Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository

8-2013 12:00 AM

Thinking with Arendt: Authenticity, Gender and Leadership

Rita A. Gardiner, *The University of Western Ontario*

Supervisor: Dr. Helen A. Fielding, *The University of Western Ontario*
A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree in Women's Studies and Feminist Research
© Rita A. Gardiner 2013

THINKING WITH ARENDT: AUTHENTICITY, GENDER AND LEADERSHIP

(Thesis format: Monograph)

by

Rita Ann <u>Gardiner</u>

Graduate Program in Women's Studies and Feminist Research

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

The School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
The University of Western Ontario
London, Ontario, Canada

Abstract

In this dissertation, I examine the conceptual underpinnings of a new management theory called authentic leadership to discover why so little attention has been paid to gender. In much of the scholarly literature on authentic leadership, I suggest there is a failure to interrogate the complexities surrounding the concept of authenticity, especially as it relates to the diversity of lived experience. Rather than encouraging a genuine approach to leadership, this theory's normative foundation is more likely to encourage social conformity. By contrast, I suggest that Hannah Arendt's insights into uniqueness provide a different lens from which to consider how lived experience influences the manner in which gender, authenticity and leadership intersect. As part of this inquiry, I conducted a phenomenological study. My guiding question was: how do senior women leaders describe their experiences of authenticity, or lack thereof, in the university workplace? These women's descriptive accounts reveal ethical tensions regarding personal principles and institutional priorities, and suggest that gender prejudice is embedded in organizational practices, as well as the cultural imagination. In exploring gender prejudice, I trace authenticity's modern underpinnings to the emergence of bourgeois selfhood. Historically, women's desire to lead was affected by notions of gender propriety. These societal restrictions still bear a trace on some women's sense of possibility, which serves to perpetuate gender inequities. Research findings also suggest that it is the self in relation that is fundamental to comprehending what it might mean to lead authentically. When we broaden our definition of what constitutes authentic leadership so as to account for the myriad ways in which we live and lead, we discover how people without positional authority can change their communities in profound ways. Thus, leadership is not dependent upon a person's organizational position, but rather on how their actions demonstrate how much they care for the world. This more expansive context, together with Arendt's insights, opens up new avenues of thinking about the interconnections among gender, authenticity and leadership.

Keywords

Acknowledgments

I wish to acknowledge, with sincere gratitude, my supervisor Dr. Helen A. Fielding who introduced me to the work of Hannah Arendt. It took me some time before I realized how Arendt's work could be of benefit to my thesis. More importantly, without Dr. Fielding's ongoing encouragement and support, I doubt that I would have accomplished this project in such a timely fashion. I would also like to take this opportunity to thank Dr. Anne Kinsella for her guidance with the interview questions and all things methodological. In terms of the historical component of my thesis, I was fortunate to be able to work with Dr. Chris Roulston. Her careful reading of my historical chapter, on multiple occasions, helped to guide the project along. I would also like to thank Dr. Antonio Calcagno for his intellectual generosity in our conversations about Arendt, and Dr. Erika Lawson for her encouragement of this project. My special thanks also go to Dr. Donna Ladkin for agreeing to be the external examiner of this thesis. Knowing that there are scholars like her interested in the connections between phenomenology and leadership has encouraged me to pursue this line of inquiry.

During my time at Western, the faculty and staff of Women's Studies were pleasant and helpful, and for that I am grateful. In particular, Dr. Katherine McKenna was a supportive Graduate Chair. I want to express my thanks for the financial assistance I received from Women's Studies, The Mary Routledge Scholarship Fund, the Faculty of Arts and Humanities at Western, as well as government funding from OGS and SSHRC. Without this funding, I would have been unable to present my work at conferences, and conduct a productive research visit at The Centre for Leadership Studies at The University of Exeter in 2012. Thanks also to Weldon library staff, especially Marg Sloan for her research assistance.

It has been a rewarding experience to be part of Western's first doctoral cohort in Women Studies. I have had the good fortune to be part of a supportive graduate cohort, and writing group. In particular, I wish to thank Jennifer Chisholm and Katy Fulfer whose friendship has made this intellectual journey a pleasant one. I also want to express my thanks to the women who took part in my study. Through their sharing of words and worlds, they opened my mind to new ways of thinking. Finally, my especial thanks go to my husband, Michael, for his generosity of spirit and ongoing encouragement of this project.

Table of Contents

Preface

> The common and the ordinary must remain our primary concern, the daily food
> of our thought – if only because it is from them that the uncommon and the
> extraordinary emerge.[1]   Hannah Arendt.

In this dissertation, I examine the conceptual underpinnings of a new management theory called authentic leadership to discover why so little attention has been paid to gender. In much of the scholarly literature on authentic leadership, I suggest there is a failure to interrogate the complexities surrounding the concept of authenticity, especially as it relates to the diversity of lived experience. In failing to account sufficiently for lived experience, I suggest that this theory has a tendency to privilege a leader's self-knowledge above her connection to others. For Arendt, a focus on the self leads to alienation from the world[2] because it serves to suppress plurality and the creation of a meaningful environment.

A critical interrogation of the scholarly literature on authentic leadership reveals an underlying presupposition that authenticity means the same thing to everyone, and manifests itself in the same way. I disagree with this viewpoint by showing how an Arendtian focus on uniqueness reveals problems with the assumption that a quality like authenticity can be measured. As such, her concept of uniqueness can uncover inherent difficulties with the discourse of authentic leadership, not least because it allows us to think about how the intersections of identity influence our social life. Following Arendt, I contend that each individual, because of her life experiences, has a unique way of perceiving the world. This uniqueness is, however, mediated by the social world. Thus, our way of being is constantly impinged upon by social factors, many of which we remain unaware. Nevertheless, this background knowledge has an effect, not only upon the way that we perceive the world, but also on how we interpret the actions of others. In short, context matters. But context is often

---

[1] Arendt spoke at a conference in her honour in Toronto in September 1972; this is purportedly taken from her speech. See Margaret Betz Hull, *Hidden Philosophy of Hannah Arendt* (London and New York: Routledge 2002), 36.

[2] World is not to be confused with the Earth but refers to the sum total of human interaction and durable objects.

overlooked in authentic leadership scholarship, which means that differences fade into the background. The result is that uniqueness is obscured by normative ways of thinking about the place of authenticity in leadership.

Thinking with Arendt can deepen our understanding of authentic leadership by revealing how much this theory takes for granted. For instance, underlying this discourse is an assumption, sometimes explicit, on other occasions implicit, that authentic leadership will result in individual success, as well as better organizational outcomes. But insofar as all action is contingent, we cannot predict leadership success ahead of time. Moreover, I find myself puzzled by scholarship that seems to suggest that leaders can effect positive change merely by dint of their charisma.[3] Not only does this tend to reinforce the great man theory of leadership that rests on the belief that a leader can dominate others through strength of will, but it also ignores the damage that some leaders cause. In addition, perceiving leaders as distinct from others serves to reproduce hierarchical modes of being whereby some bodies are judged to be better, or in this case more authentic, than others.

I see authentic leadership as an example of a theory that on the surface seems to foreground ethical issues, but is sometimes implicitly underpinned by concerns regarding leadership efficiency. For Arendt, the modern drive to organizational efficiency has severe drawbacks, not least of which is that in Western society we have become "a society of jobholders."[4] The ideology of market forces dominates our political and social landscape, and the current focus on economic accountability is a prime example of this mentality. But fiscal accountability is not the same as, and may run contrary to, ethical action. Thus, no amount of rules and policies are sufficient to stop some leaders from doing bad things if they chose not to care for others. I will show how instrumental ways of thinking tend to obscure deeper dimensions of human life.

---

[3] Charisma can be both a positive and a negative force for leadership. See Donna Ladkin, "The Enchantment of the Charismatic Leader: Charisma Reconsidered as Aesthetic Encounter," *Leadership*, 2 no. 2 (2006): 165-179.

[4] Hannah Arendt, *The Human Condition* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1958), 40.

Many scholars who write on authentic leadership are from the discipline of social psychology, and lean toward behavioral explanations.[5] Arendt is resistant to modern theories such as behaviorism, because she argues that these theories focus on some of the insidious trends in modern society, especially the promotion of indifference, and the ensuing suppression of uniqueness. As an example, she views bureaucracy as potentially the most tyrannical form of leadership, since it is based on the rule of nobody.[6] This nameless, faceless form of organizational rulership serves to suppress uniqueness and plurality in favour of social conformism.

While Arendt has much to tell us in terms of how we need to create environments where dialogue and debate flourish, she has little to say about gender and leadership. Therefore, I augment her ideas about leadership with the descriptive accounts of the ten senior women leaders whom I interviewed. This interweaving of different perspectives is important from an Arendtian perspective since, by thinking in the place of another, we can expand our own understanding. In considering the interconnections among authenticity, gender and leadership, I chose to interview senior women leaders in the higher education sector. The reason why I chose this particular sector is because of my background knowledge, having worked for more than twenty years in university administration, and as a member of various leadership teams. Interviewing women leaders served to deepen my understanding of how gender affected their understanding of authenticity and leadership.

In addition, I argue that gender normativity influences how we think about leaders. I contend that some of the prejudice against women leaders exists because they challenge the normative, hierarchical framework of officialdom. Simply put, women leaders are out of place in the gender hierarchy. This lack of "spatial" belonging may mean that some women resort to hierarchical ways of leading in order to fit in. But while assimilation may appear to be a strategic route to the "top," it leads to a continuation of structural inequalities. Furthermore, in trying to live up to some ideal leadership standard, women perpetuate what

---

[5] For an informative review, see Bruce J. Avolio, Fred O.Walumbwa, and Todd J. Weber. "Leadership: Current Theories, Research, and Future Directions." *Annual Review Psychology*, 60 (2009): 421-439.

[6] Arendt, *Human Condition*, 40.

Arendt termed the "what" over the "who" - that is, they become so caught up in their desire for success that they forget to distinguish between their role as leader and themselves as individuals.

Furthermore, in much of the published research on authentic leadership, there is limited acknowledgement of intersectionality, so important in the area of women's studies, but under-examined within authentic leadership scholarship.[7] In my assessment of authentic leadership scholarship, I draw upon some feminist critiques that alert us to the importance of taking into account multiple axes of identity.[8] By bringing an intersectional analysis to bear on the theory and practice of authentic leadership, I highlight some of the gaps in authentic leadership theory. Integral here is the need to comprehend how different social factors such as race, class, sexuality and age influence perceptions of leadership.

Chapter Breakdowns

In chapter one, I provide a literature review of authentic leadership, and outline some of the problems I see with this discourse. I argue that this theory has, for the most part, overlooked gender dynamics and the ways in which lived experience influences our ideas about authenticity. A secondary research aim is to try and understand why the theory of authentic leadership has emerged at this particular historical juncture. Specifically, why do today's leaders need a theoretical justification to teach them how to act authentically? Is a desire for authentic leadership an antidote to an ever-increasing bureaucratic existence that serves to distance people from one another, or is it an attempt to make leaders more accountable for their actions? For example, one thing that surprised me was how often authenticity in leadership is linked to greater efficiency.[9] While I understand that it is important for a leader

---

[7] This situation is changing. See, for example, Evangelina Holvino, "Intersections: The Simultaneity of Race, Gender and Class in Organization Studies," *Gender, Work and Organization* (2010): 248-273.

[8] For more on this topic, see Jan Shaw, "Papering the Cracks with Discourse: The Narrative Identity of the Authentic Leader," *Leadership*, (2010): 89-108.

[9] See, for example, Adrian Chan, "Authentic Leadership Measurement: Challenges and Suggestions," in *Authentic Leadership Theory and Practice: Origins, Effects and Developments,* ed. William L. Gardner, Bruce J. Avolio, and Fred O. Walumbwa (Amsterdam: Elsevior, 2005), 227-251.

to be effective and ethical, there are times when I feel that the former is taking precedence over the latter.

In the section on leadership training, I suggest that training programs designed to increase a person's authenticity may serve to reinforce normative ideas of what constitutes a "good" leader. Thus, rather than developing genuine leaders, as is hoped, the theory of authentic leadership may result, paradoxically, in increasing conformity. I see this conformity working in two ways. First, there is external conformism in terms of the laws we obey as a member of society. Second, there is the manner in which we modify our behaviour to fit what we perceive is in keeping with others. Social conformity may also be marked by a desire to please, which may prove problematic for some women leaders. Additionally, there is often an assumption within the literature that by displaying particular behaviors a leader is being authentic. However, this ignores how they may be merely complying with what they think is expected of them and, thus, being hypocritical. While I am not arguing that leaders should not adhere to rules, I do contend that following social rules *per se*, as well as leadership programming that purports to teach authenticity, is not necessarily conducive to authentic action.

In chapter two, I explore how the concept of authenticity is shaped by bourgeois ideas about gendered identity. I trace the antecedents of authenticity back to the Age of Enlightenment, since this was when modern ideas surrounding authenticity were initially formulated.[10] In regards to the formation of the liberal subject, I show how authenticity is linked to virtue, and describe the ways in which virtue was gendered differently. I argue that Enlightenment notions of virtue serve to constrain women's autonomy and, hence, limit their ideas about their own possibilities. These gendered values concerning what constituted virtuous action placed limitations on women's ability to perceive themselves as leaders within the socio-political sphere. Furthermore, I suggest that this historical diminishment of women's potential ability to lead may still bear an influence on gender prejudice in regards to leadership. I argue that theories of the present are influenced, in some manner, by gendered perspectives of the past. Hence, a lingering trace of gender prejudice toward women leaders

---

[10] See Charles Taylor, *The Ethics of Authenticity* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press), 1991, 25.

is embedded within the cultural imagination. My hope is that by understanding authenticity through the lens of the past, we may open up new avenues of inquiry that shed light on the connections among gender, authenticity and leadership in ways that complement current scholarship.

In chapter three, I consider the concept of authenticity through the lens of existential phenomenology,[11] because this tradition has gone the furthest to develop an account of the authentic self. Here, I explore the connections between Arendt's work and Martin Heidegger's theory of authenticity, as elucidated by the latter in *Being and Time*. I rethink his concept of authenticity in light of her diverse insights into the complex webs of relationships and interwoven narratives that affect our comprehension of what it means to be authentic. Specifically, I argue that Arendt's account of what it means to be unique enriches Heidegger's definition of authenticity. While Heidegger sees authenticity as emerging from silent resolution, for Arendt, uniqueness lies in our speech and action. She argues that it is natality, not finitude, which is central to understanding existence. For Arendt, natality refers to the fact that through action, we "insert ourselves into the world."[12] As such, each act is like a second birth that brings something new into existence. Her emphasis on natality stands in contrast to Heidegger's belief that it is by coming to terms with death that a person can realize her potential for authenticity. In short, I suggest that, taken together, Arendt's concepts of uniqueness and plurality add depth to Heidegger's concept of *Mitsein* (being with), because she emphasizes how we are always in relationship. Her focus on the importance of plurality illuminates hidden consequences that arise from leadership that is self-oriented. Put simply, a focus on the self can lead to a disconnection from the world of others.

Throughout the thesis, I suggest that thinking with Arendt illustrates how authenticity in leadership requires not only an internal sense of purpose, but also responsiveness towards

---

[11] In common with thinkers in the existential phenomenological tradition, I will often use the term "we." I recognize that this is somewhat contentious since the "we" may cover over the inequities that exist. However, I hope that my larger argument of the importance of uniqueness and plurality will show that the "we" is meant as an inclusive phrase.

[12] Arendt, *Human Condition*, 176.

others. Such a responsive orientation necessitates being willing to think from different perspectives. To enhance my own understanding of the intersections among gender, authenticity and leadership, I conducted a qualitative phenomenological inquiry.[13] In chapter four, I discuss my methodological approach, which is rooted in hermeneutic, existential phenomenology. Arendt used the term "thinking without banisters" to describe her methodological approach, a way of thinking that I try and adopt for this project. Thinking without bannisters refers to the manner in which we try and think from the position of another; this is not so as to attempt to think in the same way as someone else but rather to enrich our understanding of different perspectives. Since Arendt chose not to discuss her methodology in any detail, I briefly compare different methodological approaches to phenomenology by the major thinkers of this tradition, specifically, Edmund Husserl, Martin Heidegger and Maurice Merleau-Ponty. As well, I examine some feminist contentions regarding phenomenological inquiry that, to my mind, enrich phenomenological inquiry by illustrating how a gendered analysis offers a fuller understanding of lived experience.

Central to Arendt's *oeuvre* is that storytelling is intrinsic to comprehending how we live in the world. The reason why storytelling is central to human existence is because each one of us has a story, unique to ourselves, that can be told. I suggest personal narratives can enrich an understanding of what constitutes authentic leadership. These descriptive accounts enable us to comprehend how each person's unique experiences are important to understanding authenticity as it pertains to gender and leadership. In chapter five, I examine the descriptive accounts of the women leaders whom I interviewed. While I recognize that what is remembered is only one person's perspective on what occurred, nevertheless, each person's understanding of their particular experience opens up fresh ways of thinking about authenticity as it relates to gender and leadership.

My original research question asked in what ways senior women leaders describe their experiences of authenticity (or lack thereof) within an institutional context. What emerges from my research findings is a different way of thinking about the place of authenticity in leadership. Not only do these women offer insights into ethical dilemmas in regards to the

---

[13] Research Ethics Approval for this study was obtained from Western University in fall 2010. The ethics review number is 17419S.

institutional workings of power and privilege,[14] they reveal how gender affected their ability to navigate institutional barriers. In examining common themes, these descriptive accounts illustrate how gender differences reinforce hierarchies in subtle and, sometimes, not so subtle ways. As a result, a woman's sense of belonging may be undermined by gender prejudice regarding normative ideas about what constitutes a good leader, which, in turn, may impede her ability to speak or act in a manner consistent with personal conviction.

These women leaders' descriptive accounts also serve to complicate the notion of what constitutes an authentic leader, and run contrary to most scholarship on authentic leadership, especially as regards to the importance of self-knowledge. Instead, their accounts emphasize how leadership is a relational enterprise, founded upon mutual respect and trust. As such, they reaffirm Carol Gilligan's contention that women are socialized to lead differently, in a manner that is relational rather than hierarchical.[15] Viewing authentic leadership through a relational lens allows us to see previously hidden aspects of this phenomenon. For example, a common pattern to emerge from the interviews was the importance of building strong relationships through care. Indeed, caring was perceived as integral to many research participants' understanding of the place of authenticity in leadership. A focus on situated, gendered embodiment brings to light new ways of thinking about authenticity and leadership.

Over the course of writing this thesis, my thinking about leadership has shifted dramatically. Something that one of the women I interviewed said has stayed with me. She argued that we need to explode the notion that leadership is dependent upon a particular institutional position. Women lead in all walks of life: the problem is that much of this leadership is unnoticed or ignored. Her words reminded me of what I had always known, but had forgotten. From the account of a mother starting a Girl Guide troop for little girls from families of different ethnic and racial groups, to the story of how a single mother acts on behalf of others to change school policy by showing how the school privileges the nuclear family, we see instances of authentic leadership in action. I perceive a correspondence

---

[14] As an example, see Mary Uhl Bien, "Relational Leadership Theory: Exploring the Social Processes of Leadership and Organizing," *The Leadership Quarterly*, no. 17 (2006): 654-676.

[15] Carol Gilligan, *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982). While it is true that scholars mention relationships, it seems to me that the major focus is on the leader, and their capacity to enact change.

between the extraordinary but everyday actions that these women described to me, and Arendt's insistence that power can spring up anywhere that a group of committed individuals are willing to work together to fight against perceived injustices. From an Arendtian perspective, such spontaneous acts demonstrate how individuals work alongside their communities to try and improve others' lives. Yet these everyday acts by women in their communities are rarely described as leadership, since common ways of thinking about leaders are tied up with power and prestige.

In the conclusion to this thesis, I explore how my own ideas about the interconnections among gender, leadership and authenticity have altered. At the beginning of this project, my intention was to focus on leadership within an institutional setting. What became apparent through dwelling with the descriptive accounts, however, is that leadership within the context of an institution is not how these women described what it means to be an authentic leader. Rather, they spoke of leadership as situational, and considered it from a wider, societal lens than I had anticipated. What emerges from these accounts is that it is not sufficient to describe how women lead in institutions; rather we need to describe how women lead in a diversity of situations. By considering what it means to lead beyond the confines of the work environment, we obtain insights into how a focus on gender can redefine our understanding of the role of authenticity in leadership. While I am not implying that these accounts are indicative of women's leadership *per se*, I am suggesting that patterns emerge that may expand our understanding of the interconnections among gender, authenticity and leadership.

Curiously, what started out as a phenomenology of authentic leadership has ended up being concerned with what might be termed a phenomenology of social conformity. Perhaps this is not so surprising, since to concern oneself with lived experience is often to find that theories regarding truth are out of step with how we live in the world. Yet it is still somewhat perplexing to set off on the way to somewhere and find oneself on the path elsewhere.

Chapter 1

1   Authenticity, Leadership and Gender

In this chapter, I provide a review of the main trends in authentic leadership scholarship. I argue that this leadership theory has, for the most part, overlooked gender dynamics, and the ways in which lived experience influences our ideas about authenticity.[16] Within current scholarship on authentic leadership, I suggest there is a tendency to abstract knowledge such that it offers a limited view of human existence. The problem with such abstraction is that it can lead to a lack of understanding of the multiple ways in which we live. Furthermore, I contend that authentic leadership, as currently construed, has a tendency to privilege a leader's self-knowledge over their connection to others. For Arendt, a focus on self leads to an alienation from the world. Theories that privilege self over others serve to suppress a plurality of perspectives, and the creation of a meaningful environment.

I suggest that examining authentic leadership through the lens of hermeneutic, existential phenomenology may offer a richer way of thinking about the connections among gender, authenticity and leadership, because of its emphasis on situated, embodied knowledge. In particular, thinking with Arendt complements existing scholarship because it alerts us to the need to consider equality and difference. Specifically, her concept of uniqueness, understood as a person's particular qualities and social location, and her notion of plurality - that is, how we exist in a world of others - can deepen our understanding of the role that authenticity plays in leadership. For example, how we see ourselves is always related to who we are in context with others, since it is through action and speech that

---

[16] There are some leadership scholars who discuss gender in relation to authentic leadership. See, for example, Alice Eagly, "Achieving Relational Authenticity in Leadership: Does Gender Matter?" *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16, no. 3, (2005): 459-474, and Jackie Ford and Nancy Harding, "The Impossibility of the 'True Self' of Authentic Leadership," *Leadership,* 7 no. 4 (2011): 463-479.

each individual reveals herself to others.[17] This individual revealing is always related to a person's cultural and socio-historical place in the world.

A secondary research aim is to understand why, at this particular historical juncture, the theory of authentic leadership has emerged. Specifically, why do today's leaders need a theoretical justification to teach them how to act authentically? Is a desire for authentic leadership an antidote to an ever-increasing bureaucratic existence that serves to distance people from one another, or is it an attempt to make leaders more accountable for their actions? One thing that surprised me was how often in the scholarship the concept of authenticity is linked to greater efficiency in leadership. While I recognize that it is important for a leader to be effective, there are times when I felt that "efficiency" may serve to obscure ethics. Some leadership scholars who write on this topic impose a framework through which they attempt to determine and measure authenticity. This instrumental way of thinking is potentially damaging to human relations, and brings to mind Heidegger's notion of *Gestell*, or enframing.[18]

A serious problem in modernity, according to Heidegger, is how we see things through a scientific worldview that privileges calculation and efficiency. This mode of thinking tries to establish in advance how we encounter the world. I suggest that current discussions of authentic leadership adopt a mode of what Heidegger terms "enframing" through the overemphasis on measurement, efficiency and quantification. This instrumental way of thinking can have damaging consequences, not least because it fails to comprehend the depth and breadth of human existence. Rather than offering us insight into what it might mean to lead authentically, this somewhat narrow approach may lead to a rigidity of thinking, and a covering over of difference. In part, this is borne out of a

---

[17] Arendt, *Human Condition*, 181-88.

[18] Heidegger's notion of *Gestell* is encapsulated in his essay "What is Technology?" in *Basic Writings,* ed. and intro David Farrell Krell (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1977), 283-319.

desire to control and quantify human interactions.[19] For example, we will see that some scholars argue there are four dimensions to authentic leadership, that is, self-awareness, balanced information processing, relational transparency and internalized moral perspective. But focussing on these four dimensions leads to a prescriptive way of thinking that obscures the multiplicity of lived experience.

Thus, the theory of authentic leadership may result, unintentionally perhaps, in increased conformity to a particular way of thinking. Social conformity is a problem for leadership because it works to suppress uniqueness in favour of uniformity. In Arendtian terms, in trying to live up to some uniform standard, leaders may, sometimes unwittingly, other times deliberately, perpetuate the "what" of being over the "who." That is, their unique identity may become covered over by their social role as leader. Social conformism is counterproductive to authenticity, I suggest, because it is founded on fitting in, rather than being one's unique self. In a way, then, the discourse of authentic leadership is paradoxical in that on the surface it suggests an inclusionary model, while on a deeper level it may lead to sameness.[20]

Social conformity is a particular problem in terms of gender since women have generally been socialized to please others rather than forge their own path. I see this conformity operating in two ways. First, there is conformism in terms of laws and rules we obey as members of society. Second, there is our complicity with regard to how we take up social rules, and modify our behaviour to fit what we perceive is in keeping with others. Moreover, the suggestion that by displaying particular behaviors a leader is authentic ignores how they may just be complying with social norms, as well as being hypocritical.

---

[19] We will see in chapter five that those women I interview have very different things to say about what may, or may not, constitutes authentic leadership. While I am not suggesting that these women's accounts are by any means the last word on this topic, I do want to suggest that what constitutes authenticity in leadership shows up in different ways.

[20] Following Michel Foucault, I use discourse to mean the ways in which we speak, act and live in the world. Some discourses gain priority over others and, in so doing, seem to offer us a particular truth. Questions of truth are always bound with systems of power and knowledge, as well as our socio-historical circumstances. See Michel Foucault, History *of Sexuality*, *Volume I*, trans. Robert Hurley (New York: Random House, 1991), especially part 5.

Such conformity may also prove dangerous in crisis situations, where there is no "moral handbook" to offer leaders guidance.

I try and demonstrate how social factors affect the ways in which we think about the connections amongst gender, authenticity and leadership. I suggest that Arendt's theory of uniqueness, which I discuss in detail in chapter three, has parallels with the notion of intersectionality. The term "intersectionality" refers to how identity is influenced by multiple factors, for example, class, race, or gender.[21] Both concepts alert us to the need to take into account how different facets of identity work together. Being alert to difference helps us to consider how the intersections of identity play a role in how we think about leaders. That being said, I face something of a dilemma, since Arendt made limited reference to women leaders, and the public statements she made were far from positive. Therefore, I augment Arendt's lack of concern with gender with feminist accounts of leadership. Later in the chapter, I show how gender normativity influences how we think about women leaders. I suggest that prejudice against women leaders is, in part, because they challenge the normative, hierarchical framework.[22] Simply put, for some people, women leaders seem out of place in the higher echelons of organizational and public life. This prejudice has an additional effect in that to conform to leadership "standards," some women choose to lead by assimilating to dominant styles of leadership that serves to perpetuate structural inequities.

I begin by outlining the main themes put forward by scholars of authentic leadership. Then, I compare dominant ideas with ethical themes that emerge in the area of leadership

---

[21] Crenshaw, Kimberlé, "Intersectionality and Identity Politics: Learning from Violence Against Black Women," in *Reconstructing Political Theory: Feminist Perspectives,* ed. Mary L. Shanley and Uma Narayan (University Park: Penn State University Press, 1997), 178-194.

[22] The continuing prejudice against women leaders, while shifting, is still firmly embedded in the cultural imagination as a recent survey shows. In this survey of more than 60,000 individuals in the United States, 54% of people said that they had no preference regarding male or female bosses. However, the study also found that of those participants who expressed a preference, twice as many preferred to work for a male leader. See Kim M. Elsesser and Janet Lever, "Does Gender Bias against Female Leaders Persist? Quantitative and Qualitative Data from a Large-Scale Survey," *Human Relations,* 64, no. 12 (2011): 1555-1578.

studies. As part of this discussion, I consider some problems with leadership programming as it relates to authenticity, especially the way in which such training reinforces Anglo-American models of leading. Then, I turn to Arendt to see what insights we can obtain from her thinking about leadership and related aspects such as authority. Next, I explore the question of authenticity in leadership through the lens of gender. In the conclusion, I gather together these divergent strands to see what has emerged with regard to the interconnections among authenticity, gender and leadership.

1.1 Authentic Leadership – A Review

The concept of authentic leadership gained popularity in 2003 with the publication of Bill George's book *Authentic Leadership: Rediscovering the Secrets to Creating Lasting Value.* Due to the myriad ethical scandals within the corporate sector, he argued that the concept of leadership needs to be completely rethought. What is required to fix the ethical gap are leaders who are morally responsible, have a deep sense of purpose and stay true to core values. These qualities, he suggests, enable leaders to establish the relationships necessary to build a strong organization, while at the same time allowing them to lead with conviction and self-discipline.

At around the same time as George published this business bestseller, within scholarly literature, the construct known as authentic leadership was gaining importance in the academic community. According to Peter Northouse there are three different approaches to authentic leadership.[23] First, there is the intrapersonal as outlined by Boas Shamir and Galit Eilam who argued that authentic leaders are original since they choose not to copy others. From their perspective, it is the insights gained from their life stories that enable authentic leaders to obtain self-knowledge. The second strand is that represented by Alice Eagly who focuses on the interpersonal - that is, the relationships between leader and

---

[23] See Peter Northouse, "Authentic Leadership," in *Leadership: Theory and Practice* (Thousand Oaks: Sage 2013), 266.

follower. But the dominant scholarly perspective is the developmental perspective identified by Bruce Avolio and colleagues.[24]

In the definition put forward by Avolio *et al*., authentic leadership has four main dimensions, that is, i) self-awareness, ii) balanced information processing, iii) relational transparency and iv) internalized moral perspective. It is suggested that authentic leaders possess greater self-awareness, which enables them to understand their strengths and weaknesses, and be cognizant of the effect they have on others. Second, balanced processing means that a leader - as part of their decision-making process – is able to analyze information objectively. Relational transparency refers to being trustworthy and demonstrating appropriate emotional responses. Authentic leaders are genuine in their self-presentation so that there is no "fake self" on display. Not only are these leaders always honest, they display the right emotion for the right situation. Finally, an authentic leader's internalized moral perspective means they are guided by internal values rather than societal pressures.

While past research in authentic leadership was mostly conceptual, Bruce Avolio and Keith Mhatra[25] state that there are now measurable tools, as well as reliable techniques, to test for authenticity in leadership. They employ a survey instrument known as the ALQ (Authentic Leadership Questionnaire), developed by Avolio and others. Through empirical testing, Avolio and Mhatra contend there is now positive proof that there are four dimensions to authentic leadership, namely, self-awareness; relational transparency; internalized moral perspective and balanced processing are verifiable. Empirical data

---

[24] For earlier work on this topic, see Bruce J. Avolio and William Gardner, "Authentic Leadership Development: Getting to the Root of Positive Forms of Leadership." Special Issue of *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16, no.3 (2005): 315-338.

[25] Bruce J. Avolio and Keith Mhatra, "Advances in Theory and Research on Authentic Leadership," *Handbook of Positive Organizational Scholarship* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), accessed May 10, 2013, doi 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199734610.013.0059.

from various research studies backs up previous theoretical claims about authentic leadership. [26]

Avolio and Mhatra assert that it is because authentic leaders have a deeper understanding of self that they are able to be consistent in their dealings with others. Through this heightened sense of self, authentic leaders foster strong relationships by role-modeling positive behaviour. In developing a positive environment, authentic leaders not only improve overall morale, but also increase employee effectiveness. Put simply, authenticity can be good for the bottom line. It is further argued that leaders who are authentic are better able to achieve institutional goals because they are transparent in their dealings with others. Together with their ability to be unbiased, authentic leaders lead in accordance with their values, and remain steadfast to their principles.

In addition, four positive psychological components are perceived as relevant to authentic leadership. These components are confidence, hope, honesty and resilience. Confidence ensures that a leader has the belief that they can accomplish tasks successfully. Hope means that leaders have the capacity to inspire others through their willpower. Optimism ensures that they can overcome obstacles, while resilience allows them to recover from adversity. Furthermore, a leader's positive behaviour encourages a sense of institutional belonging amongst employees, which leads to higher levels of hope and trust. Furthermore, what constitutes right thinking about leadership seems more to do with what we currently perceive as positive thinking. The following statement by William Gardner *et al*. serves to illustrate my point in that they maintain the core components of authentic leadership are "self-awareness, positive self-regulation, positive self-

---

[26] Bruce J. Avolio *et al*., "What is Authentic Leadership Development?" in *Oxford Handbook of Positive Psychology and Work*, eds. P. Alex Linley, Susan Harrington, and Nicola Garcea (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 46.

development and a positive moral perspective."[27] Here we see that there is a strong link made between positive psychology and authenticity in leadership.

In their discussion of the relationship between authenticity and self-awareness, Avolio and others distinguish between adaptive and maladaptive self-reflection in authentic leadership. [28] Adaptive self-reflection means that a leader is aware of, and can critically assess their beliefs and behaviors in a constructive manner. Conversely, maladaptive self-reflection is destructive, since too much rumination may generate negative emotions such as self-doubt or anxiety. It is only through what these authors describe as "positive developmental interventions" that leaders can make the right decision.[29] This suggestion is worrisome, because it suggests that it is possible for leaders to take up the right amount of self-reflection. Thus the distinction between maladaptive and adaptive self-reflection may have more to do with conforming to dominant paradigms about what constitutes good leadership than being connected, in any deeper way, with authenticity.

Recent breakthroughs in neuroscience offer additional techniques to gauge authenticity in leaders, according to Paul McDonald. He claims that neuroscience can provide scientific evidence to back up previous claims concerning the four major components of authentic leadership.[30] For instance, McDonald argues that self-awareness has an internal aspect that is informed by introspection, as well as an external element since self-awareness is also affected by social factors. He further contends that neuroscience research suggests that we treat information in a different way depending upon whether we are told something by someone we know well, as opposed to a stranger. Another component of

---

[27] William L. Gardner *et al.*, "Authentic Leadership: A Review of the Literature and Research Agenda," *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22 (2011): 1123. This article provides an overview of some earlier research that relates to authenticity and leadership.

[28] Fred Walumbwa *et al.*, "Authentic Leadership: Development and Validation of a Theory-Based Measure," *Management Department Faculty Publications* (2008): Paper 24, accessed June 30, 2013, http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/managementfacpub/24, 42.

[29] Fred Walumbwa *et al.*, "Authentic Leadership: Development and Validation of a Theory-Based Measure," 42.

[30] Paul McDonald, "Neurological Correlates to Authentic Leadership," Working Paper Series, Victoria Management School (2009): 1-23.

authentic leadership – relational transparency - can be informed by neuroscience, since it appears that particular facial elements create a negative response in the amygdale, which affects how we judge people. What this means is that we judge some people as more trustworthy than others based on how they look. Those whom we find non-threatening are more likely to gain a positive appraisal, especially when we perceive them as similar to ourselves.

Neuroscience research can also offer insight into balanced processing since, according to McDonald, the brain processes soft and hard data in the same way. As a result, the brain perceives rewards such as financial incentives or enhanced reputation in an equal manner. He suggests that this may be the reason why some people are willing to forego financial compensation for a better job title. Another component of authentic leadership is internalized moral perspective. From his research, McDonald states that people who are inclined to focus on negative experiences are less able to engage in self-regulation, which seems to reinforce Walumbwa and colleagues' claim about adaptive versus maladaptive thinking. It appears that negative thinking adversely affects the ability to access the prefrontal regions responsible for self-focused thinking, and may cloud our ability to make balanced decisions.[31]

In terms of moral thinking, neuro-imagining techniques can also offer insight into how we make ethical decisions. Apparently, each person has their own neuroimagining signature that operates independently from cognitive decision-making. In practical terms, this suggests that ethical decisions are spontaneous, rather than rule-bound. What this means in practice is that reason alone will not be enough to explain a person's moral competence. If McDonald's assessment of neuroscience research is correct, then it seems that we make ethical decisions in the moment. Such spontaneity is also relevant to how Arendt understands human action. It is through action that each of us brings forward something new into the world. No matter how much we may desire control, the

---

[31] McDonald, *Neuro Science*, 14.

spontaneity of action exceeds our grasp, and this may have a detrimental effect on the outcome of what appear to be ethical decisions.

Another aspect that emerges from the literature on authentic leadership is a connection between authenticity and greater efficiency. While I understand that it is important for a leader to be effective, there are times when I felt that this was taking precedence over ethical matters. It seems to me that current explanations of authentic leadership veer toward an instrumental way of perceiving relationships. This means-ends way of thinking can be seen in how scholars begin with the hypothesis that authentic leadership rests upon a particular set of characteristics. From this list of characteristics, scholars build survey instruments to gain empirical evidence to confirm their thesis. But all this does is to reaffirm what they already believed. Thus, I suggest that the diversity of human experience is covered over by this desire to quantify and measure things. What this body of evidence does is to produce a particular way of thinking about authenticity, but it may obscure other ways of thinking about this concept. While it is laudable that these scholars are concerned about ethical behaviour in leaders, I do not believe that ethical dilemmas will be solved through instrumental ways of thinking. I think there is a danger to connect questions of ethics with questions of efficiency, because it may result in the former being obscured by the latter. Efficiency understood by the language of performance measurement and outcome-based thinking serves to ignore contingency in favour of scientific explanations that privilege consistency.

This predilection for measurable results in authentic leadership scholarship may be problematic, because it encourages a belief that truth is obtainable from data without fully acknowledging that leadership is context-dependent. Moreover, as Joanne Ciulla points out, there is often confusion in leadership accounts between description and prescription. This can lead to false assumptions being drawn. For instance, she states there is a "dichotomy between leaders who are morally good and leaders who are effective at

exercising leadership."[32] Ciulla refers to this as the "Hitler problem," that is, a leader can sometimes appear efficient without in any way being ethical. Furthermore, she contends that leadership studies should be rooted in the human sciences, not least because when we study leadership we are looking at ourselves.[33] Ever since the Enlightenment, however, scientific discourse has been afforded more cultural cache. Nonetheless, Ciulla maintains that stories can offer insights in ways that scientific theories cannot.

When we think about what authentic leadership might mean, each of us will have different ideas, informed by the stories we read, the movies we watch and our experiences in the workplace and beyond. What characterizes an authentic leader in Antonio Marturano's opinion will change over time and space, since each community has different values that are "embedded in social relations and institutions."[34] Certain traits have meaning within a particular community, he argues, rather than being rooted in a person's psychology, as some leadership scholars maintain. Furthermore, Marturano claims that it is not so much that individual leaders possess charisma, but that others believe them to be charismatic. It is easy to become swept away by the rhetorical genius of charismatic leaders. These larger than life personas may prove detrimental to an organization, according to Amanda Sinclair, since their belief in themselves may override alternate viewpoints.[35] From her work with leadership teams, she has observed a common tendency exhibited by senior managers toward dependency and obedience. This manifests itself as believing that the leader is the only person who can solve a particular

---

[32] Joanne B. Ciulla. "Handmaiden and Queen: What Philosophers Find in the Question: What is a Leader?" In *Leadership Studies: The Dialogue of Disciplines*, eds. Ronald E. Riggio and Michael Harvey (Northampton: Edward Elgar, 2011), 59.

[33] Joanna B. Ciulla, "Leadership Studies and the Fusion of Horizons," *The Leadership Quarterly* (2008), 393.

[34] Antonio Marturano, "Understanding Leadership: Is it time for a linguistic turn?" In Leadership at the Crossroads, Volume III, Leadership and the Humanities, ed. Joanna B. Ciulla (Westport, Conneticut: Praeger, 2008), 117-132.

[35] Amanda Sinclair, *Leadership for the Disillusioned*: *Moving Beyond Myths and Heroes to Leading that Liberates* (Crow's Nest NSW: Allen and Unwin, 2007), 81.

problem. As a result, the leader starts to perceive himself as omniscient. Too much emphasis on a leader's capabilities may be a way for people to mask their own insecurities. This dependency on leaders may actually be an abrogation of personal responsibility. Ignoring these power relationships is a mistake, asserts Sinclair, since it does not help us understand how leaders may, at times, feel powerless to act while, in other circumstances, gain too much power over others.

Until recently, much of the published work on authentic leadership was based either on conceptual ideas or quantitative research.[36] In reviewing studies conducted on authentic leadership, William Gardner and others note that there is too much reliance on survey measurements to gauge authentic leadership. Of the ninety-one publications on authentic leadership published up to 2010, Gardner *et al.*[37] contend that fifty-nine were conceptual, with fifty-five of these reflecting a positivist orientation while the other four were interpretive. Furthermore, 74% of the articles published come out of the fields of management or business studies in either Canada or The United States. What is required, they contend, is research that elicits thick narratives and explores ethical issues in greater depth. I'll return to ethics later in the chapter.

1.1.1   Alternative Perspectives on Authentic Leadership

There are some scholars who adopt a different approach to authentic leadership as I indicated earlier. For example, in their exploration of authentic leadership, Boas Shamir and Galit Eilam see a connection with the Aristotelian concept of eudaimonia.[38] From their perspective, to be authentic a leader must act out of personal conviction so as to encourage others to share her vision. Similarly, Lester Levy and Mark Bentley argue that

---

[36] Leadership theories are sometimes tested in controlled environments, such as university laboratories, using surveys with students as the primary subjects. Yet students are probably not the best people to study in regards to leadership, since many have a limited knowledge of the workplace.

[37] Gardner, *et al., Authentic Leadership*, 1125.

[38] Boas Shamir and Galit Eilam, "What's Your Story? A Life-Stories Approach to Authentic Leadership Development," *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16, no.3 (2005): 397.

to be authentic, leaders need to be true to themselves and act upon their beliefs for the common good.[39]

What these definitions fail to acknowledge is that truth, like authenticity, is a contestable concept. Such an approach to the study of leadership does not account adequately for the myriad ways in which institutional bias and social prejudice adversely affect who gains access to leadership roles. Moreover, there are many times when a leader's convictions may have appeared to be genuine, but have led to disastrous results. Here we may do well to remember Arendt's claim that it is not whether leaders are good that matters; rather, it is whether their leadership is good for the world that is important. In fact, we need to ask ourselves: would a world populated by authentic leaders necessarily be a better one? I will return to this question in the conclusion to this chapter.

1.1.2   Authentic Leadership and Narrative

Authenticity does not arise out of the awareness of inner values, according to Raymond Sparrowe, but through narrative.[40] He takes up Paul Ricoeur's work on the narrative self to show the limitations of current leadership research. For example, Sparrowe is critical of the emphasis on the inner self, because he argues that it ignores our relationships with others.[41] By viewing authentic leaders as constant with their beliefs, this abstracts them from their situational context, and ignores how past history are relevant to present events. Being authentic, states Sparrowe, does not necessarily mean a person will be moral. I think we can take this insight further, since to suggest that authentic leadership is inherently moral is to contend that we are all the same. Not only does this ignore how leaders act in narcissistic or duplicitous ways, it also overlooks each person's unique mode of being. (We will return to the issue of narrative in later chapters.)

---

[39] Lester Levy and Mark Bentley, "More 'Right' than 'Real': the Shape of Authentic Leadership in New Zealand," (Auckland: The University of Auckland, 2007), 10.

[40] Raymond T. Sparrowe, "Authentic Leadership and the Narrative Self," *The Leadership Quarterly* 16, no. 3 (2005): 419-439. It is noteworthy that Ricoeur and Arendt were colleagues at The University of Chicago.

[41] Sparrowe, "Narrative Self," 423.

In thinking about the place of authenticity in leadership, we need to take into account how each of us understands the world in a singular but different fashion, because of the myriad experiences that make up our life. Context matters. But context is often missing from discussions into what constitutes authenticity in leadership. So, too, is any discussion of the body. The reason why embodiment is ignored by most authentic leadership scholars, according to Donna Ladkin and Steve Taylor, is due to the focus on the leader's 'true' self. [42] Yet it is not a person's inner thoughts that are important; rather it is through speech and action that leaders are judged. [43] While Francis Yammarino *et al.* contend that authentic leaders can enhance overall workplace effectiveness, [44] because a leader's honest approach will be received positively by others, Ladkin and Taylor express reservations. One of the underlying problems they perceive with the theory of authentic leadership is that it does not account for how a leader may act in what she regards as an authentic manner but still not be perceived as genuine by others. For instance, one of the main roles of a leader, state Ladkin and Taylor, is to embody "the identity story of the group."[45] In conveying the institutional narrative, a leader needs to evoke a rapport with her audience. Whenever leaders are unable to convey the institutional story in a meaningful way, they will not persuade others to share in their vision and effect change, something deemed critical to leadership success.[46]

So we see that context is critical to understanding the role of authenticity in leadership. Yet, according to Alice Eagly, many authentic leadership scholars ignore the "fault lines that exist in communities between people who differ in gender, social class, education

---

[42] Donna Ladkin and Steve Taylor, "'Enacting the 'True Self': Towards a Theory of Embodied Authentic Leadership," *The Leadership Quarterly* 21, no. 1 (2010): 65.

[43] In terms of embodiment, for example, gender plays a significant role in how we think about leaders, something that I will discuss in more detail toward the end of this chapter and again in chapter five.

[44] Francis J. Yammarino *et al*., "Authentic Leadership and Positive Organizational Behavior: A Meso, Multi-Level Perspective," *The Leadership Quarterly*, no. 19 (2008): 695.

[45] Ladkin and Taylor, "`Enacting the 'True Self,' 70.

[46] Donna Ladkin, *Rethinking Leadership: A New Look at Old Problems* (London: Edward Elgar, 2011), 94.

and ethnicity."[47] What this means is that those who are not considered to be traditional leaders may have problems being seen as genuine. She points to tensions that may occur when a woman leader displays a lack of stereotypical feminine behaviour by being perceived as aggressive or autocratic. Because of her gender, rather than her action, a woman leader may be castigated for what would, from a male perspective, appear to be 'normal' leadership behaviour. But it is not only gender that needs to be taken into account. Depending upon the particular situation, different axes of identity can be foregrounded. In some instances, a leader might be discriminated against because of her gender, while in another situation a male leader might experience discrimination because of his race or sexual orientation. In considering what it might mean to lead authentically, an array of intersectional factors have to be noted.

I have surveyed some of the main theorists in the field in order to offer some background to current discussions. Now I want to look at what is perceived to be a fundamental component of leadership, that is, vision.

1.2 Vision

Herminia Ibarra and Otillia Obodaru maintain that the one thing that is holding women back from leadership positions is vision.[48] From their empirical research, they argue that while women are perceived as just as competent as men in the majority of managerial tasks, envisioning is the area where women leaders express unease and are also perceived to be less successful by others. If more women wish to lead organizations, Ibarra and Obodaru contend, it is necessary for them to become more comfortable with putting forward their own vision. In short, women need to stop dismissing vision, and become competent in this area of leadership.

---

[47] Eagly, "Relational Authenticity," 460.

[48] Herminia Ibarra and Otillia Obodaru, "Women and the Vision Thing" *Harvard Business Review* (2009): 2.

The purpose of vision, state James Kouzes and Barry Posner, is to offer leader a blueprint to follow that serves as their guiding light for the future.[49] They argue that some leaders have an image of what success looks like even before they embark on a project, much like an engineer builds a model.[50] This clarity of image enables a leader to move forward provided they can enlist others to help them achieve their vision. Yet I suggest we need to be cautious when we think about leadership in such a predetermined manner. Such a planned approach to leadership may not always be sufficient. For example, as action constantly brings new problems, reverting to a blueprint will be of little use in times of crisis. Furthermore, this way of thinking seems to be based on the illusion that leaders are able to control what might happen, because they are able to plan everything in advance.

Some scholars perceive vision as vital to authentic leadership. For example, R.W. Terry contends that a "truly visionary leader teaches, providing insight so that people understand."[51] But not all visions are positive for organizations. Indeed, if a person's vision is disconnected from an ethical worldview, it may create problems. There are times when a leader's vision may prove counterproductive. Moreover, too much confidence may encourage a leader to behave in self-indulgent ways. Indeed Terry Price argues that an "undue focus on issues of authenticity can actually promote unethical leadership."[52] In thinking about vision in relation to leadership, we must account for the fact that not every leader engages in an ethical way of behaving.

---

[49] James M. Kouzes and Barry K. Pozner, *The Leadership Challenge: How to Make Extraordinary Things Happen*. Fourth Edition. (San Francisco: John Wiley and Sons, 2007), 18.

[50] Their assessment brings to mind Arendt's distinction between homo faber, man as maker, and animal laborans in *The Human Condition*. In brief, the former tries to construct the world according to an idea while the latter remains concerned with the necessities of life.

[51] R.W. Terry, Authentic *Leadership: Courage in Action*, (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1993), 37.

[52] Terry L. Price, "The Ethics of Authentic Transformational Leadership," *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14 (2003): 80.

1.3 Authenticity and Ethics

Ethical decision-making depends on the leader's willingness, not only to listen to their conscience, but to act accordingly. In thinking about the place of authenticity in leadership, Chris Branson argues that "all ethical decisions are based on the interplay between rational objective knowledge and our subjective, interpretive knowledge."[53] The problem is that moral integrity can be compromised by our selfish desires. He maintains that we must ensure that the "the pure voice of the moral self is heard above the confusion and chatter that fills our minds."[54] Here, Branson seems to have fallen back on his own abstraction, since the purity of a person's moral self is, at best, a dubious claim.

It is only when leaders face an ethical dilemma, state Milorad Novicevic *et al.,* that questions of authenticity become relevant in the workplace.[55] In differentiating between personal and organizational responsibility, these authors claim that executives experience tension wherever their personal values collide with organizational expectations. In stressful times, it is important for leaders to hold on to their self-esteem, rather than be swayed by others as moral decision-making may be affected adversely by "group think." One effect of this moral disintegration, contend Novicevic *et al.*, is that executives refuse to accept personal responsibility for the organization's ethical failures.

At times of organizational crisis, Donna Ladkin suggests that Heidegger's notion of dwelling might have much to offer leaders.[56] When there is no easy solution, she

---

[53] Chris Branson, "Ethical Decision Making: is Personal Moral Integrity the Missing Link?" *Journal of Authentic Leadership in Education,* 1, no. 1 (2010): 4.

[54] Branson, "Ethical Decision Making," 5.

[55] Milorad M. Novicevic *et al*., "Authentic Leadership: A Historical Perspective," *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies* 13, no. 1 (2006): 70-73.

