

Professionalizing Leadership

Anders Örtenblad
Editor

Professionalizing Leadership

Debating Education, Certification and
Practice

palgrave
macmillan

Editor
Anders Örtenblad
Nord University
Bodø, Norway

ISBN 978-3-319-71784-5 ISBN 978-3-319-71785-2 (eBook)
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-71785-2>

Library of Congress Control Number: 2018938715

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s) 2018

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Printed on acid-free paper

This Palgrave Macmillan imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Switzerland AG
The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

Foreword

A Foreword is normally written by a person whose work is not included in the book, to introduce the book's authors and work to the reader. I am not one of the authors included in the book, though I am pleased to see that some have taken me to task for my views. The book is enriched by having more authors than one can conveniently introduce individually. Again, as the Editor explains (Örtenblad, Chap. 1 in this volume), rather than being directed towards a single topic, it reports a "debate" about leadership that has a host of angles, again too many to introduce individually. So, failing to meet the conventional criteria, this Foreword reflects what I find in the book, along with some ideas evoked by its project.

What the debate about professionalizing leadership lacks in structure is made up by its relevance. Whether it is possible to professionalize leadership—or not, and our authors are divided on this,—leadership matters greatly in human affairs; on which all surely agree. But how to think, talk, and write about it with profit? This is a problem. As noted, the volume has a wonderful variety of authors and angles. Perhaps that is the whole point. There is no simple idea that can grasp the human condition securely—only death and taxes. We bring many varied ideas to our lives. Single ideas are the mark of dogmatics and bigots. Intelligence has been defined as the ability to hold two "contrary" ideas in mind and still function, to avoid being immobilized like Buridan's Ass. Our condition

is one of constantly moving on, discovering we do not know, of being surprised, often unpleasantly. Note this only happens when we are able to observe what we had not expected, which requires having “contrary” ideas that lie outside what we expected, to wit, when we are being intelligent rather than dogmatic. We think about our lives pluralistically. Leaders help us deal with this fractured appreciation, persuading us to engage it rather than deny it, to resist the temptation to panic and hide under the pillow. Leaders help us engage these pluralities, endlessly changing and defying totalizing definition. It follows that leadership is endlessly fascinating, pluralistic, and challenging, as well as relevant and important.

But what can “professionalizing” mean, beyond asking how and why leaders are “looked up to”? Our literature shows the persistence of “traitism”, the tautology that leaders are those with leadership qualities, and leadership qualities are those which make some individuals leaders. This has tempted us for centuries and undoubtedly will go on doing so for many more. Such sloppy thinking is often comforting. We see the search for leadership traits in ancient Greece, just as some search for them today, without bothering to read Homer. Traitism’s claim of “traits” as “causes” stands against a longer history of leadership as the social, religious, military and political art of shaping other’s lives (Tead 1935; De Pree 1989). Because this does not seek causes and so explain, it may be equally tautological—leaders are those who shape others’ lives. Thinking about leadership today is about escaping these tautologies, not re-affirming them (Hunt 1999; Lowe and Gardner 2000).

One place for Western “moderns” to start breaking out is from our Enlightenment tradition, by examining the problems of creating and sustaining social order once we admit individual rights and legitimate the pursuit of individual freedoms that might conflict with others’. Many presume leadership is about the creation of order and direction among free individuals, especially social or organizational order. Writing in times of horrendous social upheaval and Civil War, Hobbes invoked the Leviathan, centralized “arbitrary” power over all citizens. Locke invoked the Commonwealth, a system of collectively generated laws under which free citizens voluntarily contract to live. A little later Rousseau saw natural social order disrupted by the pursuit of property

and reputation, calling for a social contract articulating the “general will” to social order. Spinoza, of course, earlier denied individuals much of the freedom and agency which, post-Locke, we presume, pursue, and protect, advising instead the application of reason to living.

