Debating Bad Leadership
Reasons and Remedies

Edited by
Anders Örtenblad

Palgrave Debates in Business and Management

This series will take a refreshing and creative approach to business management research, consisting of a number of edited collections that showcase a current academic debate. Each title will examine one specific topic and shall include a number of chapters from authors around the world, presenting their differing points of view on the question in hand. The intention of this series is to take stock of controversial and complicated topics of debate within business and management, and to clearly present the variety of positions within it.

More information about this series at
http://www.palgrave.com/gp/series/16112

Anders Örtenblad
Editor

Debating Bad Leadership

Reasons and Remedies

palgrave
macmillan

Editor
Anders Örtenblad
Department of Working Life and Innovation
School of Business and Law
University of Agder
Grimstad, Norway

Foreword

Years ago, I wrote a short essay titled, "Hitler's Ghost: A Manifesto" (Kellerman 2000). I had two objectives. The first was to draw attention to the fact that though what I came to call the leadership industry was maturing, for some reason it was becoming lopsided. Both in theory and practice it focused nearly entirely on good leaders, while ignoring nearly entirely bad leaders. But, as the title of the essay suggested, this seemed to me to make no sense. All well and good to try to teach how to lead wisely and well, but not all well and good to pretend that leading wisely and well is run of the mill. That leading badly was not common practice and not, therefore, an issue that the leadership industry was obliged to deal with. As anyone living in other than a cave knows all too well, bad leadership is, it happens, everywhere. It slithers insidiously into the corridors of power, wherever they might be.

My second objective, as the phrase "a manifesto" clearly implied, was to try to turn this ship around. To try to get scholars and practitioners as well as teachers and students interested in bad leadership for the obvious reason it is so profoundly important. It is important because it is ubiquitous. And it is important because it is dangerous—if not dangerous to our physical health, then to our psychological health. "Bully bosses," for example. It is difficult if not even impossible for a subordinate to be happy in the workplace if his or her superior is in some way "bad," as in,

say, woefully inefficient, or miserably temperamental, or cruelly callous, or blatantly corrupt.

Alas, I cannot claim much success regarding either one of my two original objectives. The leadership industry remains largely divorced from the real world—continuing generally to focus on the bright side while continuing generally to ignore the dark side. And, in keeping with this imbalance of attention has been an imbalance in production. Overwhelmingly what is taught—with, I might add, dubious results—is how to be a good leader. And, overwhelmingly, what is researched is good leadership not bad. As if good leadership is the norm, as if bad leadership is an aberration, as infrequent and unimportant. And as if, for that matter, *good followership was not essential to dispensing with bad leadership.*

It gives me great pleasure, then, to provide for Anders Örtenblad's edited collection on bad leadership this Foreword. He and his contributors are to be congratulated for turning their attention to a corner of the leadership literature that, while being of the utmost importance, remains still sorely neglected.

It behooves me as well to say a few words about the timing. As I write this Foreword, in summer 2020, I cannot yet know the outcome of the American presidential election in November. What I do know is that since January 2017, the United States has been saddled with what in my view certainly is the worst leader in its history. President Donald Trump has been both miserably ineffectual and grossly unethical. What I similarly know is that those who view him similarly have been stymied. We followers, we tens of millions of Americans, have been at a loss for how to depose a leader who is so bad he threatens our democracy—not as was imagined over the years from without, but from within. It is an astonishing, depressing, conundrum about which the leadership industry has little that is useful to say.

I was heartened to read the essay by Professor George Goethals (Chap. 11 in this volume) that makes the critical point that "follower[s] must be vigilant about both the morality and the effectiveness of the leaders' initiatives." But, as Professor Goethals knows at least as well as I do, not only does the leadership industry pay nearly no attention to bad leaders, it pays nearly no attention to followers. That is, it pays nearly no attention to precisely those who have it in their power to

upend a bad leader. Unless and until these things change, it is hard to see how much of a contribution the industry can possibly make to rectify the imbalance to which I refer. Teaching, researching, good leadership is important. But teaching, researching, bad leadership is equally important. For it is, alas, endemic to the human condition.

I wrote in that original essay, "Hitler's Ghost cannot be nor should it be cleansed from our collective consciousness. If we insist on continuing to ignore what Bishop [Desmond] Tutu once called 'the depth of depravity,' or for that matter the far paler shadows thereof such as thoughtlessness, stupidity, and incompetence, Leadership Studies will atrophy" (Kellerman 2000). It is, in other words, up to the likes of those who contributed to this volume to save us from ourselves.

Cambridge, MA, USA   Barbara Kellerman

Reference

Kellerman, B. (2000). Hitler's ghost: A manifesto. In B. Kellerman, & L. Matusak (Eds.), *Cutting edge: Leadership 2000* (pp. 65–68). College Park: Center for the Advanced Study of Leadership, James MacGregor Burns Academy of Leadership.

Preface

Some Truths About the Book

It is true that not all leaders are bad. Far from all, actually. But bad leaders are frequent enough to justify the existence of such a book as this one.

It is true that not even the academic world is free from bad leaders (far from all, though, are bad). For example, it happens that academic leaders put the formal grievance system out of play to protect themselves and their allies (or, put in other words, to save their own asses); it happens that academic leaders favor their own spouses at the expense of the other employees; and it happens that academic leaders take no interest whatsoever in the human aspect of leadership. If I had to choose, I would myself prefer to have leaders who know leadership—especially the human aspect of it—(but less about my work), rather than leaders who know my work (but less about leadership) (see also Örtenblad 2018a). Consequently, in *this particular respect* I am not against new public management, but that is a topic for another book.

