Personal Leadership Development within Master of Public Governance: Imaginary Interventions?

Frank Meier[1] and Christian Tangkjær
Copenhagen Business School, Denmark

22 Nordic Academy of Management Conference
Reykjavík, 21 – 23 August, 2013

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to explore how managerial agency is constructed through three relational strategies: i. between self and institutional context, ii. between self and social context, and iii. between self and oneself. The empirical source is a database of assignments by some 270 students, participating in a one year Personal Leadership Development course within a Master of Public Governance 2009 – 2012. The context of the study is the accelerated changes in Danish Public Sector, and how these changes impact managers and their organisations under dominant management discourses, New Public Management and New Public Governance etc. The empirical analysis – initiated in this paper - explore if a žižekian approach can make sense of the managers 'fantastic' reliance on leadership and management tools and concepts to complete the (likewise) fantastic promises of organisational change brought in from the above.

The originality of the project (in total) stems partly from the unique and rather massive data material, partly from the introduction of žižekian concepts into leadership research.

Introduction

Being public manager today entails dealing with increasingly complex tasks in organizational and regulatory contexts transforming at accelerating speed through waves of reform, constituting an experience of 'permanent change' within public sector. From 2000 to 2010, Denmark went through eleven comprehensive, national reforms (Greve, 2012). High demands on performance on a host of new public management objectives is commonplace, whereas the permanent change has increased demands for leadership, that is giving sense, identity and direction to self, employees, the broader

---

organization and even external stakeholders and more remote audiences. The emerging specifics of such leadership seem daunting: It shall be exercised with authenticity, communicative efficiency and relational competency.

Given the classical public manager is a professional – teacher, physician, accountant etc. – with few or no qualifications within complex management let alone not to leadership, it follows that further education is called for. In the Danish case, government, public employers' organizations and the trade unions of public employees, cooperatively with the universities designed and partly funded the executive Master of Public Governance (MPG) as an integral part of a larger 'Quality Reform' (Greve, 2013). The MPG was designed specifically to "to qualify and develop the public manager's capability to conduct professional management in a political directed public sector context with the aim of strengthening the public manager's competence in reflecting and further developing his or her own management practice" (Copenhagen Business School and University of Copenhagen, 2013).

Public sector in transition

Across Western Europe public sectors are undergoing dramatic changes, not least due to fiscal deficits and austerity politics (Blyth, 2013). Newman (2011) is using the label "The Involving State" to emphasize that public organizations normatively are expected to create public value by doing partnerships with private organizations; that clients/citizens should be involved in producing services; and broadly speaking public organizations should collaborate across borders to search for new solutions and not be trapped in silos of production. Newman states (2011: pp. 6) that this is really a matter of "..opening the 'black box' of technologies of involvement", which is basically a matter of innovation. However this compulsory involvement is not the only normative pressure on the public sector. Public organizations should not only change. They are also asked to be more efficient in terms of the resources used in producing specific public value. This is basically a matter of New Public Management, which shows that NPM is still a strong ideology, however referring to Newman's (ibid.) analysis NPM is not the only ideology shaping the ideas of public organization. The involving state represents New Public Governance (NPG) as an ideology.

Keywords

Personal Leadership development, agency, management learning, Žižek.

Method

This study explores a unique source of leadership development data, made up of 270 student assignment from a compulsory executive personal leadership development module within the Master of Public Governance (MPG) program at Copenhagen Business School from 2008 through 2012. The assignment is part of the assessment of the whole course, completed with an assignment of some 15 pages and an oral examination.

To qualify the public manager, a curriculum of – among other subjects - Human Resource Management, Communication, Reform and Change, Public Governance and notably Personal Leadership Development – is put in place within a flexible framework in which the Master can be accomplished from two to six years. The module in case - the Personal Leadership Development module - covers 5 out of the total of 60 ECTS, and aims to 'transform professional insight' from

various modules to 'personal development and expanded possibilities of action in the specific leadership reality of the participants' (Copenhagen Business School and University of Copenhagen, 2013).

The module is designed as an action-learning (Anderson, 2004; Cho & Egan, 2010; Revans, 1982) journey in which reflexivity (Cunliffe, 2005), collaborative inquiry, problem-based learning and learning sets form integral parts (Berggren & Soderlund, 2011). The module consists of a theoretical part, in which perspectives on the person and group, conflict and cooperation, leadership and management interventions are presented. The theoretical positions chosen are contemporary psychodynamic theory on the one hand and systemic/narrative organizational theory on the other. The two perspectives cover by far the majority of theoretically informed work in the field, at least in a Danish context[2].

