Grandiosity in contemporary management and education

2 authors:

Mats Alvesson
Lund University

140 PUBLICATIONS **16,081** CITATIONS

Yiannis Gabriel
University of Bath

158 PUBLICATIONS **4,835** CITATIONS

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:

Unemployed managers and professionals in later life View project

Consumerism and consumption View project

Grandiosity in contemporary management and education

Mats Alvesson, Lund University, University of Queensland and Cass Business School
Yiannis Gabriel, University of Bath and Lund University

Abstract

Contemporary practitioner and academic discourses of organizations and management have developed a tendency to discuss everyday organizational phenomena in overblown and remarkable ways. It is now commonplace to view organizations in terms of visions, missions, strategies, charisma, entrepreneurship, best practice and so forth. A hyped up language is becoming endemic to ordinary discussions of ordinary organizations doing ordinary things. This calls for some critical attention. One way of capturing this tendency to hype is through the idea of grandiosity that is taking over the ways mundane organizational phenomena are constructed and debated. In this essay we argue that grandiosity is the product of the narcissism of our times, reinforced by contemporary consumerism; we suggest that grandiosity not only affects adversely critical reflection of organizations and management, but more importantly that it undermines organizational performance and learning.

Keywords Grandiosity, management, organizations

Grandiosity sometimes refers to delusions of grandeur, characteristic of individuals with more or less severe disturbances regarding their own qualities and significance. It can be observed in obsessions of dictators and other national leaders constructing enormous monuments to commemorate themselves or to leave a lasting legacy. The recognition of the value of major achievements, through awards like the Nobel Prize or the Oscars, may be the result of grandiose ambitions, but the term is often used to describe someone who is viewed as craving praise and admiration beyond their qualities or achievements.

Grandiosity can also be used to refer to something culturally and socially driven, viewed as normal or appropriate, characterized by a more or less hidden tendency to hype and exaggeration, a constant drive to boost the status, significance and identity of everything. Contemporary cultural grandiosity – at least in open, equality-oriented societies - is socially controlled, semi-realistic and confined to loading an increasing number of phenomena with strongly positive, exaggerated associations that emanate attractiveness, success and distance from the paltry mediocrity of everyday life. as the tendency to speak of everybody is a leader, everybody as 'doing' leadership or as behaving in leader-like ways illustrates this – it is less common to claim that everybody is a follower, an administrator, a functionary or even a manager, even though these terms probably capture more effectively most people's experiences at work.

Grandiosity is typically camouflaged and represented as a favourable, but not grossly misleading representation of a phenomenon. Grandiosity gilds the lily by lending a golden haze to various phenomena. Since this involves considerable doctoring of a world that is not always so beautiful, it also involves the application of some smoke screens.

Grandiosity is linked to the widespread "narcissism" of our times and a generalized craving to enhance self-esteem. We all, it seems, want to be in the public eye, confirmed, associated with something prestigious, and to distance ourselves from what is trivial. The desire to be fascinating assumes both personal and collective expressions. Organizations, institutions and groups assume labels ('cutting edge', 'world leading', internationally famous') seeking to boost their claims to sophistication and status much in the same way as do individuals.

The appeal of grandiosity and the social pressures to enact it create significant obstacles for management learning. Topics and methods signalling something glamorous and narcissistically satisfying attain great currency, uncritically seducing students into naïve acceptance of superficial and dubious knowledge. The leadership field is a case in point. Who wants to learn about 'management' when 'leadership' offers a much more fascinating alternative, drawing attention away from the routine, the messiness and the triviality of much organizational life in favour of the more alluring image of heroic leaders leading followers towards noble achievements?