[56] Donna Ladkin "When Deontology and Utilitarianism Aren't Enough: how Heidegger's Notion of "Dwelling" might help Organizational Leaders Resolve Ethical Issues," *Journal of Business Ethics*, 65 (2006): 87-98. One of the main problems with deontological or utilitarian perspectives, according to Ladkin, is that they do not account for the times when an institution's rules may be at odds with a leader's values. When such conflicts arise, neither deontological nor utilitarian ways of thinking offer enough flexibility.

contends that dwelling with a particular problem can help leaders solve particularly intransigent issues because it enables them to see, not just from our own perspective, but also from the viewpoint of others.[57] This way of orienting oneself to the world requires an open disposition, and a willingness to tarry. Such openness to the other, and to the world around us, is our way of showing we care. Furthermore, Ladkin contends that Heidegger's notion of "coming into right relationship" may provide a more inclusive framework for dealing with ethical dilemmas. Thus, she suggests that leadership studies could benefit by adopting his notion of dwelling to address organizational problems.

Hence, Ladkin argues that dwelling can offer new, creative solutions that allow a leader to stay with their own values, while at the same time, being willing to enter into a deep relationship with others. In practical terms, such openness requires the leader to be present-minded rather than future-oriented, and to be willing to create an environment for thinking through, rather than determining the right vision ahead of time. For this to take place, a leader needs to suspend their positional power so as to openly engage with others.[58] This suspension of power requires courage and humility on the leader's part, as well as a willingness to engage with the world and others.[59]

Ethical action requires us to ensure that our decisions are responsive to other people's feelings. We act ethically by offering a person, or a problem, our meaningful attention. This requires us to step back from our own concerns to be open to the particular situation. When we are open to experience, we allow things to come into appearance that otherwise we may not notice. In so doing, we become more receptive to the problem at hand. Sometimes, the decision a leader makes will be influenced by gender. Ladkin argues that Carol Gilligan's notion of moral differences between men and women may reveal why, at

---

[57] Heidegger describes dwelling as akin to staying with things. This staying with things becomes a dominant motif in his work as can be seen in his notion of *Gelassenheit* that means letting beings be. Heidegger, "Building, Dwelling, Thinking" in *Poetry, Language, Thought*, trans. A. Hofstadter (New York: Harper Colophon Books, 1971), 151.

[58] Ladkin, "Deontology," 96.

[59] Ladkin, "Deontology," 97.

times, a woman leader may act differently from her male counterpart.[60] This is because a woman's "ethical action is centrally informed by relational values."[61] Gilligan's work has been roundly challenged for what seems to be essentialist ways of thinking. But if we allow ourselves to be open to the notion that both men and women have the ability to lead in a caring manner, then her work may open up positive avenues for leading.

1.3.1   Authentic Leadership and Spirituality

It is noteworthy that underpinning some authentic leadership scholarship is a religious or spiritual foundation. For instance, Karin Klenke argues that spirituality is at the heart of authentic leadership.[62] This spiritual dimension enables employees to gain meaning as they search for something transcendent to augment the paucity of their working lives. But there may be problems with too much emphasis on spirituality in the workplace. If we see spirituality as essential to authentic leadership, what happens to those employees who are agnostic or atheist? While spirituality may be beneficial for some, it may negatively affect those who do not conform to a particular belief system. Hence, Amanda Sinclair cautions that a spiritual approach to leadership may not be conducive to workers' spiritual enlightenment, as it may mask structural inequities, and be adopted by unscrupulous leaders to coerce others into doing their will.

The current leadership craze regarding authenticity is, in Sinclair's view, a response to the growing anxiety that we are losing our identity in the workplace. But the definition of authentic leadership currently proposed is troubling, because as she notes the "norms by which authenticity is judged have deeply social, economic, political causes."[63] As an example, Sinclair argues that performance measurement is likely to encourage leaders to be authentic within a framework that has little to do with Arendtian notions of uniqueness, and much more to do with conformity. In addition, Joanne Ciulla criticizes

---

[60] Although we need to be wary of thinking that a person's action is solely determined by gender.

[61] Ladkin, "Deontology," 90.

[62] Karin Klenke, "Authentic Leadership: A Self, Leader, and Spiritual Identity Perspective." *International Journal of Leadership Studies*. 3, no. 1 (2007): 68.

[63] Sinclair, *Leadership for the Disillusioned*, 138.

"modern management for focusing more on trying to make one feel good than on creating a just workplace."[64] Management should be careful to resist any practices that border on psychological exploitation; instead employers should offer their workers respect and a decent wage.[65]

To sum up, I have explored the main arguments by proponents of authentic leadership, as well as considering some of its detractors. The desire for an authentic leadership construct may result in inauthentic behaviour as leaders conform to this prescriptive model. In their haste to put forward a new theory, as Puck Algera and Marjolein Lips-Wiersma have pointed out, leadership scholars fail to comprehend fully the ontological roots of authenticity.[66] It is a mistake to look for methods and techniques before dwelling on the fundamental question of what it means to be authentically human. If authentic leadership becomes a management technique, then it may lead to valuing leaders in terms of their individual success, rather than engaging in an ethical relation with others. What is missing in many accounts, as Dominik Heil points out, is a deeper understanding of the connections between authentic leadership and a particular way of viewing the world.[67] Furthermore, there is a tension between ethical considerations and the desire for leaders to be more effective. Effectiveness is desired because it is assumed that leaders will be more successful. Increasingly, the way that we judge success is through profit or outcome-based measurements. There is nothing inherently wrong with wanting leaders to be more effective but when we focus on effectiveness we may move away from

---

[64] Joanne Ciulla, *The Working Life: The Promise and Betrayal of Modern Work* (New York and Toronto: Random House 2000), 229.

[65] Joanne Ciulla, *Working Life*, 227.

[66] Puck M. Algera and Marjorie Lips-Wiersma, "Radical Authentic Leadership: Co-creating the Conditions under which all Members of the Organization can be Authentic," *The Leadership Quarterly,* 23, (2011): 118-231.

[67] Dominik Heil, "Understanding and Leading Organizations: A Hermeneutic Phenomenological Investigation," *Philosophy Today* (2010):14. In this article, Heil points to how a Heideggerian notion of attendance could help the authentic leader to articulate the connection between the organization and the world.

authenticity. When questions of authenticity are connected to financial and organizational success, it may be to the detriment of personal integrity.

1.4   Leadership: An Overview

I want to spend some time situating authentic leadership within the broader domain of leadership studies to see whether this offers us insight into why authenticity is regarded, by some scholars, as an important attribute for leaders. In 1978, James MacGregor Burns published a book entitled *Leadership*, widely regarded as a foundational leadership text. He viewed leadership as "a structure of acting that engages persons, to varying degrees, through the levels and among the interstices of society."[68] In his account, Burns differentiates between two types of leadership. First, transactional leadership points to how leaders act in an instrumental manner to achieve their goals. Second, transformational leadership refers to leaders who exhibit charisma, and are able to effect change by dint of their powerful personalities. Authentic leadership comes out of this belief in transformational leaders who can create organizational change. This change may not always be beneficial, however, since charismatic leaders sometimes wreak havoc on organizations, especially when a leader's self-regard is narcissistic. Moreover, a leader's excessive adherence to a particular vision may work to the detriment of the organization as a whole. To understand leadership, Burns argues that one must first comprehend the essence of power and realize that, ideally, leadership is formed in relationship, and connected to purpose.

In the modern workplace, Burns argues that bureaucratic structures may work to the detriment of ethical leadership, because stability is prized over spontaneity. This desire for stability ensures bureaucracies take on a culture of mediocrity that permeates the organization, and functions to obstruct challenges to the status quo. Whether a person's actions are virtuous or not matters less than that she comply with a particular mode of behaving. While subordinates may perceive bureaucratic authority as legitimate, they will fight against its constraints, sometimes consciously, sometimes unconsciously, because it

---

[68] James MacGregor Burns, *Leadership*, (New York: Harper and Row, 1978), 3.

fails to offer them a space whereby they are able to be the best they can. Spontaneity is also negatively affected by the language of job descriptions, goals, objectives and outcome-based measurements. People lose hope when the workplace is no more than an environment of conforming to policies, which they may find unsatisfactory or even unethical. Thus, we see how bureaucracy, in its desire for conformity, suppresses individual uniqueness. (I will return to problems with bureaucracy in chapter three.)

A different approach to leadership was advanced by Peter Greenleaf in 1977, with his concept of "servant leadership."[69] His theory proved popular with people who desired a more communitarian approach to leading, and also for those looking for a spiritual dimension. Because of a lack of caring and an overwhelming desire for profit, Greenleaf contends that concern regarding human flourishing, understood as the well-being of a community, is becoming erased by the desire for profit. He further argued that one of the major problems in the modern workplace is that we place too much emphasis on the leader instead of seeing her as part of the organizational team. In exploring why it is important for leaders to serve their communities and act ethically, he points to some negative trends. One such trend in the modern workplace is that, increasingly, individuals with conceptual skills are sidelined in favour of those who are more operationally-minded. But conceptual thinkers are needed, Greenleaf maintains, since these are the people who ask the most difficult questions. Without the input of those who are willing to question a leader's action, a management team may become complacent.

In his discussion of universities, Greenleaf notes that it is not sufficient for conceptual thinkers to be part of the faculty; they must also be part of the senior leadership team. Without the influence of conceptual thinkers, he argues that a university can turn into an uncaring institution, and lose sight of its deeper purpose. Larger questions are overtaken by economic imperatives, such as the belief that growth is necessarily good. Those who have the tenacity to reject this model will quickly find themselves out of place. When someone chooses to dissent, they are often regarded as disloyal, rather than perceived as

---

[69] Robert K. Greenleaf, *Servant Leadership: A Journey into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness*, ed. Larry C. Spears. (New York: Paulist Press, 2002).

upholding personal beliefs. According to Keith Grint, those who dare to question are replaced by "yes" people who turn into irresponsible followers, precisely because they refuse to tell the leader she is wrong for fear of reprisal.[70] What leadership needs most, he states, are "constructive dissenters" who recognize that leaders are not omniscient beings. In Grint's opinion, we need to "abandon Plato's question: 'Who should rule us?' and focus instead on Popper's question: 'How can we stop our rulers ruining us,'[71] a sentiment with which Arendt may well have found common cause.

I have provided this brief overview of leadership to situate authentic leadership within leadership studies. What emerges for me is the concern expressed regarding too much emphasis on leaders which may, in turn, lead to a lessening of bonds between people. We have also seen how instrumental ways of leading and bureaucratic structures place a greater emphasis on organizational effectiveness, which can be detrimental to ethical action. From this overview of leadership scholarship, we learn that authentic leadership comes out of the desire for transformational, charismatic leaders who can provide solutions to organizational problems. The desire for a strong leader may, at times, prove detrimental to an organization, not least because too much belief in a leader's capabilities can lead to a lack of responsibility on the part of others, something I will discuss in depth in chapter three.

I want to turn now to look at how various scholars perceive the benefits and drawbacks of leadership training, and how it relates to authenticity.

1.4.1   Leadership Training

Just as business schools can teach students management skills so, too, can leadership programs train people to be leaders, according to James Kouzes and Barry Pozner. To master the art of leadership, these authors assert, one must first develop 'the instrument of

---

[70] Keith Grint, *Leadership: Limits and Possibilities* (London: Palgrave MacMillan, 2005), 35.

[71] Grint, *Leadership*, 40.

leadership,' that is, the self.[72] Other scholars believe that leadership programs can teach people to be authentic. For example, Adrian Chan contends that when leaders add authenticity to their leadership skills, it serves as a 'leadership multiplier,' which improves individual and organizational success.[73] Yet this presupposes a person's ability to know herself is a straightforward process, and that it is possible to train a person to become an authentic leader. I see two problems with this type of thinking. First, it is difficult to comprehend how such leadership training could be evaluated. Would program evaluation consist of the completion of a questionnaire where a leader ranked her 'authenticity quota' before and after completion of a training course? Or would program success be judged on the perceptions of others prior to and after a leader's makeover? Second, what complicates the idea of leadership programming, as it relates to authenticity, is that training someone to perform in a particular way would seem to run counter to a person expressing her personal views. Hence, my second concern is the idea that authenticity can be learned through the "right" education. If authenticity is perceived as an individual attribute, it seems paradoxical to train leaders to be authentic. In fact, training people to perform leadership authentically would seem to curtail individuality. On the one hand, it is difficult to see how something as deeply personal as an individual's authenticity can be gained from specific training. On the other, if such a quality can be taught, then it suggests that Western notions of individuality are a myth.

Indeed, Cecily Cooper, Terry Scandia and Chester Schriesheim argue that it is pointless to develop authentic leadership programs until there is agreement as to what the construct means.[74] Moreover, it is unlikely that an adult's ethical behaviour can be changed, these authors contend, since a person's moral outlook has already been formed through social

---

[72] James M. Kouzes and Barry K. Pozner, *The Leadership Challenge* (San Francisco: John Wiley and Sons, 2007), 344.

[73] Adrian Chan, "Authentic Leadership Measurement: Challenges and Suggestions," in Gardner *et al.*, *Authentic Leadership*, 227-251.

[74] Cecily Cooper, Terri A. Scandura, and Chester A. Schriesheim, "Looking Forward but Learning from our Past: Potential Challenges to Developing Authentic Leadership Theory and Authentic Leaders," *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 3 *(*2005*): 475.

and cultural processes. Bill George concurs, arguing that leadership training that consists of "lists of leadership characteristics that one is supposed to emulate"[75] will not help a person develop their leadership strengths, or lead in a genuine manner. Rather, such training merely encourages people to construct what they consider to be an acceptable leadership image. George sees this image-making to be at the heart of the contemporary crisis of contemporary leadership, since it encourages inauthentic behaviour. He connects the current leadership crisis in corporate America with the narcissistic cult of personality that is endemic, not only to the corporate sector, but also in other arenas.[76] Because leaders of Fortune 500 companies are perceived as possessing knowledge, wealth and prestige, it is not surprising in our status-conscious world that others may want to emulate them. If someone wishes to adopt the methods of a successful leader, perhaps they will be more effective. However, I fail to see how adopting another person's style of leadership is, in any meaningful way, authentic.

While some scholars maintain that they can develop leadership training programs that allow leaders to express themselves in an individual way, this is disputed by a recent Swiss study, conducted by Nada Endrissat, Werner Müller and Stephanie Kaudela-Baum.[77] In this study, twenty-six managers were interviewed and asked to give their opinions about leadership training. These managers expressed hostility toward leadership training, not least because they felt it forced them to act in a particular way, which they regarded as inauthentic. It would seem from this study that leadership training, far from allowing leaders to discover their own style, made them feel like phonies. So while some

---

[75] Bill George, *Authentic Leadership: Rediscovering the Secrets to Creating Lasting Value.* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004), 11.

[76] How else can we understand the actions of David Rennie, former CEO of Toronto's Salvation Army, who broke the public's trust by selling $2 million dollars worth of toys and other donated goods, earmarked for needy children and their families. http://toronto.ctvnews.ca/police-seize-more-toys-in-salvation-army-theft-investigation-1.1060430. Accessed December 2, 2012.

[77] Nada Endrissat, Werner R. Müller and Stephanie Kaudela-Baum, "En Route to an Empirically-Based Understanding of Authentic Leadership," *European Management Journal*, 25, no. 3 (2007): 218. From their research findings, these scholars conclude that leadership programming needs to be less formulaic.

leadership scholars see authentic leadership as a way for people to express their individuality, this is not borne out by this particular study.

A significant problem with leadership training, according to Amanda Sinclair, is that it draws from positivist social psychology and the notion that it is possible to "track down the truth about leadership and train [people] in it."[78] Such training, as well as being prescriptive may, as Jill Blackmore points out, obscure socio-cultural differences.[79] It appears that leadership training is often designed according to Anglo-American models which, she argues, do not necessarily mesh well with other cultural environments. Because different cultures operate out of different ideological frameworks, Blackmore suggests that people think about leadership in different ways. From a Western perspective, ideas about individuality may have relevance whereas in other cultures with different beliefs a focus on the self may be less salient. When local context is ignored, this results in leadership development programs failing to respect cultural diversity. Jackie Ford agrees with Blackmore, maintaining that there is a tendency for leadership training to mask its Anglo-American roots and to appear as if it is a universal idea.[80] Moreover, there is an implicit assumption, in Ford's view, that leadership is necessary to an organization's well-being. Yet this emphasis on leadership may evoke a sense of helplessness on the part of employees, who become convinced that leaders are essential for their organization to flourish.

In examining some of the strengths and weaknesses of leadership training, we see how ideas about authenticity are culturally specific. Thus teaching leaders to be authentic may not translate well across cultures. What becomes apparent is that particular experiences, rooted in time and place, affect the ways that we think about leadership. In thinking about

---

[78] Amanda Sinclair, "Not Just 'Adding Women In': Women Re-making Leadership," Melbourne Business School Working Paper (2013), 16.

[79] Jill Blackmore, "Leadership for Social Justice: A Transnational Dialogue," *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, 4, no. 1 (June 2009): 2.

[80] Jackie Ford, "Discourses of Leadership: Gender Identity and Contradiction in an UK Public Service Industry, *Leadership* 2, no. 1, (February 2006): 77-99.

the place of authenticity in leadership, it is important to consider cultural context, as well as social and historical factors.

I want to turn now to consider what insights Arendt can offer.

1.5   Arendt

As I suggested earlier, thinking with Arendt can help us reconsider the role of authenticity in leadership in a manner cognizant of equality and difference. We have seen that while there are dissenters, the dominant motif is that authentic leadership is composed of four dimensions: balanced information processing, self-awareness, internalized moral perspective and relational transparency. In this section, I want to show why some of these claims are problematic from an Arendtian perspective.

For Arendt, self-knowledge as the basis for understanding is a deeply flawed notion. Rather than self-knowledge, she maintains that it is through action and speech that humans "show who they are, reveal actively their unique personal identities."[81] The widespread belief in inner depth is, in her opinion, a fallacy. Thus, a person can never know herself in the way that proponents of authentic leadership suggest since, according to Arendt, the person who appears clearly to others remains partially hidden from the actor herself. It is because we can never know fully who we are that we cannot base a theory of leadership on the self.

A central motif in Arendt's work is an insistence that we fail to comprehend who someone is because we concentrate on their "whatness." For instance, in Western society, when introduced to a new person, a common question is "what do you do?" People are judged, consciously or unconsciously, depending upon their response, as certain professions are regarded more highly than others. But someone's profession fails to alert us to a person's uniqueness. Rather,

> [w]ho somebody is or was we can know only by knowing the story of which

---

[81] Arendt, *Human Condition*, 179.

he is himself the hero…everything else we know of him, including the work

he may have produced and left behind, tells us only what he is or was.[82]

In *The Human Condition*, Arendt notes how the Greeks used the term "*daimon"* to refer to something that was intrinsic to a particular individual, not a fleeting quality like happiness. This distinctive identity is not the same as a person's talents or shortcomings; these character traits tell us what a person is good, or bad, at doing. The *daimon* relates to "who" a person is. For the Greeks, a person's essence could only be articulated after their death, at which point it was the role of the storyteller to recount a person's life. Arendt asserts that no-one can be the author of their own life story, because it is impossible to fully grasp who someone is until after they are dead. Hence, an individual's life-story can only be told, in its fullness, as a narrative delivered by another after their death. The purpose of narrative is to provide a powerful means of remembrance. Indeed, it is through the stories that we share that we obtain an understanding of the world.[83]

In Arendt's view, a person's unique identity is always to be understood as both relational and embodied because each time we act and speak we do so within an already existent web of human relationships. Yet how we perceive ourselves is often different to how we appear to others. We do not appear to the world in the guise of an inner self; rather, we appear before others through self-display.[84] In *The Life of the Mind*, Arendt notes that self-display has two meanings. The first meaning is to display ourselves in terms of being seen, heard or touched. The second meaning is to display our inner self. She concentrates on the former notion of self-display, since it is our outward appearance that others engage with. While we may try to manage our self-presentation, there will always be aspects that escape our control. Furthermore, Arendt contests the surface/depth idea of subjectivity by stating "our common conviction that what is inside ourselves, our 'inner life,' is more

---

[82] Arendt, *Human Condition*, 186.

[83] I will return to an Arendtian notion of narrative in chapter four.

[84] Arendt, *Life of the Mind*, ed. Mary McCarthy (New York: Harcourt, Brace Jovanovich, 1971), 28-30.

relevant to what we 'are' than what appears on the outside is an illusion."[85] In the world of appearances, that is the world of others, we show ourselves through deeds and actions. In the world of the mind, that is the world of self, we reveal ourselves through the medium of thought. Simply put, it is through action that we reveal ourselves to others, while it is through reflection that we reveal ourselves to ourselves.

In relation to leadership, Arendt argues that too much emphasis on self-knowledge contradicts the contingent nature of action. She maintains that a leader should not be judged on her achievements, the outcome of which can never be known in advance, but on her initiative, since it is impossible to plan for all eventualities because of action's unpredictability. Such unexpectedness, although intrinsic to human existence, contravenes the rules and regulations a society puts in place to ensure law and order. In *The Human Condition*, Arendt traces the desire for self-control back to Plato who, she contends, disliked the vagaries of action. He regarded men as mere puppets on a stage, controlled by the invisible hand of fate, and preferred *poeisis* (making) to *praxis* (action) because the former had a predictable outcome.[86] It was because Plato wanted to give human affairs solidity that he argued that action, because of its capricious nature, should be separated from thought.

Arendt maintains that Plato's disillusionment with political life, as a result of the trial and subsequent execution of Socrates, was to have major repercussions on ways of thinking about leadership. Instead of the collective equality of the citizens of the *polis*, the new criterion for ruling was based upon a separation between leader and the led. In her words,

> The supreme criterion of fitness for ruling others is, in Plato and in the
> aristocratic tradition of the West, the capacity to rule one's self. Just as the
> philosopher-king commands the city, the soul commands the body and reason

---

[85] Arendt, *Life of the Mind*, 30.

[86] Arendt, *Human Condition*, 185.

commands the passion."[87]

Here we see that the Platonic notion of leadership is based on a hierarchy of values. In laying a political foundation based on law, Plato argued that action, because of its unpredictability, must be separated from thought. Over time, knowledge became linked to commanding others, whereas action is connected with obedience and the execution of orders. With this decisive split between beginning and ruling, Arendt maintains that Plato led the way for a conception of ruling that was anathema to human freedom because plurality was denied in favour of sovereignty.[88]

Arendt is critical of the way Plato conceived of public leadership as akin to that of the head of the household. In ancient Greece, the head of the household was like a tyrant, since he had total power over all who lived in the household. Basing a theory of leadership on the master/slave relationship of the household ensures that communal action is usurped in favour of a supreme hierarchy between the head of the household and everyone else. This form of leadership as mastery undermines the role of action in leadership, because the ruler is seen as the person who initiates action while others carry out his orders. In Arendt's view, this separation between the one who envisions something and the one who carries out that task brought about a hierarchical understanding of rulership, which served to debase an "authentic understanding of human freedom."[89]

In time, the separation between thinking and action led to the rule of the few over the many, and "the fallacy of the strong man who is powerful because he is alone."[90] Yet the notion of the strong, isolated leader is a myth, states Arendt, as it is only through working together that action can be accomplished. She notes how the Greek word *archein*

---

[87] Arendt, *Human Condition*, 224.

[88] Arendt, *Human Condition*, 225.

[89] Arendt, *Human Condition*, 225.

[90] Arendt, *Human Condition*, 40.

originally meant to begin something, as well as to lead, whereas the Latin equivalent was *agere,* which means to lead by setting something in motion.[91] These linguistic changes in the notion of rulership result in the importance of working collectively becoming forgotten. Instead, a leader is seen as someone who begins an action, which others execute on their behalf. This disconnection between the leader and others is potentially dangerous, since a leader's isolation from others creates an atmosphere of fear and suspicion.

In addition, in her exploration of the Athenian world, Arendt argues that to show oneself was essential to the Greek understanding of action. Excellence, known as *arête* in Greek and *virtus* in Latin, was limited to actions in the public arena. Thus, the political sphere was equated with the highest form of existence. The political realm was where a man could gain public admiration, so important to assuage individual vanity. Hence, the Greek *polis* represented a place to commemorate the deeds of great men. Initially, the word "hero" did not refer to someone who is courageous. Its original Homeric meaning was a free man who participated in the Trojan wars, and of whom a story could be told. It was through the storyteller's words that a hero gained immortality, something that the Greeks desired above all else. In Homer's retelling, everyone shows courage when they are willing to take action. Hence, poets like Homer had a political function, that is, to immortalize Greek action.

The Greek *polis* was regarded as the exclusive realm of freedom because citizens came together to share their opinions and make decisions on public affairs. A willingness to act was perceived as the foundation of freedom; however, it required courage to devote oneself to public life because it meant that you had to be willing to share your views with others. For the Greeks, the word "public" had two meanings. The first relates to being seen and heard, and is the manner in which an individual appeared before others. The second meaning of public is world, which represents the sum of human activity. Arendt often refers to this as "inter-est," meaning the space that resides between us, such as a

---

[91] Arendt, *Human Condition*, 177.

table that we sit around to share ideas. This in-between space constitutes the place of human interaction. As well, for the Greeks, a life lived at home was not regarded as a good life, because it meant that a man was not taking an active part in the *polis*. In fact, privacy originally meant to be deprived of something. Being outside the public realm, the fate of most men and all women in Ancient Greece meant that a person was not considered to be fully "human." Although the *polis* was the exclusive realm of freedom for male citizens, for the majority, that is, women, slaves, as well as working men, this arena of liberty was closed.[92]

In her later work, such as *The Life of the Mind*, Arendt argues that too much concentration on action ignores a critical function of leadership that is reflection, or what she calls the "stop and think." She distinguishes between the thinking being and the acting self, arguing that when we act we take on a singularity of purpose, whereas when we think we engage in internal dialogue. Thinking alerts us to the fact that we are what Arendt, following Socrates, refers to as "the two in one." In contradistinction to action, when we think, there is an interior dialogue that takes place between me and myself. Thinking enables us to understand, not in terms of knowledge, but in terms of meaning. Without the capacity for reflective thought, leaders may lose their ethical moorings since they will not be able to reflect upon their mistakes. Without this ability to reflect, a person may end up taking action that is harmful to others. Arendt underscored this fact in her examination of Adolf Eichmann, whom she regarded as evil because he was thoughtless. The "banality of evil," which she saw as Eichmann's signature, derived from his seeming inability to think about the effects of what he was doing, together with his refusal to take responsibility for his actions.[93] What is clear is that leaders must not only be able to act, but to reflect on their actions.

---

[92] To use an analogy, one could say that this originating realm of Western freedom was an elite men's club, since it was only those male citizens with property and birthright who were allowed to take part.

[93] Arendt begins *The Life of the Mind* questioning Eichmann's thoughtlessness, and asking whether it is thoughtlessness that is at the base of what constitutes evil. I explore this further in chapter three.

1.5.1   Authority and Leadership

To understand leadership, according to Arendt, it is necessary to comprehend the meaning of authority. In her essay "What is Authority?" [94] she explores the different ways that belief in legitimate authority has virtually disappeared in modern times. The breakdown in authority is due to increasing secularism, and the ensuing lack of faith in traditional beliefs. The problem, in her view, is that there is a distinct possibility that modern society has chosen to stop learning from the past. But it is valuable to delve into history, Arendt asserts, because it enables us to understand ourselves through the stories that we share over time and space.

In Arendt's exploration of the meaning of authority, she tries to ascertain what we can learn from the past through an examination of legitimate versus illegitimate forms of rule. A central facet of her argument is that we no longer understand what authority means because we confuse authority with force. But she maintains that the use of force is indicative of a failure of authority. Conversely, authority is when both the person in power and her subjects regard this rule as lawful. For Arendt, authoritarian rule stands in opposition to forcible coercion, or persuasive argumentation, because it is based upon an implicit relationship between the one who commands, and those who obey. This form of rule represents a legitimate hierarchy since both the leader and the follower concur with the relationship. In her view, power stands in opposition to its negative counterparts, force and violence, which are emblematic of harmful ways of ruling. But Arendt contends that liberal thinkers fail to distinguish between these phenomena. As an example, she shows how the term "all power corrupts," is a meaningless phrase, because it overlooks the crucial distinction between legitimate and illegitimate manifestations of power.

---

[94] Arendt, "What is Authority?" In *Between Past and Future: Eight Exercises in Political Thought*. (London: Penguin, 1993), 91-143. In her essay, she traces the difference between the Roman and Greek notion of authority. For the Romans, authority is based on the notion of tradition, and a veneration of important events in the past.

An illegitimate manifestation of power is that of totalitarian rule. Regimes based on totalitarian rule, as Arendt tells us, stand in opposition to human plurality, because "a polis belonging to one man is no polis."[95] Accordingly, any leadership regime that is conceived as deriving from a sovereign will is not conducive to good government. Hence, she vehemently disagrees with Rousseau's notion of the government of one will because sovereignty denies the basis of human freedom, that is, the ability for people to share perspectives. This, for her, represents an illegitimate form of rule. Conversely, Arendt argues that leadership functions best when it arises out of individuals working together, rather than directed by a person in charge. A type of *polis* can appear at any time when people come together for a common goal. In our time, we can see an Arendtian-style *polis* emerge whenever there is concerted action taken by groups who are striving for justice such as Occupy Wall Street, the Arab Spring, or the Idle No More movement in Canada. When people come together over common cause, they discover the strength that comes from collective action. This is why Arendt contends it is possible for a small group of concerted individuals to overthrow a dictatorship. Collective power has a libratory quality because it is through the medium of collective action that a committed group of people can topple dictators.

1.5.2   Social Conformity

For Arendt, there is another form of rule that is contrary to human flourishing and that is social conformism, which results in an inability to respect and foster uniqueness. In her view, social conformism is a modern phenomenon that arose in the eighteenth century.[96] Rather than equality for all, it created a kind of no-man rule where society dictates what we do, and how we think. Within this framework, action became subservient to behaviour because we do what is expected of us. We obey and do our duty. In our desire for acceptance, we risk turning away from our personal values to embrace social standards. When this happens we become unclear as to our moral responsibility to take a stance

---

[95] Arendt, "What is Authority," 105.

[96] For more on this topic, see Arendt's discussion in *The Human Condition*, 38-50.

against injustice. For Arendt, "rules of uniqueness and exclusiveness are, and always will be, in conflict with the standards of society."[97] Seen in this way, individual freedom, understood as a right to uniqueness, is curtailed whenever we believe we are all equal, but fail to take into account that we are all equally distinct.

For Arendt, the fundamental aspect of freedom is connected with the ability to speak and act in the public realm. I suggest, however, that social conformity is counterproductive to a deeper notion of authenticity since, rather than a world of unique others, what we have is a regulatory framework of policies and procedures. This we see constantly in the twenty-first century workplace as concepts such as risk management are put in place so as to tighten up institutional practices. In the introduction, I questioned why it is that authentic leadership has emerged as a topic of interest. Could it be that a guiding motif of our time is that of distrust, not only of leaders but of each other? A society of distrust emerges, in tandem with a penchant for instrumental modes of thinking, and may result in a lack of caring for others. But I am not sure that, in its current form, authentic leadership is able to offer us the guidance we need to create a more harmonious society.

In this section, I have argued that thinking with Arendt reveals some of the negative implications with leadership theories that purport to be about authentic relationships but are based on quantitative measurement that ignore broader questions regarding care, and highlight the problems with conformity.

We need to consider authenticity through a different lens in order to obtain a more rounded view of leadership. In the following section, I want to concentrate on women and leadership.

---

[97] This quote is from Arendt's contentious essay where she argued that the marriage laws against miscegenation were worse than school segregation. Arendt was roundly criticised for her comments, and she did apologise to Sidney Hook. I think her argument makes more sense within the context of her overall views on social conformity, and the dangers of assimilation. See "Reflections on Little Rock," in *The Portable Hannah Arendt*, ed. Peter Baehr (London: Penguin Books: 2000), 239.

1.6   Women and Leadership

 Arendt referred to herself as old-fashioned when it came to her views about women leaders. In response to an interview question from Günter Gaus, she stated: "It just doesn't look good when a woman gives orders. She should try not to get into such a situation if she wants to remain feminine."[98] Her bias against women leaders is still commonplace in society, as a recent survey points out.[99] It seems that even in the twenty-first century a significant percentage of employees state their preference for a male boss. In this section, I want to explore feminist accounts that critique authentic leadership. Before doing so, I wish to briefly consider earlier feminist critiques of work.

In looking at feminist critiques of organizational behaviour, Joan Acker contends that second-wave feminists "denounced bureaucracy and hierarchy as male-created and male-dominated structures of control."[100]An integral part of second-wave feminists' desire for change in the workplace was, she states, the creation of organizations that would operate in non-hierarchical ways. Instead of a new kind of workplace, however, the results were more of the same, that is, a number of women leaders acted as badly as some of their male counterparts. Partly, this was because, as Dorothy Smith maintains,[101] there were no models available for feminists to rethink organizational structures. Therefore, it was difficult to create an organization model outside of the normative framework.

---

[98] In the same interview, Arendt went on to say that while she may be old-fashioned in her thinking, as far as her own life was concerned she had done exactly as she pleased. These contradictions between what Arendt says about the need for women to be feminine and her own determination to follow her own path are one of many paradoxes that appear in her work. See Arendt, "What Remains? The Language Remains:" A Conversation with Günter Gaus," in *Essays in Understanding: 1930-1954*, ed. Jerome Kohn (New York: Harcourt Brace and Company, 1994), 1-24.

[99] Here I am referring to the survey results of Kim M. Elsesser and Janet Lever mentioned in an earlier footnote.

[100] Joan Acker, "Hierarchies, Jobs, Bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organizations," *Gender and Society,* 4 no. 2 (1990): 139–58, 141.

[101] See Dorothy Smith's discussion on the relations of ruling in *The Conceptual Practices of Power: A Feminist Sociology of Knowledge* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990), 14-18.

These earlier feminist critiques are still pertinent to current problems. For instance, although gender segregation has altered, change is not the same across the workforce, according to Paula England.[102] While middle-class women have made substantial gains in professions such as medicine and law there is virtually no change for women in traditional blue-collar jobs. She suggests that middle-class women chose to go into male professions so as to gain financial reward and status, rather than follow their mothers into more traditional feminine occupations, such as teaching. This has resulted in the continued devaluation of traditional women's work.[103] Moreover, in fields, such as social work or nursing, there has not been a notable increase in male students because social discrimination is greater for men who choose to pursue female professions. Those men who choose traditional female occupations are faced with a lack of status, financial rewards, as well as social disapproval. Hence England argues there is little incentive for men to change careers. One reason for this continuing gender segregation is that there has been no substantial change in social ideas regarding heterosexual relationships. Rather, the private realm reaffirms gender inequality, which has ongoing implications for the workplace in general, and women's leadership in particular.

Stereotypical ideas about gender also continue to affect women's ability to reach equal pay, as well as hamper their advancement to higher positions. According to Linda Carli and Alice Eagly, in 2009 American women who worked full-time earned 80% of the male wage in comparison with 62% in 1979.[104] In examining why this gender disparity still exists, they maintain that there is still demonstrable opposition toward women leaders at the higher echelons of organizational life. As an example in Europe, the United

---

[102] Paula England, "The Gender Revolution: Uneven and Stalled," *Gender and Society,* 24, no. 2 (2010): 149-166.

[103] England notes that in 2007, 80% of American college-educated women were employed versus 47% for high school or high-school dropouts. In 1970 the figure was 59% for college-educated women, and virtually the same at 43% for high school women. These statistics demonstrate that women with college-education have made tremendous strides in the workplace, but this has not been the experience of women as a whole.

[104] Alice Eagly and Linda Carli, *Through the Labyrinth: The Truth about how Women become Leaders* (Harvard Business School Press, Boston: 2007).

States and Canada, women make up less than 20% of senior corporate executives.[105] Paradoxically, Carli and Eagly argue that women exert greater influence when they exhibit lower levels of competence than they actually possess. As a way of gaining notice, it appears that some women ask for help from their male colleagues when such guidance is not required. Moreover, while male leaders do well by being agentic, women must appeal to communal ideals to be seen as successful leaders. Hence, a relational approach may actually work against a woman leader, since it reinforces gender stereotypes.

Eagly adopted the term "relational authenticity" [106] to describe how leaders can promote social values that followers buy into. Leadership depends upon encouraging others to share your vision so as to work together for shared values. While many leadership scholars have previously assumed that followers are persuaded by leader's words, Eagly maintains that there is often contestation between a leader's belief and a community's willingness to buy in. Followers need to believe not just that the leader has values, but that these values will benefit the community as a whole. During the last decade, she has conducted a series of longitudinal studies on women and leadership. Her research findings suggest that when women are initially hired to lead an institution, they may act differently than their male counterparts because of their different value commitments. Over the long term, however, this gender difference tends to dissipate. So while female leaders may be more vigilant in regards to business ethics, this gender difference may disappear the longer a woman is in a position of leadership. This is a problem, since if women leaders take up similar ways of acting to men, then, while gender equity may be helped, organizations will not be transformed. Similarly, Barbara Kellerman and Deborah Rhode argue that "the great man" leadership model still acts as a significant barrier for

---

[105] A recent survey by *Catalyst* in June 2013 shows that while 47.5% of the Canadian workforce is female, only 5.5% are CEO's or top earners. Other research by Catalyst in the United States confirms Eagly and Carli's findings that after gains in the 1990s, there is little movement for women gaining access to corporate leadership. See their various reports at http://www.catalyst.org/knowledge, accessed July 5, 2013.

[106] Eagly, "Relational Authenticity," 463. Her work was mentioned earlier in this chapter.

women.[107] These authors concur with Eagly that placing certain women in powerful positions will not lead to the empowerment of women as a group.

In striving for equality in the workplace what has happened is that women's limited ascension to top leadership posts has been conceived in terms of representation when, in reality, what is needed is a troubling of organizational structures. This is one reason why Jill Blackmore and Judith Sachs state that although individual women may have benefitted from leadership opportunities on the whole, gender relations have remained the same.[108] They call for new research on women's leadership that shines a light on organizational practices. By considering structural issues, alongside gender relations, it may become apparent how bureaucracies are intolerant of difference. For example, in considering the changing educational landscape and the move toward entrepreneurialism within universities, Blackmore and Sachs maintain there is a greater emphasis on similarity in understanding, and an expected commitment to corporate goals, especially amongst senior management. Practices of conformity are evident in the way people dress, in the rituals of meetings, and the symbolic use of space. Who is allocated the best location, or the biggest office, serves to reinforce institutional hierarchy, and offers spatial insight into power dynamics. Consequently, these scholars suggests that the "ongoing whiteness and maleness of educational, political, business, and community leadership is not about gender, but is a problem for democracy."[109]

Currently, in the educational sector, there is a massive push to corporatize higher education. Critics like Blackmore contend that such restructuring puts the emphasis on what are perceived to be masculine ideas of efficiency, accountability and outcomes, over less instrumental feminized leadership discourses. The problem, however, is that these

---

[107] Barbara Kellerman and Deborah Rhode, eds. *Women and Leadership: The State of Play and Strategies for Change (*San Francisco: John Wiley and Sons, 2007). Moreover, they argue that, in many American institutions, there is a huge gap between a company's policies and what happens day-by-day.

[108] Jill Blackmore and Judyth Sachs, *Performing and Reforming Leaders*: *Gender, Educational Restructuring, and Organizational Change*, (Albany: State of Albany Press, 2007).

[109] Blackmore and Sachs, 270.

feminized versions, in turn, may serve to constrain women's leadership, because women lead in different ways. As well, Louise Morley suggests that it is important to distinguish between women and feminists in academic leadership. She further argues that feminist leaders must be willing "to challenge unequal distributions and exercise of power, hierarchical structures and decision-making processes and discriminatory institutional practices."[110] In her view, it is the gendered world that is the problem. Yet I am somewhat uncomfortable with the idea that feminists lead in a particular manner. While it might be heartwarming to think in these terms, we need to remember that uniqueness is constantly covered over by social practices and ideological ways of thinking. And this includes some strains of feminism.

One way to try and overcome structural challenges and gendered biases in higher education, according to Rita Bornstein, is for women leaders to monitor their own attitudes so as not to reinforce traditional stereotypes. As the first female Jewish president of Rollins College she knows, from personal experience, how difficult it can be to achieve presidential legitimacy. At the beginning of her tenure, Bornstein describes how she experienced a great deal of hostility. For example, one senior administrator stated that the College was not ready for a Jewish president, let alone a woman.[111] She further contends that presidents face constant challenges to their moral leadership. For example, a president may have to suppress her personal views so as to uphold the values of the institution. But there is, in her view, a lack of information regarding the relationship between leadership, gender and ethics, which is vital if women leaders wish to address structural inequities.[112]

---

[110] Louise Morley, "The Rules of the Game: Women and the Leaderist Turn in Higher Education," *Gender and Education*, 25, no. 1 (2013): 126.

[111] Rita Bornstein, "Women and the Quest for Presidential Legitimacy" in Dean, *Women in Academic Leadership: Professional Strategies, Personal Choices* (Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, 2010), 214.

[112] Bornstein, "Women," 220.

It is important to understand structural power dynamics, and realize that we have agency to resist institutional norms to some degree. The problem is that over time, social and cultural systems work to ensure women either do not get power, or do not believe that they possess it. According to Amanda Sinclair, feelings of "powerlessness are historically substantiated."[113] This is not to see women as victims, but to recognize how past injustices may influence present behaviour. She advocates blending the personal with the professional so as to obtain a deeper understanding of how one's earlier education and family dynamics may help, or hinder, one's leadership. Understanding personal history can be useful in explaining why so many senior leadership teams, rather than disagree with the leader, tend to be conformist in their attitudes.

But there are other contradictions at work. For example, while people often say that they want to work in a caring environment, it appears that most people state a preference to be led by strong leaders who may posit non-caring attributes, since this is often perceived as successful leadership behaviour. This role incongruity works against women leaders in two ways. First, prejudice takes the form of perceiving women as being out of place in a leadership role. In general terms, she is perceived to have less agentic qualities because of her gender. Second, if a woman behaves in a manner that fulfills common expectations of leadership behaviour, for instance, by being assertive, she is evaluated in a negative way because her action is perceived as inappropriate, perhaps even inauthentic behaviour for women.[114] For this situation to alter, Eagly and Karau maintain that there has to be major societal change, not only in the way that most people perceive gender relations, but also in how we conceptualize leadership.

It appears that women leaders face a double-bind in that while employees say they want to work in a caring environment, they do not want leaders who exhibit a caring demeanour, because this is perceived as a sign of weakness. This equation of caring with

---

[113] Sinclair, *Leadership for the Disillusioned*, 81.

[114] Alice H. Eagly and Stephen J. Karau, "Role Congruity Theory of Prejudice toward Female Leaders," *Psychological Review*, 109, no. 3 (2002): 576-577.

weakness reinforces the belief that we need strong, independent leaders. Yet, according to Paul Begley, it is only through caring for the values of others that authentic leadership can occur.[115] But it may be difficult for men, as well as women, to lead in a way they perceive as caring. From her interviews with male and female presidents, Pamela Eddy illustrates how leaders have problems when they attempt to "transgress" gender appropriate ways of acting.[116] She describes a situation where a male president espoused a team-based approach. Rather than seeing him as an inclusive leader, faculty perceived him as weak. Thus, Eddy suggests that people still judge success from an outdated, autocratic, model of leadership that makes it difficult for leaders to deviate from the gender norm.

Another issue to consider relates to scholarship. For example, most research in organizational leadership, according to Jennifer Binns and Deborah Kerfoot, is "saturated with embodied masculinity."[117] But this is a particular kind of masculinity that views leadership as mastery, which merely perpetuates unequal power relationships. Similarly, Beverly Irby and others argue that leadership theory fails to include "feminine presence or voice."[118] Increasingly, however, there are challenges to this way of thinking about leadership. For instance, Yvonne Due Billing and Matts Alvesson argue that earlier feminist work reproduced gendered dichotomies by suggesting that women leaders lead

---

[115] Paul Begley, "Self-knowledge, Capacity and Sensitivity: Prerequisites to Authentic Leadership by School Principals," *Journal of Educational Administration*, 44, no. 6 (2006): 583. He also states that any theory pertaining to ethics needs to be considered critically rather than adopted without question.

[116] Pamela Eddy, "Leading Gracefully: Gendered Leadership at Community Colleges." In Dean, *Women in Academic Leadership,* 26.

[117] Jennifer Binns and Deborah Kerfoot, "Editorial: Engendering Leadership Dedicated to the Spirit and the Scholarship of the Late Joan Eveline," *Gender, Work and Organization*, 18, no. 3, (2011): 258.

[118] Beverly J. Irby, Genevieve Brown, Jo Ann Duffy, and Diane Trautman, "The Synergistic Leadership Theory," *Journal of Educational Administration*, 40, no. 4 (2002): 304-322.

differently.[119] Much of the scholarship on women's leadership that was conducted in the 1980s and 1990s, they argue, became mired in the nature/nurture dispute. Such an approach to leadership does not fully explain how normative assumptions regarding leadership reinforce gender prejudice. Instead, we need to rethink notions of masculinity and femininity as culturally created and reiterated bodily practices.

In a similar vein, Michèle Bowring notes that leadership research that suggests that women lead differently from men serves to reaffirm dualistic thinking. All this does is reinforce dominant modes of thinking about gender relations. It is thus not enough to "lean in" and bring one's whole self to work, as Sheryl Sandberg asserts, because this does little to explain how structural inequities work.[120] Furthermore, her assertion that authentic communication is akin to that which takes place on Facebook serves to show how authenticity is often perceived in a superficial way. What we see here is a flattening of a deeper sense of authentic connection in favour of superficial forms of relating. What we need is a more nuanced theoretical approach that takes into account intersectional identity as well as lived experience.[121]

One aspect that is not sufficiently critiqued, according to Jennifer Binns, is the notion that confidence is always a good for leadership. She contends that a leader's desire for self-certainty may negate ethical transformation, since creating ethical relationships means

---

[119] Yvonne Due Billing and Matts Alvesson, "Questioning the Notion of Feminine Leadership: A Critical Perspective on the Gender Labelling of Leadership," *Gender, Work and Organization*, 7, no. 3 (2000): 146.

[120] Sheryl Sandberg, *Lean In: Women, Work, and the Will to Lead*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2013. While Sandberg does not totally ignore social factors, for the most part, her book is concerned with how women should become more strident in the workplace rather than holding back.

[121] A recent study by Ryerson University states that while 40% of leaders in education are women, only 17% of the corporate top jobs are held by women. The higher level of women leaders in education is because the report collapses higher education with the school system, where women have been in teaching positions for much longer than other professions. See Wendy Cukier, Pinoo Bindhani, Sarah Amato, Shelley Smarz, and Amonrat Saekang, *Diversity Leads: Women in Senior Leadership Positions: A Profile of the Greater Toronto Area*, 2012.

being open to doubt.[122] While confidence is perceived as vital to a particular kind of masculine leadership, being open to doubt can overturn the dominant leadership "script" by providing an openness to consider different perspectives, and create new possibilities. A relational approach to leadership allows a person to not only acknowledge, but learn from mistakes.[123] Perhaps it is through an attention to relationships that combines a desire for equality and justice with mutual responsibility and care that we may work toward a different approach toward authenticity in leadership. By acknowledging contingency, as well as lived experience, we may be able to think further about the conditions for an ethical leadership praxis. Such an ethical leadership practice may run counter to the specific dimensions that represent authentic leadership. To think this further, we must be willing to engage in an open enquiry that is receptive to opposing views, and tries to take into account situational context. This is what I hope thinking with Arendt may provide.

1.7   Conclusion

In this chapter, we have examined the concept of authentic leadership, and its relationship to gender. I have shown how this theory tends to focus on certain dimensions of leading that serve to preclude others. There is a desire to restrict authentic leadership to a discussion of four dimensions, namely, balanced information processing, relational transparency, internalized moral perspective and self-awareness. Moreover, there is an implicit assumption that authenticity is good for leadership. In their attempt to develop a universal theory of leadership, scholars privilege a particular kind of theoretical abstraction, which serves to deny the contingency of lived experience.

Rather than arguing that authenticity in leadership is necessarily a good thing, we must be willing to interrogate the reasons why sometimes this might not be the case. This requires

---

[122]Jennifer Binns, "The Ethics of Relational Leading: Gender Matters," *Gender, Work and Organization*, 15, no. 6, (November 2008): 614. At the same time, Binns notes that this is not without problems because confidence is usually perceived as a masculine trait whereas self-doubt is feminized.

[123] Binns, *Ethics*, 601.

us to critique prevailing power inequities rather than assuming that by adding authenticity to the mix, we will develop good leaders. Earlier, I posed the question - would a world populated by authentic leaders be a better one? While some leadership scholars presume that a world populated by authentic leaders would be a better one, history is littered with examples of leaders who have been certain they are right, only to be found terribly wanting by posterity when the untold suffering of their single-minded belief, and the untold suffering caused to others, is taken into consideration. Thus we need to be willing to question whether authenticity is necessarily good for leadership.

I have suggested that thinking with Arendt may help to uncover some of the inherent problems with the discourse of authentic leadership, especially the ways in which a focus on leadership that privileges self-knowledge can be detrimental. I have argued that some scholars fail to interrogate the multifarious ways in which the intersections of identity have a bearing, not only on leadership, but on what it means to be true to ourselves. Put simply, a focus on the self can lead to a disconnection from the world, which may have negative implications for a pluralistic society. Moreover, ignoring the intersubjective dimension of everyday life can result in leaders becoming separated from everyday concerns, and acting in self-indulgent ways to the detriment of everyone else. Thinking with Arendt may illuminate some hidden consequences that arise from leadership that is self-oriented. In addition, her theory of uniqueness reveals how our relationships and forms of mutual responsiveness are central to existence. By seeing leadership in relational terms that weaves together diverse perspectives, her work opens up fruitful avenues of investigation. As such, Arendt provides us with an alternative ethical guide to considering the place of authenticity in leadership.

I have also argued that social conformity and ideas regarding gender normativity negatively influence how we approach leadership. In trying to fit in, some women choose to assimilate to dominant styles of leadership. While assimilation may seem a sensible route, it may lead to a perpetuation of structural inequality. We need to comprehend how the many skeins of social, political, historical and cultural forces have a profound bearing on our thinking about leadership. If, as I argue, gender prejudice is embedded in the Western cultural imagination, then it may prove fruitful to turn to history to see what

effects this had on women's ability to lead, as well as gendered notions of authenticity. This will be the main topic of the next chapter.