Not many courses in leadership take off from these political theorists, yet they remain seminal to Western thinking, including Marx. It seems our world’s condition, and its ecological, political, economic, technological, and social upheavals are but modern variations of the situations Hobbes, Locke, Machiavelli, and others inhabited. Most of our thinking echoes theirs and has not advanced much beyond it, despite our computers, gene-splicing, and neuroscience. Professionalizing leadership may mean being skilled in applying these philosophers’ thinking to our own times, which may differ from theirs only in the technologies available to us, especially public sanitation and “information technology”. Have people changed? If not, is leadership today about applying medicine and computers to the ancient problems of creating and maintaining social order? Is it about evolving techniques of surveillance, real-time data, more powerful algorithms, or the AI that pushes us forwards to Kurzweil’s “singularity”? No doubt many people think this is where managerial leadership is headed, for they presume there can be a formal or computable theory of leadership into which “professionals” can be trained—a curiously dogmatic approach that seems to deny our socio-historical circumstances, reminding us of the Icarus fable. No computing system will be able to anticipate humans’ ability to mess up our society and thereby render leadership obsolete. A fully computable society is as dystopian as it is unlikely.

Leadership surely reflects the challenging business and political situations we inhabit, and our intuition that some people handle such uncertainties better than others. We applaud, or perhaps fear, such individuals. If this is a useful approach, then the notion of leadership can only be understood through the uniqueness of the problem situation. There are no generalities or perfect social order. Claiming there is some universal “trait” that enables individuals so blessed to deal well with uncertainty in every situation is curious. It implies people can be known in a way isolated from their circumstances, that people have some core characteristics. Yet not one of us knows our own ‘nature’ enough to

know how we might deal with future situations. Which makes Edwards's anthropological account of leadership especially interesting (Edwards 2015).

The shift of research focus from the leader's traits to her/his circumstances and thence to more modest claims about leadership, is evident in recent studies spurred by our emerging social and organizational problems: inequity, financial collapse, gender bias, workplace harassment, automation, changes in the work place and in work, and so on. Rather than appearing for the first time, these problems are ever-present and simply pressing once again into our social consciousness. The overused term "disruption" must attach to something specific in our lives. Each category of "problem" implies a specialized leadership needed to create order in the face of disruption and disorder.

Is this trend merely an effect of how our academy works, of how "academic leaders" open new sub-fields to bypass impassable blocks on the path to a generic computable theory of leadership? We apply the scientific method because it facilitates publication and generating materials to teach, our bottom line. But does it clarify the thinking of those we call leaders and lead them to better practice? What we write about professionalizing leaders may have more to do with professionalizing our community, enabling us to separate us "leadership scholars" from the journalists, consultants, and snake-oil authors who write about the human condition without scientific method. Reading Rousseau, for instance, one cannot but be amazed at the power, economy, and relevance of his language, and its contrast with today's academic writings on leadership. His success lay in helping politicians and policy-makers characterize their political circumstances, facilitating their practice, less in suggesting generic science that dictated solutions or predicted outcomes. In short, is the point of our literature to professionalize "practitioners" or to professionalize us and our publication-driven careers?

In his Introduction, the Editor summarizes the principal means we have adopted to structure the "professionalization" debate (changing his list a bit):

1. There is a systematized "knowledge-base"
2. Used to control admission to leadership as a practice

3. Which is policed communally
4. To ensure responsibility in the social context and
5. To embrace a legitimated code of ethics
6. At the individual level.

The list stands on leadership writing's "axioms" or micro-foundations: knowledge, practice, community/society, individuals, ethics. Leadership is a term we use to point to managed relations between these axioms. Individuals are actors whose practice is shaped by others (leaders) in ways that can be evaluated socially. Curiously, the list implies rather than includes "the leader", the individual we deem to be shaping others' practice, presumed a different kind of individual. Which means the list pays little attention to the relationship between leader and led, or to the leader's mode of influencing the led. Which thus takes us towards researching the exercise of power, also of several types (e.g. French and Raven 1959). Ultimately leadership researchers must specify or imply a specific kind of power and hence a specific context wherein this power is present and, presumably, normatively and legally legitimated. There is much talk of leadership on the battlefield. There, some command while others have taken oaths and become duty/oath bound to obey, at the risk of their lives. Business leadership, probably the focus of most of our authors, is different. Perhaps there are monetary incentives, though doling these out is probably not what we mean by leadership. There is some discussion of non-monetary or "intrinsic" incentives (Osterloh and Frey 2000). Which frames business leadership as adept use of a broader range of incentives—analyzable per the context of their application.