From the theoretical foundation, students are guided through increasingly specific formulation of a leadership challenge from their own practice. This challenge may emanate outside-in: Pressure from the institutional and/or social context or inside-out: An intention of the manager to transform oneself as manager. The dynamics of agency vis á vis the leadership challenge is developed in further detail below. Having formulated the challenge, two co-students perform ethnographic studies in the students own organisation on the topic of the challenge, interviewing significant others. Integrating this data, the students develop within their learning sets a series of experimental actions to be performed in their home organisations. The actions are designed to explore ways to handle the leadership challenge. The actions and the potential change (personal and/or organisational) encountered is journalised and an essay is written up, reporting on the challenge, the ethnography, the experimental actions and the change. This data is subjected to a certain level of reflection. And even if the level of sophistication of these reflections may prove modest from conventional standards, more often than not the oral examination uncovers impressive and at times unexpected personal and/or organisational changes accomplished.

Personal leadership as part of masterprograms

Personal leadership development has become an important dimension in university based masterprogrammes. This is definitely both due to market differentiation and because of a much broader cotemporary understanding, that that leadership development involves entails a personal dimension (Berggren, 2011).

Our students are strategists, change agents and bureaucratic entrepreneurs as well as officials and public servants. They have professional identities and social roles in a changing public sector wherein we, as teachers and researcher, are supposed to facilitate processes of learning and development. And particularly in a context of changes, which is definitely the current situation for the Danish public sector Denmark, managers have to define themselves as subjects (interests, values etc.). But they are not only subjects with the capacity to reflect on own interests and values, they are – referring to Giddens (1991) – both "reflexive and flexible self-identities". In high modernity, which is a relevant sociological horizon for the public sector in Denmark - society and life is normatively

---

[2] This fact in itself constitutes probably a not very healthy situation of theoretical/ideological duopoly.

constituted as open possibilities. In such a landscape of open possibilities, public managers really need to master reflexive as well as flexible self-identities who should be recognized for their capability to cope with doubt and uncertainty. Self-identity has to be an open construction. To have flexible and reflexive self-identities has a double description: Apart from being general sociological phenomenon, they have an 'inside', that is a personal description of one-self as a leader (Kaplan, 2008). Business schools have responded to these trends (Berggren, 2011), and personal leadership development has been integrated to master-programmes all over the world.

Public leadership as representing moral characters of the changing public sector

Public leadership has been called for increasingly through the last decades, also due to the national reform strategies (Pedersen & Tangkjaer, 2013). This is not least the case in Denmark where reforms have been the primary political tools for public sector change (Greve, 2012). Most of the reforms they really have either an implicit or explicit perspective on public leadership; and basically leadership seems to be the vehicle for making changes. In that respect, we will argue, public leaders are really the primary moral characters of the public sector, and not least are they moral characters representing our beliefs in a sustainable public sector. MacIntyre (1981) says *"….that characters in our society are those social roles which provide a culture with its moral definitions"*. And public leadership does to a large degree embody the moral ideas and theories about the public sector and its changes. We will of course not argue that public leadership should be exalted to the highest moral stage, but that immanent public management is built our moral values representing hope and faith in a public sector. In that respect public leadership morally legitimates the present existence of visions of the public sector. To be morally representatives is really a strong pronouncement, however we really do believe that most of the public leaders that participate in our master program are really committed to the idea of a sustainable public sector, and they do see themselves as having a responsibility regarding the fulfillment of this vision. Not least is this the case because Master of Public Governance basically is a result of a government reform and a collaborative partnership of government and universities (Greve, 2013). One could say, which of course also was the intention, that the masterprogram should improve public leadership so that public leadership could "Transform vision, strategies, and political objectives to practical objectives and success criteria; implement and follow up on actions and initiatives". (ibid.: pp. 290). In that respect the political vision of a "changing public sector" is infused into the masterprogram, and this vision is somehow a moral obligation shared by the partners and put into the program. Of course the students are not partners to the masterprogramme, but students who are encouraged by their HR-managers to develop their leadership competences that can be deployed in fostering organizational and strategic changes in the specific public organization.