Chapter 2

2 Enlightened Virtue

In a famous essay written in 1784, Immanuel Kant argued that it is only when a man is free to make his own choices that he can be said to be enlightened.[124] In his opinion, "enlightened" freedom was composed of three components: the ability to think for oneself; the ability to think from the standpoint of others; and, lastly, the capacity to think and act in concert with one's beliefs. In this chapter, I explore how these ideas about enlightened freedom relate to women, and look at the effect this had on notions of authenticity and leadership. I focus on Western Europe, since this was where modern ideas surrounding authenticity were initially formulated. In tracing authenticity's modern underpinnings to the emergence of bourgeois selfhood, I show how women's desire to lead was affected by notions of gender propriety. My main thesis is that Enlightenment notions of virtue worked to constrain women's autonomy, and limited their ideas about their own possibilities. In examining Enlightenment ideas regarding the construction of the liberal subject, I argue that gendered notions of what constituted "right" conduct served to enhance men's freedom while, simultaneously, restricting women's agency. This is evident in a guiding bourgeois motif of the time that "the sons of reason should converse only with the daughters of virtue."[125]

Gendered ideas concerning what constitutes virtuous action served to instruct, and divide, men and women, and placed restrictions on women's ability to regard themselves as leaders within the socio-political sphere. I argue that gendered notions of virtue were a way for bourgeois society to redefine its moral standards in opposition to their aristocratic counterparts, whom they considered to be immoral. These bourgeois attitudes toward virtue encouraged a separation of gender roles. While for a man virtue was

---

[124] Immanuel Kant (1782), "An Answer to the Question What is Enlightenment." Reprinted in J. Schmitt, ed. *What is Enlightenment? Eighteenth-Century Answers and Twentieth-Century Questions* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1996), 58-65.

[125] Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707-1837* (Reading: Yale University Press, 2005), 23.

exemplified by his character, for a woman her social reputation was regarded as more important than her character. The effects of this gendered discourse regarding virtue, alongside women's economic dependency and lack of political and legal rights, served to constrain women's possibilities. Whereas bourgeois man viewed himself as a relatively free agent within an increasingly competitive public realm, bourgeois woman was defined by her marital and maternal roles. This had the effect of restricting women's sphere of influence to the domain of the domestic, whilst men were able to develop a more expansive existence through the public sphere of action, ideas and adventure. These spatial differences between what was considered appropriate action and behaviour had an adverse effect on the way that women conceived of their agency. To an extent, as I argued in chapter one, these spatial restrictions still bear a trace on the cultural imagination, to the extent that many women do not perceive themselves as leaders.

In the eighteenth century, as the rights of middle-class men were being espoused, women's freedom became increasingly restrained by social conventions, as indicated by Rousseau's popular phrase that women were "born to obey."[126] One way that this lived obedience manifested itself was through gendered ideas about caring. For women, caring for others, rather than the self, became regarded as the epitome of feminine virtue. As well, carefulness became the watchword for women, as they learned how important it was not just to be selfless, but to ensure that any pretension to talent was kept quiet. This dual legacy of obedience and selflessness impeded most women's sense of possibility, and affected adversely their ability to see themselves, and be perceived, as leaders outside the domestic sphere. Taken together, these social and cultural restrictions served to limit most women's ability to see themselves as leaders outside of the domestic realm. However, it would be wrong to suggest that these social dictates proved insurmountable. There were examples of women who were courageous enough to brave public censure in order to become involved in political debate, although these women remain the exception.

---

[126] Jean-Jacques Rousseau quoted in Colley, Linda *Britons: Forging the Nation*, 240.

The historian Joan Scott contends that we need to examine gender in its historical context so as to see how, as a phenomenon, gender is "produced, reproduced and transformed in different situations and over time."[127] In order to obtain a fuller account of the phenomenon of gender as it relates to authenticity and leadership in the Enlightenment, I shall explore the life and work of particular thinkers, as well as the wider social, legal and political restrictions on women's lives. As part of my argument, I compare the work of Enlightenment thinkers to gain a deeper understanding of the gendered discourse of virtue.

After briefly laying out some pertinent historical information, I begin with a discussion of Montesquieu's *Persian Letters*, which represents a veiled critique of the French court as well as an attack on social hypocrisy. Through his description of a changing Parisian society we observe how, due to the vagaries of modernity, people's social roles were more fluid than in the past. This social flexibility produced not only a sense of hope, but also increased anxiety. Building upon this discussion, I turn to the 1760's and Denis Diderot's withering critique of Parisian society in *Rameau's Nephew*. In this work, he captured some of the contradictions implicit in a moral versus immoral view of the world. Next, I consider the work of Jean-Jacques Rousseau. His writing heralds a new way of thinking about authenticity that places the emphasis on a gendered self. Rousseau's writing was influential, not only in terms of the development of modern notions of the self, but also in regard to the formation of gender roles. For instance, he argued that "everything that men and women have in common belongs to the species, and [that] everything that distinguishes them belongs to the sex."[128] In his view, this gender difference should form the basis of moral relationships. Here we see a significant gender dichotomy in relation to questions of authenticity. On the one hand, what constitutes authenticity for a man was his strength of character. For a woman, on the other hand, it was for others to judge her authenticity, or lack thereof. In effect, a woman's role was

---

[127] Joan W. Scott, *Gender and the Politics of History* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999).

[128] Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *Emile or On Education,* intro. trans and notes Allan Bloom (New York: Basic Books Inc, 1979), 358.

performative, that is, she had to be seen to be virtuous. It was being perceived by others as virtuous that was the most important element of a woman's claim to authenticity.

In relation to gendered notions of virtue, I want to consider what happens when the Enlightenment challenge to think for oneself runs contrary to social mores. This predicament emerges whenever women try to gain a political voice so as to fight for gender justice. To explore this in more depth, I look at two women who exhibited leadership qualities on the political stage so as to demonstrate what happens when a woman's political action is in opposition to society's dictates regarding female virtue. The first woman I discuss is Mary Wollstonecraft, who came to be regarded as notorious because of her outspokenness and perceived lack of moral decorum. The second example of female leadership is that exemplified by Olympe de Gouges. During the French Revolution, she fought against the establishment of a political system that espoused liberty while restricting access for women to the political sphere.

Any woman courageous enough to cross the gender divide was regarded in one of two ways. She was either treated as a figure of scorn, exemplified by Horace Walpole's phrase "hyenas in petticoats,"[129] indicating that her action was unbecoming to their sex. Or she was regarded as having a masculine mind and, thus being different from other women. This was the case with Mary Wollstonecraft, who was known affectionately, in her circle of acquaintances, only by her last name. She became, in effect, "one of the boys." Olympe de Gouges was also called a "male woman."[130] But in her case, this masculine identification was an attempt by her detractors to show that her action was unfeminine. Whenever women were brave enough to risk public censure, they were accused of acting in a manner inappropriate to female conduct. This gender prejudice had a negative effect on women's ability to speak and act in the public realm that, according

---

[129] This was Walpole's response on the publication of *The Vindication of The Rights of Woman*. http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9E07EFDA1739F93AA15756C0A9639C8B63, accessed February 6, 2013.

[130] Joan W. Scott, *Only Paradoxes to Offer: French Feminists and the Rights of Man* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1996).

to Arendt, is crucial to freedom. But it is not just gender that is affected by social constraints. Later in the chapter, I examine Arendt's biography of Rahel Varnhagen, where we see how Varnhagen's desire for social assimilation was a result of ethnic and religious prejudice.

In exploring issues relating to authenticity within a Western historical context, there are two interconnected threads that I perceive as worthy of attention. First, eighteenth-century commentators expressed concern regarding what they viewed as a divergence between being and appearance, that is, the gap between what is and what seems to be. Second, rapid changes taking place in society led to confusion and anxiety over who one could trust. Whether a person was or was not who they purported to be was of increasing concern as traditional roles disappeared. Indeed, we cannot conceive of eighteenth-century notions of authenticity without considering the effects of social hypocrisy. In this regard, I discuss Arendt's insights into what she calls the rise of "the social." The social realm that emerged during the eighteenth century was, for her, a sphere of inauthenticity because social dictates serve to encourage the standardization of human behavior. Rather than the agonistic nature of the Greek *polis*, which Arendt regards as a genuine space of appearance because citizens were able to enter into dialogue and debate, in the eighteenth century different mechanisms were used to contain the full range of opinion. One mechanism that suppressed public debate was the strict censorship enforced in France and Prussia, which worked to deny political and social alternatives to the absolute rule of the monarch. Another mechanism was the tyranny of social decorum, which privileged assimilation over the outward expression of differences of opinion. We will see how both aspects of tyranny negatively affect the realization of freedom, especially for women.

During the Enlightenment, ideas about freedom fomented social and political dissent. But while the ability to speak and act was touted as fundamental to "enlightened" freedom, the problem was that, for the majority of the population, full access to the public sphere was denied. Through political and legal definitions, freedom was restricted to the fortunate few, that is, men of property. In addition, one of the harmful legacies of the Enlightenment, for Arendt, was that people thought about equality in abstract terms. This had a negative effect on anyone who did not fit the ideal notion of citizen. Herein lies

some of the contradictions associated with the notion of the equal citizen, since it is based on an abstract idea that does not take difference into consideration. Instead of being regarded as a unique "who" which, in Arendt's view, is a necessary component of the full expression of human existence, people are regarded for what they are. We will see how a person's social location, particularly their gender, could curtail their freedom.

As I showed in chapter one, a person's social role is but one component of what constitutes an individual. It is the sum total of a person's experiences, together with their social location – their race, class, sexuality, gender, and so forth – that makes up who we are. Today, we recognize that social factors such as class, race, sexuality and disability play a part in influencing how a person is regarded by others, sometimes in a discriminatory way. In eighteenth-century Europe, however, such factors were deemed irrelevant to the public sphere. So while economic and social disparities make a difference to how a person may experience the world, these social distinctions often went unnoticed by others. In *On Revolution*, Arendt argues that while the Founding Fathers in America debated what constituted equality of rights for citizens, it never occurred to them to ask those whom they saw every day about their views.[131] Here, I am referring to the working poor, slaves and women. The reason why their views were deemed irrelevant was that, unlike propertied men, they had no political rights. Since this is a large topic to which I cannot do justice, I omit important aspects such as ideas of empire and slavery from this discussion. Instead, I concentrate on the gendered discourse of virtue and its influence upon ideas concerning gender, authenticity and leadership.

In the next section, I offer an overview of some socio-historical changes taking place at this time, and their effect on the emergence of new ways of thinking about morality.

---

[131] Arendt, *On Revolution* (New York: The Viking Press, 1976), 65.

2.1   Changing Values

In 1750, London was the largest European city with 750,000 inhabitants, while Paris was the second biggest metropolis with approximately half a million inhabitants.[132] Many middle-class inhabitants of these cities benefited from the wealth amassed from trade and commercial expansion. For the fortunate few, there was a greater luxury in terms of the quality and quantity of goods available.[133] The power and prestige that resulted from this new wealth created through trade influenced both public and private life. With their new wealth, the middle-class gained enhanced social status and, over time, political legitimacy. As the middle-class in Western Europe gained greater political and social status, new ideas emerged concerning what constituted good taste.[134] For example, rather than the large banquets of the past, smaller social gatherings became popular. These kinds of intimate gatherings complemented the emphasis on good manners and sociability, especially through polite and witty conversation, as we will see later in the discussion of the salon.[135]

At the same time, the popularization of scientific discoveries began to challenge traditional ways of thinking, and undermine religious beliefs. In England, along with Protestantism, new religious sects, such as the Quakers and Methodists, placed an emphasis on the relationship between the individual and God. Self-understanding was seen as a private affair, which should not be regulated by priests. These social and political changes, as Charles Lindholm notes, brought about the "erosion of a sacred

---

[132] Richard Sennett, *Fall of Public Man* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1974), 50.

[133] Sennett, *Public Man,* 50.

[134] Taste was also crucial to an understanding of judgement for Kant, which we will see in chapter three is important to Arendt's thought, especially in relation to understanding.

[135] My discussion here is informed by Sennett's discussion in *Public Man*. When reading Sennett I saw similarities between his work and Arendt's, thus I was not surprised to learn that he was a former student of hers. For more on this topic, see Finn Bowring, *Hannah Arendt: A Critical Introduction* (London: Pluto Press, 2011), 151.

hierarchy, the fragmentation of roles, and the sense of a loss of significance." [136] Indeed, judging a person's integrity, or lack thereof, became difficult as people's social roles were less well-defined. Increased social mobility, as a result of urbanization and economic expansion, led to a greater anxiety regarding whom one could trust.

Coincidentally, as Lionel Trilling points out, a desire for authenticity arose out of a perceived need for greater sincerity in social relationships. [137] This search for authenticity was thus both a response to the vagaries of modernity and a way to define middle-class morals from those of the aristocracy. The middle-class sought to set themselves apart from the aristocracy, whom they regarded as irreligious and immoral. These bourgeois notions of morality were intrinsically connected to beliefs about gender differences. For example, the idea that middle-class women had a heightened, or more refined, sense of morality began to take root, and was to have a profound influence on a woman's ability and desire to go against social "norms." For women, individual action was curtailed by what was deemed appropriate social behaviour, with the result that, as Chris Roulston notes, the Enlightenment quest for self-knowledge was not "who am I?" but rather "who must I not be?"[138]

Questions regarding role-playing became commonplace and observers noted how eighteenth-century city life in Paris and London resembled a stage. Richard Sennett contends that the metaphorical use of *theatrum mundi* served to acknowledge the operations of illusion within society. [139] We can see the phenomenon of role-playing emerging through the eighteenth-century popularity with masquerades, and the enthusiasm with which the body was perceived as a mannequin to be adorned with exotic costumes. A fascination with role-playing was also apparent in the increasing appeal of

---

[136] Charles Lindholm, *Culture and Authenticity* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2008), 4. This is also pertinent to Arendt's argument as I pointed out in chapter one.

[137] Lionel Trilling, *Sincerity and Authenticity* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press), 1972.

[138] Chris Roulston, Virtue, *Gender, and the Authentic Self in Eighteenth-Century Fiction: Richardson, Rousseau, and Laclos (*Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1998), 187.

[139] Sennett, *Public Man*.

the theatre. Indeed, the ability for an actor to transform himself into a character was regarded with wonder by *philosophes,* such as Diderot. He viewed great actors as having an exceptional ability to distill the essence of human feelings. But not everyone shared Diderot's enthusiasm for the theatre. In fact, Rousseau saw theatres as having a corrupting influence because it encouraged artifice. For some middle-class commentators, a fascination with artifice was regarded as contrary to the proper, moral values of the emerging middle-class. For others, such as Immanuel Kant, this collective role-playing could prove positive for society, since although a person may start by acting, he thought that virtues would ultimately become part of an actor's disposition.[140]

Through this brief review of some of the emerging trends in eighteenth-century Western Europe, we begin to see a pattern emerging. As well as economic expansion, there were social and political changes occurring, as the aristocracy begins to lose its place to the middle-class, whose increasing wealth gave them a say in political affairs. However, these social and political changes differed depending upon each country. In the next section, I want to look at how three different writers - Montesquieu, Diderot and Rousseau - chart the changes that are taking place in France.

2.2   Exploring Freedom – Montesquieu's *Persian Letters*

One of the first eighteenth-century writers to explore the connection between the artifice of social life and its effects on human nature was Montesquieu in *Persian Letters,* an epistolary work published in 1721. Putting Montesquieu's work into historical context, we note that the early 1700's were a time of social unrest in France. During this period, France was primarily an agrarian society. As a consequence of Northern Europe's 'little ice-age,'[141] there was a series of poor harvests. Crop failures led to a devastating famine in 1707, and a peasant revolt ensued. While this revolt was quelled by government forces,

---

[140] Immanuel Kant, *Anthropology from a Pragmatic Point of View*, trans. Victor Lyle Dowdell (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois Press, 1996), 37.

[141] Olwen Hufton, *The Prospect Before Her: A History of Women in Western Europe, Volume I, 1500-1800* (London: HarperCollins Publishers, 1995), 7.

little assistance was offered to those people most devastated by the famine. This disregard for the plight of the poor was to have major repercussions later in the century.

Until 1715, France was ruled by the conservative monarch Louis XIV. Together with the Catholic Church, the Monarchy kept a tight check on the spread of "radical" ideas. This State and religious censorship made it difficult for writers to disseminate their thoughts. In contrast to France, England and Scotland had a flourishing public arena, and had entered a period of scientific and artistic revitalization. Following Louis XIV's death, Philippe d'Orléans, the new Regent in France, instigated major changes. An Anglophile, he wanted to bring a new spirit of learning to encourage artistic and scientific advances in France. As part of his desire for cultural change, the Court moved from Versailles to Paris, which became the centre of intellectual activity in France.[142]

In *Persian Letters*, Montesquieu investigates how these changes in the political order were influencing social ideas. Through his comparison of two different locations – Parisian society in the early 1700's and the fictional depiction of a Seraglio in Persia - Montesquieu explores how social pretensions can negatively influence human behaviour. He contrasts the static environment of the Seraglio, where everyone's life is controlled by their fixed roles, with that of the fluidity of Paris, which is regarded as a place of transformation, not just of society, but also of the self. Montesquieu's main characters in the book are two Persian visitors, the tyrant Usbek and his servant Rica. They act as dispassionate observers of Parisian society, which they find lacking in moral substance. In their letters, they comment on the differences between the Parisians they meet and their own society. They note the discrepancy between what people say and how they act. In one letter, Usbek comments: "I see people here arguing endlessly about religion; but at

---

[142] This discussion is informed by C. J. Bett's introduction to Montesquieu's *Persian Letters* (London: Penguin, 1983), as well as Andrew Kahn's editorial remarks in the 2008 translation of this work.

the same time they seem to be competing over who can observe it the least."[143] What Montesquieu highlights here is the difference between what people profess to believe in, and how they actually act. In another letter, Rica describes how, when dressed in his Persian costume, he was the centre of attention. Adorned in Parisian garments, however, he finds himself ignored by the very people who had previously found him so fascinating. In questioning the relationship between a man and his outward appearance, Rica wonders what effect this might have on a person's moral attitude. He comments, "if clothing and manners make the external man will the inner man change to follow suit?"[144] Similarly, at a dinner party, Rica overhears two men conspire on how they can appear witty by laughing at each other's jokes. Reflecting on their artifice, he contends that these men's "performance displays conviction in the notion that only appearance is authenticity."[145] What becomes apparent to the visitors is an inconsistency in people's words and deeds.

In highlighting the false manners of a young woman, Rica says "her gravest concern is not to have a good time, but to look as if she's having a good time."[146] Here Montesquieu points to the superficial nature of French society and how this woman acts in a way she thinks others will approve. In his letters, Usbek expressed disgust at what he perceives as the shamelessness of women's dress and behaviour. Because of their perceived lack of propriety in dress and decorum, Rica quips that "Frenchmen hardly ever talk about their wives; they're afraid to speak of them in front of men who know them better than they do themselves."[147] The women in French society are regarded as immodest; they are judged as promiscuous as a result of how they dress. In addition to observing the dubious morals of Parisian society, the Persian visitors are appalled at the profound social inequalities they witness. Usbek observes that for one man to lead the life of an epicure, a hundred

---

[143] Montesquieu, *Persian Letters,* 56. As I consulted two editions, I have cited both; however all page references are to the edition trans. by Margaret Mauldon with editorial remarks by Andrew Kahn (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.)

[144] Montesquieu, *Persian Letters,* xvii.

[145] Montesquieu, *Persian Letters,* xvii.

[146] Montesquieu, *Persian Letters,* 148.

[147] Montesquieu, *Persian Letters*, 72.

others must work to satisfy his desire for indolence.[148] While he makes disparaging comments on the inequities of French society, Usbek refuses to examine the inequalities that exist in his own culture.

Although various wives write declaring their passionate love for him, Usbek exhibits a growing anxiety that they might not continue to obey him. The longer he resides in Paris, the more Usbek realizes that a society based on obedience is devoid of genuine relationships because there is no personal autonomy. Yet this knowledge affords him little enlightenment, since he is reluctant to change the social order in Persia, even though his power affords him no contentment. What is common to both cultures is that women are perceived as the property of men.

Paradoxically, however, through sharing information about the different social relationships that exist in Paris, it is Uzbek's wives who, in gaining knowledge about different ways of living, choose to revolt against their own condition. Usbek is incredulous to learn of the emerging anarchic disorder in the Seraglio, and is especially distraught to learn that his favourite wife, Roxana, has committed adultery. In her last letter to him, Roxana explains that she is about to commit suicide by swallowing poison. Before she dies, however, she wants Usbek to know her real feelings for him. She writes: "How could you suppose me so credulous as to believe that the sole purpose for my existence was to adore your caprices? That while you refused yourself nothing, you had the right to frustrate every desire of mine?"[149] Although it appeared that she was content to submit to his desires, Roxana had felt very differently. Her deceit enabled her to live as she chose which, in this case, meant taking a lover. Roxana maintains that her "mind has always remained independent."[150] While her external role was that of obedient wife and servant, her portrayal of modesty had been an act she adopted so as to obtain her own desires.

---

[148] Montesquieu, *Persian Letters,* 143.

[149] Montesquieu, *Persian Letters*, 213.

[150] Montesquieu, *Persian Letters, 280.*

In the fictional Seraglio, each person has a fixed role, subject to one man's rule. Social mores are dependent upon the ruler's whim. Montesquieu sets up this spatial contrast so as to question whether the world of the Seraglio is really that different from that of Paris. He suggests that both societies are overly dependent upon the dictates of the ruler. In societies run by tyrants, it seems that people are more inclined to do what they think they should, rather than what they wish to do. One way this is demonstrated is through the ways in which public opinion oscillates as "the French change their ways according to the age of their king."[151] But when people acquiesce to a leader's desires, or to the dictates of social morality, they risk losing their capacity to think for themselves and, concomitantly, compromise their freedom. Here, as Marshall Berman notes, Montesquieu suggests that a ruler's freedom depends upon his willingness to treat others in a caring manner.[152] In the case of Usbek, however, to demonstrate his concern for his people would involve changing the power structure, something that he will not countenance, since it would mean relinquishing power. He prefers to rule by force and violence, even though he knows that his isolation as tyrant means that he is unhappy.

To sum up, Montesquieu intimates that all people have a right to freedom.[153] Those societies that refuse to offer their people freedom are tyrannies, not only for the slave, but also for the master. There can be no freedom for the ruler or servant in a hierarchical relationship. For Montesquieu, it is natural for people who have been oppressed to want to revolt. It is only by overturning the social order that both master and slave can achieve autonomy. While *Persian Letters* is often seen to be a satirical observation of the social mores that existed under the Regency of Philippe d'Orléans, it can also be read as a political allegory. The wives' revolt serves a metaphorical function to show what may happen when a group organizes to defeat the social order. Montesquieu's work was prescient, since the French tried to realise their freedom from political and social

---

[151] Montesquieu, *Persian Letters,* 133.

[152] Marshall Berman, *The Politics of Authenticity: Radical Individualism and the Emergence of Modern Society* (New York: Athenaeum Books, 1971), 25.

[153] Berman, *Politics*, 22.

repression through the French Revolution of 1789. In *Persian Letters*, Montesquieu makes us aware of two different kinds of tyranny: first that of autocratic rule and, second of social conformity. Both forms of tyranny can work to deny a person's autonomy. We see that the potential for genuine relationships is constrained by what Arendt called 'the no-man rule of society,' and that of autocratic rule.[154] In both instances, "we never see people as they are, but as they are constrained to be."[155]

I want to pause here to discuss this idea of social tyranny in more depth. In *The Human Condition*, Arendt maintains that the eighteenth-century concern with economics, together with the rise of statistics, encouraged the standardization of behaviour.[156] Both monarchical rule and bourgeois capitalism lead to social conformism. The Enlightenment desire for an abstract notion of equality resulted in a denial of difference. Instead of dialogue and dissent between competing views, we see the move towards a social order where everyone is encouraged to behave in a particular manner. Arendt argued the modern world altered how people thought about the private and public realms. With the introduction of what she terms "the social," aspects of what were previously deemed private concerns now appear in the public realm. She maintains that the bringing of what used to belong to the private, such as those activities that are part of the life process into the public realm, had a negative influence on the ability of people to excel. The bourgeois desire for conformity works to suppress excellence, and the type of action that Arendt argues is critical to human flourishing. When excellence fades from political life, in its place we have a standardization of behaviour, which serves to deny the full range of human experience and expression.

---

[154] In *The Human Condition*, Arendt argues that these are really mirror images of each other, and derive from the fact that eighteenth-century society based its foundation on economics, which previously had been under the constraints of the household.

[155] Montesquieu, *Persian Letters*, 82.

[156] Arendt, *Human Condition,* 38-72.

2.3 *Rameau's Nephew:* An Exploration of Social Hypocrisy

What constituted virtuous action was a topic of much contention in the eighteenth century. The *philosophe* Denis Diderot, for example, argued that it was the task of the artist to illustrate how vice is evil and virtue attractive.[157] In the following discussion of his satire *Rameau's Nephew*, we will see how the concept of virtue is explored through two very different perspectives. In this work, Diderot contrasts the virtuous man with the charlatan to illustrate contrasting ideas about the nature of virtue. The virtuous man is depicted in the character of "Moi," while "Lui" represents a literary manifestation of selfishness.[158] Published posthumously, *Rameau's Nephew* is ostensibly based on a conversation between Diderot and Jean-Philippe Rameau, the nephew of a famous court musician. In brief, during the summer of 1761, Rameau lost his position as sycophant to the house of Bertinhus when, rather than lying, he chose to speak his mind.

In their discussion, each character espouses a different opinion on virtue. For Lui the good life is about self-enjoyment, gained through wealth and prestige. For Moi, by contrast, virtuous living is defined through one's relationships with others, which he regards as more important than social status or material goods. Lui and Moi disagree on most topics, including the value of Socrates dying for his beliefs. Moi argues that the judges erred when putting Socrates to death, showing that not all legal and ethical pronouncements stand the test of time. Lui counters by declaring that Socrates' willingness to die for his principles was a futile act. What matters is to be rich and successful, and use whatever means necessary to obtain what you want, regardless of the cost to others. While Moi concurs with Lui that life's pleasures are wonderful, he argues that there is an intrinsic difference between happiness and virtue. A virtuous life is preferable, Moi contends, since it is fulfilling to act morally, and to care about the welfare of others. In Lui's opinion, such virtuous conduct is downright dull. In fact, he derides

---

[157] Denis Diderot, *Rameau's Nephew/D'Alembert Dream*, trans. and intro. Leonard Tancock (London: Penguin 1966). Because some entries offended the French censors, D'Alembert left Diderot to finish alone. During the 25 years he worked on the *Encyclopédie*, many poured scorn on his project. *Rameau's Nephew* is purported to be Diderot's satirical retort to these naysayers.

[158] To avoid confusion, I refer to the "I" character as "Moi," and the "he" character as "Lui."

the notion that there can be a one-size-fits-all notion of the good, which he regards as an eccentric idea, common to philosophers, but not applicable to eighteenth-century society. Instead, being immoral is the way to get ahead, declares Lui, and this is the reason why he is willing to play the dual role of sycophant and jester. As he observes: "Supposing virtue had been the road to fortune, either I should have been virtuous or I should have simulated virtue as well as the next man. But people wanted me to be ridiculous, and so I have made myself that way."[159] Lui justifies his sycophantic action as essential for social success. As he contends, "I say to myself: Be a hypocrite, by all means, but don't talk like a hypocrite. Keep the vices that come in useful to you, but don't have either the tone or the appearance, which would expose you to ridicule."[160] In adopting these diverse personae, Lui suggests that "I remain myself, but I act and speak as occasion requires."[161] Indeed, he maintains that there is only one man who is free to do as he pleases - that is, the King. Everyone else, he argues, just strikes up a pose.

Lui is a perfect example of a Machiavellian character who justifies his actions according to his desires, irrespective of their effect on others. Yet while Diderot depicts Lui as a man without scruples, he is also portrayed as an astute observer of social mores. For example, in their debate on education, Moi declares his intention to teach his daughter ethics. Lui derides this suggestion since, he asserts, ethical instruction is pointless for girls because it is only their attractiveness that counts in a society where beauty has far more cachet than virtue. Instead, he argues that if you want your child to succeed, you should offer them a modern education, and train them in the art of deceit. In bypassing moral instruction, Lui allows his son to develop naturally and observes, with fatherly pride, that his progeny "is already greedy, smooth, a thief, a waster and a liar."[162] This amoral education befits the times far more than Moi's moral instruction.

---

[159] Diderot, *Rameau,* 83.

[160] Diderot, *Rameau,* 82.

[161] Diderot, *Rameau,* 82.

[162] Diderot, *Rameau,* 108.

In *Rameau's Nephew,* Diderot shows how the trickster may have more insight into society, not least because the virtuous individual fails to comprehend how people can be tempted by vice. We see that, in a society based on self-interest, what passes as virtue may actually be its mirror opposite. Paradoxically, then, it is the inauthentic individual who sees through social pretence, and offers a deeper understanding of human nature, since he brings to light things that the good man misses. *Rameau's Nephew* was to have a major impact on Romantic thinkers. For example, Hegel was so enamoured with Diderot's exposé of social mores that he made use of this fictional account in the *Phenomenology of Spirit,* where he inverted the commonplace notion of what is noble and what is base.[163] For Hegel, Lui represents the triumph of the human spirit over moral orthodoxy in that he sees through social pretence.

The concern with hypocrisy is a recurring trope in the eighteenth century. One reason why hypocrisy was so manifest in French society, according to Arendt, was because rulers preferred their nobility to engage in court intrigue, rather than letting them take an active role in affairs of state. These intrigues fostered an atmosphere of deceit which pervaded society. In her exploration of hypocrisy, Arendt notes that the Greek root of the word 'hypocrite' is play-actor.[164] As we have seen, this focus on role-playing was often commented upon. She asks why it was that so many writers remarked on the problem of hypocrisy, which seems to be a far lesser evil than, say, violence. What makes hypocrisy so bad, Arendt suggests, is that "integrity can indeed exist under the cover of all vices except this one."[165] Hypocrisy can lead us astray in our judgments of others, since those who profess honest motives may hide dishonourable intentions. But she acknowledges that an emphasis on virtue is also problematic since it "transforms all actors into hypocrites; the moment the display of motives begins, hypocrisy begins to poison all

---

[163] For more on the influence of Diderot's work on Hegel, see Humdert, E.J. "The European Enlightenment and the History of the Self," in *Rewriting the Self: Histories from the Renaissance to the Present,* ed. Roy Porter (London: Routledge, 1997), 84.

[164] Arendt, *Revolution*, 99.

[165] Arendt, *Revolution*, 99.

human relations."[166] A hypocrite, states Arendt, "is too ambitious; not only does he want to appear virtuous before others, he wants to convince himself" of his incorruptibility.[167] While no-one can be completely sure of their motives, the hypocrite convinces himself that he is above ambiguity which, as we will see later, can have devastating results.

2.4   The Gendering of Authenticity in the Work of Rousseau

While Montesquieu and Diderot celebrate the liveliness of Paris, Jean-Jacques Rousseau detested the polite veneer of Parisian society. He especially disliked the rich aristocrat who, he argued, was corrupted by vanity. The rich acquire possessions, he insists, not because they need them but because their sense of who they are is related to what they own. The superficial facade of polite society masked the fundamental prejudices that existed. For instance, Rousseau despised how the rich treated others, arguing that they were "pitiless and hard toward all the rest of the world."[168] Social inequalities between rich and poor were entrenched, not only by wealth and pleasure, but in terms of how people regarded each other. The poor were not perceived as individuals, but as a homogenous, expendable group. Rousseau believed that it was only those who had known suffering who could understand the plight of others. Indeed, it was his mistreatment by a Countess when he worked as her valet that convinced Rousseau of the need for social change. As a servant, he was disregarded, and judged "less by what I was than by what she had made me."[169] Echoing an earlier sentiment expressed by Montesquieu's character, Rica, Rousseau notes that, in Parisian society, a person's outfit is perceived as a marker for the self. That is, it is dependent upon a person's status as to whether or not they are perceived to have a worthy opinion. Yet, he argues, a person's social role was no indication of their moral worth. The problem, however, is that inequality was deeply embedded in the fake morality of Parisian society. In a society

---

[166] Arendt, *Revolution*, 93.

[167] Arendt, *Revolution*, 99.

[168] Rousseau, *Emile*, 510.

[169] Rousseau, *Confessions*, reprinted Berman, *Politics of Authenticity*, 102.

where falseness is the norm, Rousseau contends, like Diderot's Lui, it is in each man's interest to be a dissembler.

In *The Social Contract*, Rousseau maintained that there can only be genuine relationships among people if men are equally free.[170] Neither the position of master nor slave enabled a man to be autonomous. He argued that it was each man's duty to rebel against this unnatural state of affairs by refusing to don the mask imposed on him by society. Rousseau declared that it was only by pledging allegiance to a State, rather than to a specific leader, that men could ensure their equality. In uniting individual will with the public will of all, moral freedom would be realized. As part of his argument, he differentiated between man in nature and man in society. For Rousseau, man in nature is neither virtuous nor corrupt. While man can be happy in his natural state, he cannot be a moral being. To be moral, a man must be part of a society. The problem was that the competitive nature of Parisian society encouraged inauthentic behaviour so that relationships between people were often false. True intimacy was debased because, instead of love, which Rousseau maintained was necessary for virtuous conduct, people engaged in superficial affairs. Furthermore, while society could offer a person innumerable examples of beauty and taste, each new desire, instead of bringing satisfaction, created a greater sense of anxiety. It was by recognizing the reasons why anxiety occurred that, he suggested, it might be possible for people to recognize the superficiality of their existence.[171]

In order to gain a more authentic way of life, Rousseau asserted society must change. In contrast to John Locke, he declared that laws should be less concerned with property, and more concerned with building a just society. One way that he envisaged such a just society being developed was through rethinking the role of women. Through their maternal role and virtuous natures, he maintained that women could provide a civilizing counterforce to the competitive nature of men. What was needed to encourage human

---

[170] Rousseau, *The Social Contract*, trans and intro by Maurice Cranston (Aylesbury: Penguin Books, 1968), 64.

[171] This seems to resonate with Heidegger's account of anxiety, as we will see in chapter three.

flourishing, according to Rousseau, was not just reason, but sensuous reason. One way to obtain this delicate balance between the sensuous and reason was through moral education. In *Emile*, for example, he described how, rather than learning through competition or being taught by rote, a child must learn through experience. With this knowledge, he could begin to judge for himself, and guard against falling prey to the prejudices of others. In so doing, a child would be able to realise his full potential. Moreover, if a person was taught how to be flexible, then they would be better able to deal with changing circumstances while, at the same time, sustaining their core identity.

It is important to note that Rousseau's position on the education of girls was diametrically opposed to the instruction that he thought boys should receive, as his depiction of Sophie in *Emile* illustrates. Unlike her future husband, Sophie is offered little opportunity to develop her talents, other than through domestic knowledge gathered from her mother. These domestic skills were all a woman required, he argued, for it was her proper place to take care of the home and teach her children to be virtuous. Even when a woman had genuine talent, Rousseau contended that her dignity required that she keep such talents unknown, since her glory came from her selfless devotion to her husband and children.

This notion of selfless action as integral to a virtuous woman's role in life creates dissonance in that, for a woman to believe in herself, she has to go against society's dictates about what constitutes virtue during this period. One of the ensuing problems with this ideology is, as Roulston states, that "the ideal feminine self cannot be articulated through the public sphere - hence the fundamental contradiction in Rousseau's social vision."[172] The ideal feminine self that he admired was an abstract concept that no woman could attain.

In her discussion of the connections between virtue, authenticity and selfhood in the eighteenth-century novel, Roulston contends that sentimental narratives depict a character's desire for self-revelation as a departure from artifice.[173] This self-confession

---

[172] Roulston, *Virtue,* 137.

[173] Roulston, *Virtue,* 137.

is somewhat dubious, however, since this declaration is always affected by the moral strictures of society. Rather than revealing a 'true' self, Roulston maintains that the self revealed through the language of virtue may be just another form of masquerade.[174] The fictional desire to establish a feminine, modest self is intrinsically connected with bourgeois constructions of identity. Within the domestic realm, common to most novels of this period, she argues that "privacy, femininity and authenticity serve as mutually reinforcing markers"[175] that serve to restrict a woman's autonomy. We see this clearly in Rousseau's famous novel entitled *Julie, or the New Héloïse,*[176] which we will now discuss.

 The novel's central character, Julie, is a young upper-class woman who has an affair with her penniless tutor, Saint-Preux, and becomes pregnant. Horrified at his daughter's lack of propriety and her besmirching of the family honour, her father beats Julie so severely that, shortly afterwards, she loses her child. Caught between the opposing dictates of familial duty, and her desire for love, Julie asks Saint-Preux to try and comprehend the hopelessness of her predicament, as follows:

> Consider the situation of my Sex and yours in our common
> misfortunes and decide which of us the more to be pitied is? To feign
> insensibility in the throes of passions; to appear joyous and content
> when prey to a thousand woes; to have a serene appearance and a
> troubled soul; always to say something other than what one thinks to
> disguise everything one feels; to be false for the sake of duty, and lie
> for the sake of modesty; such is the usual situation of any maiden my

---

[174] Roulston, *Virtue,* xiv.

[175] Roulston, *Virtue,* 136.

[176] Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *Julie, or the New Héloïse. (1760). Letters of Two Lovers who Live in a Small Town at the Foot of the Alps,* trans. by Philip Stewart and Jean Vache *(*Hanover and London: University Press of New England, 1997).

age. One's finest days are thus spent under the tyranny of propriety.[177]

In this extract, Julie rails at the ignominy of her position that requires her to act in a manner contrary to her desire. Social propriety tyrannizes young women, she argues, since they are not allowed to show their true feelings. Instead, they must disguise their desires and behave in a duplicitous manner. Here, we see how the dictates of social decorum negatively affect a woman's autonomy. Julie's ability to do as she wishes is restricted by societal constraints and familial duty.

Since her father will not allow her to marry the man she loves, Julie acquiesces to her father's request to marry his friend, Baron de Wolmar. During the marriage ceremony, Julie undergoes a kind of spiritual transformation. She decides that from now on she will become a paragon of virtue, and forego her erotic longings for Saint-Preux. Together with her new husband, Julie builds a community called Clarens. In this community, each spouse takes on a role that illustrates Rousseau's ideals regarding appropriate gendered behaviour. Wolmar's role is that of the stern, rational leader, while Julie plays the part of dutiful wife and benevolent matriarch. In doing so, they act in compliance of the gender norms which society expects of them.

But the community is not quite the idyll it appears to be on the surface. For example, the servants who work for the Wolmars are brought into service when they are very young. These girls and boys come from peasant families in rural villages, since the Wolmars believe that their lack of knowledge of society will make these children more pliable as servants. From the day these young people begin work at Clarens, they are not allowed to visit their families. Instead, the Wolmars act as their parental overseers. To maintain order, each servant is encouraged to spy on her fellows. When servants do wrong, they are punished in one of two ways. Wolmar reprimands them in a cold, rational manner; these stern admonishments are designed to maintain control. Julie takes a different approach to punishment in that she reproaches the wrongdoer by taking away her love for

---

[177] Rousseau, *Julie,* 173.

them. Rousseau writes that while the servants may fear Wolmar, they are emotionally distraught at the thought that Julie may cease to care for them.

At Clarens, Julie endeavours to live her life as the model of middle-class female virtue. She is a faithful wife to Wolmar, and loving mother to her children. Yet, it is only by sublimating her desire for Saint-Preux that Julie is able to play the part of virtue.[178] Some years' following their marriage, Wolmar invites Saint-Preux to visit them so that he can see how virtuous Julie has become. In a letter to her former lover, Julie writes of her perfect life and her contentment with her role as wife and mother. After Saint-Preux visits Clarens, Wolmar decides that Saint-Preux should become the tutor to their children. But Julie is unhappy with her husband's decision, which she perceives as a way for him to exercise his control by forcing her to be in close contact with her ex-lover while maintaining her decorum. Julie tells Saint-Preux that she does not want him to live at Clarens for she is concerned with what might happen between them. But Saint Preux is delighted that Wolmar regards him as having sufficient character to resist temptation. Julie starts to feel a growing anxiety as she questions whether her virtuous life may have been as rich an existence as she had previously thought. This causes her to feel unhappy without understanding why. As she writes to Saint-Preux:

> Will another woman be more sensible than I? Will she love her father,
> her husband, her children, her friends, her circle better? Will she be
> better loved by them? Will she lead a life more to her liking? Will she
> be more free to choose another? Will she enjoy better health? Will she
> have more resources against weariness, more attachments to the
> world? And yet I live in it with a heart ill at ease, which does not
> know what it lacks; it desires without knowing what.[179]

---

[178] Roulston, *Virtue,* 137.

[179] Rousseau, *Julie,* 570.

In this extract we see how Julie's growing anxiety results in a questioning of her choice to forego sexual desire in favour of marital duty. It seems that her previous justifications are no longer enough. Shortly after writing this letter, one of her children falls into the lake, and Julie jumps in to save her child. While she is not seriously injured, Julie's health deteriorates. Rather than continuing to live a life of masquerade, and deal with the constant tension between duty and desire, it appears as if she chooses to let herself die.

For Rousseau, it is a woman's duty to be selfless; her personal desires must always be sublimated in favour of her submission to her husband. In the figure of Julie, Rousseau provides us with an ethical dilemma regarding the sublimation of passion and the limitations of a virtuous life, which is resolved only through Julie's death. The way to deal with the dilemma, and stay within the bounds of propriety, is for Rousseau to kill off the heroine. And yet there seems an ambiguity in his portrayal of Julie in that he not only shows her difficult choice, but also does so in a manner that is sympathetic to her plight.[180] What we see in Rousseau's portrayal of his heroine's predicament is that authenticity consists of the pull of contradictory forces. According to Marshall Berman, what Julie wants is to be what society dictates. Ultimately, this is self-defeating because her desire stands in the way of her wish for social conformity.[181]

In his reading of Rousseau's concept of authenticity, Alessandro Ferraro sees three interconnected threads: sincerity, autonomy and intimacy.[182] Sincerity is the avoidance of being false; autonomy means acting in accordance with one's ethical principles; finally, intimacy in relationships is necessary if we want to foster personal authenticity. While an ethics of autonomy tries to contain these inner deviations, regarding them as unworthy and undignified, an ethics of authenticity recognizes that these deviations originate in emotions and feelings. What is important about Rousseau's notion of authenticity, then, is that it is derived from genuine action founded on sincere relationships. But, as the

---

[180] His novel was to bring Rousseau tremendous fame across Europe.

[181] Berman, *Politics of Authenticity*, 241.

[182] Alessandro Ferrara, *Modernity and Authenticity: Rethinking the Project of Modernity* (London and New York: Routledge: 1998), 88.

fictional experiences of Julie illustrate, genuine action is difficult - even for fictional heroines - because it is necessary to repress desire in order to submit to social dictates regarding what is proper for a woman. There is a inherent paradox in Rousseau's sense of authenticity as inner truth, and his insistence that a woman pay heed to her reputation. For Rousseau, as Lisa Disch observes, it is a woman's reputation rather than her character that matters.[183] The problem with Rousseau's ideas about social relations is that a woman's perceived virtue is more important than her character. How that virtue is perceived is dependent upon the perspectives of others.

If authenticity is about the self, then the notion that a woman's reputation is more important than her own conscience points to an inconsistency in Rousseau's thinking about this topic, which may stem from gender prejudice. His belief that the viewpoint of others was more important than a woman's own conscience serves to undermine his argument about the importance of thinking for oneself. In the eighteenth century, it was only masculine minds that were judged to have the capacity to reason and, thus, to be able to decide what was right. Women, by contrast, had to conform to social standards concerning what constituted appropriate conduct, even when this might mean a deviation from their own conscience. While a man needed to have the strength of character to enable him to go against public opinion when it contradicted his way of thinking, a woman was obliged to adhere to society's dictates even when they went against her own beliefs. Because a woman was perceived as being without reason, these social rules became more important than her own conscience. This gender contradiction was one that Mary Wollstonecraft sought to expose.

---

[183] Lisa Disch, "Claire Loves Julie: Reading the Story of Women's Friendship in 'La Nouvelle Héloïse,'" *Hypatia*, 3 (1994): 19-45. Disch makes an interesting observation that the passionate subtext within this novel is the friendship that exists between Julie and her cousin Claire. Within this relationship what is important to men - that is a woman's virtue - is immaterial, since between these two friends what matters is how they care for one another.

2.5   Wollstonecraft: A Revolution in Manners

In *Vindication of the Rights of Woman*, Mary Wollstonecraft declared that the kind of reasoning Rousseau displayed was not really about virtue, but rather designed to keep women in their place. *Contra* Rousseau, she contended that a woman's sense of self was negated by the emphasis on her reputation rather than her good conscience. In her view, it is the latter that should constitute the basis of a woman's rightful place in society. Thus, for Wollstonecraft, only a revolution in manners and education could bring about human progress in the way that the Enlightenment *philosophes* desired. Moreover, she argued that when women are treated differently from men, this created an environment where false morals rule, leading to social hypocrisy. Such gender distinctions "corrode all private, and blast all public virtue."[184] While Rousseau maintained that women should be educated to please men, Wollstonecraft contended that this kind of reasoning ensured that women had limited opportunity to develop their reasoning skills. Turning his argument upside down, she asserted that if women were more virtuous than men, then they should be able to reason effectively. She challenged Rousseau's assertion that the extent of a woman's aspiration should be to obey.[185] It is not the passive, submissive woman who makes an ideal partner, states Wollstonecraft, but a woman who is willing to be a friend to her husband as well as a teacher to her children. In her opinion, women will never have the same abilities to reason unless they are afforded the same opportunities as men.

Furthermore, she brought to light the hypocrisy that occurs when women are seen as social pariahs. Wollstonecraft rails against the double standard whereby some aristocratic women insult others while being notorious in their own adultery.[186] Not only is this hypocrisy morally wrong, she argued, it encouraged a superficial assessment of a woman's character. What she desired was a new moral sensibility that would herald

---

[184] Mary Wollstonecraft, *Vindication of the Rights of Woman,* ed. and intro. Miriam Brody Kramnick (London: Penguin Books, 1985), 288.

[185] Wollstonecraft, *Vindication, 112.*

[186] Wollstonecraft, *Vindication, 241.* Here Wollstonecraft speaks from personal experience as her reputation was destroyed when she had a child with Gilbert Imlay, who refused to marry her.

opportunities for women to achieve their full potential. The establishment of 'true sensibility' would encourage a more caring attitude towards others.[187] It is only in this caring attitude that the harmful repercussions of social hypocrisy can be negated. Wollstonecraft's work represented a radical critique of social mores that reworked Rousseau's insights into the nature of authenticity with a political argument for women's rights. Hence, she illustrates the negative effects of living in an unfair, morally corrupt society, as well as highlighting the potential for change.

In her work, Wollstonecraft is informed by Rousseau's ideas in terms of complementary gender roles. But she wanted to carve out a much broader social and political role for women. By transforming society into one based on reason and virtue rather than superficiality, Wollstonecraft asserted that men and women could participate actively and equally in improving human existence. If a nation wanted women to be good citizens, then alongside political representation women needed to receive a liberal education on par with men. This meant the eradication of the notion that the only purpose of female education was to equip a woman "for a single future, marriage."[188]

At this time, most people argued that educating girls to participate in public affairs was unnecessary, since their responsibilities lay in the private realm. In general, there was great disparagement shown towards women who engaged in intellectual pursuits. Such intellectual endeavours were perceived to be inappropriate for their future roles as wives and mothers. Indeed, the language of most eighteenth-century educators in England revealed a clear distinction between how middle-class girls and boys should be taught. Boys were given instruction that would help them prepare for the demands of a competitive society. While competitive activities were seen as preparing boys for their future careers, educators regarded these forms of action as wholly inappropriate for girls since, as the educator and moralist Reverend Bennet declared, a girl's delicate nature

---

[187] Mary Wollstonecraft, "The Wrongs of Woman," in *Mary and the Wrongs of Woman* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976), 176.

[188] Hufton, *Prospect before Her,* 95.

would be harmed by "this scorching method of exposure."[189] As Michèle Cohen asserts, "the very notion of competition was distasteful in women."[190] The main instruction girls received, as I showed earlier with Rousseau's fictional example of Sophie, was how to be a dutiful wife. This supporting role, reinforced by political and legal restrictions, encouraged women to be submissive rather than to take the initiative and lead. Simply put, men were taught how to take charge while women were instructed in how to be selfless. Neither of these gendered modes of being was going to bring about an enlightened society.

While Rousseau stated that without virtuous women there could not be a virtuous society, Wollstonecraft revealed how his ideas were contradictory. For example, she disagreed with his argument that the female mind was distinct from that of the male mind. The distinctions that seem to exist are not natural, she declared, but rather a result of the restrictions society placed on women's agency. While many regarded the cultivation of a woman's mind as inappropriate, Wollstonecraft maintained that if women's education continued to be limited, this would be a problem for society as a whole since, without their full participation in public life it was unlikely that enlightened attitudes would flourish.[191] She argued that it was vital for women to speak out against societal ills. Otherwise, the pervasive false morals would never change. Without alterations to the social, economic and political order, women would never be able to reach their potential.

---

[189] Michèle Cohen, "To Think, to Compare, to Combine, to Methodize': Girls' Education in Enlightenment Britain" in *Women*, *Gender and the Enlightenment*, eds. Sarah Knott and Barbara Taylor (London: Palgrave MacMillan, 2007), 229.

[190] Michèle Cohen, "To Think," 228.

[191] Whenever a woman stepped over the gender line, and became identified with the public sphere, as in the case with Wollstonecraft, she became linked with notoriety. Thanks to the scandalous reception of her biography by her husband, William Godwin, it took more than a century to reassess her life in terms of women's rights. Ironically, however, if Wollstonecraft had lived her life as a virtuous woman, in private, we would probably have little knowledge of her life. It is because of her willingness to speak out against injustice and to cross the gender boundary that she is remembered.

Moreover, as women were the educators of their children, Wollstonecraft contended that their lack of understanding would set back the cause of progress for society as a whole.

One curious thing concerning Enlightenment discourses about gendered spheres of responsibility is that there were many women ruling countries and empires. During the eighteenth century, these rulers included Catherine the Great in Russia, Queen Anne in England, Maria Theresa in Austria, Queen Christina of Sweden and Maria I in Portugal. While there was much discussion regarding the relationship between a ruler and her subjects, the fact that there were female monarchs did not seem to challenge prevailing wisdom about prescribed gender roles. In noting this discrepancy, Joan Scott suggests that when Queens are the predominant rulers, most political commentary focuses on masculine and feminine ways of being.[192] Hence, the presence of a woman ruler tends not to affect the political discourse of the day because female monarchs are regarded as anomalies. Women rulers were either trivialized if they were perceived as weak (as in the case of Queen Anne) or regarded as "mannish" women if they were effective (such as Queen Christina of Sweden). In 1779, William Alexander pointed out this incongruity:

> In Britain, we allow a woman to sway a sceptre, but by law and custom we debar her from every other government but that of her own family ... We neither allow women to officiate at our altars, to debate in our councils, not to fight for us in the field; we suffer them not to be members of our senate, to practice any of the learned professions, nor to concern themselves much with our trades and occupations. [193]

While some commentators noted the incongruity between having a female head of state and not allowing the vast majority of women the ability to voice their political opinions

---

[192] See Joan W. Scott, "Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis," *The American Historical Review*, 91, no. 5 (1986): 1070-71.

[193] Reprinted in Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation*, (New York: Yale University Press), 239.

or the freedom to work in most professions, this did little to alter public opinion about the rightful place of women.