Grandiosity in education and organization

One area of social life where grandiosity can be observed is the ceaseless quest for academic qualifications and credentials (Alvesson, 2013). It is now widely argued that advanced societies have moved from being industry- and service-dominated economies to becoming "information societies" or "knowledge-intensive" societies. As Thompson et al (2000, p 122) write: "Policy-makers and academics alike … endlessly repeat the mantra that knowledge work offers a rationale for the development of capital in the workplace, a blueprint for the creation of "world class" firms, and a way of preventing advanced economies restructuring away their sunset industries from becoming peripheral low-wage, low skill national economies". This New Economy, triumphal and captivating in the later 1990s and currently having a resurgence rests on a constant expansion of the value of education and educational qualifications. Thus, the number of higher degrees is expanding at an explosive rate, resulting in doubling of the percentage of graduates over a couple of decades.

Politicians in countries that aspire to be at the forefront of the new knowledge and innovation economy want half the population to have a university degree. In this way, many occupations, such as nursing, are now drawn into higher education and are being transformed into university disciplines. Our society is becoming increasingly dominated by academic credentials on a broad front, with the establishment and 'professionalization' of new disciplines, such as executive coaching, gastronomy, fashion studies, international studies and competence science. Restaurant, hotel and tourism studies are being turned into academic disciplines, with degree programmes offered at university level. The proliferation and inflation of academic qualifications and credentials has led to their inevitable devaluation, this in turn resulting in a quest for still higher level qualifications and credentials. Today's degree is hardly worth

yesterday's baccalaureate and today's Masters is hardly worth yesterday's Bachelor's degree.

One dimension of this trend is the inflation of school grades in many societies. In Sweden, marks in the senior secondary school system have apparently improved by 1½ grades over the last five years. Since the results of the university Aptitude Test are the same as they were five years ago, higher grades in the school system are not because the students have become better, but simply because the marking is more generous (Dagens Nyheter, 13 Nov. 2003). Here, we have an upgrading of the rating for school achievements, education programmes and job titles that tends to give a better impression, but does not actually involve any real improvement. Another example is grades at US Ivy League institutions. These have moved steadily upwards over the decades. In the 1950's the average grade was a C+, now it is an A-. On paper almost all students are extremely good, but hardly mirrors their actual abilities and accomplishments (*The Economist* 6 Sept. 2014).

Grandiosity can be observed in every area of working life, as bureaucracy and mass production have made way for so-called knowledge-intensive companies, dynamic networks and flexible, customer-steered operations.   Instead of producing goods or delivering services, people are now employed for "value creation processes". Even modest organizations are now run by "entrepreneurs", at least in the research, education and government reports sectors. Maybe one or two cycle repairers or hairdressers have failed to keep up with the times and still regard themselves as small businesspeople? Managers and foremen have been upgraded into "leaders" and "executives". Grand terms like strategic visions, missions and empowerment have pushed aside conventional management terminology with its procedures, rules and plans. There is considerable inflation of job titles: more and people have become "managers" and "executives", and it is not particular unusual to have "Vice president" on your business card these days. New occupations have emerged – executive coaches provide sparring partners for leaders (formerly called managers). In academia, in many countries there is an explosion of the number of (full) professors. In UK business schools, the average person with the title is no longer expected to be a leading academic with an impressive array of scholarly achievements, including research grants, successful PhDs, keynote addresses in major conferences and editorial experience in respectable journals – instead, a handful of publications that boost a departmental ranking in the latest league table is often sufficient.

The inflation of labels does not only apply to individual titles. Groups have become teams, and when senior managers meet they become "executive teams" or "top teams". Rationalization is now termed "business process engineering" and management training now takes the form of "executive development programmes". A whole new vocabulary of buzzwords and euphemisms has emerged, fuelled by the activities of management gurus and disseminated through MBA programmes, where simple tasks are elevated to heroic status and mundane calculations are turned into glamorous undertakings (Collins, 2000; Jackson, 2001).

