



Profaning Leadership Studies through Fiction: Haruki Murakami's 'A Wild Sheep Chase' Read as Leadership Literature

Journal:	<i>Organization</i>
Manuscript ID:	ORG-11-0175
Manuscript Type:	Article
Keywords:	Leadership, Literary fiction, Profanation, Sacred, Sacrifice
Abstract:	<p>The leadership literature is full of stories of heroic self-sacrifice. Sacrificial leadership behaviour, some scholars conclude, is therefore to be recommended. In this paper we follow Keith Grint's (2010) conceptualization of leadership as necessarily pertaining to the sacred, but we highlight the need for organization scholars to profane (Agamben, 2007) the sacralizations embedded in leadership thinking. One example of this, which guides us throughout the paper, is 'A Wild Sheep Chase', by the Japanese novelist Haruki Murakami. By means of a thematic reading of the novel, we discuss how it can contribute to profaning particular notions of sacrifice and the sacred in leadership thinking and how it points to a radical inversion of the relation between sacrifice and leadership. In the novel, self-sacrifice does not function as a way of establishing a leadership position, but to avoid the dangers associated with leadership, and possibly redeem humans from their current collective urge to become leaders. Inspired by Murakami's fictional example, we call organizational scholars to profane leadership thinking and, in doing so, open new vistas for leadership theory and practice.</p>

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

**Profaning Leadership Studies through Fiction:
Haruki Murakami's *A Wild Sheep Chase* Read as Leadership Literature**

Abstract

The leadership literature is full of stories of heroic self-sacrifice. Sacrificial leadership behaviour, some scholars conclude, is therefore to be recommended. In this paper we follow Keith Grint's (2010) conceptualization of leadership as necessarily pertaining to the sacred, but we highlight the need for organization scholars to profane (Agamben, 2007) the sacralizations embedded in leadership thinking. One example of this, which guides us throughout the paper, is *A Wild Sheep Chase*, by the Japanese novelist Haruki Murakami. By means of a thematic reading of the novel, we discuss how it can contribute to profaning particular notions of sacrifice and the sacred in leadership thinking and how it points to a radical inversion of the relation between sacrifice and leadership. In the novel, self-sacrifice does not function as a way of establishing a leadership position, but to avoid the dangers associated with leadership, and possibly redeem humans from their current collective urge to become leaders. Inspired by Murakami's fictional example, we call organizational scholars to profane leadership thinking and, in doing so, open new vistas for leadership theory and practice.

Keywords

leadership, literary fiction, profanation, sacred, sacrifice

Introduction

Rather than being predictive or descriptive, leadership theories are perhaps better described as prescriptive (Ciulla, 1995). This would mean that leadership studies is less concerned with representation and explanation than with the provision of desirable models of leadership. In fact, many leadership theorists may even be characterized as sculptors of attractive images of leadership that are themselves fictional (Spoelstra and Ten Bos, forthcoming). Myths about great leaders from the past help to create these attractive models and often figure in academic texts on leadership (e.g. Burns, 1978; Gardner, 1997). Fictional characters may have the same effect. To give one example, articulating his conception of 'servant leadership', Robert Greenleaf (2002/1977) acknowledges that he was inspired by a fictional character in Hermann Hesse's *Journey to the East*.

Following Grint (2010), who has argued that leadership can only function by establishing sacred spaces, we suggest in this paper that leadership theories follow the same logic. They essentially create images of leadership that are sacred and therefore cannot be touched. For example, empirical tests of transformational leadership tend to suggest that this form of leadership is superior to its alternatives, namely, laissez-faire leadership and transactional leadership (Yammarino and Bass, 1990). Even when many scholars started to point out the dangers of charisma - which is one of the characteristics of transformational leadership - its proponents were quick to point out that 'authentic' transformational leadership could never be morally questionable (Bass and Steidlmeier, 1999). In other words, the theory is not challenged when empirical facts render it problematic.

It is against this background that we read Haruki Murakami's novel *A Wild Sheep Chase* as a profanation of academic and popular notions of leadership. In particular, we focus on the ways in which leadership scholars have recently begun to advocate self-sacrificial leadership behaviour. We argue that these studies sacralize particular forms of leadership, and further that such sacralizations call for profanation because of the problematic effects they produce. *A Wild Sheep Chase* provides, perhaps surprisingly, strategies for a profanation of leadership.

1
2
3 The nameless protagonist of the novel is a co-founder of a media and advertising agency. All of a
4 sudden, he finds himself chasing a mysterious sheep who, by way of entering their bodies, turns
5 ordinary people into leaders. The protagonist's friend, called 'the Rat', however, kills himself as
6 the sheep finally attempts to take possession of him. We use this story to reflect upon the
7 leadership literature. In our reading, Murakami's novel accomplishes two things. First, it displays
8 the process of the sacralization of leadership by exaggerating that which separates leadership
9 from mundane reality. Second, it offers its own take on the relation between leadership and self-
10 sacrifice: the real hero in Murakami's novel is not some heroic leader, but the one who kills
11 himself in the ultimate act of self-sacrifice, against the prospect of becoming a leader. We
12 recognize in the novel a number of academic and popular notions of leadership, but because of
13 the dramatizations, absurdities and reversed logic of the story these notions lose their sacred
14 nature. This, we argue, is a strategy of profanation that neutralizes some potentially oppressing
15 myths of leadership.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 We proceed as follows. In the first section we provide an overview of the notions of sacrifice and
29 the sacred in leadership literature, and argue that leadership studies thrives on the production of
30 sacred spaces. We then introduce Giorgio Agamben's concept of profanation. After a discussion
31 of our method, we provide an outline of the novel in terms of leadership. We continue by
32 analyzing examples of profanations of notions of leadership found in *A Wild Sheep Chase*. We
33 particularly focus on the self-sacrifice of the Rat, and relate this act to the concept of self-
34 sacrifice in leadership studies. In the conclusion, we reflect upon Murakami's implicit
35 profanation of leadership theories and our own explicit one, and call on organizational scholars
36 to continuously profane sacralized notions of leadership. We also draw implications for the use
37 of literary fiction in organizations studies.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 **(Self-)sacrifice and the sacred in leadership studies**

50
51
52

53 The theme of self-sacrifice is particularly strong in so-called 'heroic leadership approaches' such
54 as transformational leadership and charismatic leadership, which have dominated leadership
55 studies since the 1980s and 1990s (Parry and Bryman, 2006). Within these approaches, self-
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 sacrifice is primarily attributed to heroic leaders, who may sacrifice themselves ‘in the service of
4 a beneficial cause’ (Shamir et al., 1993: 582). One typical example, often mentioned in the
5 literature, is Lee Iacocca, who reduced his salary to one dollar in his first year as CEO of
6 Chrysler. But self-sacrifice is not only a feature of leaders. It may also be seen among followers,
7 since charismatic leaders often have ‘expectations for follower self-sacrifice and for performance
8 beyond the call of duty’ (Shamir et al., 1993: 578). In fact, the self-sacrifice of the leader and
9 self-sacrifice of followers stand in direct relation to one another: the leader’s self-sacrifice may
10 result in the charisma that inspires followers to sacrifice themselves in return (Conger and
11 Canungo, 1987). In his autobiography, Iacocca described this exchange of self-sacrifices as
12 ‘equality of sacrifice’ which, according to him, was the secret to Chrysler’s much celebrated
13 resurrection:
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24
25 When I started to sacrifice, I saw other people do whatever was necessary. And that’s
26 how Chrysler pulled through. It wasn’t the loans that saved us, although we needed them
27 badly. It was the hundreds of millions of dollars that were given up by everybody
28 involved. (Iacocca 1984: 242)
29
30
31
32