Leadership development, and especially leadership development in a context of sector specific transition and change in political priorities, we will argue, professionals have a tendency to reflect their own social role in the broader context of political and sector specific changes (ex. (Spender, 1989). Therefore it is reasonable to argue that public leaders attending the master-programme implicitly or explicitly are able to couple their individual competence development and the challenges in the public sector. In that respect they are moral agents, and as MacIntyre ((1981): pp. 31-32) argues *"To be a moral agent is, on this view, precisely to be able to stand back from any and every situation in which one is involved, from any and every characteristics that one may possess*

and to pass judgement on it from a purely universal and abstract point of view that is totally detached from all social particularity. Anyone and everyone can thus be a moral agent, since it is in the self and not in social roles or practices that moral agency has to be located". Following MacIntyres (ibid.) reflections then it is necessary to "know-yourself", which is the moral principle, to be a character.

Agency constructions

Our students attending the course "Personal development" are expected to analyse and reflect upon own personal leadership in own organizational context. It is not purely a matter of self-telling, because the students should rather both analyse and reflect upon the "self" and the "self-in-the-organisation". In her critical reflection on "critical reflection" in leadership development, Swan (2008) argues that a "therapeutic culture" has evolved, also in universities and business schools. And the risk of course is that learning becomes a matter of confession and a matter of just approaching the personal experience (ibid.: pp. 389-391). However, every single personal experience is a perception and an interpreted framing of one-self in society, and therefore personal experience is a political framing of an organizing individual in an organizational context (ibid.).

We are primarily interested in agency rather than identity, however we acknowledge that identity and agency are closely connected theoretical concepts in socio-economic theory. Identity could both be a matter of self-assigned characteristics and capabilities or a matter of other-assigned characteristics and capabilities. According to Wrenn ((2012): pp. 404) agency is power to act and choose, and she continues arguing, that "*In order to exercise agency, the individual must possess the power of self-reference while recognizing — regardless of accuracy — social influences and her power to act and react to them (Davis 2003). Self-reference refers to the agent's ability to develop a perception of her own position and part of the surrounding structure*". In that respect one could argue that identity and agency due to the theoretical line of arguing that "…agency is determined by the degree to which she is self-referential, and therefore is on a fundamental level making choices that reflect the self-referential identity the individual has constructed or adapted" (Wrenn, (2012): pp. 405).

Different categories of agency constructs

In our study we are not interested in how public managers create identities as such, but we are interested in how public managers (within the confines of our specific MPG module) are framing themselves in terms of agency. By framing themselves as agency we are refereeing to three things:

- That agency is a matter of the selves' power to act and choose
- That agency is both conscribed by as well as directed towards the social and institutional context
- That the construction of agency is a matter of perception of those same conscriptions.

In that respect we implicitly interested in identity, however identity as a matter of how individuals are framing themselves as agency.

From our empirical material we have identified five different framing strategies. By framing-strategies we mean the individual public managers way of positioning themselves in the social and institutional context with a specific purpose of acting in and or their organisation. Each category is defined by its relational construct between "self" and something outside the self (social or institutional structures/forces). However the five framing-strategies are actually divided into three broad categories:

1) *The first category is "Self and institutional context":*
   By this we especially are focusing on how the public manager relate own agency towards the institutional context or abstract structuring of organizational action, e.g. an financial situation, resource effiency, etc.

2) *The second category is "self and social context":*
   Rather than being focusing on an abstract outer world some public managers frame themselves in relation to the specific others, e.g. employees, management teams, manager.

3) *And the last category is "self and oneself":*
   By this category we want to focus on some public managers' ability or interest in focusing on how agency is directed towards oneself as a manager. In this regard management becomes a "technology of the self".

Each of the two first categories is actually divided into two different strings of reasoning regarding agency constructs because agency could be motivated deterministically (reaction) or by voluntarism (action). This is actually both relevant for agency directed towards the social and institutional context. It is important for us to mention that these categories are primarily are result of our interpretation of our empirical material and not theoretically constructions. However, we as researchers could of course be biased by our assumptions regarding organizational reality and our reading of social practices.