It is true that it may very well be that I myself have been/am/would be a bad leader; I would at least most certainly not be as perfect as I myself and many others would want their leaders to be.

It is true that I have taken the initiative to and edited this book in order to help, in as constructive a manner as possible, to make the world a better place; leadership is such an important aspect of the organization of society, and of people's lives, that it deserves all attention and help it can get to improve.

It is true that one does not necessarily have to be an academic to get something valuable out of this book.

It is completely true that I myself learn new things each time I read this book.

It is true that this is not the first time I have gotten something published on why there are so many bad leaders. Actually, in a book in Swedish (Örtenblad 2008), with a title that if it was translated into English would read something like "The organization question book", I suggested a number of questions (along with a set of possible answers for each question) that could be asked and discussed among students, one of which was "why are there so many bad leaders?". The ten plausible explanations—or answers to the question—that I suggested in that book were:

1. The *power* explanation, that is, there are so many bad leaders because they are more interested in the incentives that leadership positions often come with—such as power, increased salary, and status—than conducting leadership

2. The *employment* explanation, that is, there are so many bad leaders because the existing bad leaders recruit people who are similar to themselves and, thus, those newly recruited will also be bad leaders

3. The *specialist* explanation, that is, there are so many bad leaders because the only way to be promoted in many organizations is to get a leadership position, something far from all good specialists can handle in a good manner

4. The *relaxation* explanation, that is, there are so many bad leaders because after a while leaders relax and are happy with the position they have, while they are less eager to perform good leadership

5. The *evolution* explanation, that is, there are so many bad leaders because as various contextual parameters change (such as the organization's size, financial situation, etc.), there is a need for another type or style of leadership, which the leaders are unable to provide

6. The *misfit* explanation, that is, there are so many bad leaders because their leadership was not apt in the first place for the organization they were recruited to lead
7. The *education* explanation, that is, there are so many bad leaders because leadership is something that has to be learnt and the leadership education that exists does not in an adequate way address the actual challenges anybody practicing as a leader will experience
8. The *shortage* explanation, that is, there are so many bad leaders because there is a shortage of people talented in leadership, and such talent is needed to conduct good leadership and it cannot be replaced by education, training, or experience
9. The *inhumanity* explanation, that is, there are so many bad leaders because the leadership role, as well as how leadership positions are designed, puts inhumane demands on those practicing leadership—demands that no (or at least very few) people can live up to
10. The *dismissal* explanation, that is, there are so many bad leaders because of system inertia—it is difficult to get rid of those who once were recruited as (maybe good) leaders, even when they start practicing bad leadership

In addition, I offered a counter proposition to the question asked, namely, that the very question—"why are there so many bad leaders?"—is based on a myth; people may *think* that their leaders are bad, but the leaders are just doing their job. They are not there to be liked, especially since at least parts of being a leader implies leading, controlling and putting demands on the employees, tasks that far from always are very popular among employees. Instead, leaders are often – unfairly – scapegoated, even in cases when the demands they put on employees are reasonable.

I authored that book in an effort to offer an alternative to all those "textbooks" that are used in academic education (not least at business schools), and which in my opinion are doing the students a bear's service, in that they to such an extent appear to offer definitive answers. Examples of other questions that were dealt with in that book are "why are organizations re-organized so often?"; "why is there still not equality in the working life?"; and "why are some better paid than others?" (the latter question resulted in the book *Debating equal pay for all: Economy,*

practicability and ethics, Örtenblad 2021). The organization question book (Örtenblad 2008) encouraged readers to question that which often is taken for granted and, thus, continue to ask questions, as well as learning to put intriguing questions. As I see it, the world is in need of people who can put good and provoking questions, rather than people who are able to come up with good answers (or, even worse, merely repeat textbooks' answers). The world is already full of "answer-ers." But that is a topic for another book.

It is completely true that this book to a large extent mirrors my own academic ideal, offering arguments from different standpoints and perspectives.

It is true that not all books that are published necessarily have to have the anatomy of debating, but it is also true that there at least is a need for *one* book series that publishes books with such an anatomy: *Palgrave Debates in Business and Management* (*Palgrave Macmillan* 2020).

It is true that this is neither the first nor the last book to be published in this book series, for which I am the editing founder. The first book in the series is about "equal pay for all" (Örtenblad 2021), and I have also edited another book with a debating format for the same publisher—on leadership as a profession (Örtenblad 2018b)—but at the time when it was to be published, the book series did not yet exist (it was when doing the book on leadership as a profession that I got the idea for the book series), which is the reason why it was not included in this book series.

It is true that I did not ask any of the contributors to this book to take on any particular standpoint; I openly invited people whom I thought would have something interesting to say about the frequent occurrence of bad leaders to contribute to the book. It is also true that I did not ask anyone to argue against the premise of the book; those who did that made it on their own initiative. It is also true that I was quick to welcome their criticism and to include it in the book. If I had not, I doubt that anyone would have taken the debating anatomy that this book has, seriously.

It is completely true that such a book as this one could not have been written by a single author, at least not by me. Even if somebody would have been able to come up with all the standpoints and arguments that this book contains, no single person would have what it takes to make all

standpoints and arguments justice. Thus, all contributors (inclusive, of course, of Barbara Kellerman who has authored the Foreword) deserve a very big THANK YOU and all appreciation they could possibly get.