33 Self-sacrifice among leaders has the power to trigger self-sacrifices among followers, which
34 would then result in improved business performance. According to transformational leadership
35 scholar Bruce Avolio, the ‘utility of their sacrifices’ is very much on the mind of most self-
36 sacrificing leaders (Avolio and Locke, 2002: 177).
37
38
39
40
41

42 The first articles to systematically discuss self-sacrifice in leadership appear in the late 1990s but
43 have since come to constitute a research topic in its own right (Choi and Mai-Dalton, 1998,
44 1999; De Cremer and Knippenberg, 2004a, 2004b, 2004c; Javidan and Carl, 2004; Matteson and
45 Irving, 2006; Singh and Krishnan, 2008; Yorges et al., 1999). In these studies self-sacrifice is
46 commonly defined as the abandonment of the leader’s self-interest in favour of his or her
47 followers, their organization or the common good. One representative definition is offered by
48 Choi and Mai-Dalton (1999: 399): ‘self-sacrifice in organizational settings is defined as the
49 total/partial abandonment, and/or permanent/temporary postponement of personal interests,
50 privileges, or welfare in the (1) division of labour, (2) distribution of rewards, and (3) exercise of
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 power.' The subsequent question that these studies ask is: 'What are the benefits of self-
4 sacrificing leadership behaviour for organizations?' Typical findings include that self-sacrifice
5 leads to the attribution of charisma (Conger and Canungo, 1987; Choi and Mai-Dalton, 1999; De
6 Cremer and Knippenberg, 2004c), the attribution of legitimacy (Choi and Mai-Dalton, 1999), the
7 encouragement of follower reciprocity (Choi and Mai-Dalton, 1999), an increase in
8 organizational commitment and team efficiency (De Cremer et al., 2004; Yoon, 2006), and a
9 decrease in perceived autocracy (De Cremer et al., 2004). Most of these studies, then, confirm
10 Iacocca's conclusion that self-sacrificial leadership behaviour can be a profitable strategy for
11 organizations. Since the generation of organizational benefit is ultimately a business leader's
12 main concern, this instrumentalization raises questions of whether any real sacrifice is taking
13 place. As in Mauss' (1970) classic study *The Gift*, there is a question over whether the sacrifice
14 is really freely given, or whether it is simply an investment or moment in a broader process of
15 calculation and exchange (Dunne and Spoelstra, 2010).
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 However, the popularity of the theme of sacrifice in leadership studies is not limited to cost-
29 benefit analysis. More normative-oriented studies also exist. Bass and Steidlmeier (1999), for
30 example, have used self-sacrifice or the abandonment of self-interest as a way of distinguishing
31 'pseudo-authentic leaders', who 'profess strong attachment to their organization and its people
32 but privately are ready to sacrifice them' (Bass and Steidlmeier, 1999: 187), from authentic
33 leaders who engage in self-sacrifice 'for the sake of attaining virtue and justice' (Bass and
34 Steidlmeier, 1999: 195). In other words, for Bass and Steidlmeier authentic leaders are not
35 engaged in self-sacrifice to make a profit, but have a genuine orientation towards the good.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 This normative approach towards sacrifice and self-sacrifice can also be read into some earlier
45 work on transformational leadership (Burns, 1978) and servant leadership (Greenleaf,
46 1977/2002). Even though these works rarely explicitly use the term sacrifice, they also portray
47 ideal leadership as rooted in an abandonment of self-interest. For example, Greenleaf's idea of
48 the leader as servant suggests that great leaders abandon their own interests when serving their
49 followers. For Greenleaf it is not enough to make self-sacrifices that promise a good return on
50 investment. To truly serve means that one gives without reciprocity in the form of power or
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 status. Indeed, the ‘genuine humility’ that characterizes the great leader must also be ‘open and
4 ready to receive the gifts of others, whatever they may be’ (Greenleaf, 2002: 325).
5
6
7

8
9 Similar images of successful and/or moral leadership can also be found in popular leadership
10 books. In *Good to Great*, Jim Collins (2001: 21) argues that the leader releases him or herself
11 from subjectively derived self-interest in order to exercise what he calls ‘extreme personal
12 humility’. ‘Level 5 leaders’, Collins’ term for supreme leadership, ‘channel their ego needs away
13 from themselves and into the larger goal of building a great company’. In popular segments of
14 the leadership literature one also finds frequent references to great figures such as Socrates, Jesus
15 and Gandhi, portrayed as the best examples of leaders who sacrifice their own interest for a
16 higher ideal. Koestenbaum (2002: 128) even refers to Socrates when he concludes that ‘the
17 bottom line’ for business leaders, as any other leader, ‘is the willingness to die. To risk death is
18 to risk oneself, even sacrifice oneself, for the sake of the company or the customer, the
19 partnership or the client – for what is right’.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 This line of argument directly links (self-)sacrifice and scapegoating (as argued also by Grint,
31 2010). It is either implicitly or explicitly expressed by the collective, who have been led astray
32 into for instance economic or moral crisis: the leader who either gives up his (*sic*) wages or
33 leaves office takes on a collective guilt, and become himself the sacrificial victim (Grint, 2010:
34 99). In René Girard’s (1977, 1987) theory of mimetic desire, the organization of the social rests
35 upon a repeated ritual that can restore order in the crisis where everyone mimes the desire of
36 everyone else. This ritual is the sacrifice of a scapegoat who, for instance during the carnival, is
37 made king and after that ceremoniously executed. Girard (1977) further argues that the sacrifice
38 of Christ is (the beginning of) the end of sacrificial killings, since it produces redemption:
39 Christ’s death concerns everybody and intends to break with the logic of scapegoating. This
40 redemptive event has already, in Girard’s (Catholic) view, had social consequences in the West’s
41 history and its development of, for instance, the welfare states. In some fundamental (if
42 Girardian) sense, such sacrifice is also the end to heroic theories of leadership, since these are
43 bound to continue the vicious circle of making and breaking a king/CEO/manager.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 More recently, then, leadership studies has started to develop post-heroic approaches to
4 leadership (Collinson and Collinson, 2005; Fletcher, 2004; Parry and Bryman, 2006). These
5 approaches attempt to break with the assumption that effective leadership is dependent on one
6 single heroic figure. Instead, they argue for collective forms of leadership, emphasizing the role
7 that followers play in the constitution of leadership (Howell and Shamir, 2005; Shamir, 2007), or
8 arguing that 'self-leadership' has become important for all organizational members (Manz and
9 Sims, 2001). One example of a post-heroic approach is 'shared leadership' (Pearce and Conger,
10 2003; Raelin, 2003), which proposes leadership without leaders, or at least without one central
11 leader. This idea lies also at the heart of so-called 'distributed leadership' (Gronn, 2002), which
12 holds that leadership can be found 'not solely in the individual at the top, but in every person at
13 entry level who in one way or another, acts as a leader' (Goleman, 2002: 14, cited in Grint, 2010:
14 90).

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26 One may question, however, whether it still makes sense to use the term 'leadership' when the
27 subject of analysis can perhaps be better understood with reference to other topics within
28 organization studies, like group behaviour, team building, team work, spontaneous organization
29 and synergy, horizontal control, or alternative forms of organization. In other words, the problem
30 with post-heroic approaches to leadership is that they might be said to make the very concept of
31 leadership disappear. Grint's analysis of leadership explains why this may be the case, and this
32 pertains directly to our interest in sacrifice and the sacred in this paper. For Grint (2010: 89)
33 leadership *is* the social space created by sacralization: the sacred is 'not so much the elephant in
34 the room but the room itself – the space that allows leadership to work'. Self-sacrificial
35 leadership behaviour, as advanced in leadership studies, has precisely this function: it attempts to
36 map the organizational advantages of sacralizing the leader. Post-heroic leadership approaches,
37 in contrast, attempt to think leadership without sacralization, hence contradicting the very nature
38 of leadership. Grint therefore questions the very possibility of post-heroic leadership, suggesting
39 that conceptually it is at worst oxymoronic and at best unrealistic.