Grandiosity triggered by expansion of consumption

The rise and expansion of grandiosity must be seen in connection with contemporary consumerism which is now colonizing a variety of domains, including the public and voluntary sectors, education and learning. It is advertising, after all, that archetypal genre of contemporary consumerism, that consistently glamorises the everyday and hypes the mundane. The explosion of grandiosity is clearly spearheaded in the area of consumption with its focus on youth, beauty and success. Fashion and brands have a great impact on the identities of those who consume them and individuality becomes a question of adopting particular consumption and lifestyle patterns. Ever more exotic products, experiences, and thrills are sought as consumers try to differentiate themselves from others, leading, as in the case of qualifications and labels, to inflation and devaluation. Yesterday's exotic holiday destination becomes mundane and boring as tourists venture further afield in search of excitement and distinction. In the case of Europeans, London and Paris have been replaced by Australia and New Zealand or, even better, ecotourism in the Himalayas or Vietnam. Basic needs are becoming less important, while a larger part of consumption supports narcissistic strivings, as people, encouraged by marketing and other life-style experts, seek products and experiences ostensibly to express and develop their identities to the full (Baudrillard, 1970/1988; Gabriel and Lang, 1995; Bauman, 2001). A branding philosophy is permeating every sphere of social and economic activity, with different brands constantly striving to outdo each other with ever more exorbitant promises and claims (see, e.g. Arvidsson, 2005; Ashcraft et al., 2012; Brannan et al., 2015; Muhr and Rehn, 2014; Willmott, 2010).

The rise of advertising, itself a crucial part of the new knowledge intensive economy, is inextricably linked to the growth of hype and the glamorizing of the mundane. Advertising has emerged as a formidable machine relentlessly generating meanings and values attached to everyday products and experiences. Yet, by constantly shifting signifiers ('attractive', dazzling', 'innovative', 'fresh', 'youthful' etc.) from one product to another, from one brand to another, advertising also destroys meaning – the meaning of these words becomes unstable, fleeting and banal. A perpetual noise of information and pseudo-symbols swallows meanings. As a result, authors like Baudrillard have argued that the world of contemporary consumption is full of signification and empty of meaning, consumerism becoming a black hole into which meaning disappears (Baudrillard, 1988).

The age of grandiosity?

These trends are all aimed at enhancing status, self-esteem and image, whether by inflated academic qualifications, job titles or everyday work and consumption activities. They operate at individual, group, organizational and social levels. Grandiosity is a persistent attempt to give yourself, your occupational group/organization, or even the society in which you live, a positive if somewhat superficial, well-polished and status enhancing image. Our era is becoming permeated by such grandiosity Alvesson (2013). Learning increasingly turns into learning how to appear impressive, learning how to create a self-brand, learning how to sell oneself in what Fromm (Fromm, 1947/1965) termed a marketing orientation. Many occupations turn into "sweet talk" as core work, engaged in persuasion and seduction (sales, marketing, communication, consulting, HRM, management), while others, still doing 'hands on' work, increasingly rely on projecting the right image, with the right flavour of superiority and an air of being above the mundane or ordinary – not just being competent, doing a good job or having

occupational or craft skills but offering a unique, highly personalized and designer-produced offering.

Grandiosity, of course, is hardly a new phenomenon. Pyramids, memorials and other large monuments are testaments of past grandiosity. In old myths, grandiosity often featured as an aspect of hubris almost invariably drawing upon divine retribution (nemesis), as myths like those of the Tower of Babel or Icarus and Daedalus suggest (for the propensity of leaders to lapse into hubris, see Owen and Davidson, 2009). What is unique about the grandiosity of our age is the generalized and compulsive attempt to claim uniqueness and specialness by almost everyone, an attempt that sometimes becomes a desperate quest for self-importance. What was once a potentially disastrous quality of conquerors and potentates is now permeating popular as well as organizational cultures, the grandiosity of TV celebrities, film stars and star-CEOs trickling down and normalized to suffuse most social and cultural discourses. Psychologically, grandiosity is rooted in what psychoanalysts call narcissism, a normal condition that sometimes turns into a pathological orientation, "the grandiose self", a personality characterized by fantasies of omnipotence, exhibitionism and extreme ambition.