Grimstad, Norway   Anders Örtenblad
31 August 2020

References

Örtenblad, A. (2008). *Organisationsfrågeboken: En bok som ställer frågor snarare än kommer med enkla svar*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Örtenblad, A. (2018a). Preparing for turning leadership into a true profession. In A. Örtenblad (Ed.), *Professionalizing leadership: Debating education, certification and practice* (pp. 349–358). Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.

Örtenblad, A. (Ed.) (2018b). *Professionalizing leadership: Debating education, certification and practice*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.

Örtenblad, A. (Ed.) (2021). *Debating equal pay for all: Economy, practicability and ethics*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.

Palgrave Macmillan. (2020). Palgrave debates in business and management. https://www.palgrave.com/gp/series/16112. Accessed 30 Aug 2020.

Contents

Notes on Contributors

Muhammed Abdulai is a PhD candidate at the School of Governance, Law and Society, Tallinn University, Estonia, and a lecturer at the Faculty of Communication and Cultural Studies, Department of Communication, Innovation and Technology, University for Development studies (UDS), Ghana. Over the past eight years, he has taught, supervised and reviewed numerous student projects and dissertations in African and European universities. His research interests are: communication, culture and media, cross-cultural management and leadership, migration, and mobility.

Jem Bendell is Professor of Sustainability Leadership at the University of Cumbria, UK and founder of the Deep Adaptation Forum. He specializes in transdisciplinary research analysis, communication and education, to help people prepare for societal collapse due to climate chaos. He has worked on sustainable development in seven countries on four continents over 25 years with many organizations, including United Nations agencies, WWF-UK, the Labour Party and investment firms. The World Economic Forum recognized him as a Young Global Leader.

Julia Bistrova CFA, is head of the research and financial analysis unit of the Swiss asset management firm Herens Quality Asset Management. She oversees a team of analysts covering US, EU, Asian, and Baltic stock

markets. She is also assistant professor at Riga Technical University, lecturing on financial markets, investments, financial analysis, and corporate governance. Her research interests include earnings quality, corporate governance, and fundamental analysis.

Warren Blank is President of The Leadership Group, a leadership and organizational development firm founded in 1986 with corporate headquarters in Seattle, Washington. Warren provides leadership training, consulting and speaking for organizations throughout the United States and 40 other countries. Corporate clients include over 70 Fortune 500 firms and 100 government agencies. He is the author of six books and numerous articles published in professional journals.

George Boak is a senior lecturer in Leadership and Innovation at York St John University. His research interests are in leadership practices, leading change and innovation, and leadership development. He has worked on aspects of individual and organizational development for over 30 years, with managers and professionals from a wide range of public sector and large private sector companies in manufacturing, banking and energy, as well as with smaller companies.

Clive Boddy is Professor of Management at the University of Tasmania. His research investigates the influence of workplace psychopaths on their peers, the institutions they work for and on society. Clive has a TEDx talk on "corporate psychopaths and bullying" and has also written 2 books and 48 papers on the subject of corporate psychopaths.

Louise Boulter PhD, is a senior lecturer at Middlesex University Business School, UK. Louise's research is focused on individual and organisational performance. In particular, she is interested in outlier performance, both negative and positive, and its causes. Louise's current research is focused on Positive Deviants and sub-clinical psychopaths. Louise is a member of the British Psychological Society (MBPsS), and is a qualified lawyer.

Jennifer L. S. Chandler is a senior lecturer at Arizona State University and is the Assistant Director for Diversity and Leadership for the Center for Bio-mediated and Bio-inspired Geotechnics both in Arizona,

USA. Her research focuses on revealing and disrupting dominant normative behaviors that are embedded in organizational leadership practices, procedures, and cultural norms that perpetuate systemic oppression.

Nuria Chinchilla is Full Professor of Managing People in Organizations at IESE Business School. She holds the Carmina Roca and Rafael Pich-Aguilera Women and Leadership Chair. She is the founder of the International Center for Work & Family and the I-WiL Initiative. Professor Chinchilla holds a bachelor's degree in Law, an MBA, and two PhDs. Her areas of specialization include women and leadership, self-leadership, Corporate Family Responsibility, and Purpose-Driven Organizations.

Simon Fishwick was a lecturer in human resources, industrial relations, leadership and change management at the University of Tasmania for 18 years after a career in human resources and management. He now consults part-time in strategy, change management, leadership and selection. He holds qualifications in Economics (Hons.), an MSc (LSE), and a PhD in the implementation of HR strategy.

Jessica Flanigan is Associate Professor of Leadership Studies and PPEL and the Richard L. Morrill Chair in Ethics and Democratic Values at the University of Richmond, VA, USA, where she teaches Leadership Ethics and Critical Thinking in the Jepson School of Leadership Studies. Her work addresses topics such as paternalism, prohibition and regulation, public health ethics, and egalitarianism.

Tom Giberson is Associate Professor of Organizational Leadership at Oakland University in Rochester, MI, USA. His teaching and research are focused on leaders and the impact they have on their organization's culture, teams, and individuals. He also applies his academic work to real-world challenges through his consulting practice, Lead.Grow. Change.®, as an executive coach and top team coach.

George R. Goethals is Robins Distinguished Professor at the Jepson School of Leadership Studies at the University of Richmond, VA, USA. His research focuses on heroism and presidential leadership. His

2018 book *Realignment, Region, and Race: Presidential Leadership and Social Identity* considers how US elections may produce further mismatches such as the one in 2016 where the candidate who wins the popular vote will fall short in electoral votes and thus lose the election.