2.6   Speaking Out Against Gender Injustice - Olympe de Gouges

I want to turn now to explore the life of a French woman who, like Wollstonecraft, was willing to speak out against gender injustice. Olympe de Gouges was a playwright, courtesan and working-class woman who actively worked for social change, especially during the initial events of the French Revolution. As Joan Scott notes, Gouges sought to expose the contradiction that it was natural for men to be leaders while it was unnatural for women to be so.[194] She argued that revolutionary demands for equality which denied difference went against the laws of nature. Dividing humans into two groups makes no sense as each human being displayed both male and female qualities. To illustrate her point, Gouges described herself as a courageous woman, as well as a timid man. In playing with ideas about gender, she highlighted the hypocrisy of denying women a place in the political realm. As a result of her political action, Gouges was branded a male woman. While this was intended as an insult, she regarded this label as an indication that a woman could reason just as successfully as a man.

Like Wollstonecraft, Gouges maintained that a nation could not be deemed virtuous when it denied political representation to most of its people. Indeed, if human progress was desired, she argued that it was essential that all people have the opportunity to share their ideas as to how to improve society. She used the platform of speeches and petitions to put forward ideas about women in politics. By arguing that women could have an active, rather than a passive imagination, Gouges undercut Enlightenment distinctions regarding what constituted the proper roles for women and men. In *Declaration of Women,* published in 1791, she argued that social and political change in regard to women's rights was necessary if the Revolution sought to bring about a just society. If the Age of Enlightenment was to be the Age of Reason, Gouges asserted, antiquated notions of

---

[194] The discussion on Olympe de Gouges is informed by Joan W. Scott's *Only Paradoxes to Offer: French Feminists and the Rights of Man.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1996.

sexual hierarchy needed to be overturned. She maintained that women were not just a homogeneous group, but individual persons who could think for themselves, but this was the kind of incendiary idea that was not to prove popular with the new political establishment.

Freedom from the tyranny of the absolute monarchy of Louis XIV did not result in liberty for all. Once the Girondists (of which Gouges was a member) lost to the Jacobins, a different form of tyranny emerged. When the Jacobins took control of the National Assembly under the leadership of Robespierre, those who dared to disagree with the will of the Nation, like Gouges, were branded as traitors to the Revolutionary cause. Her statements became increasingly inflammatory as she railed against the Jacobin government, asserting that there was no logical reason to deny women political status and legal recognition. But Gouges' arguments had little sway as the new French constitution upheld gender divisions. When she further declared that it would be better to live under a benevolent monarch than under the Republic, Gouges had gone too far. In 1793 she was arrested, imprisoned for treason, and guillotined.

The suppression of voices like Gouges was to be emblematic of what has become known as Robespierre's "Reign of Terror." In *On Revolution*, Arendt argues that his tyrannical leadership was, in fact, a "terror of virtue," in part a reaction to the lack of concern for the plight of the people, emblematic of Louis XIV's autocratic rule.[195] Robespierre's Jacobins, influenced by Rousseau's political philosophy, put the cause of virtue above all else, demonstrated initially through their compassion for the malheureux. Yet Robespierre's rule became tyrannical as his search for the truth and the rooting out of hypocrisy took hold. By trying to unmask hypocrisy, and to bring the suffering of the masses to light, it was rage rather than virtue appeared on the political stage. Those who tried to put forward alternative perspectives were singled out, and declared traitors to the

---

[195] Arendt, *Revolution*, 90-104. She differentiates between Robespierre's rule of terror and the institutional forms of terror, which as we will see in the next chapter are distinctive of totalitarian regimes. A key difference is that Robespierre's reign began in good faith, but his attempt to root out hypocrisy was doomed to fail. He wanted to root out the traitor, rather than destroy innocent people, which she regards as emblematic of totalitarian rule.

Republic. By speaking out against gender oppression, Gouges was one of the many casualties of this "virtuous" leadership.

For Arendt, one of the key aspects of political life is the ability for citizens to act and speak freely. The problem is that absolute goodness, like absolute evil, may prove devastating to the political realm, since goodness (like evil) cannot be altered by dialogue and debate. What we have instead is the suppression of plurality in favour of the one voice of the State. Those women who tried to take on a public role in Enlightenment politics faced humiliation and danger. In the eighteenth century, women risked their reputations and, at times, their lives to gain a voice on the political stage. Olympe de Gouges was one of many individuals who paid such a price. Wollstonecraft and Gouges are examples of women who tried to change the social order through political action. In their desire to be heard, they exemplified Arendt's notion of virtuosity, in that they tried to bring something new into the world by having the courage to share their ideas with others, and speak out against gender injustice.

I want to turn now to a discussion of a different phenomenon that appeared in the eighteenth century, the salon, so as to show how women were involved in this new arena.

2.7   The Emergence of the Salon

In spatial terms, the eighteenth century created new opportunities for people to meet and share ideas. As the century progressed, there was a flourishing of public spaces. Public life was enriched by discussion in different venues. What was distinctive about the bourgeois public sphere, according to Jürgen Habermas, is that it represented "the sphere of private people that comes together as a public."[196] Each European city had diverse examples of these new public spaces. For example, at the height of their popularity, London had 3,000 coffee houses, each with its own regular patrons.[197] Discussions were wide-ranging, and included topics from art to politics. Women were denied entry to many

---

[196] Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society* (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1994), 27.

[197] Habermas, *Structural Transformation*, 32.

of these coffee houses, however, thus limiting their ability to speak out in the public realm. This lack of female inclusion contrasts sharply with that of another eighteenth-century phenomenon, the European salon.

The salons began to emerge in France during the seventeenth century and continued to flourish throughout the eighteenth century. Most salons were located in Paris and were run by upper-middle class women. For a short period, the salon also flourished in other European cities, such as Berlin. Most salons allowed for a mix of people such as the upper middle-class, prominent artists and intellectuals, as well as members of the aristocracy. In France, the rise of the salon had much to do with the strict censorship that I discussed earlier. It was because *philosophes* like Diderot had no political voice that the salons became, according to Dena Goodman, the "civil working space of the Enlightenment."[198] In Paris, the salons provided an intimate setting for authors to test their ideas publicly.

Women had an integral part in organizing the salons. Some of the prominent salonnières were Madame Geoffrin (1699-1777) Mme de Staël (1766-1819), and Julie de Lespinasse (1732-1776), whose guests included the *philosophes*, D'Alembert and Diderot. But not everyone was happy with women's dominant roles in the organization of the salon. In his "Letter to D'Alembert," Rousseau maintained that salons were run by immoral women, such as Madame de Staël.[199] He lamented that, due to social etiquette, men were forced to pay attention to women. According to Rousseau, such behaviour was demeaning, since false gallantry was emasculating. His negative assessment of the salonnières seems to have stemmed from the fact that he perceived women's presence as a distraction from the vigour of masculine discussion. Yet while Rousseau regarded the rarified atmosphere of the salon as restrictive to intellectual debate, Goodman contends that the salonnières created intellectual venues. Furthermore, the women who ran them were highly

---

[198] Dena Goodman, *The Republic of Letters: A Cultural History of the French Enlightenment* (New York: Cornell University Press, 1994), 53.

[199] Goodman, *Republic of Letters*, 49.

intelligent, and exhibited that "flexibility of tongue" that Rousseau believed gave women an edge in conversation, albeit not in intellect.

2.8   Rahel Varnhagen: The Inauthenticity of Assimilation

During the period 1780-1806, according to Deborah Hertz, Berlin salons provided a venue for the aristocracy and middle-class intellectuals to mingle.[200] I want to turn now to consider one particular Berlin salon run by Rahel Levin Varnhagen. What is especially notable about the success of her salon was that she was Jewish. Central figures of German Romanticism, such as Friedrich Schlegel and Friedrich Schleiermacher, were frequent guests of Rahel Levin's salon. Her guests were impressed not only by her sensibility, but also by her intellect. One admirer described Levin as "the most intellectual woman on earth."[201] While her salon was famous for its witty conversation, it is noteworthy that women guests had to remain silent so as not to disrupt the elegant flow of philosophical dialogue.[202]

But the flourishing of the Berlin salons was short-lived. Life in the city was to change dramatically following the defeat of the Prussian army by Napoleon in 1806. Jews were no longer welcome in Prussian society. Previous acquaintances began to ignore Levin, who despaired of her social isolation.[203] To combat the risk of becoming a social outcast, she changed her surname from Levin to Robert, and wrote to her brother that "the Jew

---

[200] Deborah Hertz, *Jewish High Society in Old Regime Berlin.* West Hanover: Yale University Press, 1988), 156.

[201] On a visit to Berlin in 1804, Madame de Staël recorded in her diary that, while not as intellectual gifted as Parisians, the women she met, like Levin, were infinitely superior to the men. See Hertz, *Jewish High Society*, 258.

[202] Excerpt from a letter from Henriette Hentz to Rahel Varhagen, reprinted in Deborah Hertz, *Jewish High Society*, 115.

[203] Arendt, *Rahel Varnhagen: The Life of a Jewish Woman,* trans. Richard and Clara Winston (New York and London: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1974), 121.

must be extirpated from us."[204] The erasure of her ethnic identity and religious background was, in her view, the only way of regaining a place in society.

Levin desired social acceptance above all else. After several unsuccessful love affairs, she married August Varnhagen, a match that enabled her to take up a place in polite society. Her husband enjoyed moderate success as a diplomat, and discovered he was related to some minor nobility, thus further improving the couple's social standing. In 1813, Rahel Varnhagen joined her husband in Prague where, for the first time, she experienced what she describes as a sense of belonging because people regarded her as German, rather than a Jew. Paradoxically, Rahel Varnhagen was more at home in an alien country since, in that city, her ethnicity did not wholly define who she was. Upon their return to Berlin, the Varnhagens hosted a new salon, and established a Goethe cult. At last, Rahel Varnhagen had acquired her twin goals of rank and marriage, but she found herself discontented. As the wife of a government official, her role was "to represent something in respectable society."[205] Rahel Varnhagen realized that she had sacrificed her freedom for the sake of social acceptance. The society in which she lived regarded her as a mere appendage to her husband. Social assimilation had not afforded her the expansive existence of which she had dreamed. It was only at the end of her life that she began to regard her Jewishness as something integral to her sense of self, and not something of which she should be ashamed.[206]

In her examination of Rahel Varnhagen's life, through the use of diary extracts and letters, Arendt explores the ethnic and religious prejudices that existed in Prussian society, and how the Jewish intelligentsia sought to belong to a society that despised them. Because of this prejudice, they were often at the margins of society, and only allowed to work in certain occupations, such as money-lending or the law. The only way to become accepted socially was to be regarded as an 'exceptional' Jew. One person who

---

[204] Arendt, *Rahel Varnhagen*, 130.

[205] Arendt, *Rahel Varnhagen*, 213.

[206] Arendt, *Rahel Varnhagen*, 3.

was accepted into society as an exceptional Jew was the philosopher, Moses Mendelssohn. He regarded Jewish assimilation as a logical extension of Enlightenment ideals of progress and equal rights. If such rights are possible, he maintained, there was no logical reason for such rights not to be extended to Jewish people. Over the long-term, assimilation was a good idea, he contended, since ethnic prejudice would be lessened when Jews showed what good members of society they were. The trouble with Mendelssohn's argument, for Arendt, is that being accepted into society as an exception to one's ethnicity forces a person to reject an integral part of who they are. It is only when she is willing to recognize her Jewish identity, Arendt argues, that Rahel Varnhagen is able to find peace with the world.

In her account of Rahel Varnhagen's life story, Arendt discusses the self-absorption that was a dominant motif of Romanticism. The Romantic preoccupation with inwardness was a negative quality for Arendt. For the Romantics individuality, instead of being displayed in the public realm, shifts to the interior world of the self. This private isolation, according to Seyla Benhabib, encourages a "concern with the uniqueness, authenticity, and psychic harmony of the self"[207] to the detriment of an engagement with the world. Arendt argues that one of the gravest mistakes that humans made was to allow things that are private to appear in the public realm. In her view, the rise of the social realm, that is, the bourgeois public sphere, had the negative effect of making people conform to social expectations rather than to excel. Instead of virtue, understood in the Greek sense as excellence, we see the rise of a particular form of behaviour that teaches people what they should and should not do. This standardization of human behaviour has the effect of negating spontaneity. Hence, for Arendt, a homogenization of social standards is detrimental to individual freedom. As we have seen, this is especially the case for women who are supposed to behave in a manner that conforms to prevailing social mores, rather than individual desire.

---

[207] Seyla Benhabib, "Feminist Theory and Hannah Arendt's Conception of the Public Space," *History of the Human Sciences*, 6, no. 2 (1995), 113.

Arendt illustrates what can happen when a woman's life is overly determined by social expectations. How Rahel Varnhagen defined herself, and how others saw her, was affected negatively by ethnic and religious prejudice. It seems to me that there are similarities here between the fictional world of Rousseau's Julie and the experiences that Rahel Varnhagen records in her diary. Both women had to deny a part of who they were to comply with society's dictates. In the fictional account, Julie resigns herself to a loveless marriage so as to comply with familial duty and the expectations of middle-class society. In Rahel Varnhagen's case, her desire to be accepted in Prussian society required her to renounce her ethnic background, and live her life pretending to be other than who she was. But there was a negative cost to this desire to belong. Ultimately, it was by recognizing the absurdity of social rules that Rahel Varnhagen was able to perceive the hypocrisy of the society that she once venerated.

Arendt contends that Rahel Varnhagen's destiny was constrained by gender prejudice, not least because there is often a "discrepancy between what men expected of women in general and what women could give or wanted in their turn." [208] What Rahel Varnhagen was capable of, and what she was able to accomplish, was restricted not only by her ethnicity but also by her gender. Her solution, as Benhabib notes, was to seek romantic affairs and marriage to a gentile in order to take her place in society.[209] But the problem is that Rahel Varnhagen never does quite fit into the society to which she desired entry. At times, Arendt despairs of the political naivety that encouraged Rahel Varnhagen to believe that social assimilation was the answer to prejudice. In her comparison of the parvenu and the pariah, Arendt argues that the human cost "demanded of the pariah if he wishes to become a parvenu is always too high."[210] The problem with assimilation is that it can never overcome prejudice, since social acceptance meant "assimilating to anti-

---

[208] Arendt, *Rahel Varnhagen*, xviii. Given that Arendt was so reluctant to discuss women's rights, this seems to me an important insight into gender relations.

[209] Benhabib, "The Pariah and her Shadow: Hannah Arendt's Biography of Rahel Varnhagen." *Political Theory*, 23, no. 1, (1995): 5-24.

[210] Arendt, *Rahel Varnhagen*, 213.

Semitism."[211] Social assimilation is too high a price to pay for giving up one's heritage because, in doing so, a person has to give up something of herself. That is why, in Arendt's opinion, it is the only the social pariah who is able to remain true to their ideals. Being on the margins of society offers insights, according to Arendt, because "the pariah instinctively discovers human dignity in general long before Reason has made it the foundation of morality."[212] Through her study on Rahel Varnhagen, Arendt points to the ethical dilemma that ensues when people try to assimilate into a society that despises them.

2.9   Conclusion

In this chapter, I have considered how authenticity became gendered. In the eighteenth century, notions of propriety, together with educational differences, defined feminine ways of behaving in contrast to masculine ways of acting. I have argued that gendered notions of virtue worked to enforce particular kinds of female behaviour, such as obedience and submissiveness, which had the negative effect of constraining women's belief in what they could accomplish. Gender differences about what constitutes right conduct had an effect upon the ways in which authenticity and selfhood are conceptualized and experienced. For example, Dena Goodman sees a correlation between female timidity in the eighteenth century and Iris Marion Young's contention that women lack trust in their own bodies, the result of which is that women lack the necessary confidence to carry out their projects.[213] This lack of self-belief in their talents is a response to social dictates that encourage women to be submissive, rather than to lead. In the eighteenth century, prevailing gender prejudice, together with a lack of educational training, meant that women lacked the necessary skills to take up a dominant role in the

---

[211] Arendt, *Rahel Varnhagen*, 224.

[212] Arendt, *Rahel Varnhagen*, 214.

[213] Dena Goodman, "L'Ortografe des Dames: Gender and Language in the Old Regime," in *Gender and Enlightenment*, eds. Sarah Knott and Barbara Taylor, 221.

public sphere. But despite those drawbacks, we have seen that there were some women who were courageous enough to fight for gender justice.

In the eighteenth century, authenticity was related to gendered ideas of virtue. Social wisdom decreed that the opinion of others was more important than a woman's own sense of self. We have seen in the course of looking at the Age of Enlightenment that there were social barriers that affected women's ability to think for themselves, especially in regard to the widespread belief that women should obey their fathers and, later, their husbands. If obedience is seen to be the most important facet of a woman's life, then being willing to take a leadership role is likely to feel less comfortable. Being authentic, according to Arendt, depends upon our willingness to express ourselves in words and deeds. However, the gendered nature of social life barred women from seeing themselves as uniquely able to do so. While there were exceptions, as my discussion of Mary Wollstonecraft and Olympe de Gouges shows, nevertheless, when a woman has been inculcated to believe that her foremost duty is to be obedient, it will be more difficult for her to find the courage to freely express herself within the political sphere.

Bourgeois ideology privileged some bodies over others. It allowed middle-class men to view themselves as unique individuals while a middle-class woman's sense of self was confined to their wifely or maternal role. Thus, the Enlightenment sets up a paradox in terms of gendered notions of freedom and authenticity. For Arendt, like Kant, one of the most fundamental aspects of the human condition is the ability and the courage to think for oneself. For male citizens, new ways of thinking about freedom engendered an open attitude toward their potential possibilities. Conversely, for the majority of people without political rights, the public realm was experienced in a very different manner. Women who tried to break through such gender barriers were often held up to ridicule. If authenticity is connected with one's ability to think and speak for oneself, then being ridiculed may negatively affect a person's wish to be part of the social order.[214]

---

[214] However, this did not mean that their ideas were lost, but it did mean that they sought different vehicles for self-expression. In fact, one could argue that the voices of women who tried

Furthermore, if freedom and human excellence derive from being able to be seen and heard in the public sphere, as Arendt maintains, then being unable to take a commanding role in the public arena will have future repercussions, especially for women's leadership.

In 1933, Arendt reviewed a book on contemporary women's issues, where she notes that while women were afforded the same legal rights as men, "they are not valued equally by society."[215] This gender inequality is evident, not only in the fact that women receive lower wages, but also because the professional woman often had primary care of her household and children. In her view, "a woman's freedom to make her own living seems to imply either a kind of enslavement in her own home or the dissolution of her family."[216] While I am not suggesting that Arendt had feminist inclinations, she was astute enough to recognize that the gendered conditions of women's lives had a negative influence on their ability to flourish in the public realm. In this chapter, we have seen how social conformity results in the vast majority of people concurring with dominant ideologies without thinking about their full implications. There are vestiges of these historical inequities regarding gendered roles in our current society in how we think about leaders, and the ways in which we may overestimate the talents of some while underestimating those of others. Prejudice toward women leaders was and still is embedded in the cultural imagination, and has ongoing ramifications in regard to notions of gender, authenticity and leadership.

In writing this chapter, I have begun to realize the extent to which authenticity is connected to ideas about freedom, not just in the sense of realizing one's own dreams, but also in the sense of envisaging social change. When people are not allowed to share their visions of a different community that would be fairer to the majority of humanity then

---

to gain access to politics were transposed to fiction, where female authors could, not only comment on social injustice, but envision different ideas about women's autonomy.

[215] Arendt, "On the Emancipation of Women," In *Essays in Understanding: 1930-1954,* ed. Jerome Kohn (New York: Harcourt Brace and Company, 1994), 66-68.

[216] Arendt, "Emancipation of Women," 67.

their voices become erased. Enlightenment thinkers, as Charles Taylor contends, believed that rational individuals possessed dignity.[217] Yet the Enlightenment motto: "Sapere Aude! Have courage to use your own understanding," was thought not to apply to women since they were not regarded as rational, thinking beings.[218] So while I concur with Taylor's sentiment that "authenticity requires that we discover and articulate our identity," [219] what we have seen in the eighteenth century is that the restricted gender roles available to women limited their opportunities for self-expression in the public sphere. Thus, while men were able to take up positions of leadership, many women who were just as eloquent and intelligent were denied that opportunity.

If we define who we are through dialogue and debate with other individuals who respect our point of view, then we can continue to flourish and grow from these interactions. In this chapter, we have seen some of the ways in which gender prejudice served to limit women's potentiality for intellectual and personal growth, since women have had to define themselves against abstract notions of virtue. This legacy of gender prejudice still has traces in our own society. Furthermore, it cannot be through one voice – whether that of the ruler or that of society - that we can effect a fairer world but through the recognition and respect for diverse viewpoints. This necessitates a willingness to listen, and to respect opinions that differ from our own. When we conceive of authenticity solely in terms of self, we lose an ethical dimension that allows us to take into consideration the views of others. If we do not attend to the connections between self and world, the result can be devastating, as I shall demonstrate in the next chapter.

---

[217] Taylor, *Sources of the Self: The Making of the Modern Identity* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1983).

[218] Taylor, *Self*, 366.

[219] Taylor, *Ethics of Authenticity,* 82.

Chapter 3

3   Authenticity, Ethics and Leadership

In the last chapter, I concentrated on gender and its relationship to authenticity and leadership. In this chapter, I want to continue this discussion by focussing on authenticity as it pertains to ethical responsibility. In particular, I compare the work of Martin Heidegger with that of Hannah Arendt. I shall begin by outlining Heidegger's concept of authenticity since his work is often referred to by authentic leadership scholars.[220] Concentrating on *Being and Time*, I show how his notion of authenticity as resoluteness, or inner purpose is one that may, at times, privilege self over others. Following on from this discussion, I return to the work of Arendt. I contend that her concept of uniqueness builds upon Heidegger's notion of authenticity in a radical existentialist manner. While Heidegger gestures toward the importance of relationships with his concept of *Mitsein* (being with), I suggest that his conception of authenticity has a tendency toward being self-oriented. Conversely, Arendt enriches his notion of *Mitsein* to reveal how mutual responsiveness is central to a caring human existence. This responsiveness requires a willingness to think from different perspectives than one's own, so as to better comprehend the world.

As part of this discussion, we will consider how personal morality is affected by the extreme experience of living in a totalitarian regime. I compare specific actions that Arendt and Heidegger took during the Nazi period in Germany. I suggest that Heidegger's foray into leadership is clouded by his vision of bringing about a change to university education. His action was not an ethical response to the crisis of the time though it may, from his view, have been authentic. In his desire to promote his vision, Heidegger seems to have forgotten that *Mitsein* requires us to care for one another. By contrast, in her actions, Arendt demonstrates her courage and commitment to others in

---

[220] There is a tendency by leadership scholars, especially those schooled in positivism, to take up Heidegger's concept of authenticity in a rather perfunctory manner. This has been pointed out by other scholars. See, for example, Algera and Lips-Wiersma, "Radical Authentic Leadership."

her attempt to fight against a totalitarian regime. As we saw in chapter one, she highlights the difference between leadership, understood as a collective endeavour, and leadership as mastery. To explore this distinction further, in the final part of this chapter, we will consider the connections among bureaucracy, ethics and leadership.

3.1   Heidegger

In *Being and Time,* Heidegger's overarching purpose is to understand the nature of being. By disclosing the ways in which we live in the world, he contends that we will be able to discern the nature of existence. Critical to Heidegger's thesis is to demonstrate how we have failed to grasp the truth of being primarily because of a focus on metaphysics. According to Heidegger, metaphysics, or an inquiry into what is, has led philosophers to misunderstand the nature of truth, and focus instead on "scientific" or theoretical proof. But a metaphysical desire for certainty concerning the nature of existence serves to privilege what can be perceived or measured rather than what actually is.[221] To comprehend the essence of truth, therefore, we need to uncover what has been obscured by metaphysics through a hermeneutic, existential analysis.

C*ontra* metaphysical claims Heidegger contends that the nature of being can only be understood if we consider the question of who we are existentially and ontologically. In order to question being, therefore, we need to ask who we are in relation to being in general. His hermeneutic approach represents a continual back and forth between the question of being and the question of being as beings, that is, between how we appear to ourselves (ontic) and how we connect this appearing to being (ontological).[222] The difference between an ontological enquiry and fundamental ontology may be construed as follows. In an ontological enquiry, as Brett Davis contends, we might ask why the

---

[221] As I showed in chapter one, some scholars contend that authentic leadership is comprised of four components that can be measured in a quantifiable way. Yet, this desire for proof through a quantifiable approach is not able to show us how authenticity manifests itself in its fullness.

[222] For an informative account of the ontic and ontological in Heidegger's work, see Tom Greaves, *Starting with Heidegger* (Continuum Books, 2010), 25-31.

being of a plant is different from the being of an animal. By contrast, fundamental ontology questions why anything exists at all.[223]

It is because man's essence is grounded in existence, and is inherently temporal, that Heidegger suggests that we should be able to gain insight into the question of being by discerning "who Dasein is in its everydayness."[224] According to Tom Greaves, Heidegger is trying to distinguish between the 'existentiell,' which I understand to mean the way we interpret our lives, and the 'existential,' that is, the self-understanding that arises from this interpretation.[225] Hence, the 'existential' is concerned with the manner in which we choose to take up specific projects. Heidegger's account works on two levels. On the ontic level, he describes what is observable in everyday life. From these observations, he tries to ascertain how the ontic phenomena he perceives relate to their fundamental ontological structure. For Heidegger, phenomena exist as surface and ground which constitute ontic and ontological. In his exploration of being, he considers both the ontic and ontological as, together, they underscore the conditions of possible existence and the variety of ways in which we exist in the world.

As part of his phenomenological investigation, Heidegger is trying to destruct (his term) common notions of subjectivity. In order to do this, he argues that we need to comprehend how what we commonly think is "I" is, in fact, a "not I."[226] Heidegger contends that, in the past, philosophers erred when they argued that the "who" of *Dasein* meant the same as oneself. So while philosophers like Descartes thought it was self-evident that 'I' is the same as *Dasein*, Heidegger is emphatic this is not the case. This is principally because by focussing on the subject, we have failed to address the

---

[223] For more on this topic, see Brett W. Davies, "Introduction: Key Concepts in Heidegger's Thinking of Being," in his edited collection *Martin Heidegger: Key Concepts* (Durham, Acumen, 2011), 1-17.

[224] Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 149. Please note all references use page numbers not section numbers.

[225] See Greaves, *Heidegger*, 26.

[226] Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 152.

phenomenological question of 'who.' This is what his phenomenological investigation aims to accomplish.

For Heidegger, what constitutes the 'who' of *Dasein* does not change throughout a person's life experiences; rather, there is a core essence that stays the same throughout a person's life. Yet, for the most part, we live in the world, not as an authentic 'who,' but as someone who fits in with others. Thus, we take up the views of others while believing that each decision we make is solely our own. Heidegger juxtaposes *Dasein*, (his term for the authentic self) with the term 'the they,' which refers to our everyday inauthentic mode of existence. He suggests that *Dasein* is both fascinated with and absorbed by the world. Because of this fascination, on an everyday level, we often act without thinking. This is not an authentic mode of existence because it is focused upon conforming. What happens is that "[e]veryone is the other, and no one is himself,"[227] and this becomes my way of knowing the world and myself. In practical terms, what this means is that we carry out everyday activities without stopping to think about them, and live our lives by compartmentalizing what we do. Such compartmentalization leads to a failure to understand, or even question life's overall purpose. The end result is that we lose our ability to comprehend fully who we are, since our distinctive identity is obscured by the 'they' self. This loss of individual agency ensures that people lead inauthentic lives without knowing or, in some cases, caring.

Such inauthentic modes of existence can be traced back to instrumental reason, states Heidegger, and the way that humans perceive the world as a collection of things. In this instrumental mode of being, we fail to make connections between different entities. For example, in daily life, we encounter objects without noticing, and become oblivious to our surroundings, or we may walk past a colleague without stopping because we are late for an appointment. Instead of caring about what is nearest to us, we turn our minds to the next activity. Ultimately, this leads to viewing the world as a means to an end, which constitutes an inauthentic mode of being as it encourages us to see people and things as

---

[227] Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 165.

objects to be used and discarded at will. If, instead of viewing objects for their use-value, we allow entities to be as they are, he suggests we might begin to comprehend being. Instead of acting in such an instrumental fashion, we need to take a more open approach to the world. One way to obtain such an open stance is by tarrying with things. Such tarrying shows that we care about the world and one another, and awakens us to the possibility of leading a more authentic existence.

3.1.1 Care and Authenticity

Fundamental to Heidegger's overall argument in *Being and Time* is that "Dasein's *Being* reveals itself as care."[228] He maintains that the primary purpose of care is to bring humans back to their essence.[229] Through an acknowledgment of care, we can engage in the world in a manner that tries not to dominate others. However, we must guard against confusing authentic care with inauthentic semblances such as "will, wish, addiction and urge."[230] For example, an inauthentic mode of being might be to neglect to do something, and this neglect would constitute a deficient mode of care. Conversely, accomplishing a task is an authentic mode of care. Heidegger outlines solicitude in a similar manner. An inauthentic form of solicitude involves 'leaping in' and taking over from someone. In doing so, we limit the other person's sense of autonomy. This is an inauthentic act because the other person is forced to become reliant upon us. As well, showing empathy is an inauthentic instance of solicitude. The reason why he suggests empathy is negative is because it leads us to project our own desires onto others. Authentic solicitude, by contrast, seeks to restore care in a genuine manner. An example of authentic solicitude is listening to someone's predicament without giving advice, asking appropriate questions, and allowing that person to resolve her own problem by talking it through together. In so

---

[228] Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 227.

[229] Martin Heidegger, "Letter on Humanism," in *Martin Heidegger: Basic Writings*, ed. David Farrell Krell (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1977), 243.

[230] Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 227.

doing, a person is able to make up her own mind, and determine her future actions without being led by another. Thus, caring means allowing others to be as they are.

What it is critical to note is that, for Heidegger, no-one is authentic in the manner in which some leadership scholars interested in authenticity suggest. Rather authenticity represents "an existentiell modification of 'the they.'"[231] What this means is that we do not live our lives as either authentic or inauthentic persons. As Brett Davis contends, there can be no authentic existence if what that implies is an existence that "takes complete ownership of itself or completely disclaims itself."[232] Furthermore, Davis maintains that authenticity is only possible for those people who differentiate between authenticity and inauthenticity, since Heidegger contends that there is another mode of being-in-the-world, and that is the mode of indifference.[233] Indeed, it is this mode of indifference that may represent the most problematic way of being, states Carmen Taylor, since it constitutes a lack of care.[234] This lack of care for others can be seen in how some people act in an apathetic manner towards others. Such apathy is one reason why Heidegger contends that it is important to understand the function of mood.

3.1.2   Mood

A critical component of Heidegger's phenomenological investigation into the nature of being is the function of mood. He argues that our moods are the way in which we live in the world. It is through mood that things show up in a particular manner. We are always in a mood of some sort, and this influences how the world appears to us. In the mood of

---

[231] Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 168. Theodor Adorno viewed Heidegger as naive in his inability to recognize that authenticity, once it became part of the public lexicon, would become a component of the 'they' speech. Adorno also disparages what he regards as Heidegger's subject-oriented self of *Being and Time*. See Adorno, *The Jargon of Authenticity* (London and New York: Routledge, 2003), 103.

[232] Tom Greaves, *Heidegger* 62.

[233] Heidegger, *Being and Time*,

[234] See Carmen Taylor, "Authenticity," in *A Companion to Heidegger,* eds. Hubert L. Dreyfus and Mark A. Wrathall (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Inc., 2005), 285-296. For Taylor, becoming authentic, in a Heideggerian sense, does not necessarily mean throwing off social conventions; rather, it means being aware of those conventions one chooses to follow.

anxiety, for example, we may express discomfort but not know why. There is a profound difference, he contends, between the moods of fear and anxiety, since anxiety is not caused by anything specific. To demonstrate the distinction between anxiety and fear, he shows how our approach to a situation changes but in different ways. Fear is always a fear of something. In the mood of fear, for instance, one may become bewildered. Heidegger offers the example of how people in a burning building pick up what is nearest rather than what is important because, in their disorientation, they focus on what is close at hand. Conversely, what threatens us in anxiety cannot be found in a particular place. Rather, anxiety reveals itself through a vague feeling that we may describe as "uncanny." When this anxious feeling occurs, we may exclaim that we feel "out of sorts" or "we do not feel at home."[235] Hence, mood affects how things appear to us.

Another example of this anxious unease is when, on entering a place for the first time, we experience a feeling of *déjà vu* - a sense that we has been there before. Rather than trying to understand what is happening, people dismiss these feelings since they have no rational explanation. This is a mistake, according to Heidegger, because these experiences offer us a glimpse of something valuable. What these uncanny feelings reveal to us is a sense of otherness, perhaps of authentic possibility.[236] These uncanny experiences are worth paying attention to, because we may obtain insights into the comprehension of *Dasein*. If we focus on the ways in which anxiety shows itself, we may gain understanding about authenticity, and, in turn, a greater comprehension of what it means to exist. To sum up, unlike fear which can be understood as a fear of something,

---

[235] As a child, I remember people stopping in mid-conversation, saying that they felt a shiver go down their spine just as if "someone just walked over my grave." This apparently comes from a time in the nineteenth century when people used to buy family grave plots. It was seen as a sign of disrespect to walk on someone's grave.

[236] Heidegger changed his mind arguing in later work, such as "What is Metaphysics," that it is when we feel at home that is a fundamental aspect of *Dasein*. See Julian Young. "What is Dwelling? The Homelessness of Modernity and the Worlding of the World," in *Heidegger, Authenticity, and Modernity: Essays in Honor of Hubert L. Dreyfus, Volume 1,* eds. Mark Wrathall, and Jeff Malpas (Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 2000), 187-205.

anxiety is a response to nothing in particular. But this nothing is more important than it might first seem to suggest.

In Heidegger's view, it is only in those intense moments when we recognize the inauthenticity of our lives that we may gain a glimpse of what it means to be authentic. It is through what he describes as the *Augenblick* (anxious moment of vision) that we can attempt to transcend our everyday life, and begin to live in a more authentic way.[237] The purpose of these angst-ridden insights is to awaken *Dasein* to its future possibility. This is the mode of existence he refers to as resoluteness. For Heidegger, resoluteness is the most primordial truth of *Dasein* because it is an individual response to the call of conscience. In his words, "resoluteness as authentic disclosedness, is *authentically* nothing else than *Being-in-the-world*."[238] What is most authentic to *Dasein*, for Heidegger, is its resolute response to the silent call that emanates from within.

For Heidegger, anxiety represents the ontic manifestation of the ontological state of authenticity, since how we perceive anxiety offers insight into what it might mean to be authentic. Yet, for authenticity to be unique to each person, he contends that the call of conscience must remain unsaid.[239] He insists that it is not through speech but via silence that we comprehend *Dasein*. To hear the call, it is necessary for each person to listen to her inner voice. Heidegger shows that there are three distinct ways in which we can hear or ignore the call of conscience. The first way is when we receive a call that we are guilty of something, the second is when we obtain a warning as to the possibility of being guilty, and the third is when we obtain an affirmation that we are not guilty.[240] It is

---

[237] Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 387-8.

[238] Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 348.

[239] This notion of a silent call of conscience has a long history in Western philosophy. As Arendt points out, Socrates spoke of the *daimon* which was similar to Heidegger's notion of *Dasein* in that it was unique to the self. See Arendt, *Human Condition*, 179.

[240] Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 281. An example of being guilty is when we owe a debt for an action that has deprived another person in some way. Another instance of being guilty is by being responsible for causing something negative to happen. Conversely, it can be a lack of action that

because we can hear the call of conscience that he contends we know that we are guilty before we undertake a misdeed. However, the call's purpose is not to be critical of *Dasein's* action, but to remind *Dasein* of its potentiality for being. This does not necessarily imply that we want to have a good conscience, but rather that we are open to receiving the call of conscience. When the call of conscience arrives, it is often unexpected and, sometimes, unwanted. Moreover, it is possible for the call of conscience to be misinterpreted by the "they" self. Nevertheless, the call of conscience is a vital component of authenticity, in Heidegger's view, since it is through this desire for a conscience that *Dasein* is able to realize its own potentiality.

Heidegger also contends that language is critical to comprehending being. He states that there can be no "home" for humans outside of the realm of language, since the latter represents "the house of being."[241] We make sense of our lives through the medium of language. The significance of an experience, and the meaning we attest to it, arises through how we speak or think about the event. It is because of language that Heidegger argues that humans dwell in the world in a different mode than other entities, such as animals or things.[242] Furthermore, he notes that language, like life, is constantly changing. This is why Heidegger contends that we cannot comprehend the fullness of

---

causes a person to become guilty, which results in a feeling that we "owe" someone something. Guilt can also be seen as a "lack," such as when we fail to do something, which may manifest itself as regret. Hence, the German word for guilt "schuld" has various meanings such as being guilty, owing something or being responsible. I thank Helen Fielding for bringing this to my attention.

[241] Heidegger, "Letter on Humanism," 239.

[242] Here Heidegger makes a crucial, if controversial, distinction between the ways in which humans encounter each other as opposed to animals which, in his view, do not possess *Dasein* because they do not have language. His argument that other animals do not possess language has been disputed by critics as well as admirers such as Jacques Derrida.

language if we consider words to be "like buckets and kegs from which we scoop a content."[243] Rather words are "wellsprings" whose meaning shifts over time and space.

The meaning of words alters. This is one of the problems that I see with the way in which some scholars want to pin down the meaning of the "authentic leadership." In doing so, we ignore the fullness of meaning. For instance, if we trace the etymological roots of the word "authentic," we discover that it has different meanings that have been forgotten. For example, one meaning of "authentic" (now obsolete) is "authoritative," which derives from the Middle English "autentik." The word also derives from the Greek "authentēs," meaning author.[244] Perhaps if we were to translate these different meanings of the term into modern-day English, we could say authenticity refers to that which seems to me to be both authoritative and true. What this suggests to me is that a person's sense of authenticity will differ depending upon her particular standpoint.

In addition, it is only possible to live an authentic existence, according to Heidegger, when we come to terms with our own mortality. But facing up to our own death may be difficult within a social world where people who talk about death are considered mawkish. Instead of accepting death's inevitability, he argues that the "they" transforms anxiety about dying into fear. Such a refusal to accept death represents an inauthentic mode of existence, since it is only possible to face death authentically by owning up to its eventuality. Once we accept our own mortality, this enables *Dasein* to release itself from the illusions of the "they." Consequently, it is through our determination to be true to ourselves, which involves coming to terms with mortality, as well as our desire to take responsibility for our actions, that we can move toward a more authentic mode of being.

---

[243] Martin Heidegger, *What Is Called Thinking*? trans. J. Glenn Gray (New York: Harpers and Row, 1968), 130.

[244] In reviewing etymology, I consulted *The New Shorter Oxford English Dictionary on Historical Principles*, edited by Lesley Brown, Volume I, A-M, (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1993), accessed March 10, 2010. In a recent article, John Lawler and Ian Ashman maintain that the root of authenticity shows that knowing thyself is an erroneous, though often-quoted aspect of authenticity in the leadership literature. See John Lawler and Ian Ashman, "Theorizing Leadership Authenticity: A Sartrean Perspective," *Leadership* 8, no. 4 (2012): 327-344.

A crucial component here is recognizing our own finitude; only then can we begin to live an authentic existence.

3.1.3   Destiny and Time

For Heidegger, there can be no being outside of time because being and time form co-determining ways of existing in the world. In his view, temporality, or our lived experience of time, is intrinsically related to being. Hence, we cannot think about what it means to be authentic without accounting for how temporality influences existence. Each moment of our lives is an amalgam of past, present and future. When we think about time, therefore, a residue of the past influences current thinking, such that previous knowledge and attitudes have a bearing on present situations. The present moment also includes the future because we are always-already oriented beyond the present moment toward a future act. The problem is that, at times, we become so focussed on the future that we can forget the present. This is why we need constantly to see time as in a sense of flux. Our understanding of temporality means that we are able to comprehend past actions, present circumstances, and decide on future possibilities. This is why he argues that "being" and "time" are fundamentally linked.

Consequently, there is no "now" except in this oscillation between past, present and future. Time is not to be understood as in a series of "nows," but as a constant to-ing and fro-ing. Here, as Simon Critchley asserts, Heidegger is contesting the Aristotelian belief that time occurs "as a uniform, linear and infinite series of now-points."[245] This linear model of time has been the mainstay of philosophy from the Greeks through to Hegel. Yet, according to Heidegger, this is not the way that we experience time in everyday life. Neither is it correct to think of time as in a Christian form of eternity. We see this connection between temporality and being in language in everyday phrases such as 'there's no time like the present,' or 'time waits for no man.' These common sayings reveal our implicit awareness of the interconnection between personal mortality and time.

---

[245] Simon Critchley, http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/belief/2009/jul/27/heidegger-being-time-philosophy, accessed, November 16, 2010.

This is what Heidegger refers to as a "reckoning;" he views this reckoning with time as elemental.

In exploring the ontological conditions through which people relate to history, Heidegger differentiates between the word "fate" that relates to an individual, and the word "destiny" that relates to a people. In his view, inauthentic historicity manifests itself in a lack of steadfastness, which shows itself when people evade choosing their future. He contends that "[o]ur fates have already been guided in advance … Dasein's fateful destiny in and with its generation goes to make up the full authentic historizing of *Dasein.*"[246] This historical component of *Dasein* is intrinsically connected with time. Here Heidegger is suggesting that a people's fatefulness is within their grasp. But they must choose not only their destiny but also their hero.

As I will show later, it is possible that Heidegger's initial support for National Socialism was because he perceived this regime as a way to awaken the German people to their destiny. In his infamous Rector speech, Heidegger suggests that an important aspect of a people's destiny, and an indicator of *Dasein's* authenticity, is its resolute loyalty to a particular leader. This resolute loyalty is in direct contrast to Arendt's contention that we must always be on the alert against the dangers of absolute loyalty, since it may lead to a lack of questioning, as well as to a refusal to be responsible for one's actions.

I have discussed *Being and Time* in some detail because Heidegger's work is fundamental to debates about authenticity. Similar themes resonate in Arendt's writing, either in the sense of negating Heidegger's claims about the separation of being and appearance, or as an ongoing dialogue as in the case of what it means to think. In the next section, I will contrast Arendt's approach with Heidegger's.

3.2   Arendt

I suggest that Arendt re-envisages Heidegger's concept of authenticity through her discussion of uniqueness and plurality. She demonstrates that uniqueness, expressed in

---

[246] Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 385.

deeds and words, is important, not only in our relationships with one another, but also in relation to what it means to exist. As I pointed out in chapter one, for Arendt, a person's unique identity is to be understood as both relational and embodied because each time we act and speak we do so within an already existent web of human relationships. In her work, she fleshes out Heidegger's notion of *Mitsein* to show that human existence is inherently relational, as well as temporal.

Further, Arendt rethinks Heidegger's concept of authenticity to show that it is natality, not finitude, which is central to understanding existence.[247] Her emphasis on natality stands in direct contrast to Heidegger's belief that it is by coming to terms with death that a person can realize her potential for authenticity. Natality refers to how, with each act, we "insert ourselves into the world."[248] Each action is like a second birth since through each act we bring something new into the world. While Heidegger sees authenticity as emerging from silent resolution, for Arendt, uniqueness lies in actions. In her view, it is through *amor mundi* (love of the world) rather than a resolute *carpe diem* (seize the day) that we can work toward a more inclusive way of thinking about existence.[249]

Arendt was no naive admirer of Heidegger.[250] For instance, in "What is Existential Philosophy," written shortly after the Second World War, she is harshly critical of his

---

[247] Dana Villa argues that plurality is a distinctive difference in the work of Heidegger and Arendt. See Villa, *Public Freedom*. (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2008.)

[248] Arendt, *Human Condition*, 176.

[249] I would not want to convey the impression that Arendt is a derivative thinker but that, as part of her approach, she recognized and affirmed those thinkers who were important to her thought. As she believed that discord was just as important as concord in coming to a decision, it is not surprising that she would include her disagreements with other thinkers, as well as her agreements. In *The Human Condition*, for example, she explains why it is that she thinks Marx made missteps in his thinking. At the same time Arendt makes it plain that, like Cicero on Plato, she would prefer to be led astray with those thinkers that she admires, than spend time in the company of those she does not. I am seemingly affected by Arendt whose thought on occasion perplexes me, occasionally irritates me, but this does not stop me returning to her work.

[250] Much has been made of the fact that Arendt and Heidegger had an affair when she was his student. My own sense is that what is most important is that their ongoing intellectual friendship

philosophical approach. Here, Arendt contends that the reason he adopted the term *Dasein*, rather than man, was to avoid a discussion of Kantian definitions such as freedom, dignity and reason.[251] She argues that the Heideggerian self "is a concept of man that leaves the individual existing independent of humanity."[252] A self without others is a meaningless concept, however, since we live together within a common world.[253] Moreover, Arendt contests his claim that it is through a resolute acceptance of personal mortality that people learn to be authentic.

As I mentioned in chapter one, Arendt contends that we have a desire for self-display. She distinguishes between self-display, which she sees as something beyond a person's control, and self-presentation. Self-display is not the same as self-presentation, not least because appearances can be manipulated. Arendt observes that if we attempt to unveil the "true" identity of an animal that may have changed colour to better adapt to its surroundings, what we would perceive is not the truth of that creature, but another semblance. Similarly, when we unmask a hypocrite, this unmasking may destroy the deception but it does not "discover anything authentically appearing."[254] Thus, for Arendt, there is always a possibility of a deliberate manipulation in that a person can choose to appear in the "guise of seeming, pretense and willful deception."[255] The

---

had a positive effect on their writing. In addition, her largesse of spirit, given his Nazi affiliation, is an example of her ability to forgive.

[251] Arendt, "What is Existential Philosophy?"in *Essays in Understanding 1930-1954*, ed. Jerome Kohn, 178.

[252] Arendt, "Existential Philosophy?" 181.

[253] As Seyla Benhabib points out, Arendt turns away from the isolation of the Heideggerian self in *Being and Time* toward a politics of plurality. See Benhabib, *The Reluctant Modernism of Hannah Arendt*. Thousand Oaks: Sage, 1996, especially 47-51.

[254] Arendt, H. *Life of the Mind*, 39.

[255] Arendt, H. *Life of the Mind*, 36.

problem as it relates to the question of authenticity is that we cannot know whether a person is being a hypocrite or not.

Our outward appearance is not the same as showing our innermost self. As she states "appearance is by no means the outward manifestation of an inner disposition, if it were, we probably would all act and speak alike."[256] Arendt maintains that we do not have access to an internal, stable self. An 'inside self,' if it exists at all, never appears to either the inner or the outward sense."[257] Rather what we perceive, she states, are inner sensations. These sensations present themselves to us through our emotions and moods. Here we see a similarity with Heidegger's account of mood.

A central distinction between Heidegger and Arendt, however, is her emphasis on action. It is how we act in the world that matters. Thus, it is not knowing who we are that matters but appearing to others as we would wish to appear to ourselves. In others words, it behooves each person, if they wish to act ethically, to be consistent in word and deed. She argues that whenever we appear in the world, being and appearance coincide.[258] Because being and appearing are the same, she states there can be no two-world theory that bifurcates the depth of being and the surface of appearing. Hence, we cannot go beyond appearances to the thing itself. Further, she maintains that scientists and philosophers are in error in their "relentless search for the truth behind mere appearances,"[259] for it is not possible to move beyond the boundaries of perception to the inner sanctum of truth.

---

[256] Arendt, H. *Life of the Mind*, 35. I have kept the italics that appear in the original source. If we were all the same, then there would be no need for psychology, although she does disparage what she calls depth psychology since, unlike individual psychology by which she means fiction, all it does in her view is to outline moods.

[257] Arendt, *Life of the Mind*, 39.

[258] Arendt, *Life of the Mind*, 19.

[259] Arendt, *Life of the Mind*, 26.

For Arendt, the world is like a stage upon which we arrive and disappear. Within that world, each person perceives things from her own particular standpoint. At times, we act as spectators and in other moments as actors. With each act a person differentiates herself. Yet such differentiation depends upon one's ability to belong.[260] At different times, the rights of people to belong to society have been denied for a variety of reasons. Yet it is only when each person feels that they belong that humans may flourish. In a just society, each person needs to be recognized and respected for who and not what they are. It is the focus on the "who," understood as the unique way in which each person orientates herself to the world, that we are able to recognize and distinguish one another.

The problem in modernity is that individual distinctiveness, understood as the ability to speak and act, is covered over by social norms and prejudices. As we saw in chapter one, Arendt argues that we are inclined to focus on the "whatness" of a person, that is, what they do rather than who they are. In becoming a "society of jobholders," she argues that we have lost a deeper sense of connection with one another. In modernity, this lack of connection between people, together with a focus on self, has led to an increase in loneliness. The breakdown of communal ties allows for the emergence of totalitarian regimes.

As I pointed out in chapter two, Arendt is critical of the Enlightenment's stress on equality because it is often perceived in the abstract. Within such an abstract framework, there is little respect for difference. This is her chief objection to what she termed 'the rise of the social' in the eighteenth century, and the focus on correct ways of behaving rather than on individual action. Thus, for Arendt, an emphasis on equality, understood as sameness, is not conducive to plurality, because it is based on an abstract way of thinking about human relations. Moreover, too much emphasis on equality obscures the fact that

---

[260] Following the Holocaust, the notion of what it meant to belong became an important component of Arendt's political thought. Peg Birmingham argues that Arendt's telling phrase "the right to have rights" is probably her most important contribution to political philosophy. Underpinning this phrase is a withering critique of human rights as presently constituted. See Birmingham, *Hannah Arendt and Human Rights: The Predicament of Common Responsibility* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2006).

only some individuals are perceived as equal. For example, she argues that what makes a tyranny distinct is that everyone is equal with the exception of the tyrant who dictates the lives of others. For Arendt, human flourishing is based on the ability for each human being to exist in an environment that allows both equality and distinctiveness to appear. But, in modernity, human distinctiveness is covered over by abstract notions of equality. As we saw in the discussion of the pariah and the parvenu in the previous chapter, is not who we are, but who we are allowed to be.

Furthermore, social conformity can be dangerous for those who are not perceived as in compliance with social dictates. If a person does not conform, this may result in isolation and loneliness and, in extreme situations, conformity may threaten the very basis of humanity. In its most sinister form, as in totalitarian regimes, absolute orthodoxy can result in a denial of a people's right to exist. In her preface to *Men and Dark Times*, Arendt observes that Heidegger's observations of 'the they' were uncannily precise. She writes: "[i]n his description of human existence, everything that is real or authentic is assaulted by the overwhelming power of "mere talk."[261] Hence, Arendt perceives Heidegger's account of the "they" as prescient, given what was to transpire in Nazi Germany, and the destruction of a plural society.

In this section, I have shown how Arendt's work both complements and contradicts Heidegger's approach to authenticity. She demonstrates how important it is to take into account self and world. Furthermore, a plurality of perspective is something that runs contrary to what she terms the Leader Principle, as I will now show.

