


Moral Leadership

**The Theory and Practice of Power,
Judgment, and Policy**

Deborah L. Rhode
Editor

Foreword by Warren Bennis

 **JOSSEY-BASS**
A Wiley Imprint
www.josseybass.com

THREE PRACTICAL CHALLENGES OF MORAL LEADERSHIP

Joshua Margolis, Andrew Molinsky

The business scandals that unraveled in the early years of the twenty-first century provoked renewed interest in the roots of misconduct. Journalists and academic researchers alike have documented a range of misdeeds, traced their origins to everything from public policy to personality disorders, and proposed theories designed to help prevent future recurrences. What about the other side of the picture? What enables people to be effective moral leaders: to engage in exemplary conduct that reflects conscientious judgment and principled deliberation, conduct that attends to the rights, needs, and claims of others, conduct that meets these standards especially when it may be inconvenient or exact a personal cost? The answer depends on the academic discipline you subscribe to.

There seem to be four dominant portraits of human beings that emerge from the study of moral conduct across academic disciplines: human beings as functions of layered forces, human beings as deliberate actors, human beings as obligated agents, and human beings as heroic characters. Each of these portraits carries different implications for moral leadership. Cognitive and social psychology, sociology, and organizational behavior document the ways in which a range of forces within us and external to us operate beyond conscious control to lead us to do wrong. Human cognitive faculties, social pressures, institutional norms, and structural features all conspire to lead well-intentioned people to do harm. We human beings are products of forces that often elude our control—and even our

notice. Moral leadership thus requires tuning in to these cognitive and social forces and, once attuned, taking care in how they are managed.¹

On the other side of the spectrum, philosophy implies a fully deliberative portrait of human beings. Philosophical approaches to ethics help people identify, sort through, and weigh underlying issues and claims, providing lenses for discernment and standards necessary for judgment. Moral leadership is then possible when people engage in careful analysis, thoughtful reflection, principled judgment, and action consistent with this deliberative process. A third portrait emerges from economic approaches to individual behavior. Economic accounts often cast managers as agents whose responsibility lies in their duties to principles. What enables moral leadership is a well-designed context: a set of incentives, controls, and contracts that facilitate the fulfillment of an agent's duty to his or her principles. Structural features foster moral leadership by influencing individuals' rational, self-interested calculation so it coincides with the interests of those whom they represent. Studies of leadership present a fourth portrait: human beings who triumph over limitations, adversity, and flaws. What emerges are individuals who exercise wisdom in weighing options; they negotiate the narrow pass between expedience and principle, between ambition and social welfare, and they recognize human and material costs in a humane way, but they do not waver from what must get done and do what must get done with expert proficiency. Just as the philosophical portrait contrasts with the social-psychological one, so too this portrait contrasts with the economic one. What enables moral leadership is not the context that surrounds people but what resides within them: their character.

These portraits provide vital guidance for fostering moral leadership, especially when taken together. But they constitute an incomplete gallery, and in one particularly acute way. They do not capture the actor's firsthand experience of encountering ethical challenges in practice. While the other portraits can provide prac-

tical insight, they can be significantly augmented with a systematic grasp of the look and feel of lived moral experience. An individual's firsthand raw experience of pressure-filled and ambiguous organizational settings, as well as of the vying expectations of professional roles, poses significant demands that must be met to exercise moral leadership. A person situated in a well-structured context, intent on being a moral leader, equipped with robust character and vigilant awareness of psychological tendencies, may know how he or she would ideally want to act in a particular situation. What cannot be anticipated is the person's actual experience of that situation. That real experience of pressure, ambiguity, and vying demands creates obstacles to moral leadership. Grasping that firsthand experience can attune people to those obstacles and develop their capacity to convert the practical guidance that emerges from other ethical portraits into moral action.

In this chapter, we describe three practical challenges that shape how people experience the ethical demands of their work. These challenges emerge from our research on professionals' performing "necessary evils," tasks that entail doing harm in order to advance a valued objective. These tasks, such as laying a person off or evicting a family from its home, entail great responsibility and embody ethical tensions. Necessary evils shed light on the realistic texture of what people experience when they encounter ethical tensions in their work. Recognizing these tensions can prepare people to meet the ethical demands of professional roles and organizational settings. That alone, though, neither amounts to moral leadership nor guarantees it. However, it is an essential ingredient if those from whom society expects moral leadership are to manage the ethically complex environments they face.