Marc Grau-Grau is a WAPPP fellow at Harvard Kennedy School and a Researcher and coordinator of the Joaquim Molins Figueras Chair and lecturer at the Faculty of Education at the International University of Catalonia. Marc has a PhD in Social Policy from the University of Edinburgh, a Master in Political and Social Sciences from University Pompeu Fabra and a degree in Business Administration from ESADE. His research interests focus on work–family balance, fatherhood involvement and flexible policies.

Esther Jiménez is Dean of the Faculty of Education and Vice-Chancellor at the International University of Catalonia. Esther has a PhD in Business Administration from the University of Navarra. She has obtained a degree in Law and Labor Sciences. She is also Lecturer at IESE Business School and member of different councils and academic commissions. Her research areas focus on leadership, motivation, development of managerial skills and advancement of women in organizations.

Barbara Kellerman is James MacGregor Burns Lecturer in Public Leadership at the Harvard Kennedy School. She is the Founding Executive Director of the School's Center for Public Leadership. From 2003 to 2006 she served as the Center's Research Director. Kellerman has held professorships at Fordham, Tufts, Fairleigh Dickinson, George Washington, Uppsala, and at both Dartmouth and the Tuck School of Business at Dartmouth. She is author and editor of many books including *Bad Leadership* and, most recently, *Professionalizing Leadership*.

Charles D. Kerns is Professor of Applied Behavioral Science, Pepperdine Graziadio Business School, USA, and has served as Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. He is a trusted executive advisor, teacher, and diplomate in Industrial-Organizational Psychology, and Organizational Business Consulting Psychology (ABPP). His experience, publications, and evidence-based approach to the study and practice of leadership

underpins his Corperformance Leadership System. This integrated holistic framework develops leaders to optimize performance and well-being.

Richard K. Ladyshewsky is a professor at Curtin University, School of Management, Perth Australia. He is a fellow of the University's Academy and the Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia. His research interests are in peer coaching and professional development in health care professionals and leaders. He also conducts research in online learning and works for Curtin from Victoria, British Columbia, Canada.

Verity E. Litten is a sessional academic in the School of Psychology at Curtin University, Perth Australia. Her PhD research in psychology explored the cultivation of empathy and psychopathic traits in non-clinical populations, with several publications noting the significance of these traits in higher education environments. Her research interests include social psychology and personality; specifically, psychopathy and other dark personality traits that predict antisocial and destructive behaviors.

Richard Little is a professor at the Institute for Leadership and Sustainability (IFLAS), University of Cumbria, UK and is Visiting Professor, Warsaw Social Sciences University (SWPS). Richard is driven by the need for change in the nature and purpose of business education and leadership development, toward critical-scholarly and activist perspectives for sustainable and socially just organizations.

Han Liu is the co-founder of Group Relations China, an organization founded in 2017 with a vision to promote understanding of society and social dynamics. Liu provides behavioral leadership coaching and consultation in China, Russia, the US and the EU. Liu is currently a Ph.D. student in Organizational Behavior at Case Western Reserve University. Her research interests are leadership, identity, personal growth, and group/system dynamics.

Alyson Meister is Professor of Leadership and Organizational Behavior at IMD Business School in Switzerland. Her teaching and research interests surround identity and diversity, leadership, and team dynamics in

organizations. In these areas, she consults to organizations spanning several industries and sectors, from not-for-profit to professional services, technology, and industrial goods. Her work has appeared in *Academy of Management Review*, *Journal of Management Studies*, *Human Relations* and *Leadership Quarterly*.

Anders Örtenblad is Professor of Working Life Science at the University of Agder, Norway. He is the editor-in-chief of *The Learning Organization*, and has edited books for publishers such as Edward Elgar Publishing, Oxford University Press, Palgrave Macmillan, Routledge and Sage. His main research interest is learning in and by organizations. He is the editing founder of the book series *Palgrave Debates in Business and Management*.

Markus Paukku is a lecturer at the University of Amsterdam Business School's Strategy and International Business section. His research interests are in international business, emergent digital strategies, and sustainability. Paukku has coauthored articles in leading journals including *Regulation and Governance* and contributed to books including *Strategic Innovation* (Pearson/FT Press, 2015). Paukku has recently established the Amsterdam Living Case Lab to innovate management education and develop "good" leadership.

Terry L. Price is Professor and Coston Family Chair in Leadership and Ethics at the Jepson School of Leadership Studies at the University of Richmond, VA, USA. His research is in leadership ethics, especially moral psychology and influence. Price is author of *Understanding Ethical Failures in Leadership* and *Leadership Ethics: An Introduction*, both by Cambridge University Press. His book *Leadership and the Ethics of Influence* was recently published by Routledge.

Robert J. Sternberg is Professor of Human Development at Cornell University and Honorary Professor of Psychology at Heidelberg University, Germany. His PhD is from Stanford and he holds 13 honorary doctorates. Sternberg is past-president of the APA, and past winner of the Grawemeyer Award in Psychology and the James and Cattell Awards from the Association for Psychological Science. He has been cited over

182,000 times in the scholarly literature. He studies intelligence, creativity, wisdom, love, hate, and leadership.

Liisa Välikangas is Professor of Leadership at DTU Management in Denmark. She is also affiliated with Hanken School of Economics in Finland. Her research is on innovation leadership and strategic resilience and renewal. She is Senior Editor of the *Management and Organization Review*, published by Cambridge University Press. Välikangas has consulted and worked with many small and large companies around the world and served in the board of the Finnish National Innovation Agency, Tekes.