3.3   The Leader Principle

In chapter one, we saw how the problem with the separation of leadership into those who think and those who act brought about a hierarchical way of thinking about human relationships. What happens in modernity, according to Arendt, is the emergence of totalitarianism and the success of "the Leader Principle," which leads to the willful

---

[261] Arendt, *Men in Dark Times* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1968), ix.

destruction of pluralistic society, since it is based upon total obedience. In her study of the origins of totalitarianism, Arendt sees a connection between the beginnings of this destructive force and nineteenth-century imperialism. For instance, she contends that empire building has always been concerned with hierarchies of raced and sexed bodies. Arendt shows how, in the nineteenth century, many democratically-minded European nations were complicit in the creation of race-based thinking. Chief amongst these was England's desire to create an empire based upon trade, no matter the cost to others. She perceives a link between the colonial mentality and the rise of totalitarianism. Nineteenth-century expansionist policies sacrificed others' lives for greed and profit. This instrumental way of acting, coupled with a complete disregard for human life, opened the way for totalitarianism to emerge in the twentieth century. Hence, for Arendt, the destructive exploits of nineteenth-century imperialism led the way to the rise of totalitarianism.

Phenomenologically, a significant feature of totalitarian rule is that there is no personal responsibility for any act, other than that of the leader. Arendt sees this lack of personal accountability as symptomatic of the failings of modernity. She maintains that totalitarian leaders like Hitler led in a different manner from a tyrant. One main difference is that while tyrants use people as scapegoats to maintain power, in totalitarian regimes, everything is conducted based on the will of the leader.[262] For example, in Nazi Germany, all acts were carried out in the name of the Fuehrer. The Leadership Principle decreed that Hitler's word superseded written law.[263] In effect, this meant that Hitler was personally responsible for all official action. In practical terms, this way of leading resulted in each official acting as the living embodiment of the Fuehrer in obeisance to his every command. What happens when a Leader claims total responsibility in this manner is that there is a lack of personal accountability on the part of everyone else.

---

[262] Arendt, *Origins of Totalitarianism, 375*.

[263] In German this is known as the *Fuehrerprinzip.* For more on this topic, see Daniel Stone, "The Holocaust and the Human," in *Hannah Arendt and the Uses of History: Imperialism, Nation, Race, and Genocide*, eds. Richard H. King and Dan Stone (New York: Berghahn Books, 2007), 232-250.

Furthermore, because of this centralized power in the hands of one man it seems to the outside world as if the only person who knows what is happening is the leader. Thus, Arendt is in agreement with Hitler's statement that without him, Nazi Germany could not exist.[264] The main problem with the "Leader Principle" is that these regimes undermine the public realm. People stop taking responsibility for their actions and at first are willing, and then forced, to give up their freedom in favour of what appears to be strong leadership. Another salient feature of the totalitarian state is mobility. Constant changes of direction by the Leader ensure that people are kept off-guard. Thus, members of the elite are constantly changing. These alterations in personnel enabled Hitler to ensure rival factions did not obtain too much power. In this way, the Leader proves that he is not only infallible, but indispensible. While there is mobility within the system, for the majority of citizens, freedom of movement and speech is constrained.

Arendt often conceives of politics in terms of spatial metaphors. For instance, she likens constitutional government to a space where the law is like a hedge placed between buildings. The space provided by this metaphorical hedge allows for dialogue and debate which, in turn, enables human flourishing. Conversely, Arendt argues that tyranny is akin to a desert where the tyrant's will to dominate functions like a sandstorm that overtakes travelers. Conversely, totalitarianism has no spatial topology because it acts "like an iron band of terror"[265] that compresses people together until it appears as if there is no opposition, since everybody speaks with one voice. In reality, differences of opinion are contained by this concentration of power. What seems, on the surface, to be an equality of voice is, in fact, the destruction of different viewpoints by means of force and violence.

In Arendt's view, it is not the totalitarian leader's personality that is important, but his organizational skills. Thus, she maintains that Max Weber was incorrect to perceive

---

[264] See Arendt's discussion of the Leader principle in *Origins of Totalitarianism, 375-6*.

[265] Arendt, *Origins of Totalitarianism*, 473-479.

charisma as necessary for leadership success.[266] Arendt observes that both Stalin and Hitler were able, prior to coming to power, to build around them a group of people who were totally loyal since they owed their appointment to the leader. Unquestioning loyalty by followers is central to any totalitarian leader's success, since it ensures that no matter what a leader requests there will always be followers willing to carry out the orders.[267] It is this unquestioning loyalty that is so dangerous, because it ensures that someone will be willing to do what the leader says.

What also distinguishes a totalitarian state from other forms of rule is that the regime is based on the Leader's infallibility, whose success, in turn, is built upon fabrication. Lies are necessary so that people, whether members of the ruling elite or the mass, see the Leader as intrinsic to their future well-being. The Leader's absolute command and total sense of assurance brings with it a false sense of security. After the defeat that Germany suffered following World War One, Hitler's leadership appeared to offer an alternative to past humiliations. Arendt contends that while most of the German population admired Hitler's leadership, these sympathizers did not know the full extent of what was taking place. Only the inner elite were apprised of the Leader's objectives. The naive followers express their loyalty to the Leader, while the elite carry out criminal activity in a cynical way. Moreover, each totalitarian regime adopts a distinctive ideology to obtain its long-range goal of world domination. In the case of the Nazis, their vision was based on Aryan supremacy. Because the realization of world domination cannot take place within a single lifetime, what makes leaders like Hitler able to retain power is partly because their pronouncements cannot be defeated by rational argument. Factual truth is denied in favour of the totalitarian leader's vision, which is based on lies and delusions. Whether the leader is morally right or wrong becomes irrelevant. Under such conditions, knowledge is disconnected from truth since claims to factual truth are no longer considered necessary.

---

[266] Arendt, *Origins of Totalitarianism*, 362 ff.

[267] We saw in chapter one how this unquestioned loyalty to a leader can create havoc for an organization.

In this section, I have examined Arendt's thinking on the emergence of totalitarianism, and its historical antecedents. I wanted to offer some historical and philosophical context for why totalitarianism emerged in the twentieth century. Now I want to turn to questions of ethical responsibility and leadership.

3.4   Morality in Dark Times

In the interviews I conducted, the connection between questions of ethics and the notion of personal authenticity in leadership emerged. While most interview participants stated that authenticity was important in regards to leading ethically, not everyone agreed. In one interview, for example, Olive argued that the problem with theories like authentic leadership is that they fail to account for the "ancient problem of dirty hands." I want to look more closely at this question of "dirty hands" by exploring the connections among authenticity, morality and individual responsibility.

In her essay "Personal Responsibility under Dictatorship," Arendt argues that the controversy that ensued over the publication of her book on the trial of Adolf Eichmann raised moral issues that she had not anticipated.[268] Her detractors argued it was wrong for Arendt to judge men like Eichmann, since each one of us might have been morally culpable under similar circumstances. While her critics maintained she was wrong to judge, Arendt insists that judging is crucial to an ethical worldview. Moral judgments are necessary because without a willingness to judge, the world alters without us noticing. To illustrate her argument, Arendt describes how when she was growing up in Germany in the early part of the twentieth century, there was little attention paid to moral issues because ethical conduct was assumed. In hindsight, she sees this early moral disintegration in German society as a prelude to the abominations that were to follow.

In the 1930s and 1940s in Germany and Russia, Arendt argues that established moral standards collapsed. This moral decline was more heinous in Nazi Germany, she states, because there was a tacit acceptance from all strata of society to accept a new way of

---

[268] Arendt, "Personal Responsibility under Dictatorship," 19.

thinking about morality. The German people knew what the Nazis were like because Hitler did not hide his intentions. In her view, the true moral crimes were not carried out by the Nazis, who acted out of some perverted sense of commitment to Hitler, but by ordinary Germans. For Arendt, morality collapses when ordinary people choose to go along with a regime they find morally repugnant. It is precisely when people choose to acquiesce with the majority and refuse to make individual judgments that ethical conduct is found wanting. One way this moral disintegration can be seen, she states, is that at the moment of Nazi defeat, German morality changed once more. What the world witnessed, therefore, was a total collapse of a "moral" order not once but twice, which begs the question of how is it possible for society to change its ethical standards so abruptly. Arendt contends that this ethical disintegration reveals morality's true meaning "as a set of mores, of customs and manners, which could be exchanged for another set with no more trouble than it would take to change the table manners of a whole people."[269] She further maintains that the first people to accept this new set of values were respectable members of society. What this demonstrates is that polite society is not the best judge of moral standards.[270]

The problem when we conform to social mores is that at times of crisis we no longer know how to act. But, if not to moral standards, then where should a person turn at times of crisis? Well, according to Arendt, not to religious doctrine. In Nazi Germany, for instance, religion proved of little assistance in guarding against moral failings because a person's religious beliefs were regarded as a private matter. And while moral philosophy may teach us how to act in times of peace, it is not sufficient in a crisis. At such critical junctures, she maintains that the Socratic way of thinking is "the only working morality in borderline situations."[271] Socrates argued that the reason why it is better to suffer than to do wrong is because it is preferable to disagree with others, "rather than that I, being

---

[269] Arendt, "Personal Responsibility under Dictatorship," 43.

[270] Here I think we see resonances with Arendt's argument and Heidegger's discussion of 'the they.'

[271] Arendt, "Some Questions of Moral Philosophy," 106.

one, should be out of tune with myself and contradict myself."[272] From this perspective, the reason not to commit evil is because it would be hard to live with oneself. This, in Arendt's view, is our best defense against evil.

In her discussion of moral responsibility, Arendt considers how other philosophers have thought about ethical conduct. For instance, Kant argued that it was necessary to have an imperative to keep the will (an individual facet that she argues was unknown to the ancients) in harmony with reason.[273] This is why he argued that every inclination, both good and bad, were temptations that led one astray. From Kant's viewpoint, people do evil things because of temptation. Contra Socrates, he argued that self-contempt was not enough to guard against immoral acts because a man can lie to himself. For Kant, moral conduct is an internal matter.[274] Thus, his categorical imperative serves as a moral compass that helps individuals guard against human frailty. To obey the Kantian categorical imperative means to obey reason and, in doing so, remain in harmony with oneself. With the laws of nature one has no choice but to obey; therefore, Kant maintained it made no sense to say that a person obeys the laws of nature. Conversely, with moral law, each person is obligated to obey the laws of the land. When a person obeys the law of the land, he accordingly obeys himself. (Unintentionally, Arendt suggests, Kant divorced moral philosophy from religion when he argued that man, not God, was the basis for the law of morality.) In placing the duties a man has to himself above those responsibilities he has towards others, this leads to a contradiction whereby it is love of the self, rather than love of others, that compels us to do right. The problem with this viewpoint is that it turns the self into the ultimate standard of what is morally good. As the self can lie, it should never be the sole arbiter of morality. Instead, we must

---

[272] Arendt, "Some Questions of Moral Philosophy," 90.

[273] Arendt makes this argument on several occasions because she believes that it was in Christianity, specifically through Paul, that the will become known. See, especially *The Life of The Mind*.

[274] My understanding of Kant is mostly derived from Arendt. As well as the essays I mention here, I am familiar with her *Lectures on Kant's Political Philosophy,* ed. Ronald Beiner (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1982).

look for a more worldly and intersubjective activity, which Arendt argues exists through our most plural faculty, judgement.

Originally a theory related to aesthetics, Kant's notion of good taste serves as the basis for the Arendtian notion of judgement. Arendt regards judgement as exemplary because of its intersubjective nature. Through the act of judging a person can take not only her own perspective into account as she does in solitary reflection, but also consider the views of others. In the act of judging, Arendt states, one must attempt to come to a potential agreement with the company of others who may or may not agree with one's position but with whom eventually one needs to fashion some kind of concord. Being willing to consider an issue from different perspectives is why she argued that judgement is the most essential activity to ensure the flourishing of the world. Having the confidence to judge for ourselves is vital if we are to save humanity from totalitarian-like ways of thinking. Being willing to disagree with others is critical if one intends to take a principled stance.[275] This is especially important in times of crisis where there is no moral guidebook to follow because the situation is novel. Hence, Arendt asserts that, in periods of moral upheaval, it is neither heroes nor saints that are needed, but ordinary people who are willing to take a moral stance, which entails judging for oneself.

For Arendt, "an individual's personal quality is their 'moral' quality."[276] This she terms the moral standard of the self. But this standard is not wholly sufficient. In addition to this personal characteristic, it is important that there be a moral standard of the world. To understand this more fully, we need to turn to another thinker. Arendt regards Machiavelli's famous statement in *The Prince* that rulers have to be taught "how *not* to be good"[277] as astute because he recognized that it is not whether a person's conduct is good that matters, but whether that person's conduct is "good for the world he lives

---

[275] Here we might remember Keith Grint's idea of the constructive dissenter that I mentioned in chapter one. Constructive dissent is important because it enables us to think for ourselves, rather than going along with the majority.

[276] Arendt, "Some Questions of Moral Philosophy," 79.

[277] Arendt, *Human Condition,* 77.

in."[278] For Machiavelli, in ruling the standard is always political, and, as such, always worldly. From this perspective, wrongdoing is a necessary evil for leaders. To return to the issue of dirty hands, I introduced earlier, perhaps we can argue that a leader sometimes has to make decisions that may negatively influence others. Ultimately, what is important is whether one's leadership conduct is good for the world.

Self and world must be taken into consideration if leaders wish to be ethical in their decision-making. Without taking self and world into account, there can be disastrous consequences. For example, we saw in chapter two how Robespierre's apparent goodness wreaked devastation on the French people, as he tried to root out hypocrisy wherever it could be found. For Arendt, goodness has no place on the political stage, since once goodness shows itself it becomes corrupted.[279] As she explains in *On Revolution*, we can never be certain of a person's good intentions because we cannot see into the depths of the human heart. Furthermore, as Dana Villa argues, a demand for authenticity can turn leaders into fanatics.[280] This is why Arendt, states Villa, is fiercely opposed to a politics of authenticity, because it transforms actors into hypocrites.[281] He sees a difficulty with Arendt's desire to separate action from morality is that celebrating a Machiavellian concept of *virtu* can cause amoral attitudes in leaders. But also the political actor cannot always distance himself from the fact of "dirty hands." Sometimes, it may be necessary to choose the lesser evil.

But how do we guard against leaders committing evil on a regular basis? Is evil indicative of a lack of forethought? This connection between evil and thoughtlessness is

---

[278] Arendt, "Thinking and Moral Considerations," 151.

[279] Villa, *Arendt and Heidegger*, 57.

[280] Perhaps this is why in conversations I have had with people about authenticity and leadership, Hitler's name is so often brought up by interlocutors.

[281] He perceives a contradiction in Arendt's view of action and virtue. For instance, according to Villa, in regards to an agonistic view of action, such as Machiavelli's, what counts is not whether the act is good or bad, neither does it matter whether the act achieves it ends. See Villa, *Arendt and Heidegger*, 55.

Arendt's main thesis in her study of the trial of Adolf Eichmann, where she argues that evil arises when leaders fail to reflect upon what they do.[282] Rather than being radical, as Kant contended, she argues that evil arises through banality, and is often a result of putting oneself first. Arendt suggests that acts of evil occur whenever there is an absence of thought. By contrast, when a person engages in thinking, she is grounded in memory. Because of this internal memory, it is impossible for a thoughtful person to do evil because "knowing that he has to live with himself, there will be limits to what he can permit himself to do."[283] Here we see again the Socratic basis of Arendt's thought on questions of moral responsibility. A lack of forethought demonstrates a failure to care. Moreover, to refuse to question a leader's orders is, over time, to destroy one's moral sensibility. Arendt insists that limitless evil is possible only when reflective thinking is absent.

In considering questions of guilt and innocence, Arendt maintains that these attributes can only be applied to individuals. This is why she is fundamentally opposed to the notion of collective guilt as it can result in a feigned equality. In her view, collective guilt may lead to a lack of personal responsibility on the part of those individuals who commit immoral acts. Arendt maintains that "it is as wrong to feel guilty without having done anything specific as it is to feel free of all guilt if one actually is guilty of something."[284] She argues that collective guilt is a misnomer, because "no moral, individual and personal, standards of conduct will ever be able to excuse us from collective responsibility."[285] When it comes to moral questions, Arendt contends that an ethical response "concerns the individual in his singularity."[286] She sees a connection between

---

[282] Arendt, *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil* (London: Penguin Book, 1963).

[283] Arendt, "Personal Responsibility under Dictatorship," 47.

[284] Arendt, "Personal Responsibility under Dictatorship," 28.

[285] Arendt, "Some Questions of Moral Philosophy," 47.

[286] Arendt, "Some Questions of Moral Philosophy," 97.

legal and moral issues since when someone is brought to justice, they always appear as an individual. In a courtroom, the answer that someone carried out an act because he was following orders is never sufficient, because it does not address the question of why, as an individual, a person chose to respond in a particular manner.

Yet Arendt maintains that most Nazis brought to trial denied that there was anything personal about their actions, contending that they were merely following orders. This was the argument that Eichmann used at his trial, to her dismay. This refusal to take responsibility for one's actions is, from an Arendtian perspective, an immoral act. But many Nazis officers maintained that it was their duty to obey, rather than think for themselves. The Nazi fallacy about obedience can be traced back to the Platonic notion that a body politic consists of the ruler who commands, and the ruled who obey orders. In her view, obedience leads to a lack of personal responsibility. *Contra* Kant, Arendt contends that the word "obedience" has no place in a legal or moral framework. It is those who refuse to obey, and act out of personal conviction who demonstrate true leadership in Arendt's view. Their actions express a willingness to become personally involved in the public sphere. In contrast, blind obedience to a regime shows a lack of personal responsibility.

In this section, we have seen how judgement is critical to a person's authenticity, especially in times of crisis. In totalitarian regimes, being willing to judge for oneself is necessary if the regime is ever to be overthrown. One of the problems that Arendt highlights is the way that people went along with the Nazis, out of some perverted sense of belief that such a regime could bring about a fundamental change in society. Moreover, the changes that are wrought by totalitarian regimes serve to suppress human flourishing in favour of a belief in the certainty of an ideology that is connected to the Leader Principle that worked by valorizing one person's vision over all others. As such, it is contrary to human freedom since one person's sovereignty negates plurality.

3.5   Authentic Visions?

Previously, I stated that Arendt's views on uniqueness and plurality are important to counterbalance notions of leadership that put too much emphasis on the self. As an

example of her argument, it might be useful to consider Heidegger's unsuccessful attempt at putting his leadership vision into action. In April 1933, he was elected Rector of Freiburg University. In his Inaugural Address, he stated that the purpose of the Rectorate is to provide "spiritual leadership" to students and faculty.[287] Heidegger contended that the "essence" of a German university could only be revealed if and when leaders are committed to its mission. To realize this mission, what was required was "leaders and guardians [who] possess the strictest clarity of the highest, widest, and richest knowledge."[288] Each leader must hold fast to their vocation. This is not due to a desire for power, but rather that in keeping to a resolute stance a leader finds strength of purpose. In his address, he called for a transformation of the university system from a "technical organization-institutional pseudo-unity" into a genuine place where learning will occur. A battle needs to be fought between professors and their students who collectively would transform the university into an environment where students would receive discipline and preparation for "the highest service." But Heidegger was not given the opportunity to develop a different kind of university because his leadership was to prove unpopular with faculty and students. He was to fall out with the student leadership because of their desire to post the "Jew Notice." His initial refusal to allow the Reich Student Leadership to post this notice led to a reprimand by the Nazi hierarchy. In April 1934, Heidegger resigned from his post.[289]

Reflecting upon his brief leadership experience, Heidegger states that his unpopularity as a leader was because he had little interest in the minutiae of institutional life.[290] He

---

[287] Heidegger, "The Self-Assertion of the German University and the Rectorate 1933-34: Facts and Thoughts." *Review of Metaphysic*s, 38, 3 (March): 467-502, 476.

[288] Heidegger, "Self-Assertion of the German University," 476.

[289] According to some critics, his resignation was a result of being snubbed by the party when they had not placed him as the leader of the National Conference of Rectors as he had hoped. See Daniel Maier-Katkin and Birgit Maier-Katkin, "Hannah Arendt and Martin Heidegger: Calumny and the Politics of Reconciliation," *Human Rights Quarterly*, 28, 1 (February 2006): 86-119.

[290] The following discussion is based on Heidegger's own remarks in "The Self-Assertion of the German University." While I have read around this subject, his own exploration of his actions is a fascinating document, not least because, in my mind, he manages to apologize without really

describes his initial reluctance to become Rector. It was his predecessor, Wilhemn von Mollendorf, dismissed because of his left-leaning politics, who had encouraged Heidegger to put his name forward. In describing his term in office, Heidegger explains that it was his spiritual vision that propelled him forward. It appears that he had no interest in everyday matters; what mattered to him was to return the German university to its true "historical vocation in the Western world."[291] Forging positive relationships was less important than establishing a modern university based on platonic ideals. Through his leadership, he hoped to create "a gathering of what is German unto the historical essence of the West.[292] His purpose in becoming Rector was to try to instill his authentic vision onto an institution, and he saw in the Nazi movement the potential to bring this transformation about. In remembering this period, Heidegger admits to being impressed with the glory of National Socialism. He explains that his decision to join the party was one he did for the good of the university.[293] Furthermore, Heidegger suggests that it is only those who do not reflect sufficiently on the matter who would see his Rectorial Address as being in support of National Socialism.

Heidegger's explanation and initial support of the Nazi regime suggests to me that he saw strong leadership as important to the well-being and destiny of the German people. But he severely misjudged Hitler's megalomania. What Heidegger shows is a lack of judgement, together with an unwillingness to admit he was in error.[294] In his defense, Heidegger maintains that he adopted Nietzsche's will to power in his speech as Rector to

---

doing so, in part, by suggesting that it was the responsibility of others wiser than he to explain his error.

[291] Heidegger, "Self-Assertion of the German University," 483.

[292] Heidegger, "Self-Assertion of the German University," 498.

[293] Heidegger, "Self-Assertion of the German University," 493.

[294] If we take into account his own philosophy about the call of conscience, it is possible that the reason why he did not make a public apology was because a genuine remorse is not one that is uttered aloud but is a matter between me and myself.

show how there was a deficiency in the world that had been caused by secularism. He describes himself as being "not so wise" as to realize where Nazism would lead.[295] What Heidegger's disastrous foray into leadership suggests to me, however, is that strong personal visions, when they do not take the world into account, can lead to self-delusion and a lack of good judgement. This is why leaders cannot rely solely on self-knowledge as their guide.[296]

By contrast to Heidegger, Arendt did not view herself as a leader. Indeed, as I pointed out in chapter one, she argued that leadership was unbecoming to women, since it was unfeminine.[297] Yet when we review her actions both before and during the Second World War, I suggest that she demonstrates courage and leadership. In her interview with Günther Gaus, she describes herself as apolitical during her early adulthood.[298] With the rise of National Socialism and the burning of the Reichstag in 1933, she argues that it was impossible to remain a bystander. At the age of twenty-six, Arendt began to engage in political activity at some risk to her own safety. At the request of Kurt Blumenfeld, President of the Zionist Organization, she began attending different events in various clubs in Berlin, as well as reading professional journals, to build a collection of what the Nazis were doing. Because of her activity, she was arrested by the police. During her eight days in prison she was interrogated by a police officer. In order not to give herself and or her comrades away, she spun him many stories about what she was doing. In the meantime, her Zionist colleagues obtained a Jewish lawyer to help her case. However, Arendt decided to send the lawyer away because she trusted the police officer, because he

---

[295] Heidegger, "Self-Assertion of the German University," 485.

[296] Richard Wolin suggests that Heidegger saw National Socialism as a way to overcome nihilism. In Hitler's resolute stance, Wolin maintains that he embodied a politics of authenticity, something that Heidegger admired. We know from a letter to Karl Jaspers that Heidegger was enamoured by Hitler's personae, especially admiring his hands. See Richard Wolin, *The Politics of Being: The Political Thought of Martin Heidegger* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1990).

[297] Gaus, "What Remains," 2.

[298] Gaus, "What Remains," 5-6.

had an honest face. When she is released, she and her mother make their escape from Germany first to Prague, and later Switzerland. Finally, Arendt made her way to Paris where she was to spend the next eight years before emigrating to The United States.[299]

In the same interview, Arendt states that what disheartened her most about what took place in Germany before and during the Second World War was the way in which people co-operated with the Nazis. Arendt's dislike of intellectuals arises from observing people she knew voluntarily step in line. It is of note that she believed that there is something about intellectuals that encouraged this activity. For example, she argues that "I still think that it belongs to the essence of being an intellectual that one fabricates ideas."[300] What was worse was that some intellectuals actually believed in Nazism, partly because they were trapped by their ideas.[301] It is hard not to read a condemnation of Heidegger's actions in her comments.

In the correspondence between Karl Jaspers, her doctoral supervisor and friend, Arendt expresses her anger at what she saw as Heidegger's betrayal of Edmund Husserl. In accordance with Nazi instructions, and in his role as Rector, Heidegger did end up signing a letter dismissing all Jewish professors; this act created an irrevocable rift between him and Husserl. She contends that Husserl would have been indifferent if the letter had been signed by someone else. Because Heidegger personally signed the letter dismissing his former mentor, this was a deep shock to Husserl. For both Jaspers and Arendt, he had a choice in that he could have resigned, rather than signing the letter

---

[299]While in France, Arendt begins working for the Zionists helping German and Polish Jewish teenagers obtain vocational skills so that they would be prepared to work in Palestine. During the eight years she is in France, she meets Herman Blücher whom she eventually marries. For an informative account of Arendt's life see Elizabeth Young-Bruel, *Hannah Arendt: For the Love of the World* (Princeton: Yale University Press. 2004). In her preface, Young-Bruel notes how Arendt is sometimes seen as an apologist for Heidegger, who saw himself as a modern day Plato. Heidegger, she notes, originally viewed his relationship to Hitler as akin to Plato's with the tyrant Dionysus from Syracuse.

[300] Gaus, "What Remains," 11.

[301] It is hard here not to see a resonance between her remarks and Arendt's short piece entitled "Heidegger the Fox," whereby she alludes to how an animal gets trapped within a burrow, and cannot find a way out. See Arendt, *Essays in Understanding*, 361-362.

dismissing the man who had been his mentor.[302] In his desire to promote his vision, Heidegger failed to take into account his own philosophy, namely that care is fundamental to being in the world. Without care, which shows itself in the manner in which we act towards others, leadership lacks *Mitsein*.

In this section, I have tried to show how differently Arendt and Heidegger dealt with the difficult circumstances of the Second World War. What we see in their different actions, I suggest, is a greater willingness on the part of Arendt to consider both self and world. Heidegger's authentic vision was so all-encompassing that it led him to forget our personal responsibility to care for others. I think that Arendt provides us with a deeper, more relational understanding of the way in which ethics, authenticity and leadership connect. I want to turn now to explore the question of ethics in relation to how their work has been interpreted by different scholars.

3.5.1   Questions of Ethics

The Platonic model that Heidegger was attracted to, according to Julia Kristeva, is diametrically opposed to Arendt's emphasis on intersubjectivity.[303] This difference has a profound effect on the way these thinkers view questions of ethics.[304] An Arendtian notion of ethical action is founded upon a commitment to others. In *The Human Condition*, Arendt argues that we demonstrate this loyalty to one another through

---

[302] Hannah Arendt to Karl Jaspers, letter 42 in *Correspondence: Hannah Arendt and Karl Jaspers 1926-1969*, ed. by Lotte Kohler and Hans Saner, trans. by Robert and Rita Kimber (Harcourt Brace Jovanovich New York: 1985), 47.

[303] Heidegger's notion of the will and resolute action, in his later work, changes as he becomes more interested in the notion of "Gellasenheit." See Bret W. Davis, "Will and Gelassenheit" in *Martin Heidegger*, 168-183.

[304] In her correspondence with Jaspers, following the Second World War, Arendt reflects upon the connections she sees among philosophy, reason and tyranny. In response, Jaspers notes what Plato did once in error, that is, try and teach a tyrant, others took up in earnest. He mentions a book that was published in 1933 called Plato and Hitler. Arendt, in reply, says that there is no connection, in her view, between earlier philosophy and the emergence of totalitarianism. See letters 107-109 in Arendt/Jaspers correspondence.

promise-making and forgiveness.[305] It is important to keep to our promises because this is the only way to compensate for the vagaries of action. We forgive each other because it is the right thing to do. While we can never forgive a heinous act, we can pardon the wrongdoer. It was because of her belief in the power of forgiveness that Kristeva argues that Arendt forgave Heidegger for his Nazi involvement. Such acts of forgiveness are fundamental to the Arendtian notion of plurality because they enable each of us to start anew.

Joanna Hodge argues Heidegger's lack of judgement in connecting himself with Hitler's regime makes it hard to decouple his philosophy from his politics. Yet Heidegger's political failings need not outweigh his philosophical insights into the problems of metaphysics. By questioning the place of ethics in metaphysics, Hodge argues he opens up the possibility to rethink ethical relations. For instance, in his critique of instrumental ways of being, Heidegger shows how, in modernity, we privilege abstract thinking over the ways in which we live in the world.[306] The problem we face is that ethics has stopped being concerned with thinking about human flourishing. Instead, ethics becomes linked to particular issues. Current versions of ethics that proliferate in medical, educational and political environments are not what Heidegger meant by ethics. As an example ethics is sometimes linked to specific outcomes, which I suggest obscures a deeper understanding of ethics as care.

Furthermore, in modernity, questions of ethics have become subordinated to technology as opposed to being rooted in an understanding of human flourishing. But ethics is fundamentally about responsiveness. Indeed, Jacob Golomb argues that an ethics of

---

[305] See Arendt's extended discussion on forgiveness and promising in *The Human Condition*, 236-243.

[306] Such ethical inquiry is opposite to metaphysical questioning since it puts humanity in question. Hodge differentiates between metaphysical questioning which she sees as concerned with "what," and ethical inquiry which is focussed on "how." Joanne Hodge, *Heidegger and Ethics* (London: Routledge 1995), 23.

authenticity seeks to provide the conditions of a genuine morality.[307] While Heidegger badly misjudged the political climate of Nazi Germany, he does have much to offer in terms of a critique of instrumental reason. For example, he shows that acting in terms of having predetermined ends is unethical, since it subordinates human relations to instrumental ways of relating. The trouble with instrumentality is that it limits human expression. Moreover, when language becomes instrumental, it loses significance. By viewing the world in instrumental ways, we objectify things, and truth, rather than being a question, becomes a matter of certainty. Hodge argues that any ethical investigation requires reflection on "ethical questions of action, responsibility, evaluation and judgement."[308] This may not always be central to Heidegger's project, but it sounds very pertinent to Arendtian thought.

In his brief discussion on ethics, Heidegger contends that ethics is under the sway of metaphysics. In *Letter on Humanism*, for instance, he maintains that thinking stopped with the foundation of ethics, logics and physics.[309] In his view, morality and ethics are part of a metaphysical way of thinking that from Plato onwards has barred us from the truth of being. Despite his claims to the contrary, many critics search for an ethics in his work. For example, Tom Greaves contends that Heidegger's work is profoundly ethical, since his writing encourages us to make a distinction between those actions we undertake in a genuine way, and those acts we take up because everyone else does.[310] As well, Mariana Ortega suggests that you can discover an ethics in *Being and Time*.[311] Rather

---

[307] Jacob Golomb, *In Search of Authenticity: From Kierkegaard to Camus* (London: Routledge, 1995), 90-104. Golomb also argues that irony is connected to authenticity especially with regard to Socratic questions of doubt. I see a connection with his comments on irony and the discussion in chapter two on *Rameau's Nephew*.

[308] Hodge, *Heidegger*, 177.

[309] Heidegger, *Letter on Humanism*, In *Martin Heidegger: Basic Writings,* ed. David Krell (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1977), 193-242.

[310] Greaves, *Heidegger*, 59.

[311] Marianne Ortega, "When Conscience Calls, Will Dasein Answer? Heideggerian Authenticity and the Possibility of Ethical Life," *International Journal of Philosophical Studies,* (2005): 15-34.

than being anti-ethical, she claims that due to its ontological structure, "*Dasein* has the possibility of being ethical."[312] Ortega further contends that Heidegger connects his phenomenological findings with ethics in his account of authenticity as properness and resoluteness. In doing so, he equates living a moral life with the call of conscience. While it is true that in his discussion of guilt, Heidegger shows that it must be possible to detach individual notions of what it means to be authentic from moral notions of right and wrong, it is Arendt who reveals why conventional ways of thinking about morality have the potential to be damaging to human relationships. This is one reason why it is vital to critique an understanding of leadership as sovereignty or mastery. I suggest, therefore, that Arendt provides us with a more ethically enriched way of thinking about leadership, which I will now consider in more depth.

3.5.2   Leadership

As we saw in chapter one, Arendt argues that the notion of the strong leader is a myth since it is only through working with people that actions become accomplished. She considers Nietzsche to be the first philosopher to understand fully how men gain pleasure from control over others. It is by association with authority that she contends that a person begins to experience a "feeling of superiority which comes from wielding power."[313] Arendt is adamant that leadership should not be identified with a role but is context specific - that is, whenever a group converges, a leader will emerge. This is an organic way of thinking about leadership rather than one that is founded on hierarchy. It stands in contrast to commonplace notions of leadership, which are based on a profound unfairness which, as she demonstrates, serves to privilege the few over the many. But the notion of the exceptional man or woman is incorrect because no-one can control the outcome of her actions. We all need others to help us. For Arendt, it is the courageous

---

[312] Ortega, "Conscience?" 16. Furthermore, Ortega argues that Heidegger connects his phenomenological findings with ethics in his account of authenticity as properness and resoluteness. Hence, she suggests that he equates living a moral life with the call of conscience. It is noteworthy that Charles Taylor in *The Ethics of Authenticity* does not mention Heidegger.

[313] Arendt, "Some Questions of Moral Philosophy,"132.

act, rather than the person who enacts it, that is deemed worthy of greatness. Accordingly, heroism means having the courage to take a stand publically. This is something that everyone is capable of rather than the heroic few.

Arendt suggests that leadership functions best when it arises out of collective action rather than being directed by a person in charge. Rather than a leader setting something in motion for others to carry out, the leader's success depends upon the assistance of others. Seen in this light, a leader is no more than "*primus inter pares*, the first among his peers."[314] It is not leadership that is dangerous to plurality, but leadership in the form of mastery. It is important to note that for Arendt there is nothing wrong with power *per se*. The problem is that we confuse the productive nature of power with the negative effects of violence. Hence, power is always about potential, and derives from the collective action of people.[315] Conversely, tyranny arises whenever people are denied the basic form of political organization - that is, speaking and acting together.

Seyla Benhabib distinguishes between Arendt's notion of the agonistic and associational public realm. The agonistic public realm constitutes, in Arendtian terms, a place where excellence can be displayed. This competitive realm is one where people vie for recognition to ensure that moral valour and political pre-eminence come to the fore. The agonal space differentiates people. Benhabib makes the interesting observation that Arendt's description of the *polis* is a domestication of the war hero in favour of Aristotle's notion of the citizen who speaks and persuades. In so doing, Benhabib argues that Arendt performs a feminist transformation of the violent hero into reasoned citizen. In Arendt's depiction of the associational public space, what is noteworthy is how humans come together. Within the associational realm, for a short time, places turn into sites of power, whenever people use speech and persuasion to consider future action, such as a kitchen table where dissidents gather together to discuss political activity. [316]

---

[314] Arendt, "Some Questions of Moral Philosophy," 47.

[315] See Disch, *Hannah Arendt*, 12.

[316] Benhabib, "Feminist Theory," 102.

In Arendt's view, successful leadership is about collaboration through dialogue and debate, rather than ruling through command and control. But too often the systems under which we live are not conducive to human flourishing. We have seen how spontaneity is suppressed when a society expects its inhabitants to conform. I want to conclude by exploring ethical dilemmas involved within the modern context of bureaucratic life.[317]

3.5.3   Bureaucracy

In *The Origins of Totalitarianism,* as I indicated earlier, Arendt discusses the connections between race-based thinking and bureaucracy. What connects these seemingly disparate ideas is the disregard for uniqueness. Within a bureaucracy, uniqueness is threatened because each person is seen as expendable. Arendt regards bureaucracy as "the least human and most cruel form of rulership," because leaders refuse to take responsibility for their actions, and encourage others to do likewise.[318] There is a connection between systems of bureaucracy and totalitarian-like ways of thinking since both function to suppress plurality of viewpoints. Arendt also sees a negative correlation between obedience and bureaucracy because together they work to deny uniqueness in favour of conformity. Impersonal systems have a detrimental effect on those who attempt to humanize them. Such systematic approaches to social life reinforce inequality because a voiceless, autonomous way of life serves to deny, or suppress, individual expression.

As we saw in Burns' critique of bureaucracy in chapter one, what is demanded in bureaucracy is assent, not dissent. In response, people may feel alienated and refuse to take responsibility for their actions, preferring to hide behind corporate policies and institutional rules. One of the ways that we see this is with phrases such as "I'd like to help but..." or "This is the way that it's done here." This lack of ownership is indicative of how individuals lose their identity in the bureaucratic speech of the "they."

---

[317] Young-Bruel contends that government by bureaucracy was the fourth pillar in Arendt's notion of totalitarianism. See Young-Bruel, *Hannah Arendt*, xii.

[318] Arendt, "Personal Responsibility under Dictatorship," 37.

Thus what Arendt calls the no-man rule of bureaucracy is damaging to plurality and uniqueness. Within the context of the work environment, plurality means not only that everyone is permitted to speak, but that they are encouraged to express dissenting opinions. In fact, the space of appearance can only be truly plural when people come together in the knowledge that their contributions will be received with openness. Yet such openness occurs infrequently within the modern workplace. This is partly due to the hierarchical nature of bureaucracy, whereby institutions prefer conformity to freedom of expression, but also because of a fear of reprisals on the part of many employees. Without the freedom to dialogue and debate with one another, genuine engagement may be curtailed. When the multiplicity of human expression is lost, so too is an ability for genuine interaction.

For Arendt, each one of us has the capacity to reflect upon our actions. Yet, many times we choose not to take the time to do this necessary reflection. She was enamoured with the Socratic notion of the inner voice that guides us in the decisions that we make. This inner relationship is not always one of concord. Rather, this inner voice represents an internal dialogue that incorporates both thinking and judging. Not only does this mean having confidence in one's view but also leaving room for doubt. Doubting is a necessary part of the thinking process because it enables us to bring to light alternative perspectives. In many organizational settings, it becomes easier to go along with whatever bureaucratic decision is made, rather than taking the time to figure out whether or not we agree. This is part of the problem when action usurps thinking. For a robust public space, both have to be in productive tension. But it also means that people must be willing to disregard a leader's request if it is considered unethical, and be willing to take a stand. Only then will we be able to create more caring and thoughtful working environments that are not prone to the alienation, mistrust and obtuseness common in bureaucratic and political life.

3.6   Conclusion

In this chapter, I have compared the work of Hannah Arendt and Martin Heidegger as it pertains to authenticity, ethical responsibility and leadership. I have contended that Arendt enriches Heidegger's concept of authenticity through her stress on uniqueness. She shows that it is plurality, not singularity that is central to understanding existence.

Arendt's emphasis on natality demonstrates that it is life not death that is vital to comprehending human existence. Each person's uniqueness is crucial to an Arendtian worldview. Such uniqueness has always to be tempered by a commitment to take self and world into account.

For Arendt, a world built around the self is insufficient to ensure that we care for one another, and can lead to a lack of genuine responsiveness. By contrast, uniqueness and plurality represent the ethical foundation of our intricate web of human relationships. In order to be ethically responsible, it is necessary to be willing to put forward one's viewpoint and, where necessary, make a judgement. If we do not, as Arendt shows us in her depiction of the moral disintegration that took place in Nazi Germany, our environment may alter without us noticing. When the public arena starts to disintegrate, it becomes easier for people to refrain from taking a particular stance and behave as if they were no more than cogs in a machine. This is dangerous because it leads to a lack of personal responsibility. In its most dire form, in totalitarian regimes, it results in the destruction of the common world. Without a shared, common world, there can be no caring relationships. Arendt regards caring as a relationship between self and world, defined by our respect for one another which we demonstrate through our actions. An ethical approach as it relates to authenticity and leadership requires not just an internal sense of purpose, but also receptiveness towards others. Part of this responsiveness necessitates being willing to think from different perspectives than one's own, as I hope to show further in the final chapter. Before then, we will consider methodological approaches to questions of phenomenology.

Chapter 4

4   Troubling Method

In the last chapter, I concluded by suggesting that authenticity requires not just an internal sense of purpose, but also a responsiveness towards others. Such a responsive orientation necessitates being willing to think from different perspectives so as to enrich one's understanding. Arendt described this activity as "thinking without bannisters," which requires a person to move beyond the constraints of their own assumptions. As part of my attempt to 'think without bannisters,' and enhance my understanding of the connections among gender, authenticity and leadership, I conducted a qualitative study. The main purpose of this chapter is to explain my qualitative approach, which is in the tradition of existential hermeneutic phenomenology, coupled with a feminist orientation.

I have entitled this chapter "troubling method," because I find distinctions between terms such as "method," "methodology," and "theory" somewhat perplexing, as it is not always clear to me where one begins and the other ends. While social scientists try to distinguish between these concepts, I find it more difficult to do so. In thinking about this issue, I am also concerned with how gaining knowledge of a technique – in this case phenomenological methodology - informs my inquiry. Thus, troubling method is my attempt to comprehend how my feminist orientation may enhance or restrict phenomenological inquiry, and vice-versa.[319]

In thinking about the connection with feminism and phenomenology, I tried to find a balance between these different perspectives. But this was no easy task. While feminist phenomenology has found its voice, Linda Fisher questions whether feminist inquiry is as

---

[319] Anne Kinsella argues that many feminist commentators resist dualities such as theory/method. Any feminist study needs to be mindful of this, which she regards as in keeping with critical hermeneutics. See Kinsella, *"Hermeneutics and Critical Hermeneutics: Exploring Possibilities within the Art of Interpretation," Forum: Qualitative Research*, 7, 3, 19 (2006).

"noisy" as phenomenology.[320] She suggests that feminists need to "amplify" their voices to critique and unsettle the phenomenological tradition. In this chapter, I hope to partially answer Fisher's "call to action" for feminist researchers to push phenomenology further - in this particular case, so as to pursue the ways in which gender, authenticity and leadership intersect.

When I first conducted my literature review, I discovered a paucity of research that examined women's experiences of leadership in relation to authenticity. This discovery prompted me to conduct interviews as part of my overall inquiry. By examining descriptive accounts provided by the women leaders whom I interviewed, together with my socio-historical and philosophical inquiry, I hoped to provide a richer conceptualization of what it might mean to lead authentically. This sums up my original intent. In what follows, I discuss the actual unfolding of the qualitative component of the research. Two questions in particular concern me. First, what were some assumptions that I took for granted? Second, how does one's epistemological orientation affect the manner in which one employs a particular methodology? This chapter represents a going back and forth between my original intent, my gradual understanding of phenomenology as a methodology, and interviewing as a method of inquiry.

After reviewing my initial research intentions, I discuss theoretical and methodological contestations as to what constitutes phenomenological research. Following this, I explore feminist contentions regarding methodological inquiry. Throughout the chapter, I also discuss Arendt's approach to methodology. My aim is to offer insights into my approach, and to discuss the ethical issues I encountered. In addition, I provide contextual information regarding the interviews and the research participants. In the conclusion, I circle back to ethical issues, and consider what I learned through the interview process regarding what it means to me to conduct a feminist, phenomenological inquiry.

---

[320] Linda Fisher, "Feminist Phenomenological Voices." *Continental Philosophy Review*, 43 (2010): 83-95.

4.1   Phenomenology as Research Methodology

I chose to use hermeneutic, existential phenomenological inquiry as my methodological approach as it fit with my overall theoretical framework, which focuses on the situated, embodied nature of social life. In particular, I wanted to adopt the Arendtian concept to 'think without bannisters,' which she also describes as "visiting." For Arendt, visiting refers to the ability to try and think from different perspectives. This is not the same as stepping into another person's shoes. Rather, it represents a gathering of diverse viewpoints to arrive at a more robust comprehension of the particular phenomenon under question. Visiting entails coming close to some things, while at the same time moving away from others. By visiting, one has to think from another place, and move beyond the comfortable boundaries of a singular perspective. In Arendt's preference for visiting as a methodological approach, she has many intellectual companions. For instance, Arendt is influenced by the Kantian notion of judgement from his *Critique of Judgement*, which she regards as exemplary because it is based on a plurality of viewpoints.[321] It is through a diversity of views that she maintains we will be able to comprehend a phenomenon in a fuller manner. The purpose of visiting, therefore, is to deepen one's own perspective by taking into account the perspectives of others.[322] In so doing, we should, hopefully, arrive at a richer understanding.

The problem I face is that Arendt rarely discusses methodology. Neither does she explicate fully what she means by the term "visiting."[323] As I will show later, on the rare occasions when Arendt does try to explain her approach, the result is somewhat

---

[321] Arendt had an idiosyncratic way of applying Kant's ideas regarding judgement, as commentators like Margaret Canovan have pointed out. See Canovan, *Hannah Arendt*: *A Reinterpretation of her Political Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 270-273.

[322] As much as Arendt disliked system building, Canovan argues that Arendt's thinking is highly systematic. See Canovan, *Hannah Arendt,* 6.

[323] For an informative account of Arendt's concept of visiting, see Lisa Disch, *Hannah Arendt and the Limits of Philosophy* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1994), especially chapter five.

contradictory, as I will demonstrate by looking at her response to the historian Eric Voegelin's negative review of *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. As Seyla Benhabib notes, even in this response, Arendt's description of her methodology is somewhat confusing.[324] This may be partly due to what Benhabib sees as two distinctive threads weaving through Arendt's work. The first thread reveals the deep influence on her thinking of her friend, the essayist Walter Benjamin.[325] Arendt was predisposed to his method of looking to the forgotten fragments of history in order to bring forth stories from the past that had been erased so as to dislocate and dislodge commonplace thought. The second influence in her work was that of phenomenological inquiry.

It is possible that Arendt's sparse comments regarding her methodological approach may be indicative of her claim that when we try to clarify what we are doing, we can only ever achieve a partial understanding. However, it makes it difficult to discuss her methodology adequately. Therefore, I turn to other theorists who wrote in the phenomenological tradition. In the next section, I offer an overview of the different approaches to phenomenological inquiry adopted by Edmund Husserl, Martin Heidegger, and Maurice Merleau-Ponty to show how these initial proponents had differences of opinion as to the manner in which phenomenology should be conducted. As I will demonstrate, the methodological disagreements between Husserl and Heidegger, in particular, continue to divide scholars engaged in phenomenological, qualitative inquiry.

4.1.1   Edmund Husserl

Heidegger's early work was indebted to his mentor and teacher Edmund Husserl, who opened up phenomenology as a form of inquiry. A former mathematician, Husserl was interested in how logical problems are affected by worldly conditions. One of his aims

---

[324] Seyla Benhabib, *The Reluctant Modernism of Hannah Arendt*, 63-69.

[325] In her insightful essay on Benjamin, Arendt discusses how Benjamin kept a notebook full of jottings which he would share with friends. Apparently, he would alternate poetry with news reports such as that of a gas company in Vienna which in 1939 wanted to disconnect the gas supply to many Jewish families as many were not paying their bills. The reason for this is that Jewish people were committing suicide through asphyxiation. See Arendt, "Walter Benjamin," in *Men in Dark Times*, (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1968), 200.

was to distinguish phenomenology from other forms of scientific investigation. In *Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to Phenomenological Philosophy*, published in 1913, Husserl maintains that researchers need to suspend their judgement so that the phenomena under question are allowed to appear as they are. By bracketing off what he describes as the natural attitude, Husserl argues it may be possible to grasp the essence of a phenomenon such that everything significant about it could be described. In her summation of Husserl's approach in "What is Existential Philosophy," Arendt describes his project as a way to reconnect being and thought so as to re-envision a home in the world for humankind from which they have become alienated.[326] Central to Husserl's approach, she states, is that there is an intentional structure of consciousness. What this means is that each conscious act is oriented toward something, that is, it must have an object. Husserlian phenomenology is a way to gather together the pieces of the world, and Arendt sees his project as providing a new foundation for humanism. What makes his methodological approach of particular importance, she states, is that it represents a rigorous attempt to free philosophy from the confines of Hegelian historicism. As such, Husserl brought a new manner of thinking about the world through his emphasis on the things themselves. The difficulty Arendt perceives with Husserl's phenomenological approach is that it turns man into what he can never be, that is, "the creator of the world."[327]

4.1.2   Martin Heidegger

In contrast to Husserl, Heidegger argued that it was impossible to bracket off one's attitude from one's research. Instead, he insists that our moods affect how we orient ourselves toward things. In Heidegger's opinion, phenomenology is not a technique that serves to characterize the "what" of an object; rather, it is an explanation of the "how" of research. He maintains that phenomenology conducted in a hermeneutic manner must move beyond metaphysical distinctions toward a deeper understanding of what it means

---

[326] Arendt, "What is Existential Philosophy," 164.

[327] Arendt, "What is Existential Philosophy," 167.

to live in the world. Hence, phenomenological inquiry is a way to gain access to ontology, which Heidegger regarded as the primary philosophical concern. In his view, critical to the "methodological meaning of phenomenological description is *interpretation*."[328]

In conducting a hermeneutic phenomenological inquiry, a researcher must be able to "intuitively" grasp a phenomenon's meaning. But this is no simple task since a researcher might fail to grasp the original meaning of a phenomenon. Sometimes, this is because semblances of a phenomenon are misconstrued as the phenomenon itself. For example, a sore throat might indicate tonsillitis, or it could be a viral infection, or something more serious, such as meningitis. Each symptom does not show the illness as "is," but reveals itself only in semblances. Because of this revealing as semblance, researchers must be careful not to misconstrue the essence of something by assuming that what appears on the surface constitutes its "meaning and ground."[329]

Another way that a researcher may misconstrue phenomena relates to how what was once apparent might become concealed over time. An example of this concealment might be how eugenics, in the early twentieth century, was widely regarded - by intellectuals and members of the general public - as an indication of the superiority of the white race. Because of a change in what is deemed socially acceptable, there may be people who still believe in eugenics, but few who are willing to speak about their beliefs publicly. This kind of concealment is, in Heidegger's opinion, most pernicious since there is a possibility of being misled by the false opinion of someone. It is also possible for a phenomenon to have once been regarded as genuine, but to have become commonplace. This is because, in Heideggerian terms, things get taken up by the "they." As such, phenomena may lose their intrinsic, or unique, value.[330] In addition, as I discussed in

---

[328] Heidegger, *Basic Writings*, 86.

[329] Heidegger, *Basic Writings*, 84.