Many features of organizations and professional roles shape a person's ethical experience and capacity to enact moral leadership. We focus on three that tend to get overlooked: time pressure, ambivalence, and how people see themselves, or what we call self-construal. These three features share two characteristics in common.

First, they constitute the current of ethical experience that must be navigated. That current rarely gains the attention that a salient obstacle or impediment, such as a distorting incentive system, receives. These three features receive little notice in discussion of ethics because they lurk beneath the surface of events. They rush invisibly through the ethical challenges that arise routinely in professional roles and organizational settings, perhaps treated as bothersome distractions at best. Second, these three features are all double-edged swords. If ignored, they can capsize efforts to exercise moral leadership. If managed, they can propel moral leadership. Exercising moral leadership is never guaranteed, but recognizing these three features and preparing to manage them exposes people to the realities of ethical challenges that must be mastered for moral leadership to be possible. We introduce the three features in the sections that follow, drawing from our own and others' research to illustrate why they can be such crucial points of leverage in preventing or enabling moral leadership.

Time

Time in professional and organizational settings is often scarce. We have studied how professionals in four different occupations handle tasks that entail harming another human being in order to advance a professional or organizational objective. We spoke to managers about firing people, police officers about evicting people, doctors about performing painful procedures, and addiction counselors about disciplining clients. The time available for performing these tasks is short of the ideal. Not only because police officers must complete twenty evictions in a day, or doctors have to see a certain number of patients to satisfy a contract, or a company wants all laid-off employees out by noon. It is also because another pressing situation calls, with another aggrieved party seeking restitution, another patient in need, or another employee needing patience and understanding. A doctor of emergency medicine, one of the 111 professionals we studied, described this reality for us:

You could walk out of a situation, where you just told somebody their kid is dead, and have to walk into somebody pissed off that they've waited for two hours because their kid has an ear infection. And you can't say to that parent, "Look someone else's kid just died. Shut the f— up and just let me do this." . . . You can't just call in your crisis management team, or your debriefing team, or let the whole place go slide while you take care of how you feel emotionally. . . . And no one else in the situation is going to either. The charge nurse is trying to deal with all the backup in the department from the fact that you've been—I've been—tied up with this sick kid, and she's not going to come out and say, "Boy, do you need a break. Why don't you take a half hour, go eat." She's going to come up to me with a list of people who are waiting and mad.

It is at this very moment that the emergency department and the patients most need moral leadership. It is also at this chaotic, time-pressured moment when it is most difficult for the doctor, or any other professional in a comparable situation, to exercise moral leadership: to model conduct by putting others' needs and her own responsibility above the din of the situation and the pressures of the moment.

Grave mischief can be done when people have too little time. The Enron board of directors exemplifies the dangers of limited time. The U.S. Senate investigation of Enron found that at a single special meeting held by teleconference on June 28, 1999, the board of directors covered a number of significant matters. Among them, CEO Kenneth Lay discussed a reorganization occurring at Enron, and the board reviewed resolutions to authorize a stock split, alter the company's stock compensation plan, purchase a corporate jet, and invest in a power plant in the Middle East. At this same meeting, a vote was also taken to establish one of the notorious special-purpose entities, LJM1; the company's code of conduct was waived, thereby permitting the chief financial officer, Andrew Fastow, to head the special-purpose entity despite a conflict of interest; and the entity's first transaction, with Rhythms NetConnections, was reviewed. All of

these issues, mundane and questionable alike, were covered in no more than one hour.²

Time was not the cause of misdeeds at Enron, but this example illustrates how moral leadership can easily be compromised when time is scarce. Not only can limited time aid and abet mischief, inhibiting a board full of business leaders from deliberating thoroughly and questioning troubling practices, it can also frustrate natural human tendencies to aid others. In their famous study of helping behavior, John Darley and Dan Batson discovered that the most influential factor determining whether a bystander would respond to a person in distress was whether the bystander had sufficient time. A bystander late to an appointment was less likely to heed a plea for help.³ Moral leadership in aiding others, much like moral leadership in stopping misconduct, gets squeezed in the hands of the clock.

Is more time the antidote? Not necessarily. Too much time, it turns out, can also contribute to grave mischief. Philip Zimbardo has related his classic Stanford prison experiment to the inhumane treatment of prisoners at Abu Ghraib.⁴ One contributing factor at Abu Ghraib, Zimbardo has noted, was the endless, vacant, and unsupervised time that guards had on the night shift. Again, time alone did not cause guards to mistreat prisoners. However, with so much time on their hands, immoral conduct sprouted. Copious time, it would seem, is no guarantee of moral leadership.