Jo Whitehead is a director at the Strategic Management Centre, London, UK. His research covers corporate and business strategy and strategic decision-making processes. His books include *Think Again, Why Good Leaders Make Bad Decisions; What You Need to Know About Strategy* and *Strategy for the Corporate Level*. He co-authored *Why Giants Stumble*, published in *California Management Review* in 2019. Previously he was a vice president at the Boston Consulting Group for 20 years.

Jack Denfeld Wood is Professor of Management Practice, China Europe International Business School (CEIBS), Shanghai, China; Emeritus Professor of Leadership, IMD, Lausanne, Switzerland, and Visiting Professor of Leadership, Moscow School of Management (Skolkovo), Russia. His interests are in leadership, ideology, unconscious processes, and group/system dynamics. His PhD is from Yale University and his Diploma from the C. G. Jung Institute, Zürich.

List of Figures

List of Tables

Part I

Background and Introduction

1

Background and Introduction: Why Debating Bad Leadership?

Anders Örtenblad

Considering all leadership education, leadership training and development, leadership literature, leadership consulting, and so on that there is, and that has been developed and conducted throughout the years (see, e.g., Gurdjian et al. 2014; Kerns, Chap. 12 in this volume; Ladyshewsky and Litten, Chap. 15 in this volume), not least during the last few decades, one could assume that most leaders are good (or good enough) or at least that there are too few bad ones to make a big thing out of it. However, as is reported in many chapters in this book, the leaders that could be categorized as "bad" (at least temporarily) are rather *many* than *few*, just like the occasions that leadership could be categorized as "bad" are *many* rather than *few* (especially when including "soft types" of bad leadership; see Jiménez et al., Chap. 7 in this volume). The following are some of the many *examples* of bad leaders and/or bad leadership, conducted and/or caused by leaders, that are dealt with in the book (of which some are specific situations and others, more general):

A. Örtenblad (✉)
Department of Working Life and Innovation, School of Business and Law, University of Agder, Grimstad, Norway
e-mail: andersortenblad@yahoo.com

- BP oil tragedy
- Enron scandal
- Foxconn suicidal tragedy
- France Télécom suicidal tragedy
- Lehman Brothers bankruptcy scandal
- Nokia stumble
- Volkswagen diesel scandal
- Watergate scandal
- Destruction of value due to bad leadership at Yahoo
- Reduced levels of organizational success
- Declines in shareholder wealth
- Poor investment decisions
- Dumping of toxic waste materials
- Destruction of the rain forest in Brazil
- Inadequate treatment of climate changes in Australia
- Environmental degradation
- Organizational disfunction
- "Inappropriate behavior" by senior executives
- Workplace bullying and harassment
- Aggression
- Abusive supervision
- Subtle forms of mistreatment like indifference
- Workforce stress
- Diminished employee well-being
- Not taking care of one's followers
- "Everyday ethical failures", that is, breaking more informal, ethical expectations
- Nepotism
- Favoritism
- Fraud
- Corruption

We could also consider findings from others' research:

> Gallup's research reveals that about one in 10 people possess the talent to manage. … [C]ompanies miss the mark on high managerial talent in 82% of their hiring decisions. (Beck and Harter 2020)

> The present study shows that destructive leadership behaviour is very common. Depending on the estimation method, between 33.5% and 61% of all respondents report their immediate superiors as showing some kind of consistent and frequent destructive leadership during the last six months… (Aasland et al. 2010, p. 446)

> One of the aims of the survey was to assess the prevalence of bad leadership in the workplace. Three questions in the survey related to this issue. Collectively these questions provide support for the notion that bad leaders are not uncommon in the workplace. (Erickson et al. 2007, p. 37)

Whitehead (Chap. 2 in this volume) states, based on a study on the forcing out of CEOs, that bad leadership seems to be frequent, not least at the most senior levels of large companies.

If, instead of "leaders", it had been a question of "aircraft pilots" whose bad behavior had adventured the health of other people, aviation security organizations would immediately have stepped in to explore how this could happen in the first place and what exactly it would take to see that it never happens again. This is, at least, the impression one gets of what happens when an aircraft has crashed, when watching "Air crash investigation" on the TV channel "National Geographic" (*National Geographic* 2020). Even if bad leadership occasionally gains attention in the media, rarely does one hear that any "Leadership crash investigation" has been conducted which investigates in depth the reasons and suggests remedies. Such kind of investigations would be reasonable, considering that leadership just like "pilot-ship" can cause a lot of harm to many people, not to speak of the economic values and natural resources bad leadership may contribute in ruining (Pfeffer 2018; Schyns and Schilling 2013; Rose et al. 2015; Beck and Harter 2020; in this volume, see, especially, Blank, Chap. 9 in this volume; Kerns, Chap. 12 in this volume; Giberson, Chap. 14 in this volume). If there is any investigation at all, then it is to get the leaders in question convicted for any crime they may have

committed, not to improve conditions *in general*, which would have happened in the case of aviation security. Especially as long as "leadership" has not been professionalized (e.g., Kellerman 2018; Khurana 2007; Örtenblad 2018) one should perhaps not have very high expectations that any measures would be taken to improve leadership in general based on experiences from any particular leadership crash case.

