven and hell. ***Management Learning***, 38: 458–472.

Smith, E. B., & Kuntz, P. 2013. CEO pay 1,975-to-1 multiple wages skirts U.S. law. (30 April 2013 ed.) ***Bloomberg.*** Accessed online on 10th November 2014, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-04-30/ceo-pay-1-795-to-1-multiple-of-workers-skirts-law-as-sec-delays.html.

Smith, K. K. 1989. The movement of conflict in organizations: The joint dynamics of splitting and triangulation. ***Administrative Science Quarterly***, 1: 1–20.

Snook, S. 2007. Leader(ship) development. ***Harvard Business School Note***, n. 408–064.

Snow, D. A., & Anderson, L. 1987. Identity work among the homeless: The verbal construction and avowal of personal identities. ***American Journal of Sociology***, 92: 1336–1371.

Spender, J. C., & Khurana, R. 2013. Intellectual signatures: Impact on relevance and doctoral programs. In B. C. Holtom & E. C. Dierdorff (Eds.), ***Disrupt or be disrupted: A blueprint for change in management education***: 131–178. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley & Sons.

Starkey, K., & Hall, C. 2011. The spirit of leadership: New directions in leadership education. In S. Snook, N. Nohria, & R. Khurana (Eds.), ***The handbook for teaching leadership: Knowing, doing and being***: 81–98. London: Sage.

Starkey, K., & Tempest, S. 2008. A clear sense of purpose? The evolving role of the business school. ***Journal of Management Development***, 27: 379–390.

Starkey, K., & Tempest, S. 2009. From crisis to purpose. ***Journal of Management Development***, 28: 700–710.

Stiglitz, J. E. 2012. ***The price of inequality: How today's divided society endangers our future***. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Sturdy, A., Brocklehurst, M., Winstanley, D., & Littlejohns, M. 2006. Management as a (self) confidence trick: Management ideas, education and identity work. ***Organization***, 13: 841–860.

Surowiecki, J. 2014. Moaning moguls (July 7 ed.). ***New Yorker***. Accessed online on 10th November 2014, http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2014/07/07/moaning-moguls.

Sveningsson, S. F., & Alvesson, M. 2003. Managing managerial identities: Organizational fragmentation, discourse and identity struggle. ***Human Relations***, 56: 1163–1193.

Symons, L., & Ibarra, H. 2014. What the scarcity of women in business case studies really looks like (April 28 ed.). ***Harvard Business Review Blog***. Accessed online on 10th November 2014, https://hbr.org/2014/04/what-the-scarcity-of-women-in-business-case-studies-really-looks-like/.

Trist, E. L., & Bamforth, K. W. 1951. Some social and psychological consequences of the longwall method of coal-getting. ***Human Relations***, 4: 3–38.

van Knippenberg, D., & Hogg, M. A. 2003. A social identity model of leadership effectiveness in organizations. ***Research in Organizational Behavior***, 25: 243–295.

van Knippenberg, D., & Sitkin, S. B. 2013. A critical assessment of charismatic–transformational leadership research: Back to the drawing board? ***Academy of Management Annals***, 7(1): 1–60.

Voronov, M., & Vince, R. 2012. Integrating emotions into the analysis of institutional work. ***Academy of Management Review***, 37: 58–81.

Waddock, S., & Lozano, J. M. 2013. Developing more holistic management education: Lessons learned from two programs. ***Academy of Management Learning & Education***, 12: 265–284.

Wang, L., Malhotra, D., & Murnighan, J. K. 2011. Economics education and greed. ***Academy of Management Learning & Education***, 10: 643–660.

Waytz, A., Hoffman, K. M., & Trawalter, S. 2014. A superhumanization bias in Whites' perceptions of Blacks. ***Social Psychological and Personality Science***, 6: 352–359.

Weick, K. E. 2004. Mundane poetics: Searching for wisdom in organization studies. ***Organization Studies***, 25: 653–668.

Weick, K. E., & Putnam, T. 2006. Organizing for mindfulness. ***Journal of Management Inquiry***, 15: 275–287.

Winnicott, D. W. 1975. Transitional objects and transitional phenomena. In D.W. Winnicott, (Ed.), ***Through pediatrics to psychoanalysis***: 229–242. London: Karnac (Original work published 1958).

Wolf, M. 2014. Failing elites threaten our future. (January 14th 2014 ed.). ***Financial Times***. Accessed online on 10 November 2014, http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/cfc1eb1c-76d8-11e3-807e-00144feabdc0.html#axzz3NUYSmA5c.

Wood, J. D., & Petriglieri, G. 2004. The merchandising of leadership. In S. Chowdhury, (Ed.), ***Next generation business handbook:*** 200–219. Toronto: John Wiley & Sons.

Wood, J. D., & Petriglieri, G. 2005. Transcending polarization: Beyond binary thinking. ***Transactional Analysis Journal***, 35: 31–39.

World Economic Forum. 2014. Outlook on the global agenda 2015. ***World Economic Forum***. Accessed online on 10 November 2014, http://reports.weforum.org/outlook-global-agenda-2015/.

Yeung, A., & Berman, B. 1997. Adding value through human resource measurement to drive business performance. ***Human Resource Management Journal***, 36: 321–335.

Gianpiero Petriglieri (Gianpiero.Petriglieri@insead.edu) is associate professor of organisational behaviour at INSEAD in Fontainebleau, France. He holds an MD with specialization in psychiatry from the University of Catania Medical School, Italy. His areas of interest include leadership development, systems psychodynamics, and experiential learning.

Jennifer Louise Petriglieri (Jennifer.Petriglieri@insead.edu) is assistant professor of organisational behaviour at INSEAD in Fontainebleau, France. She received her PhD. in organisational behaviour from INSEAD. Her research explores identity dynamics in organizations in crisis and contemporary careers, the social function of business schools, and the dynamics of identity development in management education.