Table 1 shows how the cases distribute within the categories outlined. Arrows indicate the motivational direction:

Table 1 Distribution of cases within categories

Categories	Framing strategies	n	%
Self and institutional context	A: I → it	9	3
	B: I ← it	133	49
self and social context	C: I → Them	26	10
	D: I ← Them	77	29
self and oneself	E: I → Me	25	10
N		270	101

Analytical framework

The question that we are asking in this workingpaper is "How do public managers construct themselves as agency?" So far we have discussed how public managers are installed in a meta-narrative in the public sector; a meta-narrative wherein the welfare state is changing, where the future should be invented and wherein management is one of the major solutions. Empirically our workingpaper focuses on 270 public managers who have written a personal reflection/analysis of own personal leadership as something going on in their own organizational context. These reflexive writings represent all in their own way different narrative constructions of public managers as agency. As such these agency constructions are both personal and professional identifications. We have categorized our empirical material, the reflexive writings, in five different categories of strategies for agency constructions. These categories are interesting in itself because they show us an empirical pattern in the way public managers seems to understand the point of departure for organizing agency. However we are more specifically interested in how these different agency constructions represent different ways of subjectivation.

Agency as desire

One important finding when we looked across assignments was that a significant numbers of the public managers were following a teleological way of arguing or reflecting on own leadership as agency. The teleological rationality imbedded in their reflexive writings seems to be a generalized (or idealized) perception of management and organisation. According to Townley (2002) this seems rather obvious as long as we understand that management is a moral character (with reference to (MacIntyre, 1981) or a regime of ordering that is constituted by modern rationalities (rationality, causality, certainty, sovereignty, agency, ibid.). In modernity the demand for management and leadership is not a constant factor, but it is a growing and increasing one. These idealized and abstract perceptions of management meet reality – reality, which is non-rational, non-causal, uncertain etc. However, rather than being reduced, our demand for management and leadership is increasing due to the fact that modern rationalities are deeply rooted and institutionalized into

society, and of course modern organizations. In these institutionalized dynamics gaps between reality and idealized perceptions of management and leadership accelerates our beliefs in and demand for management and leadership (e.g. (Sørhauge, 1996)). The legitimacy of management and leadership builds on its ability to simultaneously understand these gaps and act on the moral obligation to decrease gaps between reality and idealized visions of purified organizational practices.

And public managers are of course institutionalized into modern rationalities. They are inscribed into modern society and the strong institutionalized settings that order management and leadership. Therefore it is not surprising that the reflexive assignments represent teleological way of arguing, because this is the very basic legitimacy of the character of being a manager, and being a public manager becomes an even stronger moral obligation, insofar the re-building of the welfare state itself becomes a moral obligation. We wish to explore, how this teleological rationality construct agency in different ways, and especially we want to understand the reflexive writings as narratives of desires to reduce the gaps between reality and idealized perceptions of organizational reality.

We have – in that regard - been inspired by Slavoj Žižek, a philosopher and political theorist, who is interested in understanding ideology in modern society as fantasies or imaginations of the real. The Žižekian vocabulary has yet to be properly imported from philosophy and political theory into organisational theory (Böhm & De Cock, 2005). One possible explanation for this omission may be, that the intention of organisational theory is pragmatic, focused on providing solutions and optimizations for modern, organisations of late capitalism, whereas Žižek's project may indeed be the radical transformation of this particular societal formation. Nonetheless, we seek to explore the applicability of his core concepts here.

In modern society there are three different ontological orders, namely "The Real", "The Symbolic" and "The Imaginary" (Žižek, 1989), following the core distinctions from Lacanian psychoanalysis. (Bjerg) (2013, p. 28) defines the symbolic order "*as the order of logic, calculation, rule of law, predictability, coherence, completeness etc. The order of the imaginary, on the contrary, has the form of paradox, tautology and incoherence. In the order of the imaginary, we find a vague and often not fully articulated fantasy about a completed state of the symbolic order where contradictions and antagonisms have been overcome*" that is "*as a system of signs that emerge as the real is integrated into a social order of language, meaning, law, etc.*" (Berg, p. 22) and thus connects Žižek to the wider social constructionism in that regard.