40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53 However, Grint's critique of post-heroic leadership is not limited to this conceptual point. His
54 thesis that we cannot dispose of leadership by replacing it with other functions also has an
55 important ethical and political dimension. In referring to the 'execution of distasteful but
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 necessary tasks by leaders' (2010: 94, emphasis added), Grint assumes that there is something
4 inherently desirable in leadership that organizations should not do without. But this alleged
5 necessity of leadership is never justified. Furthermore, he suggests that leadership causes a form
6 of inequality, legitimated by the sacralization of leadership, that is 'mutually beneficial' (2010:
7 95). From such a position, the ideal of a democratic, post-heroic leadership is not only
8 conceptually impossible – because 'leadership' is defined by the sacred space that it occupies –
9 but is also empirically undesirable. Finally, Grint argues that post-heroic leadership is
10 unsustainable in practice because it would 'undermine the sacred nature of leadership' and
11 thereby 'destabilize the ability of an organization to function' (Grint, 2010: 103).
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 To summarize, Grint shows that the forms of self-sacrificial leadership behaviour promoted in
22 leadership studies (and by business leaders such as Lee Iaccoca) are directly linked to the nature
23 of leadership itself: by means of self-sacrificial behaviour a sacred space is established that is
24 constitutive of leadership practice. This is a valid point and an important insight for the study of
25 leadership. However, we take issue with Grint's claim that these sacred spaces are beyond
26 contestation. The fact that sacred spaces are needed *for leadership* does not mean that they are
27 needed for, say, organizations or society. Indeed, leadership scholars have for a long time
28 pointed towards some of the negative effects associated with leadership practices. The power
29 structures that the sacred spaces of leadership can consecrate are well-known, though relatively
30 'silenced' in the leadership literature. For example, one early study of leadership (Tead, 1935:
31 211) notes that 'when people are in a position to exercise power over others, certain dangers are
32 likely to creep in'. These dangers include 'emotional instability', 'obsessive fears', 'inferiority
33 feelings' and 'sadistic tendencies' (Tead, 1935). Some of these dangers resonate with more
34 recent writings that associate leaders with narcissism (Kets de Vries, 1985), followership with
35 helplessness and alienation (Gemill and Oakley, 1992), and leadership with masculine bias and
36 gender discrimination (Calás and Smircich, 1991). Others have pointed towards the negative
37 cultural effects of a strong belief in the charismatic leader as some kind of 'saviour' (Khurana,
38 2002; Rieff, 2007). Grint's insight that leadership phenomena by definition include sacred spaces
39 reminds us that these dangers are not only to be explained in terms of the personality of the
40 leader, but are also actualized through the sacred spaces in which the relation between leaders
41 and followers is consecrated.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The negative effects of the sacralization of leadership cannot, however, be effectively countered
4 through the way leadership studies currently treats notions of leadership. Instead of
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

The negative effects of the sacralization of leadership cannot, however, be effectively countered through the way leadership studies currently treats notions of leadership. Instead of problematizing them, it tends to reproduce or create sacralized conceptual spaces, within which the necessity of leadership and the unequal power structures within the leader-follower relation are romanticized (Meindl et al., 1985) and uncontested (Gemmil and Oakley, 1992; Rost, 1991). For this reason, some leadership scholars have called into question the taken-for-grantedness of heroic notions of leadership, and have interrogated them through interpretive and conceptual studies (e.g. Alvesson and Sveningsson, 2003; Barker, 2001; Gabriel, 1997). Our paper contributes to these efforts: drawing upon Giorgio Agamben's concept of profanation, we argue for the importance of profaning leadership studies and through our reading of Murakami's *A Wild Sheep Chase*, explore what happens when this is done.

From the sacred to the profane

The relationship between the sacred and leadership is intimate. The Greek root *hierós* of the very notion of hierarchy means holy or divine (see for a discussion, Grint, 2010: 91; Parker, 2009). According to Agamben (1998), the figure of the sacred is the first political paradigm of the West. It is only later that Christianity pairs it with the opposition 'the secular'; its ancient opposition is the profane (de la Durantaye, 2009: 378). Agamben further mistrusts the most widespread understanding of the term religion, namely, that it derives from the Latin *religare*, which refers to the act of relating and uniting. He argues that the word instead stems from *relegere*, which refers to the hesitation one must observe when faced with the separation between the sacred and the profane: '*Religio* is not what unites men and gods but what ensures they remain distinct' (Agamben, 2007: 75). The sacrifice is then the event that perpetually re-instantiates the sacred space as an important but basically useless place, since what is destroyed in sacrifice is the very usefulness of the thing (Bataille, 1989). Only by cutting a thing off from its worldly bonds, and thereby its possible utility, can an object (e.g. an animal or in our case a leader) be lifted from the world to the divine, otherworldly or unreal. To sacrifice, i.e., to make sacred, is to destroy the reality of a thing in order to give it a higher, divine, status (Agamben, 2007: 73).

1
2
3 Where sacralization separates something from the ordinary (e.g. the leader from the followers),
4 profanation goes the other direction. Profanation neutralizes the power structures that are
5 activated through the sacred: 'once profaned, that which was unavailable and separate loses its
6 aura and is returned to use' (Agamben, 2007: 77). The 'return to use' is an important aspect of
7 profanation: profanation does not annihilate the sacred, it rather incorporates the sacred in daily
8 practices and thereby, at least temporarily, neutralizes its power effects.
9
10
11
12
13

14
15
16 In practice profanation occurs through 'touching' that which is considered sacred (and, for that
17 reason, is considered to be 'untouchable'). Sometimes this can be taken literally: a participant in
18 a sacrificial slaughter, for example, can profane organs that are meant for the gods by touching
19 them with the hands, which causes 'a profane contagion, a touch that disenchant and returns to
20 use what the sacred had separated and petrified' (Agamben, 2007: 74). In a secular context, the
21 national flag, e.g. of the United States, may not touch the ground. But the sacred can also be
22 touched in less literal ways. For Agamben (1993, 2007), one of the most effective forms of
23 profanation occurs through play. 'Playland', Agamben (1993: 79) writes, 'is a country whose
24 inhabitants are busy celebrating rituals, and manipulating objects and sacred words, whose sense
25 and purpose they have, however, forgotten.' The rituals and separations are maintained but the
26 sacralizations that once instantiated these separations has become powerless.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 Elaborating his important distinction between profanation and secularization, Agamben (2007)
38 sees secularization as a form of repression that 'leaves intact the forces it deals with by simply
39 moving them from one place to another' (2007: 77). In other words, in secularization sacred
40 spaces are not challenged; they remain operative but in a secular sphere. This is also why Grint's
41 analysis of leadership in terms of the sacred should not be understood metaphorically: much of
42 popular and academic thinking of leadership accepts basic religious notions and structures, but
43 places them in a business (i.e. secular) context. As also Barker (2001: 472) notes, 'conventional
44 understanding of leadership has been systematically constructed from other conventional
45 knowledge about social hierarchies, and about their command and control structures'. These
46 social hierarchies are more often than not of religious origin (e.g. they mobilize the notion of
47 charisma, the visionary, or the divine right of kings) (Parker, 2009; Sørensen and Spoelstra,
48 2010). But even when these hierarchies are not of explicit religious origin, they still remove
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 someone or something from ordinary life, and are in this sense established by the creation of
4 sacred spaces. This, however, also shows why we cannot (and should not) accept Grint's
5 assertion that the sacred within secularized forms of leadership is to be understood as necessary
6 for organizations. Just like some religious laws deserve contestation (e.g. laws against abortion,
7 euthanasia, suicide and the use of condoms, because of the sacred status of life), so do a range of
8 leadership phenomena and theories call for profanation.
9
10
11
12
13
14