The point here is that the discussion of leadership (in business) properly begins with ideas about its context with a "theory of the business firm". We are ambivalent about this. Our literature suggests two "contrary" master metaphors: the firm as a designable machine versus the firm as a community or mini-society (Morgan 1997). When the organization is presumed emergent, as in "organizational ecology" (Hannan and Freeman 1989), management is peripheral; there is no leadership. If the firm-as-machine is perfectly designed, constructed, and monitored, leadership is computational, maximizing resource use and systemic efficiency towards a known goal. Most of what we write about leadership lies

between these two bounds. Which axioms can take us beyond the fully designed or fully emergent metaphors, perhaps towards some middle ground or “third way”? Each of the book’s authors justifies writing about leadership in their own way. The reader is invited to compare their contributions in terms of the axioms they adopt, and ponder whether they cover the same topic or are actually divergent, whether the interplay between the contrary ideas expands or diminishes the discussion.

Incentives are crucial to the machine model. The community model is held together by talk. In both models, leadership is the successful exercise of rhetoric (persuasive talk). Obviously, there are many types of professional rhetorician: politicians, clerics, actors, even writers and teachers like us. The history of educating people for positions of social leadership—whether in the church, in the military, in politics, or in business—is a 2000 years’ history of studying, teaching, and practicing rhetoric. From this point of view, business leadership means developing and delivering rhetoric that is persuasive in particular business settings. “Rhetorician” is a profession to the extent it stands on the body of knowledge produced by 2000 years of studying “rhetorical models of man” from Aristotle on—in contrast to standing the analysis on the “*homo economicus*” of the recent post-Walras era, on goal attainment or maximization. Persuasion is contrary to the use of incentives to shape others’ rational decision-making. The definition of “rhetorical man” goes back, at least, to Isocrates and his axiom: “Men can persuade . . . and be persuaded”. There is curiously little attention to teaching rhetoric within the leadership canon or elsewhere, save in vestigial programs in English composition (Peter Davis, Chap. 6 in this volume, touches on rhetoric in his critique of an essay of mine). Until the latter half of the nineteenth century, university teaching presumed students were headed towards socially influential settings, whether in the church, military, or society generally. The curriculum was based on the *trivium* and *quadrivium*. Rhetoric was foundational. Managers’ interest in this kind of “persuasive leadership”—contrasted against “command and control”—is evident in a flourishing practitioner-oriented literature (e.g. Heinrichs 2017). Have today’s scholars of business rhetoric much advanced much from Aristotle?

Professionalization may well hinge on a socially legitimated “body of knowledge” and institutionalized policing. It may well need moral and ethical content. But the litmus test of professionalization is skilled

practice; if the audience's ethics do not matter to them, they are irrelevant to the leader. The medical profession has had many periods in which its professionals were practicing what we now regard as "incorrect science". Thus professionalization is more about contextualized practice than about empirically validated knowledge (science). The modernist intuition is that good practice is determined, or at least shaped by, "correct knowledge"—which leads us to emphasize validated science over history and practice. Professionalization suggests we go the other way and emphasize effective practice over the science available. By analogy, does it matter if successful competitive cyclists cannot explain how they ride? Or ride "wrong"? If business is legitimated as democratic capitalism's means to make economic profits and become stable, many business leaders show they can be professional irrespective of the scientific soundness of their rhetoric. Perhaps the unarticulated (tacit) aspects of their practice are more material than their conformance to some science. In other social contexts, who knows what professionalization might mean? Perhaps professionalization means adapting to the business manager's circumstances and helping hone her/his rhetorical practices rather than persuing the "higher aims" imagined by academic writers.

New York, NY, USA

J. C. Spender

References

- De Pree, Max. 1989. *Leadership Is an Art*. New York: Doubleday.
- Edwards, Gareth. 2015. "Anthropological Accounts of Leadership: Historical and Geographical Interpretations from Indigenous Cultures." *Leadership* 11(3):335–50.
- French, John R., and Bertram H. Raven. 1959. "The Bases for Social Power." In *Studies in Social Power*, edited by Dorwin Cartwright, 150–67. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.
- Hannan, Michael T., and John Freeman. 1989. *Organizational Ecology*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Heinrichs, Jay. 2017. *Thank You for Arguing: What Aristotle, Lincoln, and Homer Simpson Can Teach Us About the Art of Persuasion* (3rd ed.). New York: Three Rivers Press.