The grandiose self has its roots in early childhood, when "his Majesty the baby" (Freud, 1914/1984) experiences for the first time separation from its parents and compensates for its feeling of being little, marginalized and dependent (Kohut, 1977). Successful development involves integration of such grandiose fantasies into a more positive, stable and realistic self-image. In some cases, though, the development process goes awry (particularly if the child has enjoyed lavish praise and unconditional admiration throughout his/her early years) and may result in "narcissistic personality disorders", characterized by intense mood swings and alternations between reasonable perceptions, expressions of grandiosity – omnipotence, perfection and success – and their opposite, a sense of emptiness, meaninglessness and failure. Such narcissistic disorders appear to have increased in recent decades, overtaking some of the disorders that dominated earlier periods, like hysteria, transference and obsessional disorders (Kovel ,1981 p.104). Immature, grandiose, idealizing fantasies and an unstable self-image seem to have become an increasing feature of "problem-loaded normal psychology".

The need for narcissistic confirmation is not a new phenomenon, nor does it necessarily lead to grandiose delusions, disproportionate emphasis on image and presentation or constant craving for recognition, approval and praise. What is new is the generalized 'culture of narcissism' (Lasch, 1980) which suffuses late-capitalism's where people become obsessed with trying to build a positive self-image, often through consumption of objects, experiences and brands. As Gabriel and Lang (1995: 95-6) argue:

> Today's Narcissus spends endless amounts of time looking at
> himself in mirrors, but is not lost in self-admiration. He is not
> happy with what he sees. He worries about growing old and ugly.
> He sets about busily constructing an ego-ideal around idealized
> qualities of commodities, aided and abetted by the propaganda of
> the makers of dreams. He pours money into anti-ageing cosmetics,
> plastic surgery, and every conceivable beauty aid. He yearns for

admiration and recognition from others, striving for intimacy, yet
he is unable to establish long-term relationships; after all his only
interest lies in himself and his ego-ideal, forever elusive, yet
forever appearing within reach. Although blemished, the
narcissist always finds something to admire in himself; his life-
story may not have been crowned with glory yet, but the happy
end is within sight – if only he tries a little harder, gets a lucky
break, or, above all, finds a bit more money.

Grandiosity and organizations

Growing out of a culture of narcissism, the ethos of grandiosity has far-reaching effects
on organizations, their members, management and customers. First, narcissistic
individuals seeking to enhance their self-image easily embrace an employing
organization's glamorous image and allure as a means of supporting and nurturing their
self identities. They will work hard, sacrifice their personal and private lives and
internalize their employer's values and rhetoric in order to maintain an identification
that nourishes their self-esteem and sense of worth (Schwartz, 1987). They easily
become corporate acolytes (Höpfl, 1992) and are therefore liable to manipulation and
control by organizations and their managements. Thus the pursuit of individual
grandiosity frequently results in quiescence and uncritical compliance with
organizational objectives.

Second, today's organizations, imbued as they are with an ethos of grandiosity, are very
liable to be led by narcissistic leaders. These are attractive and imaginative individuals
with great flair in communicating their ideas and relishing the limelight. They can
inspire their followers with their visions and can, sometimes, turn around moribund
organizations and groups. Such leaders, however, are liable to become ever more
concerned with public relations, celebrations and ceremonies, opulent buildings and
grandiose undertakings, losing track of the organizational 'nuts and bolts', the
machinery necessary to ensure the smooth running of an organization. As Owen and
Davidson (Owen and Davidson, 2009) have argued narcissistic leaders easily lapse to
hubris syndrome (see also Picone et al., 2014: : 450-2; Gabriel, 1998; Gabriel, 2012; Kets
de Vries, 1990), preoccupied with preserving the corporate image at all cost, cutting
corners in anything that does not seek to directly enhance their organization's profile,
cutting corners and believing that they are accountable not to their followers or public
opinion but to 'history' or 'to God'. Such leaders may gradually lose touch with reality
altogether – their vision becomes a reality, whether it has been realized or not
(Schwartz, 1990; Maccoby, 2000). Thus the leaders' narcissism can function effectively
as a force inspiring and uniting the followers but equally may bring about an
organization's decay and disintegration (Cluley, 2008; Tourish, 2013).