15
16 Apart from secularization, profanation must also be distinguished from demystification
17 (Sørensen and Spoelstra, 2010). Demystification, a popular objective among critical leadership
18 scholars (e.g. Guthey et al., 2009; Jackson and Parry, 2008), aims at the annihilation of that
19 which is demystified: to demystify myths of the heroic leader would amount to showing that
20 these leaders do not really exist. This is one of the central ideas behind Alvesson and Spicer's
21 (2011) recent collection, for example. In the introduction, the editors argue that in depth case-
22 studies of managers could 'disturb some of the heroic and damaging images of what a leader is
23 and what they might do' (Alvesson and Spicer, 2011: 5). The separation between the real and the
24 higher real, upon which notions of heroic leadership rest, is annihilated in the process.
25
26 Profanation, in contrast, does not annihilate the separation between the follower and the leader.
27
28 The divisions that separate the leader from the follower cannot simply be made to disappear, but
29 they can, as de la Durantaye (2009: 379) argue in his reading of Agamben, be 'rendered
30 inoperative and thereby deprived of their destructive power'.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40
41 Profanation, as far as leadership is concerned, can occur both in leadership practice and in
42 relation to leadership concepts as developed in leadership studies. In practice, the sacred aura of
43 a leader could be damaged, for example, when he or she is 'photographed in an "undignified"
44 situation' (Žižek, 2004: 209). Our focus in this paper is not practice, but rather the concepts of
45 leadership as they are used and developed in leadership studies. Our centre of attention is the
46 idea of the self-sacrificing leader, which, as we have pointed out, is often implicit in popular
47 leadership concepts such as charismatic leadership and transformational leadership. In our
48 reading, Murakami's *A Wild Sheep Chase* profanes both scholarly and popular concepts of
49 leadership that are deeply ingrained in Western culture. This does not mean that the separation
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 between the leader and the follower is annihilated, but the mystical aura of self-sacrificing
4 leaders is neutralized in ways that may best be termed political or ethical.
5
6
7

8 9 **The novel as method of profanation**

10
11
12 There is now an established literature on the use of narrative fiction and other forms of popular
13 cultural artefacts within the study of organization (Bell, 2008; Beverungen and Dunne, 2007; De
14 Cock, 2000; De Cock and Land, 2005; Hassard and Holida,y 1998; Land and Śliwa, 2009;
15 Patient et al., 2003; Phillips, 1995; Rhodes and Westwood, 2008). It was the publication of
16 William Whyte's (1956) classic *The Organization Man*, where two chapters are dedicated to
17 'The organization man in fiction', that first brought the idea of using literary fiction into the
18 study of organization. Since then, organization studies can boast of a plethora of publications
19 using fiction, theorising its relevant application, or questioning its value. In the arena of teaching
20 it has been suggested that literary fiction can provide vicarious access to the lived experiences in
21 organizations and as such can function as a counter-balance to rationalist and reductionist
22 representations of organization (Śliwa and Cairns, 2007; Czarniawska-Joerges and Guillet de
23 Monthoux, 1984; Knights and Willmott, 1999).
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 In research it has also been argued that literary texts can help researchers to access and
36 understand the non-rational in organization, for example, the unconscious (Case, 1999), socially
37 unacceptable emotions (Patient et al., 2003), or pain and suffering (Burrell, 1997). Underlying
38 these uses of literary fiction within organization studies is the idea that both academic texts and
39 novels are forms of performative writing, often deploying structurally similar, if not identical,
40 genre conventions. Rhodes and Brown (2005: 469), write that:
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 fiction has emerged as a methodological concern in three related ways: (1) fictionality
48 can be seen to be a characteristic of research writing in general and therefore; (2)
49 explicitly fictional stories can be regarded as appropriate empirical material for
50 organizational research; and (3) fictional genres can be used as a legitimate mode for the
51 writing of research.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 In this paper we follow the second of these approaches, taking Rhodes and Brown's idea that
4 fiction can function as empirical material for analyzing organization. Yet, we want to broaden
5 their point since fiction, as is the case with Murakami's novel, can also in itself contribute
6 analytically and conceptually to the field of organization studies. In the broadest of terms this
7 approach is justified by the recognition that organizational phenomena as well as the activity of
8 thinking about them are always in a reciprocal relationship with a social and cultural context.
9 Representations of leadership and management in popular culture thus directly shape the ways
10 that people behave in organizations and make sense of their organizational lives (Bell, 2008). In
11 relation to leadership, we might also note that representations of leadership both within the
12 academic literature and within the field are often characterised in terms of myth, fiction and
13 storytelling (Bourne, 2008; Gemmill and Oakley, 1992; Munro, 2005).

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25 In our reading of *A Wild Sheep Chase* we find representations of leadership that are parallel to
26 how leadership is conceptualised within the academic literature. However, at each turn of the
27 story Murakami unsettles the sense that had been made in the previous sections and in the end
28 offers no simple reading that can be mapped directly onto leadership theory. In our analysis, we
29 argue that the novel profanes the concepts set up by leadership theory. It is in its capacity to
30 profane our very understandings of the sacralizations that it works with and to enable a more
31 playful engagement, more messy and less certain in its outcomes, that we see the real power of *A*
32 *Wild Sheep Chase*.

33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41 As we show in our discussion below, the novel exaggerates, parodies and deconstructs notions of
42 sacrifice and sacralizations within leadership studies. While it does not provide an answer to the
43 question of what leadership should look like, it offers an evocative confrontation with our own
44 assumptions of leadership and opens the possibility of thinking about it in new ways.

45 46 47 48 49 ***A Wild Sheep Chase: Introducing the novel***

50
51
52
53 *A Wild Sheep Chase*, first published in Japanese in 1982, tells the story of a young advertising
54 executive, who remains unnamed in the novel, thrown into a surreal world in which a shadowy
55 right wing political leader, 'the Boss', controls the Japanese media. The Boss has derived his

1
2
3 unsurpassable leadership skills from the spirit of a mystical sheep with a star on its back, which
4 has taken possession of him.
5
6
7

8
9 Going in to work, the protagonist is visited by a 'strange man', who is the representative of the
10 Boss's organization. From him we learn that the Boss has become terminally ill, leaving his
11 organization in a serious crisis. The strange man believes that this crisis is caused by the
12 departure of the mystical sheep from the Boss's body. He is convinced that the sheep has to be
13 found in order to ensure the continuity of leadership and the integrity of the organization.
14
15
16

17
18
19 The protagonist is charged with finding the sheep since he has recently published a photograph
20 in a small-circulation pamphlet produced by his agency that, on closer inspection, contains this
21 mysterious sheep. The photograph is considered as evidence that the sheep exists and that there
22 is something exceptional about it that distinguishes it from other sheep on the photograph and
23 from all other sheep in the world:
24
25
26
27