- Hunt, James G. 1999. "Transformational/Charismatic Leadership's Transformation of the Field: An Historical Essay." *Leadership Quarterly* 10(2):129–44.
- Lowe, Kevin B., and William L. Gardner. 2000. "Ten Years of The Leadership Quarterly: Contributions and Challenges for the Future." *The Leadership Quarterly* 11(4):459–514.
- Morgan, Gareth. 1997. *Images of Organization*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Osterloh, Margit, and Bruno S. Frey. 2000. "Motivation, Knowledge Transfer, and Organizational Form." *Organization Science* 11(5):538–50.
- Tead, Ordway. 1935. *The Art of Leadership*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Preface

The two debates that are dealt with in this book, firstly, whether leadership is, can and should be turned into a true profession, and secondly whether it is a good idea that higher education institutions (HEIs) offer bachelor programs in leadership, are both close to my heart. I have taught leadership at various HEIs since the beginning of the 1990s, and have become convinced that it is possible—albeit difficult—to teach and learn leadership in a HEI setting. I have become even more convinced that there is a huge need for good leadership education, and that leadership competence can be thought of as something general that can be executed by one person in various contexts (even if adaptations are necessary).

With this background, for many years I have had an idea to design and start up a bachelor program in leadership. During the years that I have had this idea, some colleagues have been very supportive and we have together tried to put the idea into practice. Other colleagues have met my ideas with a more skeptical attitude. Some of these skeptics have argued that the leader has to be very competent in whatever it is that the “followers” perform and, thus, that leaders necessarily must be recruited among those “followers”, and for this reason leadership education should always only be a complement to another education and that it should not be the main education (thus, these people often argue that leadership education should be taken at the master level).

I am instead arguing that leaders very well may be less or virtually incompetent in the area that the “followers” are competent in and still do a good job as leaders, but that “leadership” may then have to be redefined. Thus, I agree that if leadership is about instructing followers what to do and controlling what they have done, then leaders may have to be experts in the same area as their followers. But if leadership instead is about organizing, encouraging, and getting the most out of people—for instance, by trusting that they know themselves what to do and how to perform it—and to facilitate for people’s development, then leadership may very well be something that people can perform without having much expertise in the followers’ occupation or the tasks that they perform. Instead, leaders could benefit from leadership expertise, which, in my opinion, is to a large extent knowledge about people (that is, psychology, sociology etc.).

I am not saying that a person can learn to become something other than what she or he already is through leadership education. But during a bachelor program in leadership, a person with a deep interest in people and leadership would be given the opportunities to reflect upon her- or himself, and to at least get to know her- or himself well enough to understand her or his habitual/automatic feelings, thoughts and behaviors, and be given training on alternative ways of thinking and behaving, so that she or he as a leader has a broader set of alternative ways of dealing with things than what she or he otherwise would have had.

For these reasons I believe that it is a good idea for HEIs to offer bachelor programs in leadership, that is, programs where the students are supposed to learn to become leaders. This, in turn, gives me reason to argue that leadership should be turned into a profession, which I think could possibly happen in the future, even if it will be challenging and time-consuming.

However, I have not successfully started up any bachelor program in leadership, despite attempting to with the help of colleagues. There is still a lot of resistance in academia against such efforts; possibly there is also resistance outside academia. Neither has it always been easy to explain to potential students what such a bachelor program is all about. Nevertheless, my own role in the failed attempts should not be diminished. However, I still believe in the idea, and if others have succeeded (especially in the US), there is no reason why I or other scholars should not succeed too. I would not be surprised if most universities around the world are offering

bachelor programs in leadership in the future. I would guess that it will not take more than ten or fifteen years for this to happen.

A few years ago I was arguing for this in a Swedish professional magazine, but was met by the argument that “no, leadership is no profession” by another scholar. To me, whether leadership is or isn’t a true profession is quite a different debate from the debate on whether or not it *should* be turned into a true profession, even if there, of course, are connections between the two debates. I agree that currently leadership is not a true profession but I believe that it can and should be turned into a profession.

The above is to give some kind of a personal background to why this book project was started up, a book project that to at least some extent has been different from other anthologies that I have edited. I usually like to invite contributions that function as a “counterimage” (Ohlsson and Rombach 2015) to the main book idea or the assumptions that the book rests upon, which I put in a section towards the end of the book. Such chapters tend to give books a healthy, additional dimension. In this book, however, the very idea has been to offer a broad variety of arguments in at least one of the two debates that are dealt with in the book: whether or not leadership is, can and should be turned into a true profession.