[330] As I explained in chapter three, for Heidegger, 'the they,' or 'the they self' refers to a ready-made way of approaching the world. This can lead to a way of being whereby we no longer judge for ourselves, because we allow others to do that for us.

detail in chapter three, Heidegger's work led him to search for a fundamental ontology that would explain what it meant to be in the world. In his view, phenomenology is not a school where you can learn the right technique, but is rather an individual way of thinking.

There are other major thinkers in the phenomenological tradition, as we will see in the case of Maurice Merleau-Ponty.

4.1.3   Maurice Merleau-Ponty

Blending an existential approach with phenomenology, Merleau-Ponty contends that the purpose of phenomenology is to put "essences back into existence."[331] In his early work, such as the *Phenomenology of Perception*, Merleau-Ponty was drawn to Husserl's discussion of the *Lebenswelt,* or life-world. In his later work, such as *The Visible and the Invisible*, his thought is influenced by Heidegger.[332] Truth, for Merleau-Ponty, cannot be separated from the world because "there is no inner man, man is in the world, and only in the world does he know himself."[333] Hence, we make sense of who we are through being in the world, not through self-knowledge. Further, his notion of embodiment is intersubjective, since it is through our actions within the world of others that we understand ourselves. Here we note a similarity with Arendt. Both scholars argue that knowledge of the world can be obtained from each person's particular perspective. Such "unique" knowledge is always worldly. Where Arendt and Merleau-Ponty differ, however, is in the stress they place on different existential aspects of being-in-the-world. For Merleau-Ponty, the body provides us with a perceptual framework from which to better understand how interpretation is an embodied pursuit. For Arendt, the emphasis is on relationality, and how each individual manifests herself through action.

---

[331] Maurice Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception*, trans. Colin Smith (London and New York: Routledge, 2007), vii.

[332] My understanding of Merleau-Ponty's work is derived from discussions with my supervisor, Dr. Helen A. Fielding as well as in her class "Phenomenology of Difference," which I took during winter 2012, and in conversations with a reading group in Winter/Spring 2013.

[333] Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception*, xii.

To sum up, for Husserl, phenomenology is a descriptive method that allows us to let things show themselves as they are. Alternatively, for Heidegger, phenomenological inquiry cannot be separated from interpretation. The central difference between Heidegger and Husserl relates to whether it is possible to bracket off one's prejudices, as Husserl maintained, or whether interpretation is a fundamental aspect of phenomenology inquiry, as Heidegger suggested. By contrast, Merleau-Ponty was chiefly concerned with embodiment as the obscured ground of thinking.

With this brief review of the main tenets of phenomenological thought, I now want to consider Arendt's approach to methodology in more detail. Then, I will look at some of the ways that qualitative researchers have taken up these different approaches to phenomenological inquiry.

4.2   Ethical Quandaries

Arendt often stated that the reason she wrote was to understand. As part of her methodological approach, she was concerned with isolating specific phenomenon across different historical periods to show why a phenomenon emerged at a particular time, as we saw in her exploration of totalitarianism. Yet, as I mentioned earlier, it is only on rare occasions that Arendt discusses her particular methodological approach. One such instance is her "Reply to Eric Voegelin," where she argued that questions of method and philosophical implications are interconnected.[334] In his review of *The Origins of Totalitarianism,* Voegelin stated that Arendt's book lacked conceptual unity. In her response to his review, she argued it was not her purpose to provide coherence. Rather, her aim was to reveal totalitarianism's main aspects, and to analyse the components of totalitarianism historically.[335] But Arendt found herself in an ethical quandary since she was bringing to light elements of a phenomenon that she found abhorrent. While she argues that the purpose of historiography is to preserve something for posterity,

---

[334] Arendt, "A Reply to Eric Voegelin," in *Essays in Understanding 1930-1954,* ed. Jerome Kohn (New York: Harcourt Brace & Company, 1994), 401-409.

[335] Arendt, "Reply to Eric Voegelin," 403.

preserving totalitarianism was the last thing she wanted to do. At the same time, she reasoned that to comprehend the full extent of totalitarianism, it was necessary to reveal how it was distinct from other forms of ruling.

While Arendt concurs with Vogelin's assertion that she is concerned with the philosophical implications of totalitarianism, she argues that her approach begins with facts. As we saw in chapter three, Arendt maintains that the rise in totalitarianism was a direct result of a loss of consent between people in modernity as a result of the waning of tradition, religion and authority. What distinguishes modernity from earlier times is that there are fewer common interests that gather people together.[336] This gathering together results in common consent or *inter-est*, which has a dual function in that it connects people while, at the same time, distinguishes them from each other. What made totalitarianism so heinous was that these regimes attempted to destroy human freedom in a manner never witnessed before. While there had always been immense cruelty in the world, Arendt argued, totalitarianism is different in that it tried to eradicate humanity from people through organized means of terror, such as the concentration camps. In taking away a person's dignity, totalitarian leaders were trying to show how some people were superfluous. Furthermore, the imposition of one perspective, that is the leader, aimed to deny plurality of perspectives. These aspects of totalitarianism, together with the aim of world domination, Arendt maintains, make it phenomenologically distinct from other forms of rule.

In her response to Voegelin, Arendt also states that generalization is a problem for the historical and political sciences, since oversimplification results in phenomenological distinctions being covered over in favour of arguments about causality. Rather than seeing what is new about a particular phenomenon, scholars try to explain it by drawing analogies. She regards this practice as emblematic of a particular approach that confuses knowledge with understanding. The only way it is possible to comprehend phenomena, in Arendt's view, is to investigate why they appear at particular times, and ascertain what it

---

[336] Arendt, "Reply to Eric Voegelin," 406.

is that makes them unique. It is through the discernment of a phenomenon's particularity that we will be able to make sense of it. This discernment requires us to use our imagination, which represents our "inner compass."[337]

In reasoning why she approached the topic of totalitarianism in such a passionate manner, Arendt maintains that passion was methodologically necessary given her subject matter. To describe what took place under totalitarian rule in a dispassionate way would, in her view, be comparable to explaining the abject poverty of the British working classes in the Industrial Revolution without showing indignation at human suffering. Similarly, by not showing righteous anger when confronted with the despicable conditions of the concentration camps, Arendt argues, would be akin to removing this phenomenon from its social context."[338] Rather than showing disinterest, this passionate approach underscores her belief that each one of us brings something new to our research. What we see here from Arendt's discussion of her methodological approach is her belief that phenomenology requires a researcher to be willing to engage with passion in her topic. Furthermore, she shows us how important it is to differentiate seemingly similar events.

Now that we have a sense of the different approaches to phenomenological research, I want to discuss how those different approaches are taken up in qualitative research.

4.3   Qualitative Approaches to Phenomenological Inquiry

While there is general agreement amongst qualitative phenomenological researchers as to the importance of providing rich descriptions concerning a particular phenomenon or aspect of lived experience, Linda Fisher argues there is great debate about how phenomenological research is carried out.[339] She regards this debate as healthy, however, there are times when criticism turns into confusion, especially as it concerns what

---

[337] Arendt, "Understanding and Politics (The Difficulties of Understanding)," in *Essays in Understanding*, 323.

[338] Arendt, "Reply to Eric Voegelin," 403.

[339] Linda Fisher, "Debating Phenomenological Research Methods," *Phenomenology & Practice*, 3, no. 1 (2009) 7.

constitutes "sound" phenomenological research. Much of this debate, according to Fisher, stems from the different approaches adopted by Husserlian versus Heideggerian inspired researchers. For example, a common disagreement concerns whether or not the individual researcher can "bracket off" their individual biases.[340] When a researcher states that they have bracketed off or transcended their assumptions, and then uses hermeneutics as their approach, she regards their research as muddled because it combines two distinctive phenomenological traditions.

A further disagreement concerns how explicit researchers should be about how their embodied subjectivity affects their work. This can be a problem for novice researchers who, according to Fisher, misunderstand how the Husserlian process of bracketing off represents an initial step whereby "subjective bias is acknowledged as part of the project to establish the rigor and validity of the research."[341] Thinkers in the Heideggerian tradition, conversely, regard openness to bias as an essential component of research. She argues that research can only be considered phenomenological if it offers an evocative description of lived experience that includes the researcher adopting an open attitude to her research. Fisher takes a practical approach to inquiry, arguing that researchers should tailor their approach to their specific audience, since it is only when the reader feels moved in some way by the research in question that it can be said to be successful as a phenomenological exercise.

Divergence of opinion can also be seen in the debate between whether phenomenology is connected with modernism or postmodernism. Fisher notes that while phenomenology was originally linked to modernism in that it is an exploration of human subjectivity, some researchers regard phenomenology as similar to postmodernist thought especially the notion that the meaning of any phenomenon is unstable and shifts across time and place. Fisher maintains that it really depends upon how one conceives of these terms. If postmodernism means critical reflexiveness, then phenomenology would fit into that

---

[340] Fisher, "Debating Phenomenological Research Methods," 8.

[341] Fisher, "Debating Phenomenological Research Methods," 1.

rubric. However, if it means that there is no self, only language, then this runs contrary to phenomenology's focus on subjective, lived experience.

An additional bone of contention amongst qualitative researchers relates to what it means to 'read between the lines' in a transcript. For instance, Husserlian researchers like Amedeo Giorgio contend that phenomenologists must focus solely on the descriptive account. He also maintains that an active imagination is crucial to Husserlian phenomenological inquiry.[342] An inquiry into a particular phenomenon may arise from either a fictional or factual source. What is crucial is that the researcher describes a particular aspect of the phenomenon. In Giorgio's view, what is important is that the descriptions are meaningful. [343] He suggests that a critical component of Husserlian-inspired qualitative phenomenology is to focus on the descriptive account so as to gain a deeper understanding of a particular phenomenon.

In considering the problems qualitative researchers face when trying to retain the richness of lived experience, Les Todres argues that the roots of this dilemma can be traced to Aristotle, who held that the form of something cannot be said to exist unless it can be perceived in a particular manner.[344] There are two main problems that arise in qualitative research. On the one hand, there is a danger in focussing too much on the general structure of a particular phenomenon, because one may lose what is specific to individual experience. On the other hand, remaining too close to the idiosyncratic might obscure what is typical about a particular experience. Todres also contends that scholars position their research as a dialogue, and that researchers ground phenomenological inquiry in embodiment. (Here we see how much he is influenced by Merleau-Ponty.) By conducting phenomenology in an embodied way, Todres maintains that it may be possible to "evoke

---

[342] Amadeo Giorgi, *The Descriptive Phenomenological Method in Psychology: A Modified Husserlian Approach* (Duquesne University Press, 2009).

[343] Giorgi, *Descriptive* Phenomenological Method, 112.

[344] Les Todres, *Embodied Inquiry, Phenomenological Touchstones for Research, Psychotherapy and Spirituality* (London: Palgrave MacMillan, 2007).

the presence of human phenomena."[345] This kind of embodied inquiry is a way to move toward an open stance that is respectful of differences.

What is critical is that a researcher's description brings to mind something meaningful for the reader. Todres encourages researchers to bring "texture" back to structure as the "thicker" the description, the more the reader will be able to feel a sense of connection with what has been expressed. Such a rich description needs to work on different levels: it needs to be understood intuitively as well as being comprehended intellectually. Yet, because each reader is a unique individual, it is unlikely that every descriptive account will appeal to every reader. Just as writers have their own way of writing so, too, will readers understand in different ways. For instance, I may think that by sharing a particular description, I have provided the reader with insight into the notion of authenticity. It is quite possible that this description may open up questions of gender dynamics for one person, while another reader may find the account of little interest. I cannot know this ahead of time. This is where Todres's idea that we should write "in a language that aims to elicit empathy and participation in the reader" [346] is somewhat problematic. Empathy is a term that Arendt, like Heidegger, took issue with insofar as both viewed an empathetic stance as a desire for control. One problem with empathy is that it suggests that we begin as separate selves and have to bridge this separation in our relations with others. But it is not always clear to me where a sympathetic stance ends, and an empathetic mindset begins.

Hermeneutic research requires us to bring our prejudices into the open. Yet Liz Smythe contends that most academic discourse silences prejudices. In her words, "[i]n academia what is silenced, missing and taken-for-granted is all that is already in our thinking."[347] Hermeneutic phenomenology requires the researcher to try, as much as possible, to outline prejudices prior to the research. By tarrying with things, as Heidegger might say,

---

[345] Todres, *Embodied Inquiry*, 183.

[346] Todres, *Embodied Inquiry*, 10.

[347] Smythe, Liz, "Yes We Are Prejudiced," *Community Development Journal*, (2003): 1.

one gains insight not only into the words themselves but also our own interpretation of them. The connection between understanding and qualitative inquiry is, according to Anne Kinsella, because researchers are interested in comprehending different facets of lived experience.[348] As most qualitative researchers are concerned with questions of understanding and interpretation, Kinsella argues that such research is implicitly hermeneutic. In her view, qualitative research constitutes a co-mingling since a hermeneutic inquiry requires the researcher to be willing to think with head and heart so as to be open to questioning. She also suggests that when the researcher adopts an open stance, the reader may discover something about the researcher that the latter did not anticipate. The researcher cannot know ahead of time what they reveal to another since, if we agree with Arendt, we are unable to see ourselves in the way that others do. That being said, each researcher, in taking up the same methodology, will have a different manner of approach, because their life experiences will influence their work in some way.

These issues are not only pertinent to phenomenology but also to feminist concerns regarding qualitative inquiry, as I will now demonstrate.

4.4   Voicing our Opinion(s): Feminist Concerns

The desire for a feminist method, in Sandra Harding's perspective, arose from a need to correct distorted accounts produced by traditional methodologies.[349] She maintains it is necessary to distinguish method from methodology. For Harding, method relates to a particular way of assembling evidence or a technique, while methodology is an approach to inquiry. In drawing these distinctions, she claims there are three categories of method. The first category is interviewing people; next is observing people's behavior; and the final method is examining historical documents. Arguing against a specific feminist

---

[348] Anne Kinsella, "Hermeneutics and Critical Hermeneutics," *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 7, no. 3, (2006): 1-13.

[349] Sandra Harding, "Introduction: Is There A Feminist Method?," in *Feminism and Methodology,* ed. Sandra Harding, (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987), 1-14.

method, Harding contends that preoccupation with method may overlook more important questions concerning how we live in the world.

Methodology, in Harding's view, represents a theoretical approach to the way in which research should be undertaken. She states that many social scientists, because of their training, do not consider the theoretical assumptions behind their methodological approaches. Rather, social scientists tend to perceive methodological issues in relation to specific methods. Thus, a common approach taken by social scientists is to address methodological issues when they teach methods courses. By contrast, philosophers tend to raise methodological and epistemological issues when they talk about scientific method. In her opinion, neither of these ways of thinking is robust enough; hence, it is necessary for feminists to devise different approaches.

While there are valuable connections to be made among epistemology, methodology and research method, Harding suggests it is not by concentrating on the latter that we will ascertain what is distinctive about feminist research. When considering questions of epistemology, feminists have shown how theories of knowledge have often taken "man" as the arbiter of knowledge. This male-centeredness has led to a narrowness of thinking about how we live in the world. As we saw in chapter one, some leadership scholars maintain that disciplines like organizational studies are saturated with a particular kind of masculinity. Harding contends that feminist analyses can enrich methodological accounts by revealing how women's ways of being in the world differ - not only from each other - but also from traditional male accounts of a particular phenomenon.

New ways of thinking about methodology, such as that provided by Dorothy Smith's sociology for women, [350] provide researchers with a different means of looking at aspects of lived experience that were previously ignored. She shows how women's experiences of a phenomenon offer a different perspective, one which has often been obscured. As we saw in chapter one, Smith maintains that it is not enough for women to become leaders of

---

[350] Dorothy Smith, *The Everyday World as Problematic: A Feminist Sociology* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987), 5.

institutions, because it does not deal with structural limitations that affect a leader's ability to connect with people in a caring manner. Instead, it is important to adopt methodological and empirical approaches that serve to destabilize existing organizational structures. In this way, we may obtain a richer comprehension of how hierarchical relations dominate our lives. For example, Smith's conception of the 'relations of ruling,'[351] understood as the myriad ways in which organizational structures and systems of power are interconnected, offers a means to understand how gender relations are impacted in the workplace. It is noteworthy that few researchers have placed gender at the forefront of their inquiry into the relationship between authenticity and leadership. Yet a focus on gender may offer insights that are otherwise overlooked.[352]

In the past, some second-wave feminist writers argued that all women's voices have been silenced. This contention is somewhat misleading, however, since it fails to show how silence is experienced differently, depending upon a woman's social location. As Linda Alcoff points out, it is important to develop research approaches that help mitigate power imbalances between the researcher and interview participant.[353] Thus, we need to consider how the perspective of the situated knower influences how we conduct our research. For example, when interviews are conducted with a lack of understanding of cultural difference, this can lead to a distorted version of the experiences of others. In trying to alleviate power inequities, Lugones and Spelman suggest that researchers become friends with their interviewees for "only when genuine and reciprocal dialogue

---

[351] Dorothy E. Smith, *The Conceptual Practices of Power: A Feminist Sociology of Knowledge* (Toronto: The University of Toronto Press, 1987), 14-19.

[352] It is noteworthy that in recent metastudies the only bibliographical reference to gender is to Alice Eagly's article on "Relational Authenticity." Research conducted outside social psychology seems to be excluded from these literature reviews. As an example, see Francis J. Yammarino *et al.*, "Authentic Leadership and Positive Organizational Behavior: A Meso, Multi-Level Perspective," *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19 (2008): 693-207.

[353] Linda Alcoff, "The Politics of Speaking for Others," *Cultural Critique*, 20 (1992): 5-32.

takes place between 'outsiders' and 'insiders' can we trust the outsider's account."[354] When interviewing people, it is important for feminist researchers to try and develop an atmosphere of friendship and openness. In their opinion, a vital component of human life is talking about personal experiences, since being silenced is a form of oppression. It is vital, therefore, that researchers be cognizant of the power relations between researcher and interview subject, and how their methodological and theoretical approach may work to silence others.

While I concur that a researcher must be responsible for her actions, the problem is that in the interview process things unfold in the moment. There is little time to reflect on one's responses, other than giving oneself a metaphorical "kick in the shins" on those occasions when one interrupts someone. This is where practice and theory diverge because, no matter how good one's intentions might be, there is an inherent unpredictability in the research process. There are times when things just go awry. I will return to this point in due course. But at this juncture I want to turn to consider interviewing in greater detail.

4.4.1   Interviewing

When researchers do not consider how theory influences praxis, according to Kathryn Roulston, it may lead to under-theorized and poor quality interview data.[355] This is why she maintains it is important before embarking on interviews to consider how theory and practice interconnect. Theorizing about a particular methodology might involve considering how the data is to be collected, the role of the interviewer, which participants are chosen, the theory underpinning the interviews, and how the final conclusions may be judged.[356] In Roulston's view, theory is a process whereby we construct concepts and

---

[354] Maria Lugones and Elizabeth Spelman, "Have We Got a Theory for You! Feminist Theory, Cultural Imperialism and the Demand for "The Woman's Voice," *Women's Studies International Forum*, 6, no. 6 (1983): 573-581.

[355] Kathryn Roulston, *Reflective Interviewing: A Guide to Theory & Practice*, (London: Sage, 2010), 2.

[356] Roulston, *Reflective Interviewing*, 2.

ideas about the world. In relation to interviews, the purpose of such theorizing is to consider, ahead of time, what issues relate to one's research design.[357]

When conducting a phenomenological qualitative study, Sandra Thomas and Howard Pollio maintain that there are two important criteria in relation to eligibility. First, the participant must have some experience of the particular phenomenon being studied, and second, the participant must be willing to talk about the phenomenon.[358] While some researchers argue for multiple interviews, Thomas and Pollio contend that this is not necessary providing that the interviewer has done preliminary interviews to test her questions, and become aware of her own presuppositions.[359] In addition, they argue that the ideal number for a phenomenological study is between eight to twelve participants.[360]

For Heideggerian-inspired researchers like Patricia Benner, interpretation is an inescapable component of the research process. She regards learning the phenomenological method as akin to literary criticism because the researcher is searching for different meanings that can be substantiated by the text in question.[361] Benner argues there are three narrative strategies that need to be taken into account. These are paradigm cases; thematic analyses and exemplars. In paradigm cases, the interview is read for a global understanding after which certain topics or events are selected for a more detailed analysis. When you have the paradigm case, it is then necessary to test it against another

---

[357] Roulston, *Reflective Interviewing*, 3.

[358] For a fuller discussion of how different qualitative researchers approach this issue, see Sandra P. Thomas and Howard R. Pollio. *Listening to Patients: A Phenomenological Approach to Nursing Research and Practice (*New York: Springer Publishing Company, 2002).

[359] In my study, I carried out two preliminary interviews. Furthermore, I spent a year thinking about and fine-tuning my research questions. Dr. Anne Kinsella offered me excellent advice as to the framing of my research study for which I am most grateful.

[360] There is a lot of contention with regard to how many participants are appropriate for a study. For instance, Amadeo Giorgi argues that a researcher needs at least three participants so as to get to general experience of a particular phenomenon. In my study, I had ten participants.

[361] Patricia Benner, "The Tradition and Skill of Interpretive Phenomenology in Studying Health, Illness, and Caring Practices," in *Interpretive Phenomenology: Embodiment, Caring, and Ethics in Health and Illness*, ed. P. Benner (Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications Inc., 1994), 112.

case to see whether similar concerns manifest themselves. Conversely, in a thematic analysis, you look for patterns across interviews, moving between parts and the whole of the text. Once you have identified paradigm cases and themes, then exemplars need to be discovered that display similarities or dissimilarities. Stories will come through that act as exemplars that capture important meanings.

So we see that there are different ways of reading the text or, in my case, interview transcripts, because meaning flows from an array of traditions, contexts, and experiences.[362] It is necessary to consider specific incidents or concerns, rather than opinions or ideology. Benner maintains that phenomenology is different from a Marxist 'hermeneutics of suspicion' or a psychoanalytic reading that tries to reveal the underlying truth, because phenomenology tries to examine pre-understandings and to confront otherness, silence and commonalities. This includes the researcher's pre-understanding. Indeed, she argues that having research questions challenged is part of the process. In this regard, my own research questions altered over time as a result of conversations with others. Through discussions, I realised that I needed to develop research questions that were sufficiently broad to allow for diverse opinions to emerge. For example, my initial questions were often couched as "why" questions, but with careful guidance, I realized that to obtain rich descriptive accounts, I needed to couch my questions in a "how" rather than "why" framework. Furthermore, it is the task of the researcher is to keep oriented to the thing in question - in my case, how senior women leaders experience authentic leadership, or lack thereof, in a university environment. Ideally, both interviewee and interviewer are involved in deciding whether this description is faithful to experience. I will return to this point in due course.

When conducting phenomenological research, Max Van Manen contends that it is important to keep each of the four existentials, that is, spatiality, corporeality, temporality

and relationality in mind.[363] I thought about how I might do this as I was putting the research questions together, as well as when I was going through the transcripts looking for themes. Spatiality represents an important component of how we interact with one another. I considered spatiality by asking research participants to describe instances where they felt most comfortable leading and, conversely, to describe those times where they felt ill at ease. A good example of this from the interview accounts is Dianne's description of the feeling of "shrinking" when she has found herself in situations where she felt unable to speak out. (I will discuss Dianne's account in more depth in chapter five.)

Corporeality represents the second existential, and refers to how our interactions are always embodied. In relation to corporeality, I asked participants to describe any physical or emotional sensations they experienced when they felt they were acting in a manner that they perceived as true to themselves, or in an inauthentic way. Most interviewees described a recurring physical sensation they experienced such as a tightening of the chest, a sickening feeling in the pit of the stomach, or a painful headache, that overcame them in difficult situations. It appears that these recurring embodied signals serve as a reminder that something about a particular situation made them feel uneasy in some way. It is interesting to note, however, that two of the women I interviewed reported no bodily sensations in relation to leadership. I sensed that neither of them was keen on answering the question. I am not sure what to make of this other than to wonder whether they have trained themselves in a way that they do not pick up on bodily cues.

Temporality, the third existential, is non-linear because past, present and future are interwoven. Over time, some experiences take on greater meaning, while others recede into the background. There were many examples from the interviews that relate to how past events have an influence on present and future action. One of the most poignant was Jill's description of being made homeless when her mother became sick, and she lost her

---

[363] Max Van Manen, *Researching Lived Experiences: Human Science for an Action Sensitive Pedagogy* (London: The Althouse Press, 1997), 101-106.

job. This experience of living on the street influenced not only her current research on prisoners' rights but Jill's desire to try and be responsive to others in her leadership.

The fourth existential, relationality, can be seen from the diverse examples that interview participants offer of others who influenced their own thinking about authenticity and leadership. Some interview participants described mentors they had worked with, or how they tried to encourage others to be successful. Several women also mentioned the effect particular actions by their mothers had on their desire to lead. The stories that they told about an event in their childhood seemed of especial significance to them.

I want to turn now to consider why narrative might be important to understanding.

4.5 Narrative

For Arendt, storytelling is intrinsic to comprehending lived experience, since it is through narrative that we make sense of our lives. Hence, storytelling makes us aware of the material reality that abstract theory overlooks. Each person has a narrative that is unique to them, although, as I pointed out in chapter one, she was adamant that we can never be the author of our life story, which can only be told in full after our death. As action is ephemeral, we need storytellers to record and memorialize what occurred. In her words:

> without action to bring into the play of the world the new beginning ... there is nothing new; without speech to materialize and memorialize the new things that appear and shine forth, there is no remembrance, without the enduring permanence of a human artifact, there cannot be any remembrance of things that are to come with those that shall come after.[364]

Narrative gathers together the two aspects fundamental to an Arendtian notion of subjectivity, that is, action and speech. While Heidegger's authenticity is a silent repudiation of communication with others, according to Jacques Taminiaux, Arendt

---

[364] Arendt, *Human Condition*, 204.

views narrative as revealing.[365] Arendt did not approve of autobiography, for example, because it went against her assertion that it was the task of the storyteller, not the actor, to remember a person's life. Thus, it is the spectator as narrator who is able to tell another person's life-story.

Storytelling, as Julia Kristeva notes, offers Arendt a way to re-create the connection between philosophy and politics that was lost following the death of Socrates.[366] She perceives Arendt's conception of narrative as a radical response to Heidegger's attempt to essentialize and rationalize being. Unlike philosophers, Arendt argues that storytellers are able to put themselves into the minds of others without taking a definitive stance. The reason why storytellers are essential is because we have a plurality of viewpoints from which to assess a particular action.[367] For actions to have meaning there must always be a spectator to engage and respond. Thus, for Arendt, it is not through self-knowledge that we understand what it means to exist but through our interactions with one another. Consequently, we need others to interpret our actions through storytelling and remembrance. From an Arendtian perspective, stories are plural in the sense that they are multiple, but also unique in that they belong to someone.

While Arendt sometimes apologized for using storytelling to advance her argument, Lisa Disch maintains this was somewhat disingenuous because storytelling allowed Arendt to make a judgement. Storytelling is always an interpretation of events; hence, Disch suggests that we need to be wary of making essentialist arguments or calling for a

---

[365] Jacques Taminiaux, *Thracian Maid and the Professional Thinker Arendt and Heidegger,* trans. and ed. by Michael Gendre (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1997)*, 16.

[366] Julia Kristeva, *Hannah Arendt: Life is a Narrative,* trans. Frank Collins (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001).

[367] Of course, the problem comes with the ways in which such stories are recorded so that there is an official record of events, and then there are the facts. To illustrate this, Arendt described how in Stalin's Russia all textbooks made no reference to Trotsky. In totalitarian states, as we saw in chapter three, history is to be rewritten according to who is in control. This rewriting of history is necessary for democratic societies too.

privileged standpoint through narrative.[368] One problem with narrative descriptions is that stories can be taken literally because of what is supposedly "authentic" content.

I want to pause here to consider the implications of this claim. Does it follow that one person's account is worth less than multiple perspectives? I ask because, at first glance, Arendt's notion of common-sense judgement suggests that a group would have access to more diverse opinions than a single person. These multiple voices offer a more rounded view of the world. Yet one could argue that the dissenting opinion is equally valid, because it takes courage to voice an opinion in opposition from the group. Such courage is central to Arendt's notion of heroism for, in speaking up against the will of the many, it shows bravura. What appears on the surface to be a plurality of perspectives may be no more than a tacit acceptance of an idea put forward by the most forceful personality in the group. Without open dialogue and dissent, people may become mired in "group think," which has a negative effect on people's ability to come forward with an alternative perspective. Argumentation is important for it allows different people to voice their understanding of an issue, and brings forth a deeper engagement. Arendt refers to the "interspace" or "inter-est" as the public arena, where a multiplicity of opinions are heard and considered.[369] Intrinsic to such a multifaceted arena is the place for discord. Hence, dispute and conflict are a necessary component of any political space if plurality is to flourish. But too often this dissenting voice is marginalized, or even silenced, as in the case of totalitarianism.

In her work, Arendt tries to grasp the significance of phenomena through the lens of situated experience. Arendt's predilection for storytelling is not, in Disch's opinion, because she views it as a way to pass on tradition, nor as a way to express oneself. Rather, the storyteller, through the framework of visiting, is involved in a "practice of situated critical thinking."[370] This practice requires the researcher to be willing to "think

---

[368] Disch, *Hannah Arendt*, 7.

[369] Arendt, *Human Condition*, 182.

[370] Disch, *Hannah Arendt*, 27.

without banisters," a phrase Arendt used repeatedly to underscore how thinking is an individual pursuit.[371] It is important for the researcher to consider what it is about the phenomenon that she finds meaningful.

In considering the centrality of narrative to Arendt's work, Veronica Vasterling suggests that the purpose of storytelling is to ensure that there is a space where individuals feel able to participate.[372] While science and philosophy are useful for the establishment of facts, she argues that these knowledge routes cannot make sense of the world in the way narrative does. Even qualitative research is not rich enough, in Vasterling's view, to offer the depth of understanding that can be gleaned from a good story.[373] This is because the primary aim of most social science is to clear away the ambiguity and complexity of phenomena in favour of a consistent pattern. We have seen this tendency in the way that leadership scholars define authentic leadership through four dimensions: balanced information processing, relational transparency, self-awareness and internalized moral perspective. What this desire for consistency may lead to is uniformity of meaning. Such uniformity may serve to obscure what is meaningful about a phenomenon, because we focus on similarities instead of particularity. In a phenomenological exploration both must be kept in view.

Furthermore, Vasterling expresses concern that storytelling is being undermined by scientific studies conducted by experts. When expert accounts take over from narrative, all that we are left with is rationalization, which may serve to suppress the "intangible

---

[371] Disch, *Hannah Arendt*, 169. Disch regards Arendt's approach as similar to Maria Lugones' notion of world travelling whereby we try to "travel" to a different identity not to empathize but to understand what the world looks life from another's perspective.

[372] Veronica Vasterling, "Cognitive Theory and Phenomenology in Arendt's and Nussbaum's Work on Narrative" *Human Studies,* 30 (2007): 92.

[373] Vasterling's assertion has recently been reaffirmed by leadership scholars Jonathan Gosling and Peter Villiers. They further argue that management theory often obscures leadership experiences by focusing on positive aspects of leading. For more on this topic, see their edited collection entitled *Fictional Leaders: Heroes, Villains and Absent Friends*. (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013).

web of human affairs."[374] The problem with rationalization is that expert accounts tend to privilege a particular mode of being over others. Expert accounts may result in the privileging of one voice over others. In doing so, we lose a plurality of perspectives, and the deeper understanding a multiplicity of accounts offers.

To sum up, I have suggested that Arendt places high esteem on narrative since it allows us to memorialize action. We have seen that it is the role of the storyteller to recount the story; whose wider perspective enables her to see in a manner that the actor cannot. Now I want to turn to a discussion of the interview process, participant recruitment and extracts from field notes to shed light on how I carried out the qualitative component of this phenomenological inquiry.

4.5.1   Research Participants/Recruitment

Participants were recruited for this study in three ways. First, I sent an email to university Presidents, Vice-Presidents or their equivalent that belonged, like I did, to an organization called Women's Education Worldwide. Second, I used a snowballing technique where I discussed my research with eligible candidates and asked them whether they wished to take part in the study, or knew of anyone else who might like to be involved who fit the profile - that is female, senior-level administrators, preferably Presidents, Vice-Presidents, or equivalent, who worked in the higher education sector. In the end, ten women took part in the study. These women leaders, when interviewed, worked in three different countries - The United States, Canada, and The Philippines. As well, two research participants came from the Caribbean – one from Trinidad, and the other from Jamaica.

Most of the women I interviewed had worked in universities for several decades, and the majority had been faculty members before moving into administrative roles. Two interview participants had worked in the corporate sector before embarking upon a university career. Five women had extensive experience leading at least one educational

---

[374] Vasterling, "Cognitive Theory and Phenomenology," 92.

institution. The other women leaders were in charge of major portfolios such as academic planning, external relations and student services. The participants' ages ranged from early forties to early seventies. In addition, research participants came from a variety of disciplinary backgrounds in the humanities, social and applied sciences. Below is a table that gives salient details about each research participant, followed by a brief description of each leader.

Name	Role	Age	Country of Origin
Alison	Leadership Director/Vice-President	50s	America
Claire	President (recently retired)	60s	America
Dianne	Vice-President	40s	America
Jane	Associate Vice-Provost	50s	America
Jennifer	Former Director, Diaspora Centre and Dept Chair	60s	Trinidad
Jill	President	50s	America
Kate	President	50s	Canada
Laura	International Project Leader/Vice-President	60s	Jamaica
Olive	President (former)	70s	America
Teresa	President	60s	The Philippines

Alison developed the leadership program in her university and is also a freelance consultant. She has extensive experience in the corporate world before moving to the educational sector.

Claire recently retired from her role as President of a women's college. She has extensive experience in the university sector in a variety of administrative roles in North America and France.

Dianne is a Vice-President of a large women's college. Previously, she worked in a similar role at a large university. Dianne was the youngest person interviewed.

Jane is an Associate Provost at a major institution. A full professor, she has been at her current university for more than two decades.

Jill is the President of a women's college in the United States. Previously, she was Vice-President in a major university.

Jennifer was recently Chair of an institute dedicated to Diaspora Studies, and has also served two terms as Chair of Department. She lives in The United States but is originally from Trinidad.

Kate is President of a large educational institution in a major metropolis. This is her first job as a President. Previously she held various administrative posts including the role of Vice-President.

Laura was a Vice-President of a major Ivy League university. She currently works at a black college in the United States. At 68, she is the second oldest person interviewed.

Olive has extensive experience leading co-ed and single sex institutions. She is now a Professor at an Ivy League institution, and was the oldest person interviewed.

Teresa was, until recently, the President of a large university in The Philippines. She has also worked in North America for the World Bank.

4.5.2   The Interviews

Due to financial constraints, with the exception of one interview conducted via SKYPE, interviews were conducted on the telephone. I found that the lack of visual stimuli helped me to concentrate. While this might seem to go against a phenomenological account of perceptual encounters, perhaps what I was experiencing was a different kind of bodily experience, one that centered on auditory perception. These auditory encounters worked well for me because, as a visual learner, I often find there are too many visual cues. Conversely, with the telephone, and the concentration that is required to do a successful interview, there were few distractions. The lack of visual cues, however, meant that there may have been physical responses to particular questions that I could not see that would also have been pertinent to this inquiry.

Most interviews took place in the semi-darkness of my bedroom. In my bedroom, the telephone rests on a table, adjacent to the bed, and in front of a blank wall. When I was carrying out the interviews, I would face that wall. To my left, there was light coming through the gap at the bottom of the door, yet, I could not see outside. This was purposeful on my part to help with concentration, and to cut down on distractions caused by external noise. There was something about this semi-dark space that offered comfort, not least, I suspect, because the interview took "place" in my bedroom, a space where I felt safe. This sense of spatial belonging helped me to alleviate the anxiety I felt as a humanities scholar carrying out interviews. But I also believe this spatial comfort aided my learning process. Indeed, I was surprised at how quickly I became used to the role of interviewer. I do not think that I would have gained as much confidence if the interviews had been conducted in another person's favourite space. While the research participants chose the date and time for the interview, I had that feeling of comfort that comes from being in a room of one's own. Similarly the women whom I interviewed were able to choose a place that felt comfortable to them. In some cases, this was their work office; in others, it was their home.

I began each interview by asking the participant what name she wished me to call her as a way to establish a sense of connection. In each case, the participants told me to call them by their first name. I then asked two questions asking them to describe what the term

"authenticity" meant to them, and what the term "authentic leadership" brought to mind.[375] I sensed that interview participants had been expecting questions like these because they often had answers at the ready. Several research participants spoke about their lack of knowledge of the term "authentic leadership." When this occurred, I tried to put the woman at ease by explaining that it was her experience of leading that I was interested in, rather than her academic knowledge of the term. As we moved further into the interview, people often said things like "now I see what you're getting at," or "I guess I do know more about this than I thought." It was as if, through the interview process, we were bringing to light an understanding that was already present but that the interviewee had not previously recognized. This seems to me an example of the way that the phenomenological approach functions to reveal a comprehension of a particular concept that the person already had, but of which they may not have been aware.

I had a specific question in my study that elicited stories from research participants with regard to how their personal narrative influences their desire to lead in a manner that they perceived as true to themselves. On several occasions, interviewees described instances where their mothers had played influential roles in instilling not only a sense of doing right, but a belief that they could lead. These stories, which I discuss in detail in chapter five, bring to light experiences and understandings that have been ignored. Through the interviews, I discovered that four of the women came from working-class, low-income households. The dimension of class enriched the study. Further, three interviewees self-identified as women of colour. Their insights into racial issues deepened my understanding of some of the complexities surrounding race, gender and leadership.

Occasionally, during an interview, a research participant mentioned religion. For example, one woman described how Buddhist thought influenced her ideas about authenticity. Two other participants mentioned Christianity. One of these participants was enthusiastic about her early leadership experiences in her church. The other participant who mentioned religion was less enthusiastic. In this woman's case, she described how oppressed she had felt growing up by her father's change of vocation from lawyer to

---

[375] See Appendix B for the interview guide.

parish priest. She spoke of the disjuncture between the sermons preached in church, and her home life that she described as difficult to reconcile. For some women whom I interviewed, it appears that religion provided an early path to thinking about authenticity and leadership. For others, religion served to reinforce patriarchal systems of oppression.

Turning to the practice of interviewing, on the one hand, an interview is similar to a conversation in that there is an oscillation between questioner and respondent. On the other hand, it is different since the interviewer sets the pace with the questions she poses. The researcher has an unfair advantage in that she knows the questions because she has the research guide in front of her. In some ways, this restricts the conversation by its linearity. While having research questions close at hand afforded me comfort, I can also see that it is a type of control, a way of unnaturally steering a conversation in a certain direction any time the discussion goes too far afield.

In my case, there was also the added experience of dealing with elites, and how this could influence the process. For example, when interview participants began asking me questions, I became a little unnerved. This happened on two separate occasions. Both times, I felt it was a way for the interviewee to try to change the direction of the interview. My response to this attempt by another to take control was unease, and a desire to recast the dialogue along the lines I wanted. Thus, it seems to me, there are always power dynamics taking place within the interview that make it difficult to have the kind of friendly conversation that Lugones and Spelman regard as critical to feminist inquiry.

Sometimes, those interviews that go off track can offer the most useful data if a researcher is willing to reflect on the reasons why the interview might seem to have failed. In one case, an interview I conducted became somewhat confrontational. The research participant found my interview questions exasperating. At one point, she declared that all we were doing was going around in circles as I kept asking her the same thing but from different angles. Phenomenologically, I suppose that was exactly what I was doing but my interview approach was not one with which this person was comfortable. I found myself becoming somewhat irritated by her negative responses. I thought my spirited defense of my research would culminate in the end of the interview.

Instead, her attitude softened, and she seemed to become genuinely interested in the project. There was a change in the timbre of her voice, and she began asking questions and sharing stories in a way that was very different from her demeanor at the start of the interview. Here are two examples from the beginning and end of the interview that illustrate this change of attitude.

> My problem is I'm not into this whole framework. I'm sure that your study is going to be very interesting, but you're talking about leadership in ways that I don't normally think about so I'm having trouble getting into your mindset.

> As we started out, I was thinking you know that this is going to be a very difficult conversation because this seems to me speaking a different language or too simplistic or whatever. But as we got into it, you've really made me think.

The best way I can describe this interview experience is as a kind of thawing. It seemed to me we entered into the kind of dialogue and dissent that Arendt argues is crucial to understanding. In this particular situation, discord, rather than concord, brought about a deeper understanding on both our parts.

Over the four month time span of interviewing, while I fine-tuned some of the questions, I did not alter them substantially because I found that each interviewee's response to each question was different. For instance, I noticed that there were times when an interviewee, in the midst of describing a specific instance, seemed to hesitate. When I asked a follow-up question to delve further, sometimes the interviewee remained silent. At times, hesitations and silences may illuminate something that dialogue fails to do. If the researcher pays attention to silent gaps, I believe she may gain a glimpse of something usually hidden from view. For instance, as I read across the transcripts, I realised that no one had spoken about how sexuality or disability may have affected their personal leadership. Conversely, participants talked freely about race, class and gender issues. I mention this to show there are still many things that are not discussed openly that have a bearing on our lives.

Questions that yielded seemingly superficial responses in one interview led to deeper responses in another. As I mentioned earlier in the chapter, two participants stated that embodiment played no relevance to the way in which they lead. This was in contradistinction to other interviewees, who talked openly about embodied experiences. For example, one woman, Dianne, spoke vividly about the way that she felt herself shrinking in certain situations. In her words, "I definitely have an emotional and physical sensation of shrinking, or getting smaller of being less colourful, less of me in a situation, I'm sort of bending myself a lot." This sense of not taking up space is indicative of the way that other women spoke about the problems of finding themselves growing quieter in different spaces. I suggest that silence is intrinsically linked to gender hierarchy in a way that works to encourage some to speak while discouraging others. The decision to speak, or remain silent, derives from learned experience of what is perceived as appropriate for the public space. Many women learn to restrict themselves to what is considered proper. To use Heideggerian terminology, that which is proper is always-already defined ahead of time by social convention. These social niceties may serve to constrain authentic discourse, which, in turn, has an impact on a person's sense of self.

Active listening is a vital component of interviewing. However, I found that it was not always possible to stay alert. Interviewing is both mentally and physically tiring. Tiredness affects my ability to concentrate. At any moment, thoughts rush in that are hard to keep under control. As an instance, my ability to listen to one interviewee was interrupted by a scratching sound. Suddenly, I realized this was the sound of a mouse trapped in the wall of our house frantic to get out. I was equally desperate to keep focused on the conversation, while trying not to panic at the thought of what I would do if the little creature suddenly burst through the wall. Of course, I realize that, logically, this was an unlikely thing to happen but, at the time, it seemed possible. While one might desire to be an active listener, it does not always work that way in the practice of conducting interviews.

In one interview, Kate talked about how she had begun to realise how leadership changed her personality. In her words: "I still think that it's been an authentic journey, if you will, and that I can still be the leader and the human being I want to be but I have to

understand that just as I want to change the institution, the institution and the role changed me." This statement is interesting for it shows how leaders and their institutions transform each other. In this case, Kate describes how being a President of an institution had a profound effect on her sense of self. She described how people who knew her well, that is, close friends and family members, saw her as a shy person. However, in the context of her role as leader, she thought most of her colleagues would be surprised to learn of her shy disposition. Kate's distinction between herself in private and her public role mirrors Arendt's belief that we take on a personae whenever we act within a public context. Thus, the notion that we are authentic within a social context, or even a private one for that matter, is somewhat contradictory. While there were some interviewees such as Laura who viewed their private and public personae as the same, this was not a common perspective.

In this section, I have discussed the interview process. Now I would like to consider how this research is related to ethical matters.

4.5.3 Reflexivity and Ethical Issues

Each interviewer brings a particular stance to her inquiry, which influences the themes that come to light from each interview. This unique orientation affects the ways in which a researcher approaches her work. Feminist theory, like hermeneutic inquiry, makes one aware that it is important to be cognizant of how one's situated perspective shapes the research process. Yet while I am aware of some of my prejudices, I also have blindspots. Reflexivity can only go so far, as we know from Arendt that we cannot see ourselves from the outside. What this means in terms of the interview process is that there is an ambiguity inherent within any research endeavour, because each person interprets the world from a different, situated perspective. As Merleau-Ponty tells us, we can only know ourselves in ambiguity.[376] We are each differently situated and, hence, perceive the world in a distinct manner. Thus, each interviewer will approach her work differently.

---

[376] Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception*, 344.

Moreover, past experiences will influence a researcher's approach to a topic. For example, I first became acquainted with the concept of authentic leadership through my experience setting up a Leadership Institute for Women at Brescia University College. Over the course of several years in developing a plan and a vision for the Institute, extensive discussions took place with faculty, staff, alumnae and community representatives regarding what kind of leadership the Institute was going to provide, and to whom. My recollection from many of those meetings was friction between those who wanted the Institute to be more overtly feminist in its pursuits, and others who saw this as too narrow a focus. Additionally, extensive dialogue took place concerning whether it was even possible to be an authentic leader in today's workplace. Over the years, I was involved in this planning and execution, I thought a lot about the term "authentic leadership." This phrase, for me, conveys a contradiction. When I think of authentic leadership, the term "honesty" often springs to mind, yet this word occurred only once in the interviews I conducted. Does that mean, then, that my initial understanding was wrong? Not according to Merleau-Ponty, who argues that "all views are true provided that they are not isolated, that we delve deeply into history and reach the unique core of existential meaning which emerges in each perspective."[377] This is what I have been trying to do throughout this project.

In thinking about the relationship between interviewing and ethics, Patricia Benner argues that an ethical stance is one that respects the interviewee's experiences, while also staying true to the text. One way I approached ethics was by encouraging research participants to give me feedback at the end of the interview as to whether they felt that there was anything that we had not spoken about which they considered important. For instance, at the end of her interview, Dianne suggested that one thing she had been expecting me to ask, which I did not, was a question about social capital. The term was not familiar to me so I asked her what she meant. In her view, social capital means what I am willing to do to ensure that my objectives are met. That is, on what occasions will I fight for what I believe is right, and when are the times when I am willing to negotiate

---

[377] Merleau Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception*, xxi.

with others. This negotiation is useful for the future since it will, hopefully, ensure that others will secede to her viewpoint when she most needs assistance. I find myself a little uneasy about this way of operating for it seems to me that this is how issues may become uncontested. I recognize that this is the *modus operandi* that many people adopt in the workplace. While I can see that it makes sense strategically to store up social capital; whether it is ethical or not is a different matter.

Another way of considering ethics in terms of interviewing is for the researcher to be critically reflexive of prescribed methodologies, individual knowledge and social context.[378] I tried to reflect upon my research questions and methodological approach to ensure that as a white, heterosexual, feminist researcher, I did not misappropriate the voices of others. I took field notes, both before and following each interview, so that I could explore my reactions to what was unfolding, as well as reflect upon my pre-understandings. This reflexivity enabled me to delve deeper into my own assumptions regarding gender, authenticity and leadership, and the ways in which this prior understanding is contested by study participants. While it is conceivable that I could have conducted a phenomenological inquiry without conducting interviews, I sense that my overall account may not have been as evocative or meaningful without their diverse opinions.

 If the researcher's views are not changed in some way, Benner argues that the process is insufficient. However, at the time of conducting the interviews, I did not understand what she meant by "reasoning in transition."[379] I have included below some of my field notes from three interviews to show how this reasoning in transition works. These notes were taken directly following each interview, and then after I have typed up the transcript.[380]

---

[378] Benner, *Tradition*, 115.

[379] Benner, *Tradition*, 112.

[380] In most cases, I typed the transcript up directly following the interview. I then shared the specific transcript with the research participant, giving each person plenty of time to respond, usually four-six weeks. When I had not heard from someone, I sent two follow up emails.

Field Notes – August 15

Today's interview was much more difficult. For one thing, SKYPE didn't work again. I don't know why. She seemed very curt at first. No curt isn't the right word but I felt that she was too much in her head. At one point, I thought that it would be over in thirty minutes but then I began to really hone in on what she was saying. I spoke a lot more than in the first interview but this was a necessary tactic in order to draw her out. And it worked, I think. She had problems with the question about comfort – something about that word displeased her almost. I also felt at times that she was interviewing me but then I thought well that's fine, if we think about it as a conversation, it's good for me to have to explain what it is I think I am doing.

The most interesting answer I thought was related to her background where she talked about how learning to act had enabled her to find her voice and to get out from a patriarchal household as a young woman. But all in all, I have to give myself a pat on the back for making the interview work. She also said that she liked the questions and that they had made her think. I still need to go deeper with people, but this interview showed me how hard that might be on occasion.

Field notes after transcription

This was a much better interview than I thought it was. What I saw as her negativity was just her way of approaching questions. She is a thoughtful person; hence the long pauses. It was because she was thinking about the questions that it seemed to me as if she wasn't interested. This is the problem, I guess, with telephone interviews. But this also says a lot about the way I jump to conclusions about people without having enough information – something that I accuse others of doing, but now I have to see that this is the way that we ordinarily go about the world. And, it's a problem, as Helen would say.

Field Notes – August 24

This was the first interview I had done in the afternoon. It was only 4:30 p.m. but for some reason I wasn't really looking forward to it. The other interviews had gone well if one discounts the issues with technology. I found it difficult to get her to talk. This is the

second time this has happened. This time it was not due to a reticence but to a lack of openness. It did not appear that way on the surface because she answered without hesitation. I got the sense that she had answered similar questions in the past. She was very sure of what authentic leadership was making no distinction between personal authenticity and authentic leadership. It was only at the end of the interview when I pressed her that I found that she had left her last institution because of a moral dilemma. She was very pleasant but I sensed, a lack of connection, even though I did try my best. She was very clear, honest, and open but her answers to the embodiment questions were non-existent. How can someone not have a bodily response?

Field notes after transcription

Again, I've misread an interviewee. This was a really thoughtful honest appraisal of her notion of authentic leadership. It means so much to her not least because of her working-class background. It is becoming clear to me that the people who this concept appeals to have, at one time or another, been or felt themselves to have been on the margins. I don't think it matters how long the interviews take. Some people are just quicker I guess.

Field Notes   August 30

I was a little rattled in that I had forgotten that the guy was coming to do the roof vents. However, I asked him not to be noisy at that time, and it was fine. She answered some questions in a way that resonated with what I had just been writing. Namely, the problem when leaders try and promote visions, or stick to plans, that go against the general will. The notion of fear came up again this time, not physical fear, although she did mention faculty meetings in which men threw chairs. Unbelievable! She talked about people shouting, arguing and not listening to others.

Field Notes – following transcript

As I'm writing up the transcripts, I've just realised that a word that doesn't come up is honest or honesty. It's peculiar because as I'm listening that is what I'm thinking about some of the stories I'm listening to. How it is that people will talk openly to a complete stranger who is recording their words about something deeply personal. It's quite

amazing really and is happening in a way that may take many months with someone that you get to know. What is it about this interview structure that makes people do this? Is it anything to do with Foucault's confessional, that in some way I represent an authority figure? I hope not, but it is something worth paying attention to.