28
29
30 Aside from that particular sheep, all the others are ordinary Suffolks. Only that one sheep
31 differs. It is far more stocky than the Suffolk, and the fleece is of another colour. Nor is
32 the face black. Something about it strikes one as howsoever more powerful. I showed this
33 photograph to a sheep specialist, and he concluded that this sheep did not exist in Japan.
34 Nor probably anywhere else in the world. So what you are looking at now is a sheep that
35 by all rights should not exist. (Murakami, 2003: 112)
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 Whilst bemused by his encounter with the strange man, and the absurdity of the task he is
43 presented with, the protagonist of the novel is left with no choice but to embark upon the search
44 because he is blackmailed by the threat that should he not find the sheep, his business will be
45 bankrupted and his professional future destroyed.
46
47
48

49
50
51 He starts his search for the mysterious sheep. As the story progresses we discover that the sheep
52 is now in the process of taking control of a character called 'the Rat', a childhood friend of the
53 protagonist and - as we later find out - the son of the Boss. After arriving at a house up in the
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 mountains, where the sheep has been tracked to and is now trying to take of possession of the
4 Rat, the narrator discovers that the Rat is not there.
5
6
7

8
9 In one of the final episodes in the novel, we encounter the Rat in the guise of ‘the Sheep Man’.
10 The Rat has taken on the appearance of half-sheep half-human, changing his height, posture,
11 voice and behaviour. He appears before the protagonist’s eyes at will; his actual whereabouts,
12 however, are difficult to determine: ‘The Sheep Man was just like an animal. Approach him and
13 he’d retreat, move away and he’d come closer’ (Murakami, 2003: 254).
14
15
16
17

18
19 Having shed the appearance of the Sheep Man, the Rat visits the protagonist one evening and,
20 drinking a beer together, they discuss the sheep and the Rat’s reasons to resist being possessed
21 by it, despite all of its temptations. The Rat explains that he has refused the sheep that would turn
22 him into a leader, by committing suicide. His appearance that night at the bar is hence quite
23 mystical. The protagonist asks him:
24
25
26
27

28
29
30 “Did you have to go that far?”

31
32 “Yes, I had to go that far. If I waited, the sheep would have controlled me absolutely. It
33 was my last chance.” (Murakami, 2003: 281)
34
35
36

37 **Profaning the sacred in leadership**

38
39

40 The narrative of the novel *A Wild Sheep Chase* stands in contrast to the main tenets of leadership
41 literature in which the question whether leaders are born or made is a reoccurring theme (e.g.
42 Bennis, 1989; Avolio, 2005). In the novel, leadership is neither an inherent, inborn quality nor an
43 acquired skill. Rather, the capacity to lead is premised on being possessed by a sheep. Thus, the
44 leader can be seen as a follower, not of an eagle or a lion, but of a sheep. The novel deploys a
45 tone parodying that of a scientific ethnological discourse when the reader is informed about the
46 source of the Boss’s charisma. It owes its existence to a mystical sheep that, throughout the
47 centuries, has been taking possession of various individuals, granting them special powers,
48 including that of immortality.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 In parts of Northern China and Mongol territory, it's not uncommon to hear of sheep
5 entering people's bodies. Among the locals, it's believed that a sheep entering the body is
6 a blessing from the gods. For instance, in one book published in the Yuan dynasty it's
7 written that a 'star-bearing white sheep' entered the body of Genghis Khan... The sheep
8 that enters a body is thought to be immortal. And so too the person who hosts the sheep is
9 thought to become immortal. (Murakami, 2003: 188)

10
11
12
13
14
15
16 Charged with the task of finding the mystical sheep, the protagonist is put in a situation where
17 his business, his career and his entire life are invested in and dependent on the wild sheep chase
18 – a quest that in fact may be entirely futile, as the strange man who commissions him with this
19 assignment readily acknowledges:
20
21
22

23
24
25 “Do I have any choice?” I asked. “And what if no such sheep with a star on its back ever
26 existed in the first place?”

27
28 “It is still the same. For you and me, there is only whether you find the sheep or not.
29 There are no in-betweens... You hold the ball, you had better run for the goal. Even if
30 there turns out not to have been any goal.” (Murakami 2003: 123)
31
32
33

34
35 The nameless protagonist is also referred to as '*imperius rex*' 'in the kingdom of
36 generalizations' (Murakami, 2003: 284), and his situation appears close to that of the reader. The
37 implication is clear: the protagonist as well as the reader are, together with everybody else,
38 caught up in what Girard (1977) above refers to as 'mimetic desire': we are all on a wild sheep
39 chase, relentlessly chasing the same sheep. The end goal ('even if there turns out not to have
40 been any goal') is to succeed in the quest for social climbing and become a leader: an individual
41 ontologically separated from the mass, touched only by the divine, secured in the sacred space of
42 leadership.
43
44
45
46
47
48

49
50
51 The Boss's separation, due to his position as a leader, from ordinary life is repeatedly profaned in
52 *A Wild Sheep Chase*. The novel suggests that the Boss is so unique that he has direct access to
53 the divine providences – access that he can share with the chosen by giving them God's
54 telephone number, in this case his chauffeur:
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 “The Boss is an honorable man. After the Lord, the most godly person I’ve ever met.”

6
7 “You’ve met God?”

8
9 “Certainly. I telephone Him every night.”(...)

10
11 “The Boss gave me it a few years ago,” said the chauffeur out of nowhere.

12
13 “Gave you what?”

14
15 “God’s telephone number.” (...)

16
17 “He told just you, alone, in secret?”

18
19 “Yes. Just me, in secret. He’s a fine gentleman. Would you care to get to know Him?”

20
21 “If possible” I said.

22
23 “Well, then, it’s Tokyo 9-4-5-...” (...)

24
25 “Thanks. I’ll give him a call.”

26
27 “That’s the spirit,” said the chauffeur. (Murakami, 2003: 127-128)

28
29 The introduction of a very mundane object, a telephone number, into the narrative about the
30 second ‘most godly person’ in the chauffeur’s universe, serves as ‘a profane contagion, a touch
31 that disenchant and returns to use what the sacred had separated and petrified’ (Agamben, 2007:
32 77). The telephone is also used to create the silence necessary to uphold the sacred space of
33 leadership, i.e. quelling ‘the anxiety of followers in and through the provision of safety and
34 security’ (Grint, 2010: 101). On the phone, you can talk with the Lord about everything:
35
36
37
38
39

40
41 “All you have to do is to speak honestly about whatever concerns you or troubles you. No
42 matter how trivial you might think it is. God never gets bored and never laughs at you.”

43
44 (Murakami, 2003: 128)

45
46
47 In the novel’s representation of the Boss’s leadership, we also encounter several instances of
48 sacrifice. The strange man, for instance, demonstrates a willingness to sacrifice himself in the
49 pursuit of the sheep, ‘not for reasons of my personal loss, but for the greater good of all’
50 (Murakami, 2003: 121). Similarly, the Boss himself, by being possessed by the sheep – a notion
51 which, as we have argued above, profanes leadership as such – becomes sacrificed to the purpose
52 of empire building and organization. These examples remind of the way in which self-sacrificial
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 leadership behaviour is advocated in normative strands of leadership studies. Just as, in
4 normative accounts of self-sacrificial leadership behaviour, it remains unclear what the 'greater
5 good' would involve and whom it would benefit. But in contrast to leadership studies, and
6 Grint's argument for the importance of sacred spaces in organizations, the self-sacrifices
7 presented in the novel do not establish the sacred as 'an essential mechanism for the performance
8 of all forms of leadership' (Grint, 2010: 100). Rather, they uncomfortably hint that something is
9 not right with, and perhaps is even 'unfortunate and embarrassing' (Grint, 2010: 100) about the
10 role of sacrifice in leadership. In the representations of self-sacrifice in *A Wild Sheep Chase* we
11 see a playful engagement with concepts of sacrifice and leadership as we find them in leadership
12 studies, and through this engagement these concepts lose some of their sacred aura.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 The profanations that take place in the novel are not limited to providing exaggerated, comic or
24 absurd representations of leadership. Perhaps even more importantly, the novel also profanes the
25 concept of sacrificial leadership behaviour through the mechanism of subversion. It shows how
26 self-sacrifice of the (prospective) leader – which, as we have argued earlier, commonly serves as
27 a way of exercising leadership and enhancing the position of the leader within the organization –
28 can be turned against leadership and mobilised as a way to avoid it. Specifically, profanation
29 through subversion is evident in the Rat's act of suicide, which is his final refusal to accede to
30 his allotted place as the new Boss.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 We read the Rat's suicide as an act of self-sacrifice necessary to effectuate – in an extreme and
40 irrevocable manner – his unwillingness to be put in the position of leadership by submitting to
41 the will of the sheep. Through self-destruction, then, the Rat paradoxically manages to maintain
42 his right to self-determination.
43
44
45
46
47