Third, the ethos of grandiosity brings organizations much closer to their consumers
(Gabriel, 2005; Korczynski, 2007; Korczynski and Ott, 2004). Far from being outsiders to
the world of organizations, consumers are now been drawn into each organization's
corporate fantasy, invited not only to purchase goods and services but a wide range of
glamorized images, signs and symbols, in short, they are invited to buy into the brand.
This in turn, exposes everyone working for an organization to the critical gaze of its

customers. Will they live up to the brand's glamour or will they contaminate it? More than for their competence, employees are now liable to be judged for their looks, their manners and their 'personalities'. But, by the same coin, consumers themselves are judged as ambassadors of the brand. Maintaining a high class of customer becomes itself a prized quality of the brand that can easily be tarnished if it is adopted by undesirable consumers or put to undesirable uses.

The ethos of grandiosity is one of the factors that has led to a fundamental re-evaluation of the functions and nature of management in today's organizations. Instead of a preoccupation with efficient production and rational administration, management today is seen as increasingly seeking to bewitch the consumer with the magical, the fantastic and the alluring (Ritzer, 1999). Management thus finds itself increasingly preoccupied with the orchestration of grandiose fantasies and the venting of collective emotions through the power of image in glittering sites like shopping malls and other cathedrals of consumption. The dominant image of organization itself is in Gabriel's (2005) view shifting from a Weberian iron cage to something more akin to a glass cage with an emphasis on display, an invisibility of constraints, a powerful illusion of transparency, a glamorization of image and an ironic question mark over whether freedom lies inside or outside the glass.

Grandiosity and critical thinking

Grandiosity has long been a preoccupation of philosophy and the new ethos of grandiosity poses various challenges to philosophy. Among different philosophical schools, the ancient cynics built their reputation by puncturing what they viewed as the grandiose claims of their contemporaries not through long philosophical treatises but through spectacular acts of satire and ridicule. Their very name, "dog-like", was meant to deflate the humans' grandiose claim to be superior to other animals as well as to emphasize their freedom from the airs and graces of civilized life (Cutler, 2000; Cutler, 2005). The cynics' disdain for the institutions of the state (including borders, laws, currencies, armies and slavery) finds eloquent expression in their proclamation of cosmopolitanism, citizenship of the world.

Today's ethos of grandiosity poses certain challenges to philosophy that ancient cynics, like Diogenes of Sinope, would have relished. The first concerns the relation between words and things. Reinventing a plumber as a hydraulic systems engineer or a hairdresser as a local entrepreneur opens up the entire subject of the meaning of words and the power orders that they serve. When Orwell's spoke of 'newspeak' and 'doublethink', he sought to highlight how the debasement of language leads to a debasement of thought and this, in turn, to a debasement of political freedom. The same debasement can be observed in the use of euphemisms, for example, when words that underplay the unpleasantness or violence of something it – for instance "downsizing", "collateral damage" – are used to blunt or even deny its effect (Stein, 1998). Referring to a child killed by a drone as 'collateral damage' is not only an insult to the murdered child but also a violation of the principle of referring to things by their 'proper names'. Ancient cynicism would pour vitriol at such defiling of words and actions, looking at them as instances of 'cynical' manipulation by those in power.

Postmodern and poststructuralist thought have played an ambiguous part in this. On the one hand, they have drawn attention to the various ways in which discourse, the uses and abuses of language, its silences and absences, do not merely reflect power relations but establish mechanisms of inclusion and exclusion. Thus, a barber who fails to reinvent himself as a fashion stylist is excluded from a wide range of privileges and rights enjoyed by his erstwhile partner who made this transition. Yet, the more extreme forms of postmodern and poststructuralist emphasis on discourse have colluded in the belief that it is enough to change words and labels in to change orders of privilege and exclusion (Latour, 2004). Thus renaming of junior lecturers or untenured faculty as professors hardly undermines academic hierarchies and logics of merit and power, but on the contrary may serve to camouflage and sustain them. (Ancient cynics would not have been surprised about this and would probably have responded not by writing a philosophical treatise but by appointing a stray dog to a prestigious chair!)