Too little time and too much time both inhibit moral leadership. But too little time defines the reality of professional and organizational settings, especially in an era striving for greater efficiency. Quite simply, moral leadership entails managing time. Therefore, for those who wish to exercise moral leadership, one imperative is to be cognizant of time and manage it actively rather than just lament its swift passage. Little is known about how time as a dimension of ethical conduct can be managed. As a crucial variable, time has garnered growing attention in research on organizations,⁵ and ethicists have considered intriguing questions about time,⁶ but the intersection of the two fields is where we need greater practical

insight. What does seem clear is that ethical conduct can be advanced or impeded based on how time is handled.

Our research suggests that organizational and individual mechanisms can help effectively manage the impact of time on ethical conduct. For example, some organizations have structures and systems that build in pauses and second looks. They provide a safety valve against the impact that limited time can have on decisions with ethical implications. What these structures and systems share is that they are designed as much to educate as they are to monitor. In one hospital where we spoke with doctors about necessary evils, clinical teams comprise medical students, interns, residents, fellows, and attending physicians. Although not unusual for a teaching hospital, this structure reassured the medical students and interns and gave them the opportunity to handle cases that otherwise would have been beyond their level of experience. The direction and oversight provided by more senior doctors exists primarily for educational purposes, but it ensures that multiple eyes, from a novice's to a veteran's will consider a difficult case. No one individual may have the ideal amount of time, but the overlapping attention of multiple people equipped with different sensibilities increases the likelihood that all dimensions of the situation, including ethical implications and the humanity of the patient, will get noticed.⁷

So too with an addiction facility we studied. Although individual counselors make the decision about expelling clients who violate rules, the entire team of counselors must discuss the decision and then treat it as a collective decision. For the addiction facility, the team system is designed to foster collective responsibility for life inside the facility. What it also does is build in time between making a momentous decision and sealing it. Teams at the addiction facility and hospital thus share two characteristics, which help manage the dangers of time. First, the addiction counseling team and medical teams turn deliberation from a private activity inside one person's head into a public event that occurs through discussion. Second, multiple sets of eyes review a single situation. These structures thus

build in natural pauses that decelerate action without impeding it, and they offset the constrained time of any one individual by building in time devoted from multiple people.

Limited time is still a reality of organizational life and professional roles. So individuals also must find ways to manage time and manage their reactions to time pressures. Construing time as a resource rather than as a constraint can help people be more conscious of it and more conscientious in their use of the amount of that available resource, whether it is plentiful or scarce.⁸ In addition, we found that seasoned managers, doctors, police officers, and addiction counselors all took time for short breaks, no matter how hectic the day, to collect themselves, step away from the pressure, and simply take stock of the rapid pace, as did the doctor whose comment opened this section. More than providing a solution to the rush of time, these breaks alert professionals to the impact of time and the care needed to manage it as one manages all other factors that may bear on one's conduct.

Ambivalence

Moral leadership often requires people to act in a manner they sense is right even as it unleashes uneasiness and misgivings. Here a manager and a doctor describe this experience as they laid off an employee and cleaned a wound, respectively:

Manager: "I think there is compassion, there is a, you know, sense of angst about these people. However, I have a practical side and I know this is what we need to do for the business."

Doctor: "When the man was writhing in pain, shaking, sweating and calling out in pain, I felt awful. I started to get very hot and sweaty and nervous. I knew that I had to finish, but felt like I was doing an inadequate job of both breaking loculations and of packing the wound."

Ambivalence describes the manager's clash between "compassion" and "what we need to do for the business" and the doctor's clash between feeling "awful," "nervous," and "inadequate," but knowing "I had to finish." A sense of professional responsibility motivates an action, but that action provokes a conflicting visceral reaction to do no harm. Ambivalence is about the disquieting internal tension that comes from competing duties, colliding considerations, and dissonant emotions. Although natural in situations with conflicting demands, ambivalence unchecked and unmanaged can lead to dysfunctional consequences for the leader attempting to take action.