48 The Rat's suicide is another test to the notions of sacralization permeating leadership thinking:
49 the Rat sacrifices himself not to become a better leader and to instigate sacrificial behaviour in
50 the followers, but to avoid taking on the position of leadership. In the narration of the Rat's
51 suicide, we find several examples of profanation of self-sacrificial leadership behaviour in
52 leadership studies. The very act of the Rat's suicide is described in grotesque terms:
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 “What happened was this,” said the Rat. “I died with the sheep in me. I waited until the
4 sheep was fast asleep, then I tied a rope over the beam in the kitchen and hanged myself.
5
6 There wasn’t enough time for the sucker to escape.”
7
8
9

10 In line with Girard’s (1977) theory of scapegoating, we first see that the Rat’s self-sacrifice
11 restores the social order: the carnivalesque Sheep Man (the Rat in disguise) has been sacrificed,
12 and social order is temporarily reinstalled. Yet something more profound has also taken place:
13 the Boss’s son, the Rat, has been sacrificed and with him the magical sheep. The sheep is,
14 according to the Rat, ‘hair-raising evil. Give your body over to it and everything goes’
15 (Murakami, 2003: 283). Not only has the social order been temporarily reinstalled, but the very
16 cosmic order, in which rivalry and the ceaseless quest for social climbing are the dominant
17 tropes, is being brought to an end. The wild sheep chase, as an image of social organization
18 locked in a continuous pendulum of change between a relentless social rivalry and unrest, and a
19 quasi-stable hierarchy (holy order) installed through the sacrificial scapegoating, has ended.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 The Rat, then, returns after his self-sacrifice as a ghost, in order to give advice to the nameless
31 protagonist. This does not mean that sacred spaces should be abolished *per se*, but that it is
32 through their continuous profanation that their real value is recognized, all the way to the
33 redemptive insight that any such wild sheep chase is, in the final analysis, futile and empty, and
34 must be abandoned. In the end, the Rat advises the protagonist to rush down the mountain before
35 ice and snow closes off his return, that is, before the icy separation between the heavenly and the
36 profane is permanently consecrated.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 Such redemptive events save, in *A Wild Sheep Chase*, a certain fragile humanity:
45
46

47 “The key point here is weakness... Moral weakness, weakness of consciousness, then
48 there’s the weakness of existence itself.” (Murakami, 2003: 282)
49
50
51
52

53 This weakness is not just a human quality, but also the vulnerable spot where the sheep may
54 enter. This insight fundamentally profanes the idea that a heroic leader is a particularly strong
55 individual. According to the Rat’s narrative, only because of his weakness would he have been
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 tempted to allow himself to live possessed by the mystical sheep of leadership, which is 'like a
4 blast furnace that smelts down everything it touches' (Murakami 2003: 283). While this
5 weakness is the precondition for leadership, an idea that Land et al. (2011) ironically refer to as
6 'The Weak Man Theory of leadership', it is also, perhaps paradoxically, what the Rat wants to
7 retain and redeem: he will not allow leadership to cover human weakness up. So while human
8 weakness is a necessary precondition for the existence of self-sacrificial leadership, such
9 weakness must be kept, the Rat seems to argue, as an existential challenge to be tackled. No
10 sacred space can deliver us from that challenge.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

18 19 **Conclusion**

20
21
22 The theme of self-sacrifice has become popular in organizational leadership literature and is
23 portrayed as both functionally and ethically desirable. With Grint (2010) we have argued that its
24 importance has something to do with the nature of leadership itself: leadership can only exist
25 through sacred spaces, and self-sacrificial leadership behaviour is one way in which these sacred
26 spaces are created. In contrast to Grint, however, we have argued that these sacred spaces can,
27 and should, be contested. This contestation can take different forms. One of these is
28 demystification. The logic behind demystifying leadership is that showing that our images of
29 leaders or leadership do not correspond to reality will result in aborting some of their undesirable
30 effects. In our paper, we have also sought to contribute to the contestation of the sacred in
31 leadership studies, in particular through the analysis of self-sacrifice, but in a way that differs
32 from demystification. Instead, we have drawn upon *A Wild Sheep Chase* to argue, using a central
33 concept from Agamben (2007), for a *profanation* of sacred notions of leadership.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45
46 Whilst having the same object of critique, demystification and profanation bring about different
47 outcomes. In contrast to demystification, profanation does not seek to annihilate the myth or
48 image of leadership that demystification is directed against. We agree with Grint that
49 sacralizations (and myths, fantasies, fictions) are an indispensable part of organizations and
50 social life in general. Indeed, the very point is that these sacralizations are themselves
51 constitutive of reality. In this context, the demystification of leadership, in our view,
52 underestimates how deeply embedded our beliefs in leadership are. They come with our cultural
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and religious heritage, which cannot be fully challenged by showing the discrepancy between
4 leadership practices and our concepts of leadership. A confrontation with ‘reality’ does not
5 simply change this.
6
7
8
9

10 Demystification, then, is not a sufficient way of challenging our deeply held, culturally and
11 religiously conditioned notions of leadership. They have developed over a long time, and do not
12 appeal only to the rational within us. Through a playful, but thereby not less serious, engagement
13 with the sacred, the idea of profanation reminds us how difficult it is to destabilize sacred spaces.
14 We have suggested that profanation is a more powerful way to destabilize the sacred spaces of
15 leadership than demystification. In contrast to demystification, profanation takes place in the
16 same discourse in which concepts of leadership become sacralized. Since this sacralization
17 relegates the profane into an untouchable sacred space, the discourse is immune to empirical
18 argumentation, however well-founded. Profanation does not suffer from this problem: it touches
19 our sacralizations, which – after all – are in our thinking directly through illegitimate use.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 Although in our discussion, we have mostly focused on heroic approaches to leadership, much of
31 what we have argued also applies to different versions of post-heroic leadership (Gronn, 2002;
32 Goleman, 2002). Post-heroic leadership theory points to the ‘distributed’ nature of leadership; in
33 fact, it also seeks to leave the sacred nature of leadership untouched, but it wants to inculcate this
34 feature into all and everyone. Staying with *A Wild Sheep Chase* we should all – according to the
35 now popular notion of ‘self-leadership’ (Manz and Sims, 2001) – have, as the Boss’s chauffeur
36 implies, God’s telephone number, i.e., we should all become (small scale) sacralized leaders,
37 perhaps even go down the road of self-sacrifice in order to adequately (and heroically) take up
38 our leadership task. Such implication is, of course, already by way of its artistic presentation,
39 profaned in the novel.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 As a matter of fact, our reading of Murakami’s novel may even suggest that profanation of
50 leadership studies is more present in literary fiction than in organization studies *per se*. If this is
51 true, we are witnessing a dramatic reversal of the traditional relation between fiction and critical
52 theory. After all, as Alan Liu (2006) provocatively claims, in many ways popular management
53 books, and leadership studies we may add, are more fantastic than many of the novels of our
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 time, and the traditional function of the *Bildungsroman* has been taken over by management
4 authors and ‘us’, management scholars:
5
6
7