The different levels of ontological orders of society makes it possible for modern man to approach the society and everyday life in a rather cynical way, because of the difference between our conceptualizations of modern problems (social reality), the real problems (reality) and our fantasies of ourselves taking care of these problems (imaginations). Between these levels of organizing there is an "ontological imbalance" (Bjerg, 2013): pp. 23), because "*On the one hand, symbolization bars our access to the real. But on the other hand, there is in every operation of symbolization a leftover in the form of a surplus or a deficit of the real. Thus emerges the strange paradox that the real is something we can never reach while at the same time we can never get rid of it either*." On the other hand we are driven by a desire of the Other, of the lack in Other (Žižek, 2008), pp. 118). Related to our public managers we will argue that organizational "Reality" is something which we both are part of, but we do not have a language to grasp and to fully symbolize (into the social reality). And as we try to conceptualize The Real, it is (through language) liftet into the symbolic order and thus escapes

us. However, as Žižek ((2008): pp. 70) points out: *"The point is not that the Real is impossible but rather that the impossible is Real. A trauma, or an act, is simply the point when the Real happens, and this is difficult to accept"*. Though, we can still talk about the Real, but we can never really reach it, instead we can create fantasies and we can have a desire to fulfil Reality and the gap between Reality and Social Reality.

Agency between The Real, The Symbolic and The Imaginary

Using this way of arguing on our empirical observations the public managers are framing themselves in the dynamics between the different ontological orders of the Real, Symbolic and Imaginary. And rather than becoming subjects with clear cut identities managers are constituted by misidentification (rather than clear identification). Being a manager is a practice wherein you are expected to take on very different social roles, in different contexts and a practice of dealing with *real problems* using symbolic representations that creates problems without really reaching the real thing, and not least is management a practice of desire, namely being caught in a fantasy that constitutes our desire for purified organizational reality. (Bjerg) ((2013): pp. 29) uses Žižeks philosophy in his analysis of Money, and he argues: *"Desire is the perpetual projection of an ontological 'lack of Being' onto different objects in the world (enough money, a car, a woman, a bigger house, another child, etc.) to serve as potential resolutions of the lack. The subject's desire is structured by the need to discover and obtain those particular object's that are believed to confirm and demonstrate, 'who I really am'.* But it is impossible to become a coherent ontological identity or a subject.

Bjerg's analysis of Money and his use of Žižek represents an interesting way of operationalizing Žižek, because it makes us able translate the philosophical concepts and reasoning into categories of understanding the reflexive writings. Bjerg (ibid.) uses the threefold distinction between Real, Symbolic and Imaginary in his understanding of Money. In his analysis he argues that Money is constituted by Value (Real), Money (Symbolic) and Market (Imaginary). In the following we will open up our empirical material using the Žižek framework, and we will use the categories of agency constructs that was described earlier in this workingpaper. The focus for us will be management/leadership, and specifically we will as how management/leadership is constituted on the level of The Real, The Symbolic and The Imaginary ontological level within the five different categories of agency constructions?

Analysis of framing strategy B

In this paper, we have chosen to discuss Strategy B, as this is the preferred (49%). Table 3 to Table 6 displays samples from the four other strategies. Strategy B involves a construction of the agency as determined primarily from the institutional context. This could be organisational changes (fusions, cut backs, new strategies, outside partners' actions etc.) Samples are shown in

Table 2.

Table 2 Samples from framing strategy B

Samples from framing strategy B: I ← it within "Self and institutional context"(n=133)

B1: During implementation of the new IT governance model, how do I foster the experience of sense among my employees?

B2: My section is being integrated into a new organisational design – which leadership approaches would support this change?

B3: Two districts are merging – how do I as a leader support the development of a common culture?

B4: A top management policy paper on leadership defines a certain perspective of change as preferable. What does this mean for my local group of directors, and how do I contribute to the group through this?

B5: My organisation is implementing user driven innovation. How do my leadership support this?

First, we notice the dominance of this framing strategy. Almost half of the students (49%) have chosen this particular way of framing their leadership challenge. This is hardly surprising, given our indications above of change and reform as the new normal in the public sector. We also notice in the material, that no change impulse arrives with a turn-key implementation vehicle. In fact, practically none of the changes from the institutional context where equipped with any kind of 'manual'. Thus the individual leader seems to face any change as a first one, neither being able to call on higher levels of leadership for guidance, nor on previous experiences.

At the macro level, we initially identify the dominant Symbolic order in contemporary public sector context as New Public Management. This regime is the natural and logical social order, forming the context for agency strategy for practically every manager in our analysis. This order is at times described as The Managerial State (Pedersen & Tangkjaer, 2013). In this framing, public management includes: realising economies of scale changes (eg. fusions, Shared Service Centres), various austerity measures (budget cuts, in particular personnel reductions), phasing in private providers, large-scale ICT implementations, standardization of processes and product and general leaning of processes. Confronted with such change, the public manager in the Managerial State will dig into the change management repertoire to 'implement' the changes required, thus allowing thee organisation to (re-)enter the symbolic order, only now at a new, higher and improved level.