Being a proponent of leadership/management being turned into a true profession (see Örtenblad, Chap. 19 in this volume), and of bachelor programs in leadership being offered (see Örtenblad, Chap. 25 in this volume), it has been important for me, in my role as editor of the book, to do justice to all chapters in the book, even those I agree less with or even disagree with. My firm ambition has been to edit all contributions in an equal and unbiased way as possible. For this reason I have put those chapters in which the authors argue against leadership as a profession at the beginning of the book. This is meant to show respect for my antagonists.

Finally, I want to thank all the authors of the chapters for your hard work and valuable contributions. It would have been both fruitful and enjoyable to meet you all AFK (away from keyboard), but that will have to wait until some other time.

Reference

- Ohlsson, Östen, and Björn Rombach. 2015. "The Art of Constructive Criticism."
In *Handbook of Research on Management Ideas and Panaceas: Adaptation and Context*, edited by Anders Örténblad, 149–70. Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Contents

Part I	Introduction	1
1	Background and Introduction: Leadership as a Profession and as the Main Theme on Bachelor Programs <i>Anders Örténblad</i>	3
2	What Is a Profession, and What Are the Prerequisites for Being a Profession? <i>Jill Beth Otterlei</i>	31
Part II	Against Leadership as a Profession	45
	Section A. Is Not a Profession	
3	How and Why Management Has Not Become a Profession <i>Haldor Byrkjeflot and Pål Nygaard</i>	49

Section B. *Can* Not Become a Profession

- 4 Management as a Profession: The Historian's Perspective** 71
Susanna Fellman
- 5 The Professional Leader: Man of Many Talents or Jack of All Trades? Five Questions About Professional Leadership** 87
Leif-Kristian Monsen
- 6 Leadership as a Profession: A Special Case Dependent on Organizational Ownership, Governance, Mission and Vision** 109
Peter Davis
- 7 Can Leadership Become a Profession?** 125
Frederik Hertel and Michael Fast

Section C. *Should* Not Become a Profession

- 8 Against Professionalizing Leadership: The Roles of Self-Formation and Practical Wisdom in Leadership** 143
Kenneth Mølbjerg Jørgensen and Marita Svane
- 9 The Case for Behavioral Professionalism in Leadership** 161
C. Ken Weidner II
- 10 Professionalizing Political Leaders: Is This the Cure? Lessons from Political Theory** 181
Hans Petter Saxi

Part III In Between For and Against Leadership as a Profession	197
11 The Future of Management: Global Trends and Possible Scenarios of Development of Managerial Profession <i>Alexandra Moskovskaya</i>	199
12 Management/Leadership: Profession, Professional, Professionalization <i>Rikke Kristine Nielsen, Thomas Duus Henriksen, and Kenneth Børgesen</i>	219
Part IV For Leadership as a Profession	235
Section A. <i>Is</i> Already a Profession	
13 Leadership, Management, and the Common Good <i>David Lutz</i>	239
14 Management Can Be Considered as a Profession <i>Victor J. Delacruz</i>	251
Section B. <i>Should</i> but <i>Can</i> Not Become a Profession	
15 The Professionalization of Medical Management? The Slow and Chequered Case of UK Health Care <i>Ewan Ferlie</i>	277

Section C. *Can* and *Should* Become a Profession

16 Leadership as a Profession: The Need for an Authentic Jurisdiction	295
<i>Kelly C. Jordan</i>	
17 Should Leadership Be Considered a Profession?	313
<i>Grace Wangui Kinyanjui</i>	
18 Leadership as a Profession? The Significance of Reflexive Judgment	333
<i>Lone Hersted and Mette Vinther Larsen</i>	
19 Preparing for Turning Leadership into a True Profession	349
<i>Anders Örtenblad</i>	
Part V On the Need for Bachelor Programs in Leadership	359
20 Bachelor Programs in Leadership: The Beginning of a Profession	361
<i>Allan Næs Gjerding, Kenneth Mølbjerg Jørgensen, René Nesgaard Nielsen, and Jørgen Gulddahl Rasmussen</i>	
21 “As the Twig Is Bent, so the Tree Shall Grow”: Developing Strategic Intuition Through Reflective Practices in Bachelor Programs in Leadership Studies	369
<i>G. K. Cunningham and Richard M. Meinhart</i>	
22 Yes, We Should Develop New Action-Learning-Based Bachelor Programs in Leadership	377
<i>Daniel Belet</i>	