8
9 In a sense, the search for the ‘great American novel’ is over. The winner is business
10 literature. I can’t easily think of another genre of blended realism and fantasy, gritty
11 concreteness (case studies, character studies) and sweeping vision, objective description
12 and moral designs upon our soul that has such wide cultural impact. (Liu 2006:
13
14 unpaginated)
15
16
17

18
19 Murakami’s book suggests that there might also be some truth in the reverse: perhaps the most
20 critical studies of leadership are today found in fiction, rather than in academic texts. As we have
21 shown in this paper, Murakami’s novel *A Wild Sheep Chase* subtly profanes any all-too-smooth
22 and self-confident leadership discourse.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 **References**

31
32
33 Agamben, G. (1993) *Infancy and History. Essays in the Destruction of Experience*. New York:
34 Verso.

35
36 Agamben, G. (1998) *Homo Sacer. Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Stanford, California:
37 Stanford University Press.

38
39 Agamben, G. (2007) *Profanations*. New York: Zone Books.

40
41
42 Alvesson, M. and Sveningsson, S. (2003) ‘Managers Doing Leadership: The Extra-
43 Ordinarization of the Mundane’, *Human Relations* 56(12): 1435-59.

44
45
46 Alvesson, M. and Spicer, A. (2011) *Metaphors We Lead by*. London: Routledge.

47
48 Avolio, B.J. (2005) *Leadership Development in Balance: MADE/Born*. London: Lawrence
49 Erlbaum.

50
51
52 Avolio, B.J. and Locke, E.E. (2002) ‘Contrasting Different Philosophies of Leader Motivation:
53 Altruism versus Egoism’, *The Leadership Quarterly* 13(2): 169–91.

54
55
56 Barker, R.A. (2001) ‘The Nature of Leadership’, *Human Relations* 54(4): 469-94.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Bass, B.M. (1985) *Leadership and Performance beyond Expectations*. New York: Free Press.
4
5
6 Bass, B.M. (1999) 'Two Decades of Research and Development in Transformational
7 Leadership', *European Journal for Work and Organizational Psychology* 8(1): 9-32.
8
9 Bass, B.M., and Steidlmeier, P. (1999) 'Ethics, Character, and Authentic Transformational
10 Leadership Behavior', *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2): 181-217.
11
12
13 Bataille, G. (1989) *Theory of Religion*. New York: Zone.
14
15
16 Bell, E. (2008) *Reading Management and Organization in Film*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
17
18 Bennis, W.G. (1989) *Why Leaders Can't Lead: The Unconscious Conspiracy Continues*. Los
19 Angeles: Jossey-Bass.
20
21
22 Beverungen, A. and Dunne, S. (2007) "'I'd Prefer not to". Bartleby and the Excesses of
23 Interpretation', *Culture and Organization* 13(2): 171-83.
24
25
26 Bourne, D. (2008) 'From Managers to Artists and Priests: On Transformation and Development
27 of Organisational Leaders', in M. Kostera (ed.) *Organizational Olympians: Heroes and Heroines
28 of Organizational Myths*, pp. 40-49. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
29
30
31 Burns, J. (1978) *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
32
33
34 Burrell, G. (1997) *Pandemonium. Towards a Retro-Organization Theory*. London: Sage.
35
36
37 Calás, M.B., and Smircich, L. (1991) 'Voicing Seduction to Silence Leadership', *Organization
38 Studies* 12(4): 567-602.
39
40
41 Case, P. (1999) 'Organizational Studies in Space: Stanislaw Lem and the Writing of Social
42 Science Fiction', *Organization* 6(4): 649-71.
43
44
45 Choi, Y., and Mai-Dalton, R.R. (1998) 'On the Leadership Function of Self-Sacrifice', *The
46 Leadership Quarterly* 9(4): 475-501.
47
48
49 Choi, Y., and Mai-Dalton, R.R. (1999) 'The Model of Followers' Responses to Self-Sacrificial
50 Leadership: An Empirical Test', *The Leadership Quarterly* 10(3): 397- 421.
51
52
53 Ciulla, J.B. (1995) 'Leadership Ethics: Mapping the Territory', *Business Ethics Quarterly* 5(1):
54 5-28.
55
56
57 Collins, J. (2001) *Good to Great: Why Some Companies Make the Leap... and Others Don't*.
58 New York: HarperCollins.
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

1
2
3 Conger, J.A. and Kanungo, R.N. (1987) 'Toward a Behavioral Theory of Charismatic Leadership
4 in Organizational Settings', *Academy of Management Review* 12(4): 637-47.
5

6
7 Czarniawska-Joerges, B. and Guillet de Monthoux, P. (1994/1984) *Good Novels, Better
8 Management: Reading Organizational Realities in Fiction*. Reading: Harwood Academic
9 Publishing.
10

11 De Cock, C. (2000) 'Reflections on Fiction, Representation, and Organization Studies: An Essay
12 with Special Reference to the Work of Jorge Luis Borges', *Organization Studies* 21(3): 589-609.
13

14
15 De Cock, C. and Land, C. (2006) 'Organization/Literature: Exploring the Seam', *Organization
16 Studies* 27(4): 517-35.
17

18
19 De Cremer, D. and van Knippenberg, D. (2004a) 'Leader Self-Sacrifice and Leadership
20 Effectiveness: The Moderating Role of Leader Self-Confidence', *Organization Behavior and
21 Human Decision Process* 95(2): 140-55.
22

23
24 De Cremer, D. and van Knippenberg, D. (2004b) 'Cooperation as a Function of Leader Self-
25 Sacrifice, Trust, and Identification', *Leadership and Organization Development Journal* 26(5):
26 355-69.
27

28
29 De Cremer, D. and van Knippenberg, D. (2004c) 'How Do Leaders Promote Cooperation? The
30 Effects of Charisma and Procedural Fairness', *Journal of Applied Psychology* 87: 858-66.
31

32
33 De Cremer, D., van Dijke, M. and Bos, A. (2004) 'Distributive Justice Moderating the Effects of
34 Self-Sacrificial Leadership', *Leadership and Organization Development Journal* 25(5): 466-75.
35

36
37 De la Durantaye, L. (2009) *Giorgio Agamben: A Critical Introduction*. Stanford: Stanford
38 University Press.
39

40
41 Dunne, S. and Spoelstra, S. (2010) 'The Gift of Leadership', *Philosophy Today* 54(1): 66-77.
42

43
44 Fletcher, J. K. (2004) 'The Paradox of Postheroic Leadership: An Essay on Gender, Power, and
45 Transformational Change', *The Leadership Quarterly* 15(5) 647-61.
46

47
48 Gabriel, Y. (1997) 'Meeting God: When Organizational Members Come Face to Face with the
49 Supreme Leader', *Human Relations* 50(4): 315-42.
50

51
52 Gardner, H. (1997) *Leading Minds: An Anatomy of Leadership*. London: HarperCollins.
53

54
55 Gemmill, G., and J. Oakley (1992) 'Leadership: An Alienating Social Myth?', *Human Relations*
56 45(2): 113-29.
57

58
59 Girard, R. (1987) *Things Hidden Since the Foundation of the World*. Stanford: Stanford
60 University Press.