Thus, looking at our most frequent agency strategy [I ← it] a prototypical case would entail a fusion of two entities as a result of larger organisational restructuring with strategic intent. More often than not, such change imperative arrives with little or no legitimizing or sense-making narrative of a locally relevant sort. Thus the change will often refer to goals and intentions experienced as quite distant and alien viewed locally. However, the change imperative is likely accompanied with a description of the world 'after' the realisation of the change: The Innovative Organisation, the organisational value of the leaned Organisation etc. This is a world of teleological orderliness, in

which the local circumstance (the not-yet-fused organisations) represent a lack. Thus management comes across as an attempt to fulfil the symbolic order, to conceal the lack of completeness.

In this framework, we - or our manager - have no access to the "Real", as it 'really' is. There is no access to any simple methodology to close the gap, no self-evident route by which to include the organisation in the new symbolic order. This is where we – when reading across the assignments of this agency strategy– are struck by the *fantastic* quality of the narratives at hand. By fantastic we mean a pattern, in which there seems to be a very weak relation between the incoming change imperative, the local situation and the intervention chosen to 'implement' the change. The narratives are driven by a desire to make complete the organisation, attaining the completeness inscribed in the change in the first place, whatever actions this entails. Typical interventions chosen involve the manager to 'enact the visionary leader', to 'communicate the goal with clarity and persistence', 'to engage the employees in the process' or 'to lay out a detailed roadmap of the steps needed'.

Thus the Leadership and Change Management vocabulary (in its broadest sense) is invoked as an žižekian Imaginary or fantastic realm, providing actions that promises to close the gap and playing into the managers desire. Evoking this reading opens up a discussion of how leadership and Change Management tools and rhetorics the demand for change management tools and techniques as well as a different understanding of the sustained use of this. To quote Todnem By, characterizing change management theory from a mainstream perspective: '*[W]hat is currently available is a wide range of contradictory and confusing theories and approaches, which are mostly lacking empirical evidence and often based on unchallenged hypotheses regarding the nature of contemporary organisational change management.* (Todnem By, 2005) The žižekian approach may indicate, that the modern demand for change management and leadership – however poorly supported by evidence – may originate from more ontological dynamics and contradictions within (organisational) life.

Working from the perspective of 'identity', Sveningsson & Larsson (2006) too arrives at 'fantasy' as the ultimate defensive strategy deployed by Sol Ace, their middle manager case. Facing discursive demands of leadership characterised by inspiration and visionary change, the middle manager must resort to fantasy to be able to sustain an appropriate identity as a visionary leader.

Tables

Table 3 Samples from framing strategy A

Samples from framing strategy A: I → it within "Self and institutional context" (n=9)

A1: What could be the connection between the values of my organisation, the culture of my section and my own basic assumptions?

A2: How do I use the manufacturing of a new institutional strategy to define my leadership space?

A3: How can I work with my personal competencies and relations as to promote my organisational footprint and career?

A4: How do I maintain a strategic focus – and avoid being overwhelmed by doing work, that I already have delegated to my employees?

Table 4 Samples from framing strategy C

Samples from framing strategy C: I → Them within "Self and social context"(n=26)

C1: What kind of leadership competence do I need to strengthen in dealing with the volunteers of my citizen service

C2: How do I build my affiliating leadership style with regard to my fellow managers?

C3: What does it take for me to develop my team of managers to become high performing?

C4: How do I support my team leaders to use coaching to strengthen quality in their local teams?

Table 5 Samples from framing strategy D

Samples from framing strategy D: I ← Them within "Self and social context"(n=77)

D1: A department within my area of responsibility has developed a detrimental relationship between the head of department and her employees that undercuts our overall ambitions of service delivery in my organisation. The resulting culture lacks civility and cooperation – what do I do towards the HoD?

D2: A recent double change (fusion of two departments and reorganisation into teams) has created animosity among the employees involved. How do I enquire into this situation?

D3: There exists a negative relation between me and my employees in my section. How can I through psychodynamic theory (defence and authority) i. understand this situation and ii. resolve it?