However, the practical challenge may have less to do with ambivalence run amok than with failure to acknowledge the reality of ambivalence. The implicit ideal of moral leadership conjures up a conscientious individual who deliberates over various options, all imperfect; weighs principles, rights, responsibilities, and consequences, both good and bad; and ultimately commits with resolve to a course of action, whatever its drawbacks and costs, exuding confidence that propels others to commit and thereby increases the likelihood of successful action. All the while, the individual is open to learning and adjustment, but not squeamishness, indecision, or paralyzing analysis. Contrary to this judicious and poised image, professionals in each of the occupations we studied revealed a different portrait of actual experience. Here are two managers and a police officer relating that experience:

Manager conducting a layoff: "Internally there is a nervous stomach, you feel on edge. Sometimes you get physically nauseous or a headache. Very often the night before or after you have very bad dreams that are not necessarily related to the downsizing itself, but from that stress."

Manager firing someone: "It is very difficult from an emotional standpoint knowing you are dealing with somebody's livelihood. Dealing with somebody's ego. Dealing with somebody's ability to provide for their family."

Officer evicting a family: "You feel bad for the family sometimes, especially like the mothers or the wives with their little babies in their arms."

Ambivalence is a hard fact of professional practice, especially in situations such as necessary evils, in which individuals are pulled in vying directions, trying to honor intuitive sensibilities to avoid harming others while also fulfilling their responsibility to achieve a greater good or purpose. However, as third-party observers, people often have difficulty accepting ambivalence. As observers, people seem uncomfortable when they hear that a doctor feels torn about performing a lumbar puncture on a child who absolutely needs it in order to diagnose the source of that child's ailment. As observers, we do not want to hear that our doctors have second thoughts and uneasy feelings about procedures that seem essential for health.

So too people feel uneasy when they learn that Scott Sullivan, the CFO at WorldCom, or his loyal assistant, Betty Vinson, had reservations about committing accounting fraud. Reservations about what? Where, we as observers wonder, is the good they were weighing? How could they not see the patent wrongness of their deeds? Observers search for the virtuous side of these managers' actions, the side that induced ambivalence, and have difficulty grasping it. People would prefer to hear that Sullivan and Vinson had moral clarity and indulged gluttonously in violating accounting standards at WorldCom,⁹ just as we would prefer to hear that a doctor's moral clarity leads to his or her unquestioned performance of a procedure. In real-life ethical dramas, we want our heroes and our villains. Our empathy breaks down for some reason when we learn of people's qualms.

There is a gulf between experiencing ambivalence and witnessing it.¹⁰ How an action looks differs from how that action feels if you are the actor. There is no more compelling evidence than Stanley Milgram's famous experiments on obedience to authority. Psychiatrists were asked to predict the maximum shock they believed people would administer. The psychiatrists predicted that most sub-

jects would not administer more than 150 volts and that only one in one thousand subjects would administer the maximum 450 volts. Psychiatrists were also asked to predict how they would likely behave, as were college students and middle-class adults. Only 4 of the 110 (3.6 percent) people asked thought they would go as high as 300 volts, and only 25 of the 110 (22.7 percent) thought they would administer more than 150 volts. The data from Milgram's experiment revealed that people's actual conduct defied these expectations. In the main version of Milgram's experiment, 25 subjects (62.5 percent) administered the maximum shock, and 36 of 40 subjects (90 percent) went beyond 150 volts.¹¹ Analysis from the eyes of an observer differs markedly from experience in the shoes of an actor.

An experiment we conducted also revealed the discontinuity between detached observation and involved action. We found that people judge the fairness of a hardship imposed on employees similarly whether they are observers of the hardship or managers about to inflict the hardship. Reducing pay or laying off employees are both seen as more unfair when done to augment corporate profits than when done to offset a corporate loss. This holds true for third-person observers reading about a company cutting pay, and it holds true for first-person actors who must lay someone off. Although observers' ethical judgments may parallel actors' ethical judgments, actors' real experience overwhelms that arm's-length judgment. We put people through a simulation where they took on the role of a project manager. They were introduced (on paper) to the project manager's team, given the project manager's schedule for the coming week, and asked to respond to a series of e-mails inquiring about scheduling and strategic decisions. When pressed to lay off a member of the team, the emotional experience reported by those in the manager's role was just as intense whether the layoff was intended to augment corporate profits or offset a dire loss, and the amount of severance subjects granted was comparable across those conditions. When people must do the deed, the subjective experience of causing harm to someone else produces a comparable experience across fairness conditions

despite differing objective judgments of those conditions. And that subjective experience revolves around ambivalence.

When people experience ambivalence, it provokes efforts to resolve the ambivalence, to rationalize away one side of the equation and thereby calm the emotions and discomfort. Often people favor the side that protects them from their deepest fear: the loss of livelihood, the admission of failure, or the implication of guilt. But that may not foster leadership, whereas sustaining ambivalence may.