- 1
2
3 Girard, R. (1977) *Violence and the Sacred*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
4
5
6 Goleman, D. (2002) *The New Leaders: Transforming the Art of Leadership into the Science of*
7 *Results*. London: Little Brown.
8
9 Greenleaf, R.K. (2002/1977) *Servant Leadership: A Journey into the Nature of Legitimate Power*
10 *and Greatness*. Mahwah: Paulist Press.
11
12
13 Grint, K. (2010) 'The Sacred in Leadership: Separation, Sacrifice and Leadership', *Organization*
14 *Studies* 31(1): 89-107.
15
16
17 Gronn, P. (2002) 'Distributed Leadership as a Unit of Analysis', *The Leadership Quarterly*
18 13(4): 423-52.
19
20 Guthey, E., Clark, T. and Greatbatch, D. (2009) *Demystifying Business Celebrity*. Abingdon:
21 Routledge.
22
23
24 Hassard, J. and Holiday, R. (1998) *Organization/Representation*. London: Sage.
25
26 Howell, J. and Shamir, B. (2005) 'The Role of Followers in the Charismatic Leadership Process:
27 Relationships and Their Consequences', *Academy of Management Review* 30(1): 96-112.
28
29
30 Iacocca, L. (1984) *Iacocca: An Autobiography*. New York: Bantam.
31
32 Jackson, B. and Parry, K. (2008) *A Very Short, Fairly Interesting and Reasonably Cheap Book*
33 *about Studying Leadership*. London: Sage.
34
35
36 Javidan, M. and Carl, D.E. (2004) 'East Meets West: A Cross-Cultural Comparison of
37 Charismatic Leadership among Canadian and Iranian Executives', *Journal of Management*
38 *Studies* 41(4): 665-91.
39
40
41 Kets de Vries, M.F.R. (1985) 'Narcissism and Leadership: An Object Relations Perspective',
42 *Human Relations* 38(6): 583-601.
43
44
45 Khurana, R. (2002) *Searching for a Corporate Savior: The Irrational Quest for Charismatic*
46 *CEOs*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
47
48
49 Knights, D. and Willmott, H. (1999) *Management Lives: Power and Identity in Work*
50 *Organizations*. London: Sage.
51
52
53 Koestenbaum, P. (2002) *Leadership: The Inner Side of Greatness. A Philosophy for Leaders*.
54 San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
55
56
57 Land, C. and Śliwa, M. (2009) 'The Novel and Organization', *Journal of Organizational Change*
58 *Management* 22(4): 349-56.
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Manz, C.C. and Sims, H.P. (2001) *The New SuperLeadership: Leading Others to Lead Themselves*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Matteson, J.A. and Irving, J.A. (2006) 'Servant versus Self-Sacrificial Leadership: A Behavioral Comparison of Two Follow-Oriented Leadership Theories', *International Journal of Leadership Studies* 2(1): 36-51.

Mauss, M. (1970) *The Gift: Forms and Functions of Exchange in Archaic Societies*. London: Routledge.

Meindl, J.R., Ehrlich, S.B. and Dukerich, J.M. (1985) 'The Romance of Leadership', *Administrative Science Quarterly* 30(1): 78-102.

Munro, I. (2005) 'The Mythic Foundations of Organization', in S. Linstead and A. Linstead (eds) *Thinking organization*. London: Routledge.

Murakami, H. (2003) *A Wild Sheep Chase*. London: Vintage.

Parker, M. (2009) 'Angelic Organization: Hierarchy and the Tyranny of Heaven'. *Organization Studies* 30(11): 1281- 99.

Parker, M. (2002) *Against Management. Organization in the Age of Managerialism*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Parry, K.W., and Bryman, A. (2006) 'Leadership in Organizations', in S. R. Clegg, C. Hardy, T. Lawrence and W. R. Nord (eds) *The Sage Handbook of Organization Studies*. London: Sage.

Liu, A. (2006) 'I Work Here, But I Am Cool', interview with Alan Liu, <http://networkcultures.org/wpmu/geert/interview-with-alan-liu> (Accessed 1 April 2011).

Patient, D., Lawrence, T.B. and Maitlis, S. (2003) 'Understanding Workplace Envy through Narrative Fiction', *Organization Studies* 24(7): 1015-44.

Pearce, C. L. and Conger J.A. (eds) (2003) *Shared Leadership: Reframing the Hows and Whys of Leadership*. London: Sage.

Phillips, N. (1995) 'Telling Organizational Tales: On the Role of Narrative Fiction in the Study of Organizations', *Organization Studies* 16(4): 625-49.

Raelin, J. (2003) *Creating Leaderful Organizations: How to Bring Out Leadership in Everyone*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Rhodes, C. and Brown, A. (2005) 'Writing Responsibly: Fiction and Organization Studies', *Organization* 12(4): 467-91.

1
2
3 Rhodes, C. and Westwood, R. (2008) *Critical Representations of Work and Organizations in*
4 *Popular Culture*. London: RoutledgeFarmer.

5
6
7 Rieff, P. (2007) *Charisma: The Gift of Grace, and How It Has Been Taken away from Us*. New
8 York: Vintage.

9
10 Rost, J. C. (1991) *Leadership for the Twenty-First Century*. New York: Praeger.

11
12 Shamir, B. (2007) 'Introduction: From Passive Recipients to Active Co-Producers: Followers'
13 Roles in the Leadership Process' in B. Shamir, R. Pillai, M.C. Bligh and M. Uhl-Bien (eds)
14 *Follower-Centered Perspectives on Leadership*. Greenwich, CT: IAP.

15
16
17 Shamir, B., House, R.J. and Arthur, M.B. (1993) 'The Motivational Effects of Charismatic
18 Leadership: A Self-Concept Based Theory', *Organization Science* 4(4): 577-94.

19
20 Singh, N. and Krishnan, V.R. (2008) 'Self-Sacrifice and Transformational Leadership:
21 Mediating Role of Altruism', *Leadership & Organization Development Journal* 29(3): 261-74.

22
23 Śliwa, M. and Cairns, G. (2007) 'The Novel as a Vehicle for Organizational Inquiry: Engaging
24 with the Complexity of Social and Organizational Commitment', *ephemera: theory and politics*
25 *in organization* 7(2): 309-25.

26
27 Sørensen, B.M. and Spoelstra, S. (2010) 'Keeping the Prayer Wheel of Science Spinning', paper
28 presented at Academy of Management CMS organizational workshop, Montreal (August).

29
30 Spoelstra, S. and Ten Bos, R. (Forthcoming) 'Leadership', in M. Painter-Morland and R. Ten
31 Bos (eds) *Continental Philosophy and Business Ethics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

32
33 Tead, O. (1935) *The Art of Leadership*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

34
35 Whyte, W. (1956) *The Organization Man*. London: Pelican.

36
37 Yammarino, F.J. and Bass B.M. (1990) 'Transformational Leadership and Multiple Levels of
38 Analysis', *Human Relations* 43(10): 975-95.

39
40 Yoon, J. (2006) 'How Team Leaders Use Salient Vision and Self-Sacrifice to Enhance Team
41 Effectiveness', *Advances in Group Processes* 23: 63-71.

42
43 Yorges, S.L., Weiss, H.M. and Strickland, O.J. (1999) 'The Effect of Leader Outcomes on
44 Influence, Attributions, and Perceptions of Charisma', *Journal of Applied Psychology* 84(3):
45 428-36.

46
47 Žižek, S. (2004) 'How to Live with Catastrophes?' in B. Aretxaga, D. Dworkin, J. Gabilondon
48 and J. Zulaika (eds) *Empire and Terror: Nationalism/Postnationalism in the New Millennium*.
49 Reno: Center for Basque Studies.