Reviewing these field notes now two years after conducting the interviews, it is fascinating to see how quickly I made assumptions that upon reflection were not necessarily an accurate representation of the interview. Conversely, they also show how quickly I gained confidence doing interviews. Furthermore, much of the information that I read about phenomenology and qualitative interviews only made sense to me after I had conducted the interviews.

My initial assumptions about interviewing became unravelled by a particular experience, or rather my response to it. I had not anticipated that a person disagreeing with the written transcript would be disconcerting. Indeed, in my original submission to the Research Ethics Board, I wanted research participants to have lots of opportunity to engage in dialogue with me. But the Board informed me that I must be clear about how much leeway interview participants would have to make changes to the transcript. This proved to be good advice. At first, I wanted a more open-ended dialogue. Yet, my following response to someone's desire to change a transcript reveals how contradictory my initial intent, and actual practice turned out to be.

When Clare sent back the transcript, she told me that she had rewritten some of her answers so they flowed better. In her words, "she had run off at the mouth," and wanted to change the transcript so that her responses were more focused. In her view, these alterations had improved what she was trying to say, rather than changed the meaning. When I read through the transcript, I was surprised at the extent of her changes, which probably took her considerable time to do. She had added words that she had not said, and taken away others. I was surprised at my feelings of frustration at this "rewrite." My reaction confounded me because it contradicts my initial desire for an open-ended dialogue. I had not realised how quickly I would begin to see these transcripts as part of my research, and, thus, belonging to me. But Clare's rewrite of our initial conversation

served to deny the spontaneity of her original account. The immediacy of the dialogue was lost in her revision of what took place.

Clare was the only person to make substantial changes to the transcript. With other research participants, I received an "it's fine" response indicating there were no changes to make, while some interviewees requested minor alterations to inelegant phrases. These phrases were spoken; I went back to the tapes to make sure that I had not been mistaken in my transcription typing. It is strange to strike out what was said, and incorporate what was not. This is where the co-mingling between researcher and research participant gets messy. In one way, it does not matter; the changes that were suggested – other than Clare's – were inconsequential to the account. If people are unhappy with something they said, then it seems wrong not to take their views into account. From another angle, however, these changes to the transcript affect the integrity of the research process.

What is ethical in this regard? To respond with care to the person who asked for changes, or to the original words that were spoken? Perhaps the dilemma arises from the fact that we want to get it right. I do not wish to suggest that this is an either/or problem, but perhaps researchers can become too possessive of their data. In so doing, they might forget that the interview is, for the participant, a distillation of lived experience that has significance over and above the research encounter. I mention this because on several occasions, interviewees told me that the interview had affected them in a way they had not anticipated. In follow-up emails, one person shared her ongoing insights into notions of authenticity and leadership, from events that had occurred following the interview. At first, I was surprised when a few research participants did not respond to repeated requests regarding whether they had any changes that they wanted to make to the transcription. I found this unresponsiveness odd given that all but one participant indicated they would be willing to be involved in follow-up interviews. [381] Then, I received an email from one participant in which she told me how difficult it had been for

---

[381] While most participants did indicate that they were willing to engage in another interview, these interviews did not take place as I determined, together with my advisor on the methodology component of my dissertation, Dr. Anne Kinsella, that with 200 pages, I had sufficient material.

her to go through the transcript. This made me realize how, as a researcher, my connection with these stories was 'once removed.' Within an interview context, people share words and worlds; this co-conversation is not anyone's possession, although it may seem that way.

When I began to think about ethics in relation to my study, it was in the context of gaining approval to conduct my research.[382] One of the problems I find with the research ethics approval process in universities is that permission is requested from people ahead of time. I did wonder whether some research participants would prefer not to be included in the inquiry after the interviews have taken place, although no-one asked me not to use their accounts. In choosing to be interviewed, these women leaders did, after all, agree to take part in a research investigation into the nature of authentic leadership. However, at times, I was unclear as to what was my foremost ethical obligation. Is it to the people who shared their accounts? Or is it to the furtherance of knowledge? These questions of ethics are more complex than I had anticipated when I began my doctoral research, and illustrate that there are always tensions one encounters that cannot be fully resolved.

4.6   Conclusion

Troubling method, in the end, has led me to a consideration of what constitutes an ethical process, and how one shares research findings in an ethical manner. In the role of the interpretive researcher, I see my task as creating a dialogue between myself and the participants' lived experiences. The difficulty is how to conduct interviews in an ethical way. Helen Fielding suggests that an ethical approach requires us to make "sense of what we do according to a reality that consists of multiple perspectives and voices."[383] Reality, as Fielding notes, is always evolving and dependent upon a particular situation. It is this

---

[382] I obtained research ethics' approval for my study from Western University in October 2012. As part of the interview process, prior to the interview, the research participant received a letter of information, concerning the project together with a consent form (Appendix A). Each participant was asked to sign the consent form and return it to me before the interview could take place.

[383] Helen A. Fielding, "Multiple Moving Perceptions of the Real: Arendt, Merleau-Ponty, and Truitt," *Hypatia*, 26, no. 3 (Summer 2011): 518-534.

ever-changing contingency that forms the basis for our ethical, embodied relationships. But what constitutes developing ethical relationships within the context of interviewing? In other words, what did I learn from the experience of interviewing? I think that the most important thing I learned was that of the complexity with regard to ethical responsibility in regards to representing someone else's account. There were moments where I felt unsure as to what was my foremost ethical responsibility – to the interview participants, to my scholarship, or to the university. The way I have decided to deal with this ethical quandary is to be clear that this is my particular interpretation. After all, this is the basis of research that is grounded in an existential, hermeneutic approach. Or so it seems to me.

If one holds to Arendt's way of approaching research, each scholar must be willing to offer us her own insights, and make judgments accordingly. In this chapter, I have shown that through conducting a qualitative research project, I discovered ethical issues I had not anticipated. It is in the act of doing that we become aware of the multiplicity of questions regarding what constitutes ethics. In laying out my methodological approach and offering some reflections on the process, my aim has been to explore my own pre-conceptions, as well as how feminist theory and hermeneutic phenomenology intersect. In conducting interviews so as to better understand the interconnections amongst gender, authenticity and leadership, I tried to act in an ethical way, although I acknowledge that there is always more that could be said.

Chapter 5

5 Telling Tales Out of School: Gender, Authenticity and Leadership

> "I wish you would write about what it is in people that makes them
> want a story ... Life itself is full of tales." Hannah Arendt.[384]

In a letter to her friend, the novelist Mary McCarthy, Arendt expresses her view that storytelling is fundamental to human existence. For Arendt, narrative enables us to find meaning, and gain sense of our lives. In this chapter, I explore the situated, embodied nature of leadership through the narrative accounts provided by ten senior women leaders in higher education. My main purpose is to show how these diverse accounts offer insights into the interconnections among gender, authenticity and leadership. I will also consider how Arendt's work may be helpful in creating a more inclusive way of thinking about leadership.

My original research question asked in what ways senior women leaders describe their experiences of authenticity (or lack thereof) within an institutional context. What emerges from these research findings is a more expansive way of thinking about leadership. These women's accounts serve to complicate the notion of what constitutes an authentic leader, and run contrary to most scholarship on authentic leadership especially in regards to the importance of self-knowledge. Through their descriptive accounts, these women reveal how leadership is a relational enterprise, founded upon mutual respect and trust. Viewing authentic leadership through a relational perspective allows us to see previously hidden aspects of leadership. For example, these women's accounts reveal how gender differences reinforce hierarchies in subtle and sometimes not so subtle ways. As a result, a woman's sense of belonging may be undermined by gender prejudice regarding normative

---

[384] Hannah Arendt, excerpt from a personal letter, reprinted in Adriana Cavarero, *Relating Narratives: Storytelling and Selfhood* (London and New York: Routledge, 1997), 129.

ideas about what constitutes a good leader, which, in turn, may impede her ability to speak or act in a manner consistent with personal conviction.

I have divided this chapter into two parts. In part one, I introduce the research participants, and share two or three descriptive accounts from each participant. My commentary in the first section is minimal to allow these women's stories to be foregrounded. In the second part of the chapter, I consider some common themes that flow from the interviews. The first theme I discuss concerns the conflict that may arise when institutional objectives are at odds with personal convictions. The second theme relates to care and relationships. Gender and embodiment constitutes the third theme, intersectional constitutes the fourth theme, while anxiety represents the final theme. Then, I discuss some outlying themes that I consider to have phenomenological import. Finally, I bring together the different strands of the discussion to consider how these women's descriptive accounts shed light on the interconnections among gender, authenticity and leadership. Throughout this chapter, I connect these themes with Arendt's reflections on leadership.

5.1   Part I - In Their Own Words

As I pointed out in chapter four, the ten women leaders I interviewed came from different economic, cultural and social backgrounds. Five women had extensive experience leading at least one educational institution, two women were Vice Presidents, and three had extensive experience running research institutes at their respective universities. Six of the research participants had worked in the university sector for most of their working lives; the other four moved into higher education following careers in other occupations, such as school teaching, finance or the high-tech sector. Eight women held a doctorate in either the social sciences, earth sciences, or the humanities. One participant was in the final stages of her doctorate in leadership studies; the other held a master's degree.

I will now turn to the descriptive accounts to see what insights these accounts offer into the connections among gender, authenticity and leadership.

Kate – Crossing Boundaries

Kate is the President of a large educational institution in a major Canadian metropolis. She has also held other administrative posts including that of Vice-President in other higher education institutions. Kate was the first woman, as well as the youngest person, to be hired as President at her current institution. Authentic leadership, in her words, "is about being genuine; but there are pieces of your life and your world, I think, that it's important that you don't pour out in a leader role." Here Kate highlights the importance of keeping boundaries between one's public and private life; she then described what can happen when a leader allows their professional and private lives to become fused.

> I used to say that the College was unloved and unlead. Part of the problem
> was that the leader before me had his heart broken by the institution. He
> wasn't able to do what he wanted to do, and it just genuinely broke his heart.
> So for the last two years, everywhere he went, everyone knew how much he
> had fallen out of love with the institution, and how badly it had hurt him. I
> think he needed for the good of XXX to keep that to himself. So these are the
> kind of boundaries that I mean, and I think that there's humanity that is good
> to share, and that's healthy, and then there are aspects that you need to be
> able to control. And I don't find it inauthentic; I just think it's responsible to
> keep some things out of that public arena.

Here, Kate illustrates Arendt's point about the need to separate one's public personae from that of one's private self. This separation between public and private was something that Arendt regarded as critical to human flourishing. The problem if we always stay in the light of the public realm is that we may lose a sense of depth, and even reality, since we forget that we play a role in our social lives.

The separation between how a leader feels, and how much she shows to others is, to some degree, determined by cultural ideas about leaders. Being confident, for instance, is regarded in most Western societies as a positive leadership trait, while showing disillusionment is perceived as negative. Kate's comments suggest that the previous incumbent's expression of sadness was inappropriate given his leadership role, because it

had a negative effect on staff morale. In her view, a leader "can remain true to yourself in who you are but you still have to be able to inspire and to encourage." To illustrate her point, Kate gave the following description of her first meeting as President where she addressed faculty and staff, and tries to engage others by sharing her vision for organizational change.

> I needed to build the case for change. I had to get them to start thinking that we needed to do things differently, but we could do it together. It was through stating the case in the most honest and blunt way I could. It was apologizing for how the institution had let them down. And I'll tell you that this drove my executive colleagues crazy because, of course, none of us were there when all this had happened but, to me, that didn't matter. We needed to say that leadership has let this place down, and leadership was going to help turn it around ... It was about refocusing the whole institution. That day was the first sort of laying it out catalyst, and then the job was to engage people and to be challenged. I mean, I really did go anywhere I was invited, listen to everyone who had an opinion. I did come with a plan, and a vision, because just because there is humanity, and a kindness, and sincerity, and a passion in all of this, it doesn't mean that there's not this need to deliver. So that day I said this is the plan we are going to follow, and here's how you can get involved. ... I joked with the audience that many years ago I had my thyroid out. I said to them the night before I had my throat cut I wasn't as nervous as I am standing here in front of you today [Laugh]. Part of those nerves was just that I really truly believed that if we worked together we could turn the place around. And, for me, I felt like I had an hour and a half to at least get some of the sense of excitement about where we could go, what we could do, and how we could all be in this together. I'm extraordinarily lucky that XXX rallied to that, and we are a fundamentally different place than we were.

Kate describes how important it is not just to have a vision, but to be able to encourage others to become enthusiastic about organizational change. Getting other employees to commit was critical to success. But she also discusses how nervous she was in standing

up before an audience. What Kate demonstrates here is Arendt's point that it is not what we feel inside that matters but how we present ourselves to others. Courage comes not from a lack of fear, but from being willing to hide those feelings in order to present a confident outward appearance. I'll return to this point later.

Later in the interview, Kate described an ethical dilemma she faced in her role as Vice-President at a different higher education institution. As she states,

> I was working for this extraordinary man who talked a lot about integrity in leadership, and all these kinds of things. But XXX's political environment is a little bit different than here. There's a lot of politics, and it's all small "p" political. I received an email from the President saying he'd been called by a priest in XXX about a student who was trying to get in to the College and would I deal with it. So I followed up and, in a nutshell, this priest wanted to get this young woman into our nursing program, despite the fact that she didn't qualify. He described her as a nice, good Catholic girl, and so I should just let her in. And I had an absolute reaction to that. I actually encountered that several times in XXX; this is the daughter of that politician, or this is the cousin of that man, who's a big man in that town. They either wanted you to find them a job, or wanted you to find them a way into the College. In this specific instance with this student, we managed to help her find a pathway by putting her into a program that she was more academically suited to so, that if she did well in, she could get in to nursing. ... I remember going back to the President because I was disheartened by the sense that, despite the conversations about integrity and values, and changing the place, I felt a not so subtle pressure to do what was being asked of me by the outside people. And, in the end, I was supported in that instance, and in others, in doing what was right; but I found it extraordinarily difficult to feel I might be asked to bend rules, to ignore a policy, to do something that fell out of line with my values. ... I told every Board Chair that I will always act in the best interests of the institution, and if ever I feel that I can't, it will be the day I leave.

In this account, Kate describes her difficulty in working for an organization where the values that were espoused in theory were different from everyday practice. This distinction between values that were espoused by the leader of the organization, and being asked to bend the rules was, for her, an inauthentic way of leading that ultimately led her to leave the institution. Being asked to 'bend the rules' was anathema to Kate, and contrary to her idea of leading in a genuine way.

Jane – The vision thing

Jane is an Associate Provost of a large, public university in the American Midwest. A full professor, Jane has worked in a university setting for most of her career. She recently moved into an administrative post, where she is responsible for gender issues university-wide. Jane describes authentic leadership as

> being aware, as much as possible, of who you are and bringing all the pieces
> of that to your job, to your leadership to open things, and get the obstacles out
> of the way so that other people that I work with can bring great ideas forward.
> And, to me, that's what an authentic leader really does.

She contrasted her view of what constitutes authenticity in leadership with what she described as "command and control" leadership.

> The command and control kind of leader is not particularly authentic because
> they are not making room for other people to be authentic themselves, and to
> bring what they can, all that they can, to the process. A command and control
> person is saying, I don't care what else you have, what I want from you is
> this, and it better be exactly my way. …That's what we have a lot of at the
> administration level at the moment. And so they are perfectly happy for some
> of us who are at the next level, or [a] couple of levels down, to be more about
> opening things up for other people. After all, that is my job. They probably
> would not view me as particularly good material for a Vice-Presidential post
> because I don't just lay it out and tell people what they are going to do ... I
> ask people what they think needs [to be] done. I try to bring people together

to talk about what we should do, and their tendency is not to do that. They want to be able to check the box that says we collaborated, and we asked opinions, but they don't actually want to hear those opinions, and they certainly don't want to act on them.

In her negative assessment of what Jane calls 'command and control' leadership, she reveals how important it is not only to ask for opinions, but to be willing to hear what people say. She also indicates that her unwillingness to operate in this manner is likely to affect her future prospects for advancement. Jane's account reminded me of Arendt's insistence that dialogue and debate are critical aspects of plurality, and central to human flourishing. The type of leader who is unwilling to hear others' divergent opinions is displaying a form of mastery that, while on the surface asks for input, is not interested in receiving different perspectives.

I showed earlier how Kate described how important it was to gain support for her vision. In the next account, Jane discusses some of the problems that ensue when visionary leaders do not include the opinions of others.

> We hired a new Director for the School of XXX. The Search Committee decided that they wanted a visionary, and so that's what they got. But the visionary was completely incapable of doing straight administrative work, which is okay; you can hire somebody else to do that. But the real problem, in my mind, was that the person just assumed that the vision was shared, and made no effort to explain it to anybody, to convince anyone that this vision was good, to even ask anybody else if they had any other ideas, or would like to have input on a vision. She just marched off on this vision, and spent four years trying to convince the university of this vision. The rest of us [were left] sort of looking at each other. And you know what? That's not really what we wanted to do. I'm not sure she ever really figured that out. At the end of her four-year term, she asked to retain the job and they said no because she had alienated so many people by not being at all interested in what anybody else thought. Yet I know she thought that somehow she had consulted. She really

believed that everyone was on board with this vision, but she just didn't have the first clue how to go about listening to other people. My sense is that the reason why she didn't dare ask anyone else is she wasn't really that confident; that is, she wasn't authentic enough, sure enough of herself, confident enough of herself to allow herself to open up to other possibilities. And so she grabbed on to this vision ... and it gave her something to cling to, and to aim for, and helped her to keep a shell around everything else so that she didn't have to hear from [others], or hear things that might not be comfortable to hear, or try to incorporate ideas that were unfamiliar or alien to her.

Oftentimes, leaders are hired because they have a specific vision as to where the organization should be going. In Kate's description, she explains how she spent a great deal of time trying to get others involved and enthused. What Jane suggests here is that trying to impose a vision on others is an inauthentic way of leading. When a leader shows up with a ready-made vision about where an institution should be headed, this may lead to unresolved conflict which, in time, may result in the leader's termination.[385] What Jane's account brings to light is how leaders are dependent upon others.

Dianne - "A value perspective"

Dianne is Vice-President of External Relations at a women's college in the Pacific North West. She has held similar roles at different universities across The United States. In her early forties, Dianne was the youngest person I interviewed. Authentic leadership, in her words, is about "consistency of behaviour in keeping with a kind of internal compass." In the following account, she explores a time when her ethical beliefs were tested, and how she responded.

At a former employer, a staff member came to me to express discomfort with something that was going on with my manager. My manager was doing

---

[385] We may also think back to how Heidegger's desire to impose his vision on the University of Marburg also failed in part because he was unable to obtain others' support.

something that was making my subordinate uncomfortable. For me, it was a matter of integrity, and principle, and ethics to really deal with this in a very forthright and direct way. And I think that, I don't know whether that's a good example of what you are looking for, because it did end up involving a sexual harassment suit or claim. For me, it was a big moment of saying, okay, I claim that I adhere to all the laws, and all the values, and the spirit of the law related to a sexual harassment free workplace, and here I am confronted with a very awkward situation; how will I live with my principles and my responsibilities? I got some advice from the University Ombudsman [who] gave me a menu of options. I decided to pursue the most aggressive of those, and turn the situation over to the people who had more expertise than me to really raise it to the highest level. And so, to me, that's an example of, you know, it was hard, it was unpleasant. It led to pretty much a year of unpleasantness, and yet it was something that I felt that I had to do. I had to figure out the best way of doing it and the best support for this staff member in this really uncomfortable position. I was very sorry for her that I was putting this forward at this very high level. That was uncomfortable for her, and we had to have a number of conversations about it. But, ultimately, she felt, I think, really valued that we were on the same page from a value perspective, and that we really mean what we say when we talk about, in this case, a harassment-free work place. It developed a very high level of trust for us, and a degree of mutual trust, mutual loyalty that has endured. I certainly think about my relationship vis-à-vis people who have managed me - the person in this sexual harassment situation at my former employer. I mean this lack of authenticity, and integrity, and ethical standard that were part of his behaviour. He certainly violated the sense of being a common shared team and loyalty.

In this description, Dianne shows how it is not enough to adhere to particular values, it is necessary to act upon them.

Since the time of the sexual harassment suit, Dianne has worked at two different universities. She contrasts her previous sense of disengagement with her current experience.

> At my last employer I felt very hesitant about speaking up. I did not feel that I, or anyone else, was given the benefit of the doubt in those leadership/team meetings. There was a very specific place or agenda that a couple of people were driving, and the rest of us were sort of, kind of, [it] seemed like our participation was for show. So, okay, we have to have these meetings, and you are part of the senior leadership team, but your input isn't really valued and, in fact, we are going to be pretty skeptical of the input you provide. And, over time, that has a very inhibiting impact for me. I became less engaged, and less likely to share, or to give input or feedback, or attempt to play a meaningful role setting organizational direction and priorities. By contrast, in my current position, I very much feel that within the team of college officers or cabinet members that people do recognize the value that I bring even when it's a topic where it's not in my particular scope. That has a great source of meaning and gratification for me that I can take part in the sessions about other areas - not just my own - and that my input is valued. It doesn't mean everyone agrees with me, by no means [laugh].

There are similarities here between Dianne's account and Jane's in that both show the problems that ensue when leaders do not provide an environment where dialogue and dissent is respected. Further, as we saw with Jane, asking for input when contrary views are not wanted is counterproductive, since employees may become disengaged. In her new place of employment, when meetings are open to different viewpoints, Dianne states she is more engaged. It does not seem to matter that people disagree with her; what counts is that people are willing to listen to her perspective. In turn, this sense of being valued enables Dianne to stay engaged.

Alison "It's all about relationships"

Alison is responsible for a university leadership program in The Rocky Mountains.

Her path to leadership was different from the other women I interviewed. For most of her career, Alison was employed in the corporate sector, rising to become Vice-President in a large high-tech corporation. She decided to leave the corporate setting, in her words, "because I wasn't able to go deep enough in that environment. I wanted to provide something that was more transformative for people." Since leaving the corporate sector, Alison has developed and facilitated leadership programs for an international not-for-profit organization and a university. In response to a question about authenticity and leadership, she replied:

> It's not that either you're an authentic leader or you're not. It's really a kind of an orientation toward a path. I don't think it's a steady state. I think it is something that people aspire to, and every once in a while they are able to be authentic. To me, that is when they are synchronized in what they are doing, what they are saying, what they are thinking all match, and where they are also in touch with the world. It's all about being in relation to others. Having authentic relationships means being genuine with one another, creating clear expectations, talking with one another about the relationship, rather than just enacting the relationship, and having meta-conversations about how we are doing what we are doing are all very important elements.

For Alison, authenticity is not something that can be possessed but rather flows from an alignment in values, thought and action. This alignment results in what she terms "synchronicity," which appears to be founded on genuine relationships whereby each person is clear about what is expected from them.

In response to a question about how past experiences influenced her ability to lead, Alison described her discomfort with her family's gender dynamics, and how learning to act helped her find her voice.

> In our family, the men were the more kind of verbal, outgoing ones and the women were more in the role of being the audience. ... When I was in high school, I wanted to find my own voice. I entered into a theatre class and learned about acting and improvisation. Those were just wonderful ways for

me to really discover my authenticity, although it was kind of odd because I was discovering myself through other people, through playing roles as an actor. I discovered existentialism in high school, and I learned about authenticity. It just became a theme for me in my life. And it's something I have pursued ever since in just so many different ways. So I guess the theme is something about finding voice and about being in a patriarchal situation where I felt like I didn't have voice, and that this whole theme of authenticity became very important for me. ... My interest has always been in facilitating opportunities for people to have genuine or authentic voice in the workplace.

What I find fascinating about this extract is how Alison describes how it was through role-playing that she found her own voice. Alison discusses her choice to leave a corporate setting in order to create a more holistic approach to leadership training. She also described how her deeply-held spiritual beliefs – Alison is a Buddhist – play a profound role in her desire for a deeper sense of connection with others.

For Alison, relationships are critical to her understanding of what authentic leadership might look like. As she states:

Relationships are extremely important because they are the glue or the connection that allows us to be in this dispersed, networked environment and still remain connected to one another, and in ways that are meaningful ... You can have rules, or guidelines, or even customer service agreements, or whatever construct that you want to have that you think is creating connection with people, but without authentic relationships it really lacks heart, resilience and a feeling of continuity.

In her account, Alison seems to reinforce Arendt's notion of the importance of plurality, gained through creating deep connections between people.

Olive - "Coming into focus"

Olive had been President at two higher education institutions. Of all those women interviewed, Olive was the most negative about the notion of authentic leadership. In her words:

> I have problems with authenticity as a measure of the quality or aspirations of a leader because authentic to me sounds like its simply drawing attention to the alternative that you would be somehow hypocritical or flawed ... I prefer integrity because I think you can show integrity even as you deal with different situations in different ways if your personal balance, your moral compass are still strong. But authenticity, to me, doesn't convey what I think leaders need.

Like Dianne, Olive mentions how a moral compass is vital for leaders. But the problem with linking leadership to authenticity is that, for Olive, this suggests that leaders might act in a hypocritical way.

In our conversation, Olive described how, as a young scholar, she was invited to apply for the position of President of her *alma mater*. She described her surprise at this offer, since at that time Olive had no experience in administrative roles, such as Dean or Vice-President, the usual stepping stones to a Presidential appointment. In her description of what it was like to be a President, Olive states

> It was a prickly kind of position in many ways and full of potential pitfalls than being a professor in ways that you could go awry or make decisions that wouldn't help your institution so that you were always on the alert, in a sense. There was always something else you ought to be doing, and your days were incredibly full and demanding. ... It's an exhilarating, demanding, sometimes frustrating, energetic kind of job. It was a pretty demanding kind of role and, therefore, there were times when you felt somewhat off-balance. Often, you weren't sure about the direction you ought to be taking, making decisions that seemed the right ones but had certain, potential problems that you couldn't

avoid or hadn't foreseen. ... I thought about trying to do the very best I could as a leader of two institutions that I deeply valued. I thought about trying to honor the post, and honor those institutions and be fair to the people with whom I worked, and advance goals that were valuable for the people involved as much as I possibly could. It never occurred to me that this was either true to myself or not true to myself.

Olive went on to describe the initial strangeness of being a President.

It didn't seem to me at the outset that this could possibly be me; as a sort of an ordinary young woman college professor from XXX, or somebody from the South, or whatever, it just didn't fit. It didn't seem easy at the start. Maybe your word comfortable is relevant here, but that feeling didn't persist, or it didn't impede my being able to do my work, and maybe following out of what you've been saying, when it stopped feeling that way, when I sort of felt well - for better or for worse - this is what the President of XXX is like … I was at the point that you would call authentic leadership. At the time that I was going through all this, I was also spending a lot of my energy trying to be an effective president. So I didn't spend a lot of time wrestling with it. But, as I look back, I think it's probably true that there would have been some point at which it's like an out of focus picture that comes into focus, not all of a sudden, but gradually so where you sort of see doubled vision of something, something happens where everything sort of fits together. As I look back on it that may have been the way it was. I would certainly probably never have been able to explain it that clearly at the time. But I think something like that was going on.

Olive offers the visual metaphor of "double vision" to describe how leadership, over time, became a fit for her. While the job at first seemed something that was foreign to her, over time it became like an "out of focus picture that comes into focus." I find this metaphor striking as a way to describe how something that was initially strange, and potentially alienating, becomes with time and practice more comfortable to us.

Teresa - "Thinking through"

Teresa had recently stepped down from her role as Principal of a university in The Philippines, to head up an environmental organization.[386] Like Olive, Teresa spoke about how difficult it could be to remain focused, given the multiple demands of being a President.

> There are a lot of things that could distract you, so that you constantly have to be reminded of what you are really trying to achieve. ... You have to deal with different personalities and how you keep the team going even in spite of personal differences. When you are working with people, conflicts always arise as to how you do things, or even in terms of getting the fair amount of commitment. A lot of the work is actually doing conflict management. I would have regular problems with the labour union. That is, for me, a very difficult situation. But people, like the Board members, would comment that I didn't seem to be affected ... I like to think about how to solve these problems, and how to establish your minimums, or your parameters. And how do you deal with issues, how do you organize; for instance, get the rest of the staff to your side, that sort of thing. So while this seems to be a huge problem for others, it upsets them; for me, I think I have a gift for thinking through and, you know, thinking of various ways of how to solve such problems.

In the extract above, Teresa relates her success as a leader to her ability to problem-solve, which she describes as "gift of thinking through." This "thinking through" enables her to dwell with problems, and to see problems from different aspects. The way that Teresa described her way of leading reminded me of Arendt's call to "think without bannisters"

---

[386] Previous to working as a University President, she had worked at The World Bank in the United States. Teresa was adamant that there was less gender discrimination in The Philippines than in North America, especially in regards to pay. A recent World Economic Forum 2012 report on the Global Gender Gap substantiates Teresa's claim. The Philippines was ranked 8th in terms of gender equity whereas Canada and the United States rank 21st and 22nd out of the 135 countries studied. See Ricardo L. Hausmann, Laura Tyson and Saadi Zahidi, *The Global Gender Gap Report 2012* (Geneva: World Economic Forum).

so as to arrive at a better understanding. For Teresa this meant trying to think about a problem from different points of view in order to consider how best to act. Later in the interview, Teresa reflected on the ethical dilemma that came with the realization that, as a leader, she could wield power over others.

> I question what my motives are for reacting that way, or doing this or that. For instance, you know you are President but then you realize you cannot dictate [laugh]. You have to persuade people even if you have probably the authority. Sometimes that could be addictive, no? You know you have the power, but then you cannot do as you want. So at that point, you examine yourself to see why am I reacting that way to certain things that I hear, or certain ways that people react to you?

Teresa perceives her leadership as involved in persuading others to her point of view. She also describes how easy it could be for a leader to become addicted to power, and begin to dictate to others. To avoid this temptation, Teresa suggests that leaders need to examine their actions so as to reflect on why they are acting in a particular way. This strikes me as similar to the "stop and think" that Arendt suggests is a necessary component of an ethical approach to leadership.

In her next example, Teresa describes a conflict she experienced when institutional priorities and workers' demands were at odds.

> I always had the welfare of the employees in mind but this is not the institutional position. When you have a very demanding union ... you go through this brinkmanship. ... There is an internal conflict that says you have to reserve the resources of the school. Of course, that's one thing you have to be constantly conscious about ... So you try to put up a front, that's okay, that's not a go. Of course, you have already set up how far you can negotiate with them. You are just acting your role of the Chief. ... It's a very difficult thing being authentic, right?

In Teresa's examples, she describes how there are times when leadership requires a person to forego compassion so as to deal with union negotiations. This was one of several times that a woman leader talked readily about the distress she felt at wanting to be more caring while knowing that this was not, in Teresa's words, "the institution's positioning." What Teresa reveals here is the dissonance between her role as leader, and her desire to care for her employees.

Jill - "A sense of possibilities."

Jill is the President of a women's college in New England. For more than twenty years she worked at a large co-ed university where she was employed, first as a faculty member, and later in a series of administrative roles, culminating in Vice-President, Research. Authenticity in leadership, in Jill's view, refers to leading in a way that is consistent to ensure every aspect of one's life reflects personal values. She also discussed how, in her role as President, she sometimes feels like an imposter, not least because her working-class background makes her feel out of place. In the interview, she described challenges she faced as a young woman, which she viewed as influential to her ideas about leadership. In her words,

> I grew up in a single parent household with a mother who dropped out of school at the age of sixteen to marry my father, who was nine years older, and who was in the military. ... I lived with [my mother], and worked with her in the summers in a light switch factory. I saw how institutional or organizational cultures really perpetuate and reinforce classism and sexism. There were no men in the factory. The only men were in the loading docks, or in the catering trucks, or in the boss's office. All the workers were women doing piece work. Yet I saw through my mother, in her role as a shop steward, how you could confront head on those issues of classism and sexism, and so it engendered in me a sense of possibilities in terms of women's leadership. And that had a profound influence.

In this description, Jill shows how the factory in which she and her mother worked was divided on gender lines. However, her mother's union activism engendered "a sense of

possibilities." Even though there was gender prejudice within the workplace, there were still avenues for women to show leadership.

Later in the interview, Jill described how she decided to give up a scholarship in order to look after her mother, and its impact on her sense of social justice.

> I was the first person in my family to ever graduate from high school, and first person to go to college. I attended two years of community college before my mother became chronically ill. I needed to be a care-giver for her. ... That had an impact on my perceptions of social justice, and what it means to live authentically. I lived for a while on the streets with my mother, who was homeless, and got to know that people often don't have control over the circumstances of their lives, and it's through no fault of their own. So my commitment to looking at prisoners' rights emerged from that as well - the extent to which society's failure to protect people from preventable harm mitigates when the victimized become the victimizers. [This] has always been a concern to me, because I have seen how people have been marginalized, and disenfranchised, and how they act out. So I try to lead with a sense of empathy and a commitment to social justice, and access to education for people from all socioeconomic backgrounds.

Jill's experience of homelessness had a profound impact, not only on her decision to do research into prisoners' rights, but also her ideas about authenticity and leadership. She described the practical ways in which she tried to create a more humane work environment. Here's one example:

> When I came to XXX, which is a women's college, the structure for faculty meetings was very different from what I was used to. I was at a state institution for 23 years. Then I was at a private institution that was very collaborative. [Here] the faculty meetings were set up so that the President sat in the front, and the faculty was in this auditorium. It was a very patriarchal, hierarchical structure, and I was running the meetings. I heard from junior faculty that they had a couple of concerns. One was about child care, and the

fact that the meetings extended past the time when child care ended. And the other [issue] was that they felt unengaged with respect to shared governance. The first issue was easy [as] we can subsidize day care until the meetings end. The other issue I suggested we could deal with by saying okay, if you want to be more engaged, why don't you set the agenda instead of having the President run the meetings. Why don't you have faculty stand up and facilitate the meeting? This was proposed at my first faculty meeting. It was voted down because there was a comfort level with the way things had always been done in the past. So I said my commitment to authentic leadership, and to feminist principles, really argue against this kind of structure, but I'm happy to accede to your will if this is what you want. But it was, I guess, a willingness to say this is important to me to at least raise the issues with respect to hierarchy.

In this description, Jill shows how she tried to alter what she saw as a hierarchical structure that was negatively affecting younger scholars' engagement at faculty meetings. Her failure to get adequate buy-in reveals how difficult it can be for leaders to make structural changes when they do not obtain support from others.

Laura - "Situational leadership"

Laura had been employed as a Vice-President at a prestigious Ivy League university in America. She left that role to work at a smaller college for black students where she heads up an international science and education project. In the interview, Laura described how her childhood experiences were fundamental to her ideas about the interconnections among authenticity, gender and leadership.

I came out of a type of society where the designated heads of households were not necessarily those of management. It was a dominated society in rural Jamaica; men may have had the leadership roles but, I know and I saw, that women, my mother included, managed things and made things happen, changed the dynamics of things, had her three daughters become educated women even though she wasn't, participated in organizational structures in

her church, and pushed us along in programs learning to play music, and to do algebra, and foreign languages, and so on. My mother who, by the way, did not finish high school, grew up in a strange kind of time warp in rural Jamaica. … Colonial society was dying. There was a move from rural to urban, and large land owners were now becoming land poor. I grew up in a transitional society and, for me to survive, I had to figure out ways to make the transition. I had to be comfortable with change.

You know early on in life, I lived in a world of my own. I was lucky enough to have space, maybe because it was structured by all of those male expectations. And although I recognize there are boundaries set for women, you know, we should be nurturers, I also understood from early interface with smart women, who are always around, we just have to change our definition of smart. The women who ran institutions in my village or my teachers, they had purpose, and value and integrity. … I come to authentic leadership through that kind of quiet recognition of how powerful situational leadership can be. I grew up in a rural setting, and I had freedom. You see, sometimes, you conceptualize the situation from which you come from as being deficient. It doesn't have elaborate schools, and so on, but leadership, having people follow you, being recognized as having a set of ideas that you can change something were an early part of my view of the world.

Laura describes how it was the women in her village who were the quiet leaders who got things done. Their expertise was often discounted; that is why she argues we need to change our definition of smart. I take her to mean that it is important to recognize that it is not always those in power who are the ones who get things accomplished.

Then, Laura described her experiences as a student abroad.

I was accepted as an international student as part of a gesture to do good and to reach out to the poor. … I actually had very little money when I went to university. I, perhaps, was the poorest student there; but, for some reason, I didn't seem poor because I was on a quest. For my whole life what I

originally thought were disadvantages have turned out to be advantages. … I had women role models who kept saying to me you must defy the gods. Being poor is not necessarily a disadvantage. Being a black woman at XXX is not alone a disadvantage, because it allowed me to have double consciousness. It allowed me to be very aware of who I was as an individual, and to be very strategic in my thinking. Other women who were not minorities were going there for the ride because the environment said to them come along for this ride, you are entitled to it. My difference kept saying to me you are not here for this ride, alone you are different. You are here for the ride but it is required of you to give back, to be authentic. I am always aware that I'm looking forward, but I have one hand reaching back.

In describing what she first viewed at first as the disadvantage of being a poor, black woman, Laura shows how she changed her views. Being on the margins enabled her to realise that her success was not hers alone, and that she had women role models in her village encouraging her to succeed. Chief amongst these role models was her mother, who she described in the following way,

My mother was a situational leader. ... She would say to you: "Oh no, my child, I'm not a leader. I'm just a simple, rural woman trying to make sure the church and the poor children are taken care of. She was, in fact, a powerful woman. A storm blew down the church; a hurricane earthquake tore it down. She rebuilt it. She had an after school program, she fixed the pipe organ so I became a classical musician. I played the piano. I've done so all my life. ... It's my mother who made it possible for me.

While her mother described herself as a simple, rural woman, for Laura, her mother was a powerful role model because she was willing to take action to improve the community's well-being. Thinking about Laura's account, I was reminded of Arendt's claim that it is during a crisis that people show how courageous they are. In Laura's description of how her mother set about to rebuild the church following a devastating hurricane, we gain a glimpse of how a woman takes on a leadership role in her community because she cares.

It was caring for others that encouraged Laura to have the courage to succeed even when she felt isolated in her North American environment. When she described the women from her village it was as if they held her metaphorically as she attempted to "defy the Gods" and become a successful leader.

Claire – "Mom taught me about authentic leadership."

Claire retired recently from her role as President of a women's college. Prior to her presidency, she served in a variety of administrative roles in universities in North America and Europe. In Claire's words, an authentic leader "must think and act in the context of her values." As with Laura and Jill, Claire's mother was an important role model in shaping her daughter's leadership values. Claire describes a particular event from her childhood that she found meaningful:

> My mother came from an affluent Greek family who, for a variety of complex reasons, forfeited the family's wealth to come to the United States. She was raised to be thoughtful and open to the ideas of others, as well as to people of other races and cultures. She observed and considered many things that others in her day did not. When I was ten years old, we lived in XXX - at that time a highly segregated small city – home of many of the old woolen mills. Catholics dominated the town, primarily French Canadians, Irish and Italian Catholics, as well as Ukrainian Orthodox. Nearly all activities and enterprises were based in the many local churches that were themselves divided by religion and ethnicity. The Boy and Girl Scout troops the churches housed were also homogeneous. My mother – who had been a girl scout years before - noticed this situation and didn't accept it as normal or desirable, as most people did. She said to me: 'I don't believe this was what Juliette Gordon Low envisioned when she founded girl scouting years ago. Her vision was to create an environment in which girls would develop skills, confidence, and understanding of others in the company of girls and women leaders who have different beliefs and come from many cultures. That's not what's happening here. So she packed my brother and me in the car and drove to the state office

for girl scouting in XXX. She told them about what she saw as inconsistency between founding values of girl scouting and the way it was playing out in XXX. She told them that she wanted to found an inter-denominational, cross-cultural troop, but felt she had to ask permission to do so and didn't want to go against rules that might exist [laugh.] From the surprised manner in which the officials looked at her, it was clear they had never thought to question the status quo. 'There are no rules against it,' they said, adding that it sounded like a good idea and wished her luck.

Upon returning to XXX, Mom found a few like-minded women who offered the Unitarian Church hall for the troop meeting place, and assisted in getting the word out to prospective girls. The response was strong and immediate. First of all, African American, Hispanic, and Jewish girls who had no troop to join before seemed to 'come out of the woodwork' to join the new troop. As news about the new troop and its vision spread, girls from existing parish-based troops asked to join. When the new troop totaled fifty girls, another one was started to accommodate the demand. The troops quickly became known as the best ones in town. Watching my mother – who always described herself somewhat disparagingly as 'just a housewife' – accomplish something so transformational was a powerful, early learning experience for me. To some extent, throughout my entire career, I've followed her example at the schools, colleges, and universities in which I've served. She wouldn't put it in these words, but in effect, Mom taught me about authentic leadership.

Claire's mother offered a powerful example of leadership that has stayed with her. We see in both Laura and Claire's descriptions how their respective mothers spoke of themselves in self-effacing ways such as 'just a housewife' or 'simple, rural woman.' For their daughters, however, their mothers' actions proved how it was possible to move beyond the gender stereotypes of their environment, and for women to take on a leadership role. In both cases, we see how leadership emerges when individuals are willing to act to improve their communities, primarily because they care.

Later in the interview, Claire juxtaposed the positive mentorship she received as a school teacher with her early experiences in university administration.

> When I worked in the schools, there were many women role models to emulate. … However, when I became an Academic Dean and later Vice-President for Academic Affairs in higher education in the early 1970s, I quickly discovered that I was one of only a few women present among a sea of men in dark suits at committee meetings and conferences. It was really challenging since men weren't used to having women in such positions. So I would say that I started my career in the comparatively comfortable setting of public school teaching in which I became confident about my leadership ability and felt accepted. However, initially, higher education was another story altogether. It was very challenging to be what can only be described as an 'outsider' on formerly all-male terrain. It was much more difficult to help create educational access and equity for women, girls, and students of color, when I, myself, had to also work to be accepted by my colleagues as a 'deserving' peer. However, in the end, these personal and professional experiences only heightened my resolve and sense of purpose.

In describing her positive experiences in a school setting versus higher education, Claire indicates these latter experiences informed her resolve. In her case, the marginalization that she experienced served to strengthen her determination to succeed. Again, we see how being marginalized may, in the long term, offer a person valuable leadership lessons.

Jennifer "I will always be the outsider"

Jennifer was, until recently, Chair of an Institute dedicated to African Diaspora Studies. She lives in the United States, but is originally from Trinidad. Jennifer relates her earliest leadership experiences with her current ideas about being a leader.

> I was a leader in my church. I ran things like the women's bible studies groups, and so on. I tried to incorporate this idea of being humble,

understanding the needs of the people, listening to each and every one of them, and making them feel valued as individuals. I tried to develop a democratic style where it wasn't my ideas alone. I was leading but, at the same time, people were also involved. I would listen to what they had to say and try, so far as it was possible, to incorporate their ideas. When I became Director of the African Diaspora Program, I used the same approach, not only with the faculty who worked and taught in the program, but the administrative staff, and also the students. ... I felt, for example, that faculty couldn't understand and teach about the African Diaspora successfully without experiencing that Diaspora. So I started a faculty trip every year where we'd go to a different place in the African Diaspora. ... So that was one of the things that faculty felt that we were not just a team, but we were a family. It was not like I'm up there, and they are down there. That's one thing I don't like about a lot of leaders.

Part of successful leadership, is what you do and how you approach it. But also part is who you are. And who you are is a composite of a lot of things and, for me; the difficulty that I found at XXX was leading from a position as the outsider. And so that creates its own problems, not of your making, but it leads to either some people will accept you and overlook your difference, your diversity, and others will not. And, in those cases, regardless of what you do, you can't please all of the people, all of the time. There will be detractors so I just had to keep, just keep on my path, and not let these things make you lose focus. You know, I will always be the outsider. I can't change who I am [laugh]. I don't intend to.

To me, an authentic leader has to understand the culture that you are working with, and also become responsive and sensitive. I learnt very quickly - that you don't compare, you don't say: 'Well, when I was teaching here this is how we did it.' Or 'When I was leading in this space this is how I did it,' because people become very resentful of that. So I learnt very carefully that you don't compare; you accept people for who they are, and you work with

the conditions that you are faced with.

Jennifer shows how important it is for a leader to be comfortable in her own skin, as well as to be responsive to the situation that she finds herself in, rather than assume that what works in one context will work in another. This requires a leader to refrain from making comparisons between one organization and another, and be willing to accept people as they are, rather than as she wishes them to be.

In the next account, Jennifer recounts how showing courage is an essential component of leading.

> As a single mother, I have had to find my voice and an example of that - even when I was not technically in a leadership position that people looked to me as a leader – was when my son was in kindergarten. [The School] kept sending these notes when they wanted to take them on field trips. The notes would say '[W]e consent for our child to go on this outing.' All the mothers were complaining, and I was complaining, but nobody spoke up. So eventually when one of the notes came home I crossed out We and I put I/We. Then I put a p.s. at the bottom and said that in future create an option for single parents. I was called into the Office and the Principal was not very happy with me. I said to her: 'Though I am a single parent and a woman, you have to respect me.' The next time the slips came back home they had the I/We on them. All the other single mothers came and thanked me and told me they didn't like it, but they didn't have the courage to speak up.

> Someone has to have the courage to step up. To me, that is leadership [however] women tend to not want to put their voice out there because they feel powerless. But you have to because that's the only way that you can get people to listen to you. Sometimes if you are a little more courageous than the others then you have to step out and lead.

We started with Kate's example of feeling fear but displaying courage; again, in Jennifer's description, we see an example of how a woman is willing to take a lead so as

to speak out against perceived injustices. Arendt argues that courage is not the absence of fear. Rather a person shows courage, because they have decided that this is how they want to be seen. The display of courage, for Jennifer, is at the heart of leadership.

In these narrative accounts, what emerges for me is that these women leaders have very different experiences and views about gender, authenticity and leadership. At the same time, one constant seemed to be that each of them was committed to leading by being cognizant of, and willing to learn from, the people they work with. Their descriptive accounts also reveal how specific childhood experiences shaped their leadership values. In particular, three women noted how their mothers' actions to help build community, or stand up for workers' rights were fundamental experiences that shaped their ideas about authenticity and leadership. These narratives indicate how leadership emerges out of a context whereby someone cares enough to try and change a situation which they regard as unfair. In addition, in these women's descriptions of the interconnections among gender, leadership and authenticity, what emerges is how past events can have a lasting effect on present and future action.

5.2   Part II Themes

In the second part of this chapter, I draw together some themes that emerge from the interviews to see what insights they offer concerning the interconnections among gender, authenticity and leadership. The first theme I discuss relates to ethical dilemmas, that is, when personal convictions are at odds with institutional objectives. The second theme concerns care and relationships. Embodiment is the focus of the third theme, while the fourth theme explores intersectional identity. The final theme I discuss is anxiety. Before turning to the themes, however, I want to examine participants' responses to two questions.

One of the problems with regard to some scholarly accounts of authentic leadership is the attempt to fix meaning. In chapter one I showed how scholars privilege four dimensions of authentic leadership (self-awareness, relational transparency, balanced processing and internalized moral perspective). I wanted to ascertain what the women leaders I interviewed thought about this topic. So I asked them two questions. In the first question,

I asked them to tell me what came to mind when they thought about the term "authenticity." Then, I asked them to describe what came to mind when they thought about the term "authentic leadership." Figures one and two represent the collated answers to these two questions. (When a word appears larger, it means that the word was used more often across the different responses.)

Figure One – Responses to "What is Authenticity?"

The word that appears most frequently in response to "What is Authenticity?" is values, closely followed by the term "integrity" and "self." The other words to appear in multiple responses were consistency and awareness. From these women's responses, authenticity appears to relate to adhering to particular values, and practicing integrity through being consistent in one's actions, and an awareness of the effect those actions might have on others. Their responses suggest that a consistency of attitude and self-awareness are important to their understanding of authenticity.

When we consider the responses to authentic leadership, we see a change in emphasis. In responses to the collated responses to this question, we have much more diversity of words used, as can be seen below.

Figure Two – Responses to "What is Authentic Leadership?"

In terms of the responses to the question "What is Authentic Leadership?" the word that research participants used most often was "genuine," followed by "listening" and "journey." What is noteworthy here is that none of the responses to this question mentioned the self, even though it appeared quite prominently in the responses to the question "What is Authenticity?" Instead, interviewees used action-oriented words such as "engagement" and "questioning." From these women's descriptive accounts, it appears that "authentic leadership" relates to a genuine engagement with others. This genuine engagement was sometimes described as a willingness to listen respectfully, and other times as responding in a respectful manner.

Furthermore, it seems that there is a spatial and temporal quality to authentic leadership since research participants often used the term "journey."[387] What these responses indicate is that, for these women, there is an inner orientation with regard to authenticity, and an external orientation in relation to authentic leadership. I suggest, tentatively, that this different orientation may relate to the activities of acting and thinking. That is, when we act, we are not reflecting upon what we are doing. It is only through the process of thinking that we start to engage in inner dialogue. Acting requires that we participate in the moment; reflection allows for what Arendt called "the stop and think." It is through the reflective process that we are able to consider whether our actions are in line with our principles. Action requires a forward momentum, whereas thinking requires us to step back, and this is why I see a different spatial orientation.

When we try and define a concept like "authenticity," we attempt to crystallize something that is essentially fluid. As I noted in chapter four, Heidegger argues words are like wellsprings; we cannot fix their meaning since they change over time. If we try to pin down meaning, words like "authenticity" lose their significance. Yet a desire for clarity leads scholars to attempt to contain a concept. When we seek to define words in this manner, we are in danger of losing a plurality of meaning. I suggest concepts like

---

[387] This idea of authentic leadership as a journey has been remarked upon by several leadership scholars. See, for example, Bill George, David Gergen and Peter Sim, *True North: Discover your Authentic Leadership* (San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 2007).

authentic leadership must be left open to contestation. These women's responses to these questions are not offered as an alternative to the four dimensions of authentic leadership, but rather to show that there are different ways of thinking about these terms.

Indeed, while there are similarities in these responses, there were also divergences. As I mentioned earlier, Olive rejected the idea of a connection between authenticity and leadership because she argued it shines the light on its converse, that is, that a person would be deliberately inauthentic as a leader. Instead of authenticity, she preferred the word integrity to describe a genuine way of leading. The other nine women leaders might be placed on a continuum with some regarding authenticity as central to their desired way of leading, while others viewed it as an ideal to strive for. At one end of that spectrum, Alison describes authentic leadership as a practice that people can aspire to, rather than a steady state. On the other end, Laura was convinced authentic leadership exists since, in her words; "I have lived it."

5.2.1   Institutional Challenges

I want to turn now to a discussion of themes. The first theme I consider is the clash of personal versus institutional values, a recurring motif in the interviews. Earlier, Kate described an instance when she was under pressure to admit an unqualified student. This was not an unusual occurrence she told me, and she expressed discomfort with what she termed the "disconnect between what's said to be valued and I guess reality." In another example, Jill described her frustration at being unable to change what she saw as an unfair policy.