23	The Need to Consider the Context When Offering Bachelor Programs in Leadership	385
	<i>Andrew Bolt and Pandora Rupert Bolt</i>	
24	How a Bachelor in Leadership Would Fill a Gap	393
	<i>Kenneth Børgesen, Rikke Kristine Nielsen, and Thomas Duus Henriksen</i>	
25	Why Universities Should Give Bachelor Programs in Leadership	403
	<i>Anders Örtenblad</i>	
	Index	409

Notes on Contributors

Daniel Belet is Professor of People and Organization Management at La Rochelle Business School. He is also the co-founder of WIAL-France, which is introducing and developing action learning both in management education and business development. His main domains of research and publications are: management education, leadership development, learning organizations, sustainable people and organization management.

Andrew Bolt teaches Business and Leadership students as part of an international partnership between Fort Hays University in the United States and Shenyang Normal University in China. His work with Pandora Rupert Bolt has appeared in the *International Business Education Journal* and the *Global Journal of Business & Social Science Review*. They have presented research at conferences in the UAE, Sri Lanka, and Malaysia.

Pandora Rupert Bolt teaches Leadership for an international partnership between Fort Hays University in the United States and Shenyang Normal University in China. Her work with Andrew Bolt has appeared in the *International Business Education Journal* and the *Global Journal of Business & Social Science Review*. They have presented research at conferences in the UAE, Sri Lanka, and Malaysia.

Kenneth Børgesen is a Teaching Assistant Professor at the Department of Learning and Philosophy. Kenneth is authorized by the Danish Supervisory Board of Psychological Practice and is currently finalizing his Ph.D., focusing on

the evolution of performance management in the age of technological revolution. Kenneth has extensive experience as a management consultant advising both Danish and foreign companies, and institutions on managing performance.

Haldor Byrkjeflot is Professor in Sociology at University of Oslo, currently academic director of one of the three major strategic priority areas at University of Oslo; UiO Nordic. His publications cover a broad specter of social scientific problems such as logics of employment systems, comparative health care reforms, public sector reforms as well as management systems and bureaucracy.

G. K. Cunningham is Professor of Strategic Landpower at the US Army War College in Carlisle, Pennsylvania. He is responsible for the incorporation of landpower theory and practice into the resident education curriculum, with emphasis on systems theory and center of gravity analysis. He addresses the use of intuition and intuitive judgment in military contingency planning and campaign design among strategic leaders.

Peter Davis is Adjunct Professor in Co-operative Management Education and Development at the Sobey School of Business at Saint Marys University, a Fellow of the Royal Society of Arts and an Honorary Fellow at University of Leicester School of Business. He is a former trade union organiser, management consultant and special advisor in HRD to the International Co-operative Alliance. Peter has over thirty years' experience teaching in higher education and conducting research on co-operatives.

Victor J. Delacruz is a strategist and cyberspace operations analyst at the United States Army Cyber Center of Excellence, Cyberspace Support Element. He was awarded his DBA by the School of Advanced Studies, University of Phoenix; and he is a graduate of the Emerging Leaders course, Harvard Kennedy School. A retired Army Lieutenant Colonel, his main research interests involve strategic management, the professionalization process, and professional certification.

Michael Fast is Associate Professor in organizational sociology and international business in the Department of Business Studies, Aalborg University. His main research fields and teaching are organizational sociology, leadership philosophy, philosophy of science, methodology and qualitative methods. He is research group leader of ORCA (Organizational Renewal Creativity Applied), program coordinator BSc Economic Business Administration, and member of the Study Board Business and Economics, Aalborg University.

Susanna Fellman is Professor of Business History at the University of Gothenburg. She received her PhD at the University of Helsinki in 2001. Her

research interests are the professionalization and modernization of management, business and welfare, and competition policy and cartels in a historical perspective. She has also an interest in methodological questions, especially the role of the corporate archive in business history.