It is almost as if all of us somehow have come to settle with and accept that many leaders typically do not deliver very good leadership. We should simply not have very high expectations of them. It is as if bad leadership is supposed to be forgiven. Again, if it was that only a few leaders were bad while the vast majority were good, or at least good enough, then that would have made perfect sense and there would not have been any actual, acute need to write a book such as this one. But how can one make sense of the fact that *so many* leaders are bad?

Is leadership such a difficult task to perform that it takes long training, education, and/or reflexive experience to master it, training/education/experience that too few leaders have? Are there severe shortcomings in existing leadership education and development programs, shortcomings huge enough to prevent current and future leaders from learning what they need in order to become good leaders? Are existing succession plans as well as recruitment and selection processes inaccurate to such an extent that the wrong people are hired for leadership positions? Are leadership positions typically designed in such a way that they come with demands on leaders that too few human beings realistically can fulfill? Do leadership positions often come with temptations that attract people who are not apt for leadership? Are people who are good specialists but bad at leadership far too often offered leadership positions, which they accept, since getting a leadership position is often the only career path there is? Or could the frequency of bad leaders be explained in any other way?

While the major part of leadership literature focuses on "good leadership" (Higgs 2009; Schyns and Schilling 2013), a stream of literature has appeared during, especially, the last two decades that focuses on bad leaders and the problems such leaders cause. Notable examples include Barbara Kellerman's *Bad Leadership: What It Is, How It Happens, Why It Matters* (Kellerman 2004) and Jean Lipman-Blumen's *The Allure of Toxic Leaders: Why We Follow Destructive Bosses and Corrupt Politicians – and*

How We Can Survive Them (Lipman-Blumen 2005a). Among earlier writings on bad leadership, Manfred Kets de Vries and Danny Miller's *The Neurotic Organization: Diagnosing and Changing Counterproductive Styles of Management* (Kets de Vries and Miller 1984) stands out. While these and many other studies of bad leadership help to understand why it occurs (see, e.g., Erickson et al. 2007), research on why there are *so many* bad leaders and what could be done about it is much more scarce (there are exceptions, though; see, e.g., Lipman-Blumen 2005b). This is the question that the present book deals with: as a matter of fact, this question has functioned as a common starting point for all chapters.

The general idea behind using, in the present book, the term "leader" instead of "manager", and "leadership" instead of "management", has been to avoid excluding those who have leadership positions/roles but would not call themselves—or be called by anyone else—"leaders". A typical example is political leaders; another is educational leaders. The chapter authors have been free to include other terms, such as "manager", and to use any definition of their preference for "leader" as well as for "leadership". For instance, some have preferred to focus on leadership as a process rather than as people (cf., Chandler, Chap. 19 in this volume; Little and Bendell, Chap. 20 in this volume), which makes the term "leader" less interesting.

"Bad" can, of course, mean different things to different people. It is also true to say that a leader who by one person is categorized as being a "bad leader" may very well be categorized as *not* being a bad leader—or even as a *good* leader—by another person. It may even be that the same leader in certain situations could be categorized as being a bad leader while in other situations be categorized as being a good leader—by the same categorizers and criteria (or even be both a good and a bad leader *simultaneously*). There is also a clear risk of subjectivity; for instance, leaders who may need to be a bit "pushy" in certain situations may become unpopular among the employees, but that does not necessarily mean that they are bad leaders from, for example, an employer's perspective (see, e.g., Boak, Chap. 6 in this volume; Blank, Chap. 9 in this volume; Ladyshewsky and Litten, Chap. 15 in this volume). In this book, the authors have, to a certain degree, been free to decide for themselves what they mean by terms such as "bad leader" and "bad leadership". Many

have, though, referred to and used the same or similar concepts, such as Kellerman's (2004) division of bad leadership into three subtypes of ineffective leadership (incompetent, rigid, and intemperate) and four subtypes of unethical leadership (corrupt, callous, insular, and evil). Others, such as Goethals (Chap. 11 in this volume), have divided between three kinds of bad leadership: *ineffective*, *incompetent*, and *abusive*. As a common frame of reference for the book, Wood et al. (Chap. 3 in this volume) suggest three concepts, *ineffectual leadership*, *dark leadership*, and *shadow leadership*, to be used for categories of leaders that are "not good".

The question that is asked and dealt with in the present book ("why are there so many bad leaders?")—and, thus, the very book—is based on the following presumptions:

1. Some leaders can be categorized as being "bad" (at least periodically or in certain situations).
2. There is such a big number of bad leaders that this is a problem.
3. Something can be done about it, that is, it is believed that a state could be reached where fewer leaders could be categorized as "bad" and/or the consequences from their bad leadership is decreased.
4. A reasonable point of departure for taking measures to improve the current situation is to first understand how it could occur in the first place.

As we will see, though, not all of these presumptions are shared by all of the contributors to the book, and some healthy and reasonable critique and criticism of these presumptions is, thus, also suggested in the book.

The overall aim of the book is to give attention to the frequent occurrence of bad leaders, to further explore it, and to enlighten readers, rather than to offer any definite answers. The particular anatomy of this book is dealt with in the next section of the chapter.

The Anatomy of the Book

Even if Popper might not agree with everything in this book, his following words say a lot about the spirit of the book:

[T]he growth of knowledge depends entirely on disagreement. (Popper 1994, p. 34)

The anatomy or character of this book is one where different authors debate a certain subject, in terms of proposing their own answers to the question "why are there so many bad leaders?",[1] and putting forward arguments in support of the proposed answer and, thus, the position they take. Some do, of course, also argue – more or less explicitly – against other possible positions. Thus, in contrast to other books that contain debates (see, e.g., Örtenblad 2018, 2021), the debate taking place in this book is not one where authors argue for or against a certain statement, but one where different answers to the same "why-question" are being offered.