More generally the ethos of grandiosity and the resulting inflation of claims prompts a questioning of the nature of truth. What is one to believe when confronted with constant claims of "X being world class" or "Y being cutting edge"? In his *Critique of Cynical Reason*, Peter Sloterdijk (1988) argued that cynical thinking is the only healthy response to the normalization or institutionalization of lies (including half-truths, exaggerations and so forth) into truths. "Cynical thinking", he argues, "can only arise when two views of things have become possible, an official and an unofficial view, a veiled and a naked view, one from the viewpoint of heroes and one from the viewpoint of valets. In a culture in which one is regularly told lies, one wants to know not merely the truth but the naked truth. Where that cannot be that is not allowed to be, one has to draw out what the 'naked' facts look like, no matter what morality has to say about it. In a certain way, 'ruling' and 'lying' are synonymous. The truth of rulers and the truth of servants are different" (Sloterdijk, 1988: : 218).

A crucial task for philosophy then is the quest not merely for the truth but of the naked truth, something that, in Sloterdijk's view is not achieved through abstract theorizing but through ridicule and satire (p 292). The real cynic is ever vigilant, ever ready to pounce on pomposity and grandiosity, puncturing inflated claims like so many balloons.

Grandiosity and management learning

Arguably, there are great prospects for employing critically the concept of grandiosity in organization and management studies, as 'representation regimes' in the field increasingly resort to hyped-up terms and concepts to promote the idea of an exciting, progressive, morally coherent or neutral, beautiful corporate world (Alvesson, 2013). From a critical point of view one can imagine both systematic critical explorations of academic work and studies of corporate practices informed by ideas on how the undecidabilities and ambiguities of many phenomena are hidden and exploited by grandiose constructions. Contemporary organizations and organizational life seem to offer a gold-mine for such studies. More cautiously, elements of grandiosity can be identified, analysed and critiqued even when they are not "The Issue" under investigation. Finally, a critique of grandiosity can and must become a feature of each researcher's reflexivity into his or her own practice. Researchers are under constant pressure to exaggerate the importance of what they have to say. It is tempting for academics to regard modest contributions as paradigm-shifting ones and trivial

exposures to the mass media as impact on the wider society. They are also liable to interpret mundane complaints and carping as 'resistance', to cast references to themselves as constructions of 'narrative identity', and to frame everyday managerial tasks as 'strategy as practice'. Researchers therefore may have good reasons to consider lapses into grandiosity as part of their self-reflexivity. At least for the (diminishing?) group of academics eager to resist rather than to (over-) comply with the spirit of our time checking themselves for conscious or unconscious lapses into grandiosity could be a valuable option.

The relevance of this for management education and learning is significant. Ambitious efforts need to steer clear of the temptation to make everything as grandiose and narcissistically appealing following the dictates of consumerism. Often intellectually honest and precise representation is inconsistent with the demands for grandiosity and hype. Instead of pretending to address themselves, as leaders in their fields, to 'leaders' or 'future leaders' (Edwards et al 2013: 8), they may meaningfully and with humility focus on educating people who will spend most of their lives as followers, seeking to develop their diverse abilities and potentials. Minimally, some reflection on the limits of leadership development programmes is required, which could trigger some painful but healthy identity struggles around the ethics and integrity of the 'leadership developer'. One possibility here is to explicitly raise the theme of grandiosity and its seductive nature in education and learning activities and indicate its alluring but problematic character. Here it is easy to point at the discrepancies between a beautiful world on PowerPoint presentations and popular management tasks celebrating heroic, transformation, level 5, authentic leaders on the one hand, and the inevitable imperfections and messiness of the organizational realities, on the other (Sveningsson & Alvesson, 2016). Grandiosity can, in this way, be made to work as a useful concept and framing device in efforts to promote "critical performativity" (Spicer et al., 2009). All in all then, business schools, instead of fuelling the narcissism of students and instructors with ever more grandiose claims and hyped up intellectual gizmos, could rediscover the importance of unspectacular, craft and versatile learning, imbued with humility and a tolerance for imperfections and uncertainty.