Ewan Ferlie is Professor of Public Services Management in King's Business School, King's College London. His main research areas are in health care and higher education, where he has published widely. He is coeditor of the recently published *Oxford Handbook of Healthcare Management* published by Oxford University Press. He was elected as a Fellow of the British Academy (FBA) in 2016.

Allan Næs Gjerding is Associate Professor at Business & Management, Aalborg University. His research interests comprise leadership and organization in the twenty-first century, business model innovation and submarket dynamics, and health organization management. He is teaching in the fields of management, strategy, organization, innovation, and human resource management. He is working board member at the Centre for Logistics and Cooperation.

Thomas Duus Henriksen is an Associate Professor in Internal Communication and Organisational Processes at the Department of Communication and Psychology at Aalborg University in Copenhagen. His main research interests include the use of consultancy tools for organizational development, change management, leadership development and silo management, and especially how games and simulations can be developed and used for improving organizational processes and internal communication.

Lone Hersted works at the Department of Learning and Philosophy at Aalborg University. Her research and teaching is concerned with relational leading, leadership training and organizational learning. Recently she has been in charge of a two-year action research project for school development involving ten public schools and ten day care institutions. She continues doing research on management learning in public organizations.

Frederik Hertel is Associate Professor in Organization Studies, Philosophy of management and organizational communication. Main research fields and teaching areas are Organizational Anthropology, Learning, Communication, Creativity, Philosophy of Management, Theory of Science and Methodology. He is a member of the research group named ORCA (Organizational Renewal Creativity Applied) and coordinator of the top-up program and of several essential parts of the EBA program.

Kelly C. Jordan is an Associate Professor of National Security Studies at American Military University who has taught leadership and developed leaders at several outstanding American academic institutions. He has held the academic ranks of instructor through full professor. He is the co-author of *Leadership in Agriculture: Case Studies for a New Generation* and several other leadership-related works. His main research interests include leader and character development, especially in adolescents.

Kenneth Mølbjerg Jørgensen is Professor with Special Responsibilities at Business & Management, Aalborg University. His research interests comprise power and discourse in organization and strategy, organizational learning, storytelling, and organizational and managerial practices. He is teaching in the field of organizational learning, management, organization, ethics, and human resource management. He is visiting scholar at Stockholm University.

Grace Wangui Kinyanjui is a Leadership & Management lecturer, and Director of Distance & E-learning programmes at St Paul's University, Kenya. She is pursuing a PhD in Organizational Management & Leadership. She believes in amplifying people's abilities through developing leadership competencies. For her, leadership is an approach to life, one that is an irrepressible outcome of commitment to a lifelong process of fulfilling human potential.

Mette Vinther Larsen is Associate Professor at the Department of Business and Management, Aalborg University, Denmark. Mette's research areas revolve around strategizing, organizing, communication and leading. At Aalborg University, Mette lectures and supervises on different Master programs for public and private part time as well as full-time students. Furthermore, she lectures on the Bachelor program in International Business Economics.

David Lutz is Professor of Philosophy and Dean of the Faculty at Holy Cross College, Notre Dame, Indiana, US. He received his BS from the United States Military Academy at West Point and his MBA & PhD in Philosophy from the University of Notre Dame. He taught in Africa—Nigeria, Uganda and Kenya—from 2001 to 2011.

Richard M. Meinhart is Professor of Defense and Joint Processes at the US Army War College in Carlisle, Pennsylvania. He teaches subjects related to thinking, strategic leadership, and defense department systems and processes to address complex issues. He advocates for linkages between reflection and learning in the development of one's critical and creative thinking among senior leaders during professional military education.

Leif-Kristian Monsen is Docent in Organization and Leadership, Nord University, Department of Social Sciences, Campus Bodø, Norway. He teaches leadership and organizational theory, and topics related to the leadership of change, restructuring and innovation in the private and public sectors. He has written about a variety of topics that involve leadership in organizations. His current research project deals with the leadership and management of daily life risks in organizations.

Alexandra Moskovskaya is Director of the Center for Social Entrepreneurship and Social Innovation Studies of the National Research University “Higher School of Economics” in Moscow and Head of the Department of Applied Studies of Work and Professions there. Her research interests are at the intersection of management, innovation, professional knowledge and social entrepreneurship. She combines an academic career with advice for business organizations and government agencies.