> I started an initiative to make SATs optional because I believed that they are discriminatory. There were gender biases and class biases inherent in the standardized test that we used to get into the university, and into certain schools, and so that was the case where I had some true supporters, but there were many people who were opposed. I failed ultimately in my objective. … It was frustrating and so I left the institution. ... I didn't want to work in an institution that didn't share the values that I shared.

Jill's frustration at the institution's decision not to change its policies led her to leave an institution that she had worked at for 23 years was expressed in a change of vocal tone as she spoke. Her voice became quieter, and took on a wistful tone. What this example brings to light is a contradiction between an organization's stated values and everyday practices, something that we saw earlier in one of Kate's descriptions. This contradiction meant that, at times, these women leaders had to choose between upholding personal values and complying with the institution. Some women described how they gave up the fight for institutional change, choosing to seek new career opportunities, rather than stay in an environment that did not allow them to remain true to their principles.

Yet while some women described experiencing moral angst as a result of institutional practices that negated their sense of fairness, others expressed opposing views. For instance, Olive argued that a leader's primary responsibility was to support the institution, and not to agonize over ethical dilemmas. Leaders have a duty to act for the greater good, she contended, even when this meant acting contrary to personal principles. Olive described an instance when she called in police to break up a peaceful student demonstration because she judged the students' actions to be potentially harmful to the rest of the College community. She made this decision even though she agreed, in principle, with the students' cause. For Olive, this was not a comfortable decision to make but necessary for what she saw as the community's good.

Most of the women leaders I spoke with appeared to find it more difficult than Olive to distinguish between ethical principles and their leadership responsibilities. In the interviews, women described the tensions that surfaced regarding the quandaries they faced regarding leading ethically and adhering to particular institutional priorities. For instance, some women described how they were made to feel as if their leadership style was not in step with institutional objectives. Here we may remember that earlier Teresa noted how caring for the welfare of others was not "the institutional position." In another instance, Jane described how being regarded as sensitive to the needs of others, her definition of authentic leadership, was unlikely to result in promotion in her university. In both instances we see a tension between institutional priorities and what these women regard as a more caring approach to leading.

It is noteworthy that, for the women who were Presidents of institutions, their discussion of ethical tensions appeared to centre on problems that arose when they tried to bring in what they considered as fairer policies, and/or tried to effect institutional change. In Jill's case, trying to change the hierarchical structure was met with hostility. She argued that when people get used to working in a hierarchical place, they are less open to embracing new ideas. While some research participants talked about how concern for their employees and students' welfare was important to their ideas about authenticity in leadership, others suggested that responding in a compassionate manner was often perceived as a sign of a leader's weakness. It seems that there is a delicate balance between wanting to lead in a caring way, and institutional pressures to perform leadership in a particular manner.

In many accounts, women describe the back and forth that occurs between thinking about what is the best decision to make. In Dianne's account of the sexual harassment case, she asks herself whether the values she espouses in theory are ones for which she is willing to take action. As I have previously mentioned, Arendt argues that who we are is defined by our actions. Sometimes, a leader views her actions through the lens of what is deemed socially acceptable. This may mean that for pragmatic reasons she judges it wise to concur with majority opinion. On the one hand, this decision may be a positive outcome if it has been arrived at following dialogue and debate. On the other, it could be negative if a leader acts in accordance with "group think," at the expense of personal principles. I view this as a concern in relation to authenticity since what a particular group may think is morally good may not necessarily be so. Leaders, just like the rest of us, need to stop and think about what they value and why, rather than agreeing with what most people think is right. What is crucial, according to Arendt is that irrespective of our motives "success and failure in the enterprise of self-presentation depend on the consistency and duration of the image thereby presented to the world."[388]

---

[388] Arendt, *Life of the Mind*, 36.

5.2.2 Care and Relationships

Turning to the second theme, from these descriptive accounts there seems to be a strong connection between leadership, authenticity and care. Some women contended that when a leader encourages an atmosphere of openness, it is more likely to bring about a trusting environment. It takes time, and sustained effort, for a leader to build meaningful relationships. But it also requires a leader being candid about the reasons for unpopular decisions that, in turn, means being willing to listen to points of contention, as Jill notes:

> This type of leadership requires transparency and ongoing dialogue with different groups. It is vital for a leader to lay out the choices, and then identify shared values, and then prioritize in a way that reflects those values. This is crucial for authentic leadership, because if people don't understand why we are making these decisions then there's suspicion, and mistrust, and it creates a toxic culture. However, if a leader makes decisions while keeping people informed, this creates collegiality and collaboration in the face of adversity.

Here Jill contends that it is important for leaders to ensure that people are both expected, and empowered, to make decisions. In her words, empowering others creates an atmosphere of collaboration and consensus-building. To avoid mistrust, it is necessary for a leader to have the courage to share organizational problems so that employees work together collectively to find solutions. Jill suggested that when a leader develops an atmosphere of trust, it leads to shared governance and mutual respect, fostered through meaningful conversations. Kate and Teresa voiced similar sentiments regarding the importance of being as transparent as possible in one's dealings with employees. These sentiments seem to me similar to Arendt's contention that the desire to care is related to allowing others to express themselves freely. One way to ensure that different viewpoints flourish is for a leader to welcome dialogue and debate. But this cannot be done in a superficial manner. If leaders are seen to be asking for opinions, but not really engaging with dissenting voices, this is likely to prove counterproductive.

Several women mentioned how becoming a leader was a vehicle for them to try and effect a more just environment. In some cases, there was a strong correlation between their feminist politics and their desire to lead. As Olive stated "I wasn't interested in just being a college president to be a president. I had no ambitions for that at all, but when XXX asked me to think about it, I mainly did it because I cared a lot about advancing the cause of women's liberation." Other research participants made a connection between feminist practice and caring leadership. In fact, Jill suggested that a feminist ethics of care was crucial to her understanding of leadership.[389] Indeed, some research participants argued that it was their feminist principles that encouraged them to lead in a caring way. What we must be cautious about, however, is the supposition that just because someone espouses feminist principles that this will mean that they have a caring approach to leadership. This would be tantamount to some earlier leadership scholarship which argued that having more women in the workplace would improve the lot of all. That has not happened. Therefore, we need to be cautious about suggesting that feminist principles are conducive to a desire to eradicate injustice. We can tentatively suggest that an interest in the structural and social effects of gender might encourage a leader to act in a more caring way, but this might not always prove the case.

Other research participants described how building strong relationships through caring was integral to their ideas about authenticity and leadership. Alison spoke about the importance of self-awareness in relation to leadership.

> One thing that interferes with authenticity is having an idea about yourself that's not accurate and trying to live up to that. So what I am trying to get at here is being aware of one's capacity and one's capabilities - not to say that you can't continue to grow and learn, but knowing something about your strengths and areas when you can contribute and being able to continue to track that, rather than fall into trying to become someone that you are not.

---

[389] Of course, we cannot know for certain whether their words mesh with their actions. But I suspect that giving up time to talk with a graduate student about what turned out, in some cases, to be deeply personal matters, demonstrates a willingness to care.

For Alison, there is a relationship between authenticity and learning about one's capabilities. Being self-aware, in her view, makes it easier to lead in a genuine manner. Her views here would seem to align with authentic leadership scholars. However, knowing who we are is not a simple task. In reflecting on her leadership experiences, Teresa states: *"you were asking are you true to yourself when you are doing this or that? That's always a question. I don't know. Sometimes, you could see that it's you but, in other instances, it's not very clear."* Hence, there are situations where it is difficult to know whether you are acting in a manner in accordance with your principles. Teresa's assessment seems similar to Arendt's assertion that self-knowledge is always a partial understanding.

On a related note, Claire and Kate mention difficulties that may ensue when leaders become caught up in their role. For example, Claire states:

> I'm remembering an exchange I had with a colleague some years ago. He'd just taken a college presidency, and I had not yet gotten to that point in my career. I remembered him talking about what it's like to be a college president, and I thought to myself afterwards - he's posing! He was primarily talking about how he would act in new ways to be presidential and be taken seriously. A few other colleagues also seemed to begin to behave differently when they became presidents – posing is how I describe it. I think the most effective leaders are those who remain authentic – true to themselves, and their personalities, and don't try to have a 'make-over.'

Over time, Claire argues that leaders who indulge in leadership makeovers will be less successful because others will see through their disguise. But there are institutional pressures to perform in a manner that people expect. Kate states that sometimes, "people try to be the leader that they think the organization wants or expects and that it pulls them away, or they get trapped into feeling they have to lead in a particular way. I think, in the long run it destroys your soul." Instead of leading from one's unique strengths, trying to conform to an ideal may have a negative effect. This is why Kate argues it is important to feel "comfortable in your own skin doing something that you love. And doing it the best

way you know how ... I think that how we do things matters as much as what we do."
This connection to the how of leadership emerged several times, and seemed to indicate
how important it is for a person to lead in a manner that feels right for them, while at the
same time, being cognizant of others. One has to be somewhat cautious here given that
what feels right for one person may actually be negative for others. It seems to me if they
keep the idea of self/world in mind, leaders may guard against the dangers of hubris.

5.2.3 Gender and Embodiment

Turning to the third theme of gender and embodiment, a prevailing theme arising from
several interviews is how a woman's appearance can reinforce gender stereotypes
because how a woman looks is regarded as important. This can add an additional burden
in terms of trying to conform to what an ideal woman leader is supposed to look like, as
Jill notes:

> All of these expectations about what it is to be an effective woman leader the
> men never have to think about including wardrobe issues. And so that's a
> challenge to have to think about all of these things. That people will judge me
> based on whether I have my nails done, whether my hair's done, whether I
> wear a particular dress, my weight, all of these things. [Laugh].

As I spent more time with the transcripts, I noticed that several women leaders referred to
the ways in which 'wardrobe issues' played a part in how they are perceived as leaders.
This brought to light different ways in which women leaders may be undermined by
stereotypical assumptions regarding how the ideal woman leader is supposed to look.
This does not stop at a woman's wardrobe, but encompasses the body from top to toe.
Any deviation from what is considered culturally normative may prove prejudicial to her
leadership. This social prejudice may be further heightened when other social locations
such as race, class, disability and sexuality are mapped onto the leader's body. If this is

indeed the case, then variation from what is considered to be the bodily cultural norm in terms of leadership may hinder a person's ability to lead.[390]

It appears that it is not enough for a woman leader to do a good job; she also has to make a good job of herself. For women leaders, the connection between their appearance and their role can be a source of frustration. Indeed, some of the leaders I spoke with expressed irritation at how a focus on their appearance sometimes detracted from their actions. Kate offered a striking description of this type of gender stereotyping.

> I have done presentations to rooms where because of the grace of the audience they've jumped up to their feet, and it's been wonderful and spontaneous and amazing, and I've come off the stage and I've had a man say to me: 'That was fantastic, that's wonderful, but where did you get your suit? I'd like to buy it for my wife.'

Such a superficial evaluation serves to marginalize a woman leader's performance since her actions are dismissed in favour of her outfit. These trivial comments reinforce gender hierarchy by discounting a woman leader's words in favour of her appearance. A woman's attire thus becomes a defining factor in how she is perceived by others to such an extent that this focus on the visual body may serve to undermine her actions. At times, too much emphasis on the visual body may prove detrimental to a woman's leadership.

Yet, at other times, Kate regards being a woman as advantageous to leadership, especially in regards to expressing emotion. Following the accidental death of a faculty member, she described how being a woman leader gave her an opportunity to publicly express grief. In her words:

> When I was standing up in front of our folks welcoming them back, and

---

[390] While I am not suggesting that men do not have to conform to a leadership dress code, I do think that a woman leader's figure is "read" more carefully than a male leader's body. For example, too much attention to her wardrobe may work to undermine a woman's credibility as a leader, while too little may lead to cries of derision.

talking about XXX, the tears were rolling down my face. I was broken-hearted, and everybody knew it. I think that was easier, that was more accepted, and as I said, to some degree, expected because I was a woman.

Here we see how stereotypical notions about gender enable her to openly express her emotion, since this is what is expected.

5.2.4   Intersectional Identity

It became apparent that gender on its own was not sufficient to understand these women's experiences of authenticity, or lack thereof, in relation to leadership. Many times in the interviews, women made reference to class, race and age. Thus, gender while a critical factor needs to be understood within a broader context of intersectional identity. As we saw with Laura's account, being a black woman in a predominantly white environment helped her to gain a sense of who she was. It was, in her view, being on the margins that gave her strength because it allowed her to reconnect with her past. In our conversation, she mentioned that she felt far more comfortable at the margins of an organization.

But being on the margins is not necessarily a positive experience. For example, Jennifer spoke of how she has to hide the knowledge that she learned from her experiences in Trinidad, since it was not regarded as relevant by her North American colleagues. This is surprising given that she currently works in a black college, but Jennifer was adamant that she witnesses racism because she is seen to be the outsider. As a result, from time to time, she experiences depression.

Class was also something mentioned in the interviews. For example, Jill spoke of times when she has been made to feel an imposter. In her role as President of a prestigious women's college, she described how some alumnae express surprise when they learnt of her working-class origins remarking on how strange it seems that someone from her background could be so eloquent. In another interview, Claire discussed how her working-class background had made her more aware of gender injustice, and encouraged her to fight against prejudice in her work.

Age was another factor that interview participants mentioned. It seems that age affects how we see things, as well as how we are seen by others. Maturity can result in a greater sense of confidence, as Jane notes:

> When I was younger, I was only comfortable if I could control the situation, and now I'm much better at being comfortable letting the situation become something, and just letting or waiting to see what it's going to become, and working with that rather than trying to force it into some particular direction.

Rather than trying to control one's environment, it seems that allowing situations to unfold organically is one way for a woman to become more comfortable with the contingent aspects of life. Several participants described how, when they were younger, they were more likely to conform to the rules. As they grew older, however, women described how they gained courage in speaking their minds. As Jane explains "I spent a lot of time in my younger years trying to be the way that I was supposed to be … this is how a professor is; this is how a graduate student is, rather than thinking about who am I? And what do I bring to this?"

Interestingly, two women – Jane and Laura – used the same phrase to emphasize what they saw as a barrier to women's leadership, namely, that women had to "be comfortable coming first." Both women described how when they were younger they had not taken some opportunities offered to them because of what they now describe as an uneasiness with success. However, as they gained confidence and maturity, they were more open to possibilities.

There are other ways in which a woman's age can have an effect on her leadership. As Kate demonstrates:

> I had a very sort of humbling moment when I was negotiating my contract to come to XXX. The Chair of the Board and I were negotiating my salary. I told him what I expected, and he said that's a lot of money for a young girl like you. I was forty. This was my first one-on-one with the Board Chair. I was tempted to say and if I were a man would you have even thought of

making that comment?

Here we see that Kate's attempt to negotiate her salary is belittled by a person who has power over her. In this case, the Chair of the Board use terms like "young girl" to bring Kate into line with what he considers appropriate expectations, given her age and gender. Rather than her leadership capabilities, youth and gender were used to resist paying what Kate regarded as an acceptable salary.

When we think about gender issues, we must also pay attention to other social factors. For these women, gender on its own is insufficient to explain the connections between leadership and authenticity.

5.2.5   Anxiety

The theme of anxiety was also mentioned by several interview participants. For example, some women described times when their self-assurance was negated by anxiety. Dianne offered a striking example of this angst when she described an instance when she chose to remain silent following repeated attempts to put forward views that ran contrary to her colleagues on the senior management team. In describing her experience, she states:

> Sometimes, we think of people as taking up too much space, and that's often
> a criticism that someone is too loud, or too verbal, or too dominant. When I
> said shrinking, I was sensing the opposite of that sort of not owning the space
> that I could or should own. Taking up a smaller corner of that and trying to be
> – maybe trying is the wrong word because that sounds conscious – but ending
> up being smaller, littler and less influential, both in physical presence and in
> impact. When I have been in situations where I feel uncomfortable, or
> devalued, or disempowered, I have been a smaller version of myself, smaller,
> quieter, and less impactful. I do experience a sense that I'm not behaving the
> way that I aspire to behave, or that I believe that I should be behaving.

Feeling a sense of belonging to the group is one way that a person is able to share her ideas. When Dianne senses this is not the case, the result is a sense of unease. Anxiety allows some bodies to gain prominence while other bodies recede into the background, as

Dianne's account illustrates. According to Sara Ahmed, "the economy of fear works to contain the bodies of others."[391] In spatial terms, as Ahmed notes, "the regulation of bodies in space through the uneven distribution of fear which allows spaces to become territories, claimed as rights by some bodies and not others."[392]

For some of the women leaders I interviewed, it appears that a refusal to speak out can result in feelings of anxiety. I suggest that it is only when a woman leader feels a sense of belonging to her institution, and to those whom she works with, that she is able to act in a manner she judges to be authentic. The problem is that by not taking a stance against something that you see as unjust, other instances may be ignored.

In discussing what made her feel anxious in her leadership role, Alison responded:

> I feel uncomfortable when there are expectations that are hidden or unstated or when there's a mismatch between what I think I am to be doing or what I think we have agreed on and the way things are unfolding. So that feeling of discomfort is usually something that triggers me to move toward more authenticity … I experience it in my body as tension, as anxiety.

Another issue to emerge in relation to anxiety was dealing with hostile environments. As Claire explains, "I had to learn how to deal with not being loved and to stay focus on the long-term good. That wasn't easy." A willingness to be unpopular was, at times, the only way these women leaders told me it was possible to remain true to their principles. Having the courage to go against the will of the majority seems, therefore, to be an integral component of how these women viewed authentic leadership. However, this may be more difficult for those who have been brought up to be self-deferential. Submissiveness in childhood may mean that some people are reluctant to take a stance, especially in a hostile environment. At times, therefore, there may be a dissonance

---

[391] Sara Ahmed, *The Cultural Politics of Emotion* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2004), 4.

[392] Ahmed, *Cultural Politics*, 6.

between a woman's learned behaviour, and her desire to act. Such passivity may have a negative effect on a woman's ability to lead. A woman's desire to be pleasant, for instance, may lead her to refuse to speak out.

5.2.6   Outlying Themes

I want to mention some outlying themes that seem to me to have phenomenological import. As I noted earlier, most women saw authentic leadership as having a relational quality. According to Laura, however, authentic leadership is also connected to what she called "aloneness." She described how important it was to her to spend time alone in order to think. In the interview, she expressed the view that other women I interviewed might suffer from aloneness. Laura views this isolation as necessary for a leader if she is to forge her own path. I mention this comment by Laura because Arendt also thought it important for each of us to be willing to spend time alone. Solitude is necessary so that we can gather our thoughts, but also so that we can reconnect with others.

At the end of the interview, I asked each participant if they had anything they wanted to add. Here are two responses; the first is from Dianne.

> I think sometimes we can burn a lot of political capital by taking against the
> majority when it has to do with something that's important to you from a
> principled or valued point of view. As a woman, one of the challenges for me
> is thinking how I maintain my organizational power while, at the same time,
> acting and influencing the organization in a way that is in keeping with my
> internal compass.

We can see from Dianne's description that she is constantly reflecting upon the balance between keeping organizational power and taking principled action.

At the end of another interview, Olive returned to the question of leading ethically. In her words,

> I wouldn't want to give the impression that I think that it doesn't make a
> difference whether leaders have a moral compass whether they are trying to

behave as ethically as they can. I think it makes a profound difference. I just
don't think it's always easy to describe what moral, or immoral, leadership is,
particularly if you are trying to do it through the familiar lens of private,
personal ethical decisions.

Here, Olive expresses how important she perceives leading ethically to be. But she also
shows that describing what constitutes moral, or immoral, leadership is complex. What
constitutes authentic leadership may be much easier to describe in theory than it is within
the context of everyday life.

5.3   Conclusion

From these descriptive accounts, we see that the question of what it means to lead
authentically is a complex one. For some women, authentic leadership suggests a genuine
engagement that requires a willingness to listen to others. For others, a genuine approach
to leadership depends upon being consistent with personal values. Some women
emphasized caring while others focused on the need for a strategic approach. What
becomes clear is that authentic leadership evokes different things for different people.
This multiplicity of perspectives is due to the fact that each of us is unique, and that
uniqueness, which is made up of social factors as well as embodied lived experience, will
influence the way that we lead.

While my original intention was to concentrate on the connections amongst authenticity,
gender and leadership within an institutional setting, this was not where the interviews
led me. It became apparent that leadership within the context of an institution was only
one aspect of how these women conceived of what it meant to be an authentic leader.
They spoke on a variety of topics, such as politics, racism, family, and the interconnected
ways that their lived experiences shaped their ideas about what it might mean to be an
authentic leader. A common thread weaving through these different conversations is that
leadership needs to be conceptualized outside of hierarchical frameworks. Rather than
focusing on a person's position in an institutional setting, it is important to redefine our
notions of what constitutes leadership, and show how different situations call for diverse

kinds of leaders. This is a more expansive way of thinking about leadership, and complements Arendt's idea that leadership is situational.

Too often we have a narrow idea of what constitutes leadership. By making institutional life the centre of attention, it is possible to underestimate, or even ignore, the important leadership work that is carried out in the home, family, volunteer or church groups. This situated knowledge, if considered at all, is perceived as less valuable than the "business" of leadership. Too often the focus on leadership is where most of us think power resides, that is, the public realm. Furthermore, the seeming disregard for other spaces/ways of leading may be linked to a Western obsession with hierarchies, based on considerations of profit and prestige. Hence, ways of leading that do not have a monetary value attached to them may appear to have less cache.

For most of these women leaders, there is a strong correlation between wanting to lead in a caring way, and a desire to be authentic in their leadership. Such openness shows itself through our embodied relationships with others. This relational approach to leadership is fundamental to creating an environment where others will be able to flourish. It requires leaders to welcome different viewpoints. A relational approach to leadership is fundamental to addressing the problems of instrumental ways of being that focus on a means-ends way of thinking. This is why it is important, as these women leaders have shown me, to think about leadership beyond an institutional framework. As Jennifer states, "We have to explode the idea of being a leader as a thing created by a position."

From these women's narratives, we see how leadership is complicated by gender socialization. This can lead to a dissonance between learned behaviour on the one hand, and a desire to act in a manner consistent with her values on the other. Leaders, just like the rest of us, must choose between acting in accordance with institutional practices and upholding personal principles. At times, people will make a decision in line with their values; at other moments they may not do so. From these interviews, I conclude that authenticity cannot be contained within a conceptual framework of leadership that denies difference. This is why a theory of leadership, based on authenticity, cannot take its cue from the self.

I leave the final word to Jennifer who states:

> I just want to re-emphasize that you lead, not just for your own personal embellishment and self-aggrandizement, but with the goal of moving the community forward, or the group forward. That should be your primary focus as a leader. That, to me, is authentic leadership.

6   Concluding Remarks

This thesis has been concerned with the ways in which authenticity, gender and leadership interconnect. I have contended that a significant shortcoming in current accounts of authentic leadership is that scholars tend to privilege a leader's self-knowledge at the expense of intersubjectivity. Such thinking is troubling since it ignores how the intersections of identity, as well as cultural context, affect the theory and practice of leadership. Defined in this way, authentic leadership is an example of a master narrative that takes inner truth as its bedrock without paying sufficient attention to our social, cultural and historical positioning. Such an abstracted way of thinking is not a useful way of conceptualizing human existence. Rather, it is through our intersubjective, embodied relationships that we define ourselves. These meaningful encounters always take place within a world of others.

Arendt's insights into the questions of uniqueness and plurality offer an important correlative to problems inherent with the concept of authentic leadership, and what I see as its overemphasis on the self. In contradistinction to scholars of authentic leadership, she maintains that self-knowledge can only be a partial understanding. I suggest that thinking with Arendt offers an important correlative to problems inherent with authentic leadership and its focus on the self. In her view, uniqueness emerges from shared communication through action and speech. I suggest, therefore, that Arendt's concept of uniqueness can expand our understanding of authentic leadership through its grounding in an intersubjective way of viewing the world.

I have argued that Arendt's work allows for a re-thinking of the notion of authenticity in leadership that is attentive to difference. For example, to ensure uniqueness is fostered, we need to create environments that are open to different opinions. Otherwise, we are left with a hierarchical system of ruler and ruled that has adversely affected social relations since ancient times. Arendt's emphasis on uniqueness within a plural environment is important with respect to how people choose to conduct themselves as leaders. When leaders are unwilling to listen to different opinions, they will be unable to govern in a manner that enables a society and its citizens to thrive. It is only when citizens are able to

speak and act freely in the public sphere that a society prospers since it is through dialogue and debate that we gain the plurality of viewpoints necessary for a society to flourish. Moreover, ignoring the intersubjective dimension of everyday life may have far-reaching implications, because it can result in leaders becoming separated from everyday concerns and acting in self-indulgent ways to the detriment of everyone else. Indeed, the differentiation between the few and the many have led to disastrous consequences. Whether it's the banking crisis or the negative effects of globalization, what becomes apparent is that some leaders are failing to reflect upon, or care about, how their actions negatively affect others, something Arendt regarded as a necessary requirement for a just society. To ensure uniqueness is fostered, therefore, we need to create environments that are open to different opinions.

A detailed engagement with the Arendtian corpus allows for a re-thinking of the place of authenticity in leadership that is attentive to difference. Thinking with Arendt complements existing leadership scholarship because of her emphasis on the myriad ways in which leaders must be responsive to others. By seeing leadership in relational terms that weave together diverse perspectives, her work opens up fruitful avenues of investigation. As such, she offers us an alternative ethical guide from which to consider the place of authenticity in leadership. In the course of writing this thesis, what I have aimed to show is that, when we think about the interconnections among authenticity, gender and leadership, we need to do so in a way that connects the universal with the particular. It seems to me that Arendt's call to "think without bannisters" helps us do this, since what it allows for is a way of thinking that takes into account the ideas of others.

We are caught up in our times, and this is why it is so important to look at how notions of authenticity show up in different ways. I have argued with Heidegger that language changes over time and place. Hence, it is futile to define authentic leadership in terms of four dimensions (balanced information processing, self-knowledge, relational transparency and moral perspective) to the exclusion of others. These definitions, common in the authentic leadership scholarship, serve to obscure the effect that gender, and the multiplicity of lived experience, has on our understanding of leadership. I have also contended that gender cannot be considered in isolation from other social factors. It,

too, needs to be considered within the context of lived experience. Thus, when we think about what constitutes authentic leadership, we need to take into account how various social factors affect our understanding of leadership. In the interviews I conducted, women described how – in different situations – race and class would surface alongside gender. One of the major aspects that flow through the interviews for me is how much thinking from the margins offers insights into leadership. This seems to me to reinforce Arendt's notion that it is the pariah, rather than the parvenu, who gains insight into the workings of a society.

Authentic leadership remains troubling to me, not least because I perceive a tendency amongst some leadership scholars to define and constrain the ways in which authenticity reveals itself. There is a tendency to abstract and privilege the universal over the particular. This is the problem with what Arendt termed the Archimedean worldview, which seeks to explain and justify the world from the perspective of selfhood.[393] It offers us a particular worldview. As such, it represents a mode of investigation that, unwittingly perhaps, suppresses possibilities, in favour of a regimented, abstract way of thinking. I do not mean to imply that those who conduct research in this area are lacking an ethical approach. In its current form, I do not believe that authentic leadership offers us a helpful way of thinking about leadership. I find myself somewhat concerned that the theory of authentic leadership leads to a flattening of individuality.[394] Authenticity has many critics but I have tried to show that it is not authenticity *per se* that is the problem but the way in which we perceive it in the guise of self alone. Thus, I agree with those who suggest that it may be possible to fashion an ethics of authenticity.[395]

Here is where I think Arendt can help. By considering uniqueness within the plural context of the web of human relationships perhaps we can resist the impulse to place self

---

[393] Arendt, *Human Condition*, 289.

[394] Arendt, Human Condition, 322.

[395] Here I am thinking of Charles Taylor and Alessandro Ferrara whose work I have mentioned earlier. What is missing in their accounts for me, however, is any deep discussion of gender.

above world. In my view, authenticity must remain indefinable so as to allow for the spontaneity of individual action. That being said, I do believe that it is fruitful to consider some of the ways in which authenticity, or lack thereof, shows itself in leadership from a gender perspective since it may offer insights into problems related to social conformity and gender socialization.

We saw in chapters two and three the devastation that is caused on the political stage when leaders are given free rein. While Robespierre may have initially acted out of good intent, following Arendt, we note this is not enough. What matters is not whether a leader's action is good for the self, but whether that action is good for the world.[396] Arendt maintains that political arenas that do not allow space for dialogue and debate are anathema to human flourishing. Such dialogue takes place in the present but is a remnant of the past and speaks to the future. I think that starting the conversation, as I did in chapter two, with the Enlightenment helps us to see how authenticity shows up differently in different times. I perceive a similarity between the women who tried to gain a public voice then, and the women I interviewed, as the connection between authenticity and courage. Having the courage to speak out is a thread that I now see running through this dissertation. This notion of courage in leadership is, I think, connected to the importance of creating spaces for dialogue and dissent. This is for me Arendt's most productive insight for leadership.

As I was involved in the final stages of writing this dissertation, I had the opportunity to facilitate a discussion between women leadership scholars from various parts of the world.[397] In this discussion on gender, authenticity and leadership, I observed themes that

---

[396] We only have to think of the war being waged in Syria by President Bashar al-Assad's against his own people.

[397] This discussion took place as an informal table-top discussion related to gender, authenticity and leadership as part of the International Leadership Association's Women and Leadership Conference in Asilomar, California on June 12, 2013. My role was to offer some context regarding my research into gender, authenticity and leadership, and then facilitate discussion. All the women who took part in this discussion taught leadership in different universities/colleges across the world.

flow from this dissertation come to life. One example was how one woman argued that she was always authentic in her actions. If we asked her colleagues, she stated, they would agree that what you see is what you get. The woman sitting next to her argued that it is not possible for a person to be authentic all of the time. She contended that when she is out running with her friends, she is a different person than when she teaches in the classroom. A third woman sitting across the table said that she did not believe that it was possible to be authentic in the workplace. Moreover, she argued it was important for a person to have boundaries between their personal and private personas. Following this comment, a fourth woman maintained that it was important to distinguish between authenticity in relation to being and doing. In her view, being authentic and acting authentically were not the same. In response, a fifth woman argued that all action is performative. Just before the conversation ended, the first woman who had spoken announced that she had been thinking about the question of boundaries. The notion of boundaries had never occurred to her before, and she reflected that she needed to think about this in relation to her ideas about authenticity, gender and leadership.

 In addition, two of the women who took part in this discussion had recently conducted qualitative studies on women and leadership. One study was conducted in The United States and the other study was conducted in Malawi. While neither study had originally concerned itself with questions of authenticity, it appears that the topic of authenticity kept resurfacing in their interviews. What seems clear to me is that the concept of authenticity is meaningful to questions of gender and leadership. However, there is much to do in teasing out the many connections among gender, authenticity and leadership. This thesis is just a starting point.

My original research question asked in what ways do senior women leaders experience authenticity or lack thereof in the university workplace. By focusing on the institutional context, as I mentioned in chapter five, I almost fell into the trap of comparing women leaders in relationship to their male counterparts, rather than expanding our notion of leadership to fit with diverse lived experiences. It is only by reconsidering what it means to be an authentic leader beyond the confines of the work environment that we can see the myriad ways in which gender plays a role in our understanding of what constitutes

leadership. Ignoring the intersubjective dimension of everyday life has negative implications because it can result in leaders becoming separated from everyday concerns and acting in self-indulgent ways to the detriment of everyone else. Indeed, the differentiation between the few and the many has led to disastrous consequences. Whether it's the banking crisis or the negative effects of globalization, what becomes apparent is that some leaders are failing to reflect upon, or care about, how their actions negatively affect others, something Arendt regarded as a necessary requirement for a just society.

In *Being and Time*, Heidegger maintains that each person's life is shaped partially by things outside of her control, not least because we are "thrown into the world." Yet Arendt suggests that he may be in error. As she states,

> Heidegger is wrong: man is not 'thrown in the world;' if we are thrown, then
> – no differently from animals – onto the earth. Man is precisely guided, not
> thrown, precisely for that reason his continuity arises and the way he belongs
> appears. Poor us, if we are thrown into the world![398]

For Arendt, we are guided in our entry into the world; this guidance takes many forms, but an important aspect is that of a child's relationship to her parent, especially her mother. We saw how important that maternal guidance can be in relation to questions of authenticity and leadership. But guidance takes many forms. In the process of writing this thesis, I have been guided by many people whose consideration of authenticity in relation to leadership has enriched my own understanding, although I find myself like Socrates as puzzled at the end of this project as I was at the beginning. What constitutes authenticity is thus an open question for me.

I began my research by looking at authentic leadership through an institutional lens to look at some of the gender barriers that women encounter in leading within an institutional context, especially as it relates to questions of authenticity. I wanted to

---

[398] Arendt, *Denktagebuch,* Notebook 21, Section 68, August, 19551955.http://www.hannaharendtcenter.org/?p=9260. Accessed May 6, 2013.

ascertain the conditions whereby women leaders described a tension between their desire to act in what they perceived as a genuine manner, and the limitations of the institutional environment. I see now that my bias against bureaucracy played a significant role in the way that I initially thought of my project. What I assumed to be central to my research, that is, how ethical dilemmas are affected by bureaucratic restraints was not where my research took me. What stops me feeling uneasy about this directional change is something that Patricia Benner wrote that has stayed with me. She contends that any researcher's preconceptions need to be challenged; if this does not happen then the research is not, in her opinion, sufficiently hermeneutical.[399] My research certainly went along different lines than what I had imagined. The research participants' descriptive accounts enriched my understanding of the role of authenticity in leadership in ways that I had not anticipated. These women leaders, together with Arendt, led me to an understanding that it is necessary to broaden our enquiry from institutional life to how we live in the world. Through the sharing of words and worlds, I have been guided back to what I had always known but had forgotten.

---

[399] Benner, *Tradition*, 112.

7   Bibliography

Acker, Joan. "Hierarchies, Jobs, Bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organizations." *Gender and Society*, 4 no. 2 (1990): 139–58.

Adorno, Theodore. *The Jargon of Authenticity.* London and New York: Routledge Classics, 2003.

Alcoff, Linda. "The Politics of Speaking for Others." *Cultural Critique,* 20 (Winter, 1991-1992): 5-32.

Algera, Puck. M. and Marjorie Lips-Wiersma. Radical Authentic Leadership: Co-creating the Conditions under which all Members of the Organization can be Authentic. *The Leadership Quarterly,* 23 (2011): 118-231.

Ahmed, Sara. *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2004.

Arendt, Hannah. "What is Authority?" In Hannah Arendt, *Between Past and Future: Eight Exercises in Political Thought,* 91-143. London: Penguin, 1993.

_____. *Correspondence: Hannah Arendt and Karl Jaspers 1926-1969,* edited by Lotte Kohler and Hans Saner. Translated by Robert and Rita Kimber. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich 1985.

_____. *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil*. London: Penguin Books, 1963.

_____. **"**What is "Existenz Philosophy"? In *Essays in Understanding 1930-1954*, edited by Jerome Kohn, 163-188. New York: Harcourt Brace and Company, 1994.

_____. *The Human Condition*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1958.

_____. *Lectures on Kant's Political Philosophy,* edited by Ronald Beiner. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1982.

_____. *The Life of the Mind*, edited by Mary McCarthy. New York: Harcourt, Brace Jovanovich, 1971.

_____. *Men in Dark Times*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1968.

_____. *Origins of Totalitarianism*. 1951. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1973.

_____. "Personal Responsibility Under Dictatorship." In *Responsibility and Judgment,* edited by Jerome Kohn, 17-49. New York: Schocken Books, 2003.

_____. "Some Questions of Moral Philosophy." In *Responsibility and Judgment,* edited by Jerome Kohn, 49-147. New York: Schocken Books, 2003.

_____. *Rahel Varnhagen: The Life of a Jewish Woman*. Translated by Richard and Clara Winston. New York and London: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1974.

_____. "A Reply to Eric Voegelin." In *Essays on Understanding 1930-1954*, edited by Jerome Kohn, 401-409. New York: Harcourt and Brace, 1994.

_____. *On Revolution*. 1963. New York: Viking Compass Books, 1965.

_____. "Truth and Politics." In *Between Past and Future: Eight Exercises in Political Thought*, 227-265. London: Penguin, 1993.

_____. "Understanding and Politics (The Difficulties of Understanding)." In *Essays in Understanding 1930-1954,* edited by Jerome Kohn, 307-328. New York: Harcourt Brace and Company, 1994.

_____. "What Remains? The Language Remains:" A Conversation with Günter Gaus." In *Essays in Understanding: 1930-1954*, edited by Jerome Kohn, 1-24. New York: Harcourt Brace and Company, 1994.

Aristotle. *Nicomachean Ethics*.

Avolio, Bruce J., Jakari Griffith, Tara S. Wernsing, and Fred O. Walumba. "What is Authentic Leadership Development?" In *Oxford Handbook of Positive Psychology and Work*, edited by P. Alex Linley, Susan Harrington and Nicola Garcea. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009, 39-51.

Avolio, Bruce J., Fred O.Walumbwa, and Todd J. Weber. "Leadership: Current Theories, Research, and Future Directions 2010." *Annual Review of Psychology* 60 (2009): 421–49.

Avolio, Bruce J., and William L. Gardner. "Authentic Leadership Development: Getting to the Root of Positive Forms of Leadership." *The Leadership Quarterly,* 16, no. 3 (2005): 315-338.

Avolio, Bruce J., William L., Gardner, Fred O. Walumbwa, Fred Luthans, and David R. May. "Unlocking the Mask: A Look at the Process by which Authentic Leaders impact Follower Attitudes and Behavior. *The Leadership Quarterly* 15 (2004*)*: 801–823.

Avolio, Bruce J., and Keith Mhatre. "Advances in Theory and Research on Authentic Leadership." *Handbook of Positive Organizational Scholarship*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Avolio, Bruce J., Fred O.Walumbwa, and Todd. J. Weber. "Leadership: Current Theories, Research, and Future Directions." *Annual Review Psychology*, 60: 2009. 421-439, doi 10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163621.

Begley, Paul T. "Self-knowledge, Capacity and Sensitivity: Prerequisites to Authentic Leadership by School Principals." *Journal of Educational Administration,* 44, no. 6 (2006): 570-589.

Benhabib, Seyla. *The Reluctant Modernism of Hannah Arendt*. London and Thousand Oaks: Sage, 1996.

_____. "The Pariah and her Shadow: Hannah Arendt's Biography of Rahel Varnhagen."
    Political Theory, 23, no. 1 (February 1995): 5-24.

_____. "Feminist Theory and Hannah Arendt's Conception of the Public Space." *History
    of the Human Sciences*, 6, no. 2 (1995): 97-114.

Benner, Patricia, "The Tradition and Skill of Interpretive Phenomenology in Studying
    Health, Illness, and Caring Practices." In *Interpretive Phenomenology:
    Embodiment, Caring, and Ethics in Health and Illness*, edited by Patricia Benner,
    141-167. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications Inc., 1994.

Berman, Marshall. *Politics of Authenticity: Radical Individualism and the Emergence of
    Modern Society.* New York: Athenaeum Books, 1971.

Betz Hull, Margaret. *The Hidden Philosophy of Hannah Arendt.* London and New York:
    Routledge, 2002.

Binns, Jennifer. "The Ethics of Relational Leading: Gender Matters." *Gender, Work and
    Organization*, 15, no. 6 (November 2008): 600-620.

Binns, Jennifer, and Deborah Kerfoot. "Editorial: Engendering Leadership Dedicated to
    the Spirit and the Scholarship of the Late Joan Eveline." *Gender, Work and
    Organization*, 18, no. 3 (May 2011): 257-262.

Birmingham, Peg. *Hannah Arendt and Human Rights: The Predicament of Common
    Responsibility*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2006.

Blackmore, Jill. International Response Essay "Leadership for Social Justice: A
    Transnational Dialogue." *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, 4, no.1
    (June 2009): 1-11.

Blackmore, Jill, and Judyth Sachs. *Performing and Reforming Leaders: Gender,
    Educational Restructuring, and Organizational Change*, Albany: State of Albany
    Press, 2007.

Bornstein, Rita. "Women and the Quest for Presidential Legitimacy." In *Women in Academic Leadership: Professional Strategies, Personal Choices, edited by* Diane R. Dean, Susan J. Bracken, and Jeanie K. Allen, 208-238. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, 2010.

Bowring, Michèle A. "Resistance is not Futile: Liberating Captain Janeway from the Masculine-Feminine Dualism of Leadership." *Gender, Work and Organization,* 11, no. 4 (2004): 381-405.

Bowring, Finn. *Hannah Arendt: A Critical Introduction*. (London: Pluto Press, 2011).

Branson, Chris. "Ethical Decision Making: is Personal Moral Integrity the Missing Link?" *Journal of Authentic Leadership in Education,* 1, no. 1 (2010): 1-8.

Brightman, Carol, ed. *Between Friends. The Correspondence of Hannah Arendt and Mary McCarthy 1949-1975.* London: Secker and Warburg, 1995.

Burns, James MacGregor. *Leadership*. New York: Harper and Row, 1978.

Carli, Linda L., and Alice H. Eagly. "Gender and Leadership." In *The Sage Handbook of Leadership*, edited by Alan Bryman, David Collinson, Keith Grint, Brad Jackson and Mary Uhl-Bien, 103-12. London: Sage Publications, 2011.

Canovon, Margaret. *Hannah Arendt: A Reinterpretation of her Political Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Catalyst. 2012 Report on Women Leaders in Fortune 500 Corporations, and 2013 Report on Canadian Women Leaders. http://www.catalyst.org/knowledge, accessed July 5, 2013.

Cavarero, Adriana. *Relating Narratives: Storytelling and Selfhood.* Translated by Paul A. Kottman. London and New York: Routledge, 1997.

Chan, Adrian. "Authentic Leadership Measurement: Challenges and Suggestions." In *Authentic Leadership Theory and Practice: Origins, Effects and Developments*,

edited by William L. Gardner, Bruce J. Avolio, and Fred O. Walumbwa, 227-251. Amsterdam: Elsevior, 2005.

Chan, Adrian, Sean T. Hannah, and William L. Gardner. "Veritable Authentic Leadership: Emergence, Functioning, and Impacts." *Authentic Leadership Theory and Practice: Origins, Effects and Developments*, edited by William L. Gardner, Bruce J. Avolio, and Fred O. Walumbwa, 3-43. Amsterdam: Elsevior, 2005.

Ciulla, Joanne B. "Leadership Studies and "the Fusion of Horizons." *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19 (2008): 393-395.

_____. "Handmaiden and Queen: What Philosophers Find in the Question: What is A Leader?" In *Leadership Studies: The Dialogue of Disciplines*, edited by Ronald E. Riggio and Michael Harvey, 54-66. Northampton: Edward Elgar, 2011.

_____. *The Working Life: The Promise and Betrayal of Modern Work.* New York and Toronto: Random House, 2000.

Cohen, Michèle. "'To Think, to Compare, to Combine, to Methodize:' Girls' Education in Enlightenment Britain." In *Women*, *Gender and the Enlightenment*, edited by Sarah Knott and Barbara Taylor, 224-241. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

_____. "'A Little Learning?' The Curriculum and the Construction of Gender Difference in the Long Eighteenth Century." *British Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies,* 29 (2006): 321-335.

Colley, Linda. *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837*. Reading: Yale University Press, 2005.

Cooper, Cecily. D., Terri A. Scandura, and Chester A. Schriesheim. "Looking Forward but Learning from our Past: Potential Challenges to Developing Authentic Leadership Theory and Authentic Leaders." *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16, no. 3 (2005*): 475-493.

Crenshaw, Kimberlé, "Intersectionality and Identity Politics: Learning from Violence Against Black Women." In *Reconstructing Political Theory: Feminist Perspectives,* edited by Mary L. Shanley and Uma Narayan, 178-194. University Park, PA: Penn State University Press, 1997.

Cukier, Wendy, Pinoo Bindhani, Sarah Amato, Shelley Smarz, and Amonrat Saekang. *Diversity Leads: Women in Senior Leadership Positions: A Profile of the Greater Toronto Area*, 2012, Ryerson University.

Davis, Brett. W, ed., *Martin Heidegger: Key Concepts.* Durham, Acumen, 2011.

Dean, Diane R., Susan J. Bracken, and Jeanie K. Allen, eds. *Women in Academic Leadership: Professional Strategies, Personal Choices.* Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, 2010.

Denscombe, Martyn. *The Good Research Guide for Small-Scale Social Research Projects*. Maidenhead: Open University Press, 2007.

Diderot, Denis. *Rameau's Nephew/D'Alembert Dream*. 1751. Translated and introduction by Leonard Tancock. London: Penguin, 1966.

Disch, Lisa J. *Hannah Arendt and the Limits of Philosophy*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1994.

_____. "Claire Loves Julie: Reading the Story of Women's Friendship in "La Nouvelle Héloïse." *Hypatia*, 3, (Summer 1994): 19-45.

Due Billing, Yvonne, and Mats Alvesson, "Questioning the Notion of Feminine Leadership: A Critical Perspective on the Gender Labelling of Leadership." *Gender, Work and Organization*, 7, no. 3 (2000): 144-157.

Eagly, Alice H. "Achieving Relational Authenticity in Leadership: Does Gender Matter?" *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16 (2005): 459-474.

Eagly, Alice H., and Linda Carli, *Through the Labyrinth: The Truth about how Women become Leaders*. Harvard Business School Press, Boston: 2007.

Eagly, Alice H. and S. J. Karau. "Role Congruity Theory of Prejudice toward Female Leaders." *Psychological Review*, 109, no. 3 (2002): 573-598.

Elsesser, Kim M., and Janet Lever. "Does Gender Bias Against Female Leaders Persist? Quantitative and Qualitative Data from a Large-Scale Survey." *Human Relations,* 64, no. 12 (2011): 1555-1578.

Endrissat, Nada, Werner R. Müller, and Stephanie Kaudela-Baum. "En Route to an Empirically-Based Understanding of Authentic Leadership." *European Management Journal*, 25, no. 3 (2007): 207-220.

England, Paula. "The Gender Revolution: Uneven and Stalled." *Gender and Society,* 24, no. 2 (April 2010): 149-166.

Ferrara, Alessandro. *Reflective Authenticity: Rethinking the Project of Modernity*. London and New York: Routledge: 1998.

Fielding, Helen A. "Multiple Moving Perceptions of the Real: Arendt, Merleau-Ponty, and Truitt." *Hypatia* 26, no. 3 (2011): 518-34.

Fletcher, Joyce K. "The Paradox of Postheroic Leadership: An Essay on Gender, Power, and Transformational Change." *The Leadership Quarterly,* 15 (2004): 647-661.

Fisher, Linda. "Debating Phenomenological Research Methods." *Phenomenology and Practice*, 3, no. 1 (2009): 6-25.

_____. "Feminist Phenomenological Voices." *Continental Philosophy Review,* 43 (2010): 83-95.

Fletcher, Joyce K. "The Paradox of Postheroic Leadership: An Essay on Gender, Power, and Transformational Change. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15 (2004): 647-661.

Ford, Jackie, and Nancy Harding. "The Impossibility of the 'True Self' of Authentic Leadership: A Critique through Objects Relations Theory." *Leadership,* 7, no. 4 (2011): 463-479.

Ford, Jackie. "Discourses of Leadership: Gender Identity and Contradiction in an UK Public Service Industry." *Leadership* 2, no. 1, (February 2006): 77-99.

Foucault, Michel. *History of Sexuality*, *Volume I.* Translated by Robert Hurley. New York: Random House, 1990.

Gardner, William L., Bruce J. Avolio, and Fred O. Walumbwa, eds. *Authentic Leadership Theory and Practice: Origins, Effects and Developments*. Amsterdam: Elsevior, 2005.

Gardner, William L., Claudia C. Cogliser, Kelly M. Davis, and Matthew P. Dickens. "Authentic Leadership: A Review of the Literature and Research Agenda." *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22 (2011): 1120-1145.

George, Bill, David Gergen, and Peter Sims. *True North: Discover your Authentic Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 2007.

George, Bill. *Authentic Leadership: Rediscovering the Secrets to Creating Lasting Value.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004.

Gilligan, Carol. *In A Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982.

Giorgi, Amedeo. *The Descriptive Phenomenological Method in Psychology: A Modified Husserlian Approach*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 2009.

Golomb, Jacob. *In Search of Authenticity: From Kierkegaard to Camus*. London: Routledge, 1995.

Goodman, Dena. *The Republic of Letters: A Cultural History of the French Enlightenment.* New York: Cornell University Press, 1994.

_____. "L'Ortografe des Dames: Gender and Language in the Old Regime." In *Women, Gender and the Enlightenment*, edited by Sarah Knott and Barbara Taylor, 195-223. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

Gosling, Jonathan, and Peter Villiers, eds. *Fictional Leaders: Heroes, Villains and Absent Friends*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.

Greaves, Tom. *Starting with Heidegger*. London: Continuum Books, 2010.

Greenleaf, Robert K. (1977*). Servant Leadership: A Journey into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness*, edited by Larry C. Spears. New York: Paulist Press, 2002.

Grint, Keith. *Leadership: Limits and Possibilities*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

Habermas, Jürgen. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*. Translated by Thomas Burger with the assistance of Frederick Lawrence. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1994.

Harding, Sandra. "Introduction: Is There A Feminist Method" In *Feminism and Methodology,* edited by Sandra Harding, 1-14. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987.

Hausmann, Ricardo, Laura D. Tyson, and Saadia Zahidi. *The Global Gender Gap Report 2012*. Geneva: World Economic Forum.

Heidegger, Martin. *Being and Time*. Translated by John Robinson and Edward Macquarrie. Oxford: Blackwell, 1962.

_____. "Building, Dwelling, Thinking." In *Poetry, Language, Thought*. Translated by A. Hofstadter, 143-163. New York: Harper Colophon Books, 1971.

_____. "Letter on Humanism." In *Martin Heidegger: Basic Writings,* edited and translated by David Farrell Krell, 193-242. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1977.

____. "What is Metaphysics?" In *Pathmarks*, edited by William McNeil, 82-97. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

____. "The Question Concerning Technology." In *Martin Heidegger: Basic Writings,* edited and translated by David Farrell Krell, 319-341. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1977.

____. "The Self-Assertion of the German University and the Rectorate 1933-34: Facts and Thoughts." *Review of Metaphysic*s, 38, no. 3 (1985 March): 467-502.

____. *What is Called Thinking?* Translated by J. Glenn Gray. New York: Harpers and Row, 1968.

Heil, Dominik. "Understanding and Leading Organizations: A Hermeneutic Phenomenological Investigation." *Philosophy Today*, (Spring 2010): 7-17.

Hertz, Deborah. *Jewish High Society in Old Regime Berlin.* West Hanover: Yale University Press, 1988.

Hesse, Carla. *The Other Enlightenment: How French Women became Modern.* Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2001.

Hodge, Joanna. *Heidegger and Ethics*. London and New York: Routledge, 1995.