Conclusions

Grandiosity, as portrayed in this article, aims to capture particular individual and social aspects of contemporary culture, that are arguably undermining learning as well as the realization of human potential. Our time is characterized by a powerful accumulation of institutions and mechanisms that encourage grandiosity. They may seem less ostentatious than in the past – since formerly they were associated with social elites or powerful ideologies – but they nonetheless permeate our entire culture, sometimes in less obvious ways. In contrast with the "monumental grandiosity" of another age, we have noted the distributed and, partially, camouflaged grandiosity of our own epoch and the ways it now envelopes higher education, especially management education. We can refer to the decentralization and cultural deep-penetration of grandiosity, possibly also its democratization – grandiose projects are no longer the preserve of an elite, but are now accessible for everyone, to some extent. And many organizations, occupational groups, managers ("leaders") and individuals seize this opportunity.

We may also refer to a strange mixture of fantasy and cravings as a unique feature of our age. The promoters of this process include politicians, mass media, schools, universities and education institutions, marketers, therapists, consultants and other experts on "human improvement", and they are all selling a potentially better life – if you simply buy their products or utilize their services. The combined effects of various institutions reinforcing fantasies and desires of a happier, more impressive and more highly recognized life are growing. Increasing numbers of people devote much time, energy and resources to grandiose projects of selfhood or lapse into depression and misery at the elusiveness of such projects.

From a philosophical point of view, grandiosity can be viewed as a natural outcome of to social constructionist epistemologies (and ontologies), where the undecideable qualities of naked reality and the performativity of language open up a wide range of narrative and interpretive possibilities that were unavailable in earlier periods. Poststructuralist understandings denying the idea of anything existing 'outside' discourse are difficult to reconcile with strong social critique, but pointing at social forms of grandiosity, linked to cultural forms and flooded with examples, offer some space for a potentially powerful critique. Contemporary dominant discourses are filled with grandiosity, offering an appealing regime of existentially comforting representations. As such, they neutralize realism in description and critique in reflection, thus representing a significant obstacle to learning and development from practice rather than from wishful idealizations.

References

Alvesson M. (2013) *The triumph of emptiness : consumption, higher education, and work organization,* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Arvidsson A. (2005) Brands: a critical perspective. *Journal of Consumer Culture* 5: 235-258.

Ashcraft KL, Muhr SL, Rennstam J, et al. (2012) Professionalization as a Branding Activity: Occupational Identity and the Dialectic of Inclusivity-Exclusivity. *Gender Work and Organization* 19: 467-488.

Baudrillard J. (1970/1988) Consumer society. In: Poster M (ed) *Jean Baudrillard: Selected Writings.* Cambridge: Polity Press, 32-59.

Baudrillard J. (1988) Simulacra and simulations. In: Poster M (ed) *Jean Baudrillard: Selected Writings.* Cambridge: Polity Press, 166-184.

Bauman Z. (2001) Consuming Life. *Journal of Consumer Culture* 1: 9-30.

Brannan MJ, Parsons E and Priola V. (2015) Brands at Work: The Search for Meaning in Mundane Work. *Organization Studies* 36: 29-53.

Cluley R. (2008) The Psychoanalytic Relationship between Leaders and Followers. *Leadership* 4: 201-212.

Collins D. (2000) *Management fads and buzzwords : critical-practical perspectives,* London: Routledge.

Cutler I. (2000) The cynical manager. *Management Learning* 31: 295-313.

Cutler I. (2005) *Cynicism from Diogenes to Dilbert,* Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland & Company.