In situations that involve an ethical trade-off, even though one side of the trade-off must ultimately be selected—for example, harming a person to help an organization perform better—the other side of the trade-off does not disappear. A person still loses his or her job, and a tenant still loses a place to live. Philosopher Ruth Barcan Marcus refers to this as the “residue” of moral dilemmas.¹² Action requires that we select a path, but the path selected does not eradicate the legitimate claims and concerns of the losing side. Here is where ambivalence can foster moral leadership. First, ambivalence helps those who encounter ethical challenges keep track of the moral residue and attend to that residue, even as they select the other side of the dilemma. As one manager commented, “If there’s a person across the table, even though from a business perspective I’ve rationalized that it makes sense to do this, there’s still an individual across the table whose life I’m impacting.” Second, ambivalence sustains moral sensibility and guards against callousness. A senior human resource manager and a veteran addiction counselor explained their ongoing struggle with the cross-cutting emotions unleashed by necessary evils, despite the myth that the task simply becomes routine:

Human resource manager: “I just know that I have to fight internally with myself not to say something that I want to say like, ‘I really feel sorry for you and I wish I could remove the pain for you.’ . . . It’s painful to think you may be putting somebody on welfare. Or you may be causing somebody’s

family to break up or somebody’s kids not to be able to have food. . . . Somebody else might tell you that it’s a piece of cake, it’s nothing, it doesn’t bother me, it’s a job, I have to do my job. But it’s always fighting it off for me.”

Addiction counselor: “We’re human. You’re not supposed to get close. You’re supposed to leave the work at the door. You’re supposed to go home completely devoid of what happened in the eight hours that you’re there. Anybody that can do that, please write the book and give them the million dollars and then send me a copy of the book. It doesn’t work. It works for those people who are not doing this for the right reasons.”

Ambivalence reminds managers and doctors, police officers and addiction counselors, that whatever their conduct in this instance, multiple considerations and ethical claims were in play, and the resolution was neither clean nor clear. We suggest that people prepare for ambivalence so that they can use ambivalence constructively. Ambivalence signals an unresolved collision of considerations, emotional reactions, and concerns. Ambivalence can therefore serve as a cue to take quite seriously all sides of the situation, to heed one’s instincts and intuitions, which are not completely resolved. Preparing people for the experience of ambivalence is essential, in part because this experience seems unfathomable to us as observers not in the actor’s shoes.

To prepare people to exercise moral leadership, especially young professionals and students, a different portrait of practical professional action must be conveyed, one that illuminates the reality of ambivalence. To be clear, we are not advocating indecision, excessive rumination, or paralyzing guilt. What we suggest, though, is that if individuals in professions and organizations are to exercise moral leadership—to judge wisely, plan action in the light of principle, act with proficiency and resolve, and engage in exemplary

conduct—we may need to prepare them for what moral action feels like in practice. That includes the feeling of ambivalence.

Sense of Self

Morality focuses on what we owe others: on the rights they can claim, on our duties toward them, and on the consequences of our actions for them.¹³ Moral leadership thus entails exemplary conduct in attending to the rights, needs, and claims of others, even when it is inconvenient and exacts a personal cost. In what might therefore be seen as a paradox, how a person treats others often hinges more on how a person understands himself or herself than on any thought that person gives to others. A manager, a doctor, and an addiction counselor interviewed for our research illustrate how self-construal guided what they did in ethically challenging situations:

Manager conducting a layoff: “I am not there as myself. I am there as the company. The company is an entity and the company is ice and in many cases, people did not have full responsibility for the decision, and in this one I had some if not most of the responsibility.”

Doctor performing a painful procedure: “When the white coat is on and when you’re being a doctor, it makes perfect sense that you have to do this because it’s part of the job and you know that you’re expected to rise above the situation that most people might have emotional difficulty doing. You’re the one everyone is counting on, so you fulfill your role.”

Addiction counselor expelling a client from a tough love program: “I really liked this kid, and I really saw potential in him, but he just couldn’t do it, and part of what I do is create a safe environment for other clients. And I really had to step back and allow myself to take on the responsibility of my title and who I am, and it was extremely hard for me.”

How people make decisions, James March has proposed in his “logic of appropriateness,” is a function of how people implicitly understand three things: the situation they face, their role in that situation, and the way that someone occupying their role in such a situation typically acts.¹⁴ People intuitively enact behavior assumed to be appropriate to the role they occupy in a given situation. How they see themselves guides what they do.