D4: What capacities of my personal leadership will enable me to handle the level of organisational stress – and how do I maintain the strategic direction in this?

Table 6 Samples from framing strategy E

Samples from framing strategy E: I → Me within "Self and oneself"(n=25)

E1: Did it happen? Did I crystallize as a leader?

E2: Can I tip the balance from 'management' towards 'leadership' in my role, and thus increase overall legitimacy?

E3: Will 'they' figure out, how insecure I feel as leader?

E4: How has the Master programme developed my professional and personal competences, and how does these competences then match the demands put on public sector leadership today?

E5 Will a focus on leadership styles develop my sense of authenticity?

References

Anderson, L. (2004). New perspectives on action learning: Developing criticality. *Journal of European Industrial Training, 28*(8), 657 <last_page> 668. doi:10.1108/03090590410566570

Berggren, C. (2011). Management education for practicing managers: Combining academic rigor with personal change and organizational action. *Journal of Management Education, 35*(3), 377. doi:10.1177/1052562910390369

Berggren, C., & Soderlund, J. (2011). Management education for practicing managers: Combining academic rigor with personal change and organizational action. *Journal of Management Education, 35*(3), 377-405. doi:10.1177/1052562910390369

Bjerg, O. (2013). *Making money - the philosophy of financial capitalism* (Forthcoming).

Blyth, M. (2013). *Austerity. A history of a dangerous idea.* London: Oxford University Press.

Böhm, S., & De Cock, C. (2005). Everything you wanted to know about organization theory . . . but were afraid to ask slavoj žižek. *The Sociological Review, 53*, 279 <last_page> 291. doi:10.1111/j.1467-954X.2005.00555.x

Cho, Y., & Egan, T. M. (2010). The state of the art of action learning research. *Advances in Developing Human Resources, 12*(2), 163-180. doi:10.1177/1523422310367881

Master of public governance statutes, (2013).

Cunliffe, A. L. (2005). The need for reflexivity in public administration. *Administration Society, 37*(2), 225. doi:10.1177/0095399704273209

Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and self-identity. self and society in the late modern age.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Greve, C. (2012). *Reformanalyse.* Copenhagen: DJØF Publishing.

Greve, C. (2013). Collaborative partnerships: A case study of the executive master of public governance program in copenhagen, denmark. *Journal of Public Affairs Education, 19*(2), 285-308.

Kaplan, R. S. (2008). Managing yourself. *Harvard Business Review, July - August*

MacIntyre, A. (1981). *After virtue. A study of moral theory
*. Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press.

Mintzberg, H. (2009). *Managing.* San Fransisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers Inc.

Newman, J. (2011). *The involving public sector*. Conference at Copenhagen Business School: Workingpaper.

Pedersen, D., & Tangkjaer, C. (2013). Building leadership capacity in the involving network state. *Teaching Public Administration, 31*(1), 29 - 41. doi:10.1177/0144739413478963

Revans, R. W. (1982). What is action learning? *Journal of Management Development, 1*(3), 64 <last_page> 75. doi:10.1108/eb051529

Schön, D. E. (1983). *The reflective practitioner. how professionals think in action*. New York: Basic Books Inc.

Sørhauge, T. (1996). *Om ledelse. makt og tillit i moderne organisering*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Spender, J. (1989). *Industry recipies. An enquiry into the nature and sources of managerial judgement.
*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Sveningsson, S., & Larsson, M. (2006). Fantasies of leadership: Identity work. *Leadership, 2*(2), 203-224. doi:10.1177/1742715006062935

Swan, E. (2008). Let's not get too personal: Critical reflection, reflexivity and the confessional turn. *Journal of European Industrial Training, 32*(5), 385 <last_page> 399. doi:10.1108/03090590810877102

Todnem By, R. (2005). Organisational change management: A critical review. *Journal of Change Management, 5*(4), 369 <last_page> 380. doi:10.1080/14697010500359250

Townley, B. (2002). Managing with modernity. *Organization, 9*(4), 549 <last_page> 573. doi:10.1177/135050840294003

Wrenn, M. V. (2012). Agency, identity, and the great crisis: A veblenian perspective. *Journal of Economic Issues, 0*(2), 403-410. doi:10.2753/JEI0021-3624460215

Žižek, S. (2008). *The sublime object of ideology*. New York: Verso.