Edwards, G., Elliott, C., Iszatt-White, M., & Schedlitzki, D. (2013). Critical and alternative approaches to leadership learning and development. *Management Learning*, *44*(1), 3-10.

Freud S. (1914/1984) On narcissism: An introduction. *On Metapsychology: The Theory of Psychoanalysis.* Harmondsworth: Pelican Freud Library Volume 11, 59-97.

Fromm E. (1947/1965) *Man for himself : an inquiry into the psychology of ethics,* New York: Fawcett Premier.

Gabriel Y. (1998) The hubris of management. *Administrative Theory and Praxis* 20: 257-273.

Gabriel Y. (2005) Glass cages and glass palaces: Images of organizations in image-conscious times. *Organization* 12: 9-27.

Gabriel Y. (2012) Under new management: Subjects, Objects and Hubris, New and Old. *Nouvelle revue de psychosociologie* 13: 241-264.

Gabriel Y and Lang T. (1995) *The unmanageable consumer: Contemporary consumption and its fragmentation,* London: Sage.

Höpfl H. (1992) The Making of the Corporate Acolyte. *Journal of Management Studies* 29: 23-34.

Jackson B. (2001) *Management gurus and management fashions,* New York: Routledge.

Kets de Vries MFR. (1990) The organizational fool: Balancing a leader's hubris. *Human Relations* 43: 751-770.

Kohut H. (1977) *The restoration of the self,* New York: International Universities.

Korczynski M. (2007) HRM and the menu society. In: Bolton S and Houlihan M (eds) *Searching for the human in human resource management.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 103-114.

Korczynski M and Ott U. (2004) When production and consumption meet: Cultural contradictions and the enchanting myth of customer sovereignty. *Journal of Management Studies* 41: 575-599.

Lasch C. (1980) *The culture of narcissism,* London: Abacus.

Latour B. (2004) Has critique run out of steam? *Critical Inquiry* 30: 225-248.

Maccoby M. (2000) Narcissistic leaders: The incredible pros, the inevitable cons. *Harvard Business Review* 78: 69-77.

Muhr SL and Rehn A. (2014) Branding Atrocity: Narrating Dark Sides and Managing Organizational Image. *Organization Studies* 35: 209-231.

Owen D and Davidson J. (2009) Hubris syndrome: An acquired personality disorder? A study of US Presidents and UK Prime Ministers over the last 100 years. *Brain: A Journal of Neurology* 132: 1396-1406.

Picone PM, Dagnino GB and Minà A. (2014) The Origin of Failure: A Multidisciplinary Appraisal of the Hubris Hypothesis and Proposed Research Agenda. *The Academy of Management Perspectives* 28: 447-468.

Ritzer G. (1999) *Enchanting a disenchanted world: Revolutionizing the means of consumption,* Thousand Oaks, CA.: Pine Forge Press.

Schwartz HS. (1987) Anti-social actions of committed organizational participants: An existential psychoanalytic perspective. *Organization Studies* 8: 327-340.

Schwartz HS. (1990) *Narcissistic Process and Corporate Decay,* New York: New York University Press.

Sloterdijk P. (1988) *Critique of cynical reason,* London: Verso.

Spicer A, Alvesson M and Karreman D. (2009) Critical performativity: The unfinished business of critical management studies. *Human Relations* 62: 537-560.

Stein HF. (1998) *Euphemism, spin, and the crisis in organizational life,* Westport, CT.: Quorum Books.

Sveningsson S and Alvesson M (2016) *Managerial Lives.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Thompson, P et al (2000) Human capital or capitalizing on humanity? Knowledge, skills and competences in interactive service work. In Prichard, C et al (eds) *Managing Knowledge*. Basingstoke: MacMillan

Tourish D. (2013) *The dark side of transformational leadership : a critical perspective,* London: Routledge.

Willmott H. (2010) Creating 'value' beyond the point of production: branding, financialization and market capitalization. *Organization* 17: 517-542.