An example comes from the forty-four managers in our study of necessary evils—tasks that entail doing harm to advance an organizational objective. The managers manifested two dominant ways of approaching necessary evils.¹⁵ Some emphasized fairness, quarantined their own emotion, and focused on conveying information to the harmed party. Others emphasized compassion, sought ways to integrate their emotion into their conduct, and focused on assisting the harmed party. The orientation of each group emerged from the different ways they construed their roles. The first group saw their role as protecting the company from threat, whereas the second group saw their role as protecting the target of harm from further injury. Neither group neglected ethical considerations, but how they saw themselves in their roles shaped the type of moral conduct they adopted.

An experiment we conducted also revealed the effect of self-construal on moral conduct.¹⁶ Students had to inform peers that those peers had been denied a scholarship. When subjects’ empathy was primed subconsciously through a scrambled-sentence task and a brief questionnaire, they came to see themselves not merely as messengers but as helpers for the students. The emotion students experienced toward unjust procedures and the compassion and compensation they offered differed from the emotional experience and compensatory actions of students not primed for empathy. Even when the consequences of a situation remain the same for affected parties—in this case, losing scholarship money—salient aspects of an individual actor’s identity influence that person’s moral conduct.

If moral conduct depends as much on how an actor sees himself or herself as it does on how that actor views others, then there is a

curious implication for educating those whom we expect to exercise moral leadership. The content of what students and future professionals learn about morality and ethics may be matched in importance by the implicit message sent by that content about who they are. What do we mean by this? Beyond what philosophers teach about different theoretical approaches to ethics, beyond what psychologists teach about the causal antecedents of moral conduct and misconduct, and beyond what other disciplines teach about the content of moral responsibilities and action, each discipline conveys to its students an implicit sense of who they are. Social science tells us we are much more products of our surroundings and cognitive equipment than we may otherwise care to admit. Social science has illuminated just how vulnerable we human beings are to act in unethical ways. Breathtaking findings sober us to just how much human behavior can be influenced by organizational features,¹⁷ social pressures,¹⁸ and cognitive tendencies.¹⁹

In contrast, philosophy and even economic models ride on assumptions about human beings' capacity to act deliberately, on the basis of reasoned assessments and conscious intentions. For budding professionals, philosophical approaches to ethics model careful analysis, precise logic, and reflective equilibrium that moves between tutored intuitions and rational principles.²⁰ Who we are, philosophy implies, are beings capable of exercising careful thought and control over our conduct.

Moral leadership requires that people see themselves through both lenses. It requires an appreciation for the tremendous impact that forces beyond our awareness may be exerting on our behavior. Moral leadership also requires a sense of one's capacity to exercise deliberate control over choices and behavior. That is what sustains our sense of ourselves as rational and reasonable actors. Internalizing both portraits of who we are can help people guard against invisible, corrupting influences, on the one hand, and rise to the level of our potential rational capacity, on the other.

It is not just the juxtaposed portraits of human beings as agent and actor that are important. Rather, moral leadership may require

people to see themselves as a combination of actor and agent. Consider time and ambivalence. When people experience time pressures and the uneasiness of ambivalence, they are in the grips of powerful forces that can unobtrusively shape conduct. They are agents of causal influences. People cannot step outside those forces. While being buffeted about, however, they can exert their creative capabilities to operate constructively. They can function as actors resourceful in their handling of the forces they face. A sense of self that tells us we are responsible—literally, able to respond to the forces that bombard and grip us—may be crucial for those moments when moral leadership is most needed and least likely because the forces seem so overwhelming and insurmountable.

Conclusion

Budding moral leaders must be ready to manage time, use ambivalence, and draw on dueling, and integrated, senses of self. These provide no guarantee of moral leadership, but they do reflect the demanding experience of encountering real ethical challenges in practice. Expecting them and being ready to encounter them may make the challenging waters that call for moral leadership more navigable. Moral leadership is often identified with clear conviction, a capacity to check impulsive temptations against principles, steadfast commitment to a course of action, and courage in the face of personal costs. We do not deny the need for clarity, resolve, and courage. But if they are to survive the rapids of real ethical challenges, those from whom we expect moral leadership must be equipped to handle those rapids. The relentless pace of organizations and professional roles, the destabilizing experience of ambivalence, and the implicit sense one has of one's identity and role churn those rapids. Learning that these challenges are coming and then actively navigating them can only help increase the odds that moral leadership will indeed emerge.