A number of scholars (and other "leadership thinkers") working in a variety of different academic disciplines were invited to suggest one or more answer(s) to the question at stake, and to argue for their preferred position. Their answers and arguments are more or less divergent, and put together the answers make up a set of possible, plausible answers and arguments from different perspectives to the question "why are there so many bad leaders?". This anatomy, which could be called a "debating anatomy", is a bit different from that of many other books, in that there are theses and antitheses but no syntheses (i.e., no common conclusion) in the book. Instead, readers are offered a variety of positions, as well as various kinds of arguments, and are thereby given the opportunity to make up their own minds. As Table 1.1 shows, some of the contributors suggest that we start to look—for an answer to the question "why are there so many bad leaders?"—among *people*, while other contributors suggest that we start to look for answers in the *leadership role*, in *organizational support* (or, rather, the lack thereof), or in *beliefs* about "leadership".

Nevertheless, it is also true that one *could* regard the chapters as complementary, and that, put together, they add a more complete picture of what there is a need to do to improve the current leadership situation (if so, a suggestion for a future study could be to consult experts on each of the solutions suggested—such as "improved selection", "improved leadership education", etc. (see Table 1.1)—and ask them to what extent

there is potential within their particular area to improve the situation, and there may even be room for empirical studies to investigate this further). The book per se could also be seen as an argument in the debate on "leadership" in general; the book thus argues that there are many bad leaders (at least the vast majority of chapters do) and that there is a need to explore and do something about the frequent occurrence of bad leadership.

As in any other book whose anatomy is characterized by debating (e.g., *Debating Equal Pay for All: Economy, Practicability and Ethics*, Örtenblad 2021) that wants to stimulate further, open debate, and where readers are supposed to gain *bildung*, there is definitely reason to include some healthy criticism[2] of the very premise that the book rests upon (see, e.g. Antonacopoulou 2010, p. S9; Hutchins 1936/1995), in this book too. For instance, it could be argued that this book adds to the problem it aims to solve—by continuing to focus on the divide between "leaders" and "followers" (cf. Wood and Liu, Chap. 10 in this volume)—rather than contributing to its solution. Another criticism is that the question dealt with in this book adds to the myth of leadership (cf. Little and Bendell, Chap. 20 in this volume), and yet another that the debate on bad leaders reveres "leaders" (cf. Chandler, Chap. 19 in this volume). One could also argue that the badness should not be blamed on the individual leaders and that it is thus misleading to ask why there are so many "bad leaders" (cf. Ladyshewsky and Litten, Chap. 15 in this volume). It could also be argued that there aren't as many bad leaders as this book wants to claim, or at least that bad leaders do not cause as much harm as this book suggests. Furthermore, "bad leader", which is the term used in the main question dealt with in this book, may give an impression that the problem lies in the individual, while "bad leadership" instead would mean that there are bad processes and/or bad relations between followers and leaders, which is a perspective that some prefer over "individualization" (cf. Little and Bendell, Chap. 20 in this volume). One could also argue that the followers "make" their leaders and that the main problem therefore lies with the followers, rather than with the leaders (cf. Goethals, Chap. 11 in this volume; Blank, Chap. 9 in this volume).

On the Chapters in the Book

Considering the character of the debate that this book employs, there is little or no reason to comment on or evaluate the individual chapter contributions, or even to present their content in detail. The contributors' suggested explanations as to why there are so many bad leaders stand on their own as arguments. Nevertheless, a very short presentation of the book content may be helpful for the readers. In addition to Chap. 1, there are two more chapters in the first part of the book, both of which offer a background for and introduction to the remainder of the book, in which the very debate takes place. In Chap. 2, "Is 'bad leadership' a problem worth addressing?", Jo Whitehead offers evidence that there are many "bad leaders", thereby underlining especially one of the four presumptions the book rests upon (see earlier). Whitehead has, in others' as well as his own empirical studies, looked at the frequency with which CEOs are forced out, the reasons why, and the resulting costs, and found that bad leadership seems to be frequent, persistent, and costly. In Chap. 3, "Defining the good, the bad, and the evil", Jack Denfeld Wood, Alyson Meister and Han Liu offer a framework to what bad leadership may be. They suggest a division of "leadership" on the basis of two dimensions: leadership may be (1) more effective or more ineffective, on a functional dimension of leadership, and (2) more moral or more immoral, on a relational dimension of leadership. Combining these two dimensions, Wood et al. end up in four categories of leadership, which they term "integral leadership" (i.e., moral and effective), "ineffectual leadership" (i.e., moral and ineffective), "shadow leadership" (amoral and effective), and "dark leadership" (immoral and ineffective).