René Nesgaard Nielsen is Associate Professor at Business & Management, Aalborg University. His research interests comprise innovation management, innovation in the public sector, and the relationship between innovation and work organization. He is teaching in the field of management, strategy, organization, innovation, and research methodology. He coordinates the graduate diploma in business administration, organization and management at Aalborg University.

Rikke Kristine Nielsen is an Assistant Professor of Organizational Communication with the Department of Communication & Psychology at Aalborg University Copenhagen and external lecturer of human resource management at the Department of Organization at Copenhagen Business School. Nielsen’s research interests and teaching activities center on leadership, (HR) management and cooperation in multinational enterprises. Nielsen has managerial experience from her pre-academic work life.

Pål Nygaard is researcher in business history at BI Norwegian Business School in Oslo, Norway. His main research interests include professions, organizations, business and economic history. Currently he is researching issues relating to innovation and software history. His publications cover the study of professions, business history, and infrastructure history.

Anders Örténblad is Professor of Organization and Leadership at the Faculty of Social Sciences, Nord University, Norway. He is the Editor-in-Chief of *The*

Learning Organization (Emerald), and has edited books that have been published by publishers such as Edward Elgar Publishing, Routledge, Sage and Springer. His main research interests include organizational learning and the learning organization, the spread of fashionable management ideas, and management education.

Jill Beth Otterlei is Associate Professor of Political Science at the Faculty of Social Science, Nord University, Norway. She defended her PhD thesis in political science at the Faculty of Political Science, University in Tromsø, Norway, in 2004. Her main research interests concern welfare politics, professions, local governments and organizational theory, especially institutional theories of organization.

Jørgen Gulddahl Rasmussen is Professor at Business & Management, Aalborg University. His research interests comprise strategy-as-practice and strategy-in-practice, leadership development, higher education management and organization, and change management. He is teaching in the fields of management, strategy, organization, and leadership development. He has held a number of executive positions at Aalborg University and participated in numerous task forces.

Hans Petter Saxi is a Professor at Nord University, Bodø, Norway. He has researched on the effects on organizational reforms in local and regional government, for example, on the outcomes of changing from the Alderman model to a parliamentarism in Norwegian cities and counties. He has also been publishing on political leadership inspired by Aristotle's ideas on *phronesis*.

Marita Svane is Associate Professor at the Department of Business and Management, Aalborg University. Her main research area focuses on storytelling organizations with a specific interest in strategizing and organizing processes. Areas of interest include dialogue, power, and ethics, as well as philosophy. Her teaching areas comprise the field of organizational theory, including strategy and organization, organizational culture, power, HRM, theory of science, and methodology.

C. Ken Weidner II (University of Illinois at Chicago) is Assistant Professor of Management at Saint Joseph's University, Philadelphia. His research interests include social justice in organizations; ethics in academe, business, and the professions; change/change agents; and learning/teaching. He teaches and consults on business ethics, organization change, culture, and leadership. Prior to academia, he consulted widely on health care and technology firms.

List of Figures

Fig. 16.1	Dichotomy of leadership concepts between James MacGregor Burns and Barbara Kellerman (This figure was developed by the author based upon the works of James MacGregor Burns (1978) and Barbara Kellerman (2004))	299
Fig. 18.1	Learning cycle	340
Fig. 24.1	Education levels	395

List of Tables

Table 1.1	Some previous works on management as a profession, stand-points taken in this literature and a theme-based categoriza-tion of the arguments brought up	8
Table 1.2	Some existing bachelor programs in leadership	14
Table 3.1	An overview of attempts to professionalize management in Norway 1900–2010: Taylorism, post-Taylorism and mana-gerialism	57
Table 11.1	The main characteristics of the scenarios for the develop-ment of management in accordance with its three different roles	211
Table 14.1	Occupational classification for general medical practice	256
Table 14.2	Occupational classification for physicians and surgeons	256
Table 14.3	Occupational classification for activities of head offices	257
Table 14.4	Occupational classification for chief executives, and general and operations managers	258
Table 14.5	Professionalization framework—assessment of the manage-ment occupation in the United States	260
Table 17.1	Various professional areas and their global associations	326
Table 20.1	Themes and organization of the bachelor program in leader-ship	364
Table 24.1	Connectivity to practice	397