Table 1.1 presents the remaining chapters of the book. Some explanations of Table 1.1 may nevertheless be helpful:

- The "*Type of leaders*" column refers to the group/category of leaders that are dealt with in the chapters, respectively: organizational leaders

Table 1.1 An overview of the chapters in Parts II, III, IV, V, VI, and VII (Chaps. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20)

Part	Chapter	Type of leaders	Sense of "bad"	Main posited rationale for the occurrence of so many bad leaders
Part II. People: leaders-to-become	4. *How so many toxic employees ascend to leadership* Boddy, Boulter and Fishwick	Organizational	Psychopathic	Psychopathic personality helps people to become leaders, but also to become *bad* leaders
	5. *Ethical failure and leadership: treatment and selection* Flanigan	Organizational; Political	Unethical, especially narcissistic, Machiavellian, and psychopathic	Leadership attracts people who are prone to ethical failure
Part III. People: acting leaders	6. *Shining a light on toxic leadership* Boak	Organizational	Narcissistic, Machiavellian, and psychopathic	The leadership role is designed in such a way that it offers toxic persons opportunities to abuse their position
	7. *From bad leadership to responsible leadership: the revolution of motives among leaders* Jiménez, Chinchilla, and Grau-Grau	In politics; the corporate world; media; science; in our homes	Many forms, from the most explicit (e.g., fraud and corruption) to the most implicit (e.g., silent forms of mistreatment)	Many leaders are motivated by getting results and self-interest, at the expense of others' needs
	8. *Why bad leaders? A perspective from WICS* Sternberg	Political leaders	Unwise, toxic leader behavior, especially uninterest in seeking a common good, leading to eroding democracy and limited freedom	Through modern technology and communication forms, leaders who prioritize the interest of themselves and their tribe can more efficiently seduce and dominate other people, and thereby reach and convince others to become (bad) leaders

Where, primarily, to look for reason for the occurrence of so many bad leaders?						Solution	Criticism of the book's premise (explicit and/or implicit)
People: leaders-to-become	*People: acting leaders*	*People: followers*	*Role/Role expectations*	*Organizational support*	*Beliefs*		
X						Improved selection	
X				x		Improved selection	
	X		x			Increased control; psychological development support	
	X		x	x	x	Change of belief system in decision-making, toward increased awareness of motives and toward considering others' needs, through, for example, organizational measures and education	
x	X	x			x	Increased wisdom, intelligence, and creativity	

(*continued***)**

Table 1.1 (continued)

Part	Chapter	Type of leaders	Sense of "bad"	Main posited rationale for the occurrence of so many bad leaders
Part IV. People: followers	9. *What explains the quality of today's leaders?* Blank	Anyone who has willing followers	Ineffective and unethical	Followers are focused on their own subjectively defined interests and are also cognitively biased when choosing to follow a leader
	10. *Failure in leadership: the deeper psychosocial currents* Wood and Liu	General/Not specified/ Examples from various sectors	Immoral dark and amoral shadow	It is human nature to see one's own shortcomings in others and to blame them—followers and leaders unintentionally keep bad leadership going
	11. *Bad followers create bad leaders* Goethals	General/Not specified/ Examples from various sectors	Ineffective and unethical	Followers empower leaders who in return help to fulfill the followers' needs, a symbiotic and corruptive process that makes leaders especially vulnerable to corrosive effects of powerfulness

Where, primarily, to look for reason for the occurrence of so many bad leaders?					Solution	Criticism of the book's premise (explicit and/or implicit)
x	x	X			More objective, rational approaches, especially by followers	A more relevant question is "why do people follow someone?"
	x	X	x	x	Increased self-awareness; changed beliefs about leadership	"Why so many bad leaders?" rests on a binary assumption that does not include *us*
	x	X	x	x	Increased vigilance, self-awareness, and knowledge (primarily among followers)	A more relevant question is "why are there so many bad *followers*?"

(*continued*)

Table 1.1 (continued)

Part	Chapter	Type of leaders	Sense of "bad"	Main posited rationale for the occurrence of so many bad leaders
Part V. Role/Role expectations	12. *Bad leaders: some realities, reasons and remedies* Kerns	General/Not specified/ Examples from various sectors	Ineffective, incompetent and abusive	Policy level inattention; overlooking the downside of high performance practices; a weak linkage between leadership effectiveness and organizational outcome metrics; insufficient recruitment, selection, and onboarding practices; and a leadership development– leadership ineffectiveness disconnect mainly contribute to bad leadership
	13. *Harried or myopic leadership: an undue bias for action* Paukku and Välikangas	General/Not specified/ Examples from various sectors	Ineffective and nonreflective	There is a misguided perception in many organizations that only (hasty) action equals determined and good leadership
	14. *Heads above the rest: the cognitive demands of leading the modern organization* Giberson	Organizational	Ineffective (not engaged in engaging people)	Many leaders have a consciousness and skill set that make them unfit for postmodern life or leader positions where such consciousness is needed
Part VI. Organizational support	15. *Review, reflection, and coaching: developing "good" leadership and management practices in middle managers* Ladyshewsky and Litten	Middle managers in the corporate sector	Ineffective; psychopathic	Many organizations are not good at recruiting the right persons, developing their leaders, or convincing their employees that leaders sometimes need to implement unpopular decisions
	16. *Why companies stumble: the role of bad leadership* Whitehead and Bistrova	CEOs	Ineffective	Inadequate organizational support for leaders in situations where personal characteristics align poorly with the required role

Where, primarily, to look for reason for the occurrence of so many bad leaders?					Solution	Criticism of the book's premise (explicit and/or implicit)
x	x	X	x	x	Repositioning leadership role; fostering leader high performance/ well-being; aligning virtuous values with virtuous leader behavior; improving leadership development/ education; engaging policy makers and boards of directors	
		X	x	x	Change of belief system, toward "active waiting"	
	x	X	x	x	Improved selection; more relevant leadership development	
x	x	x	x	X	Improved selection; better leadership development; more adequate organizational procedures for support of leaders	Sometimes leaders are not "bad" at all, instead the organization does not offer them effective leadership development and support
	x		x	X	More adequate organizational procedures for support of leaders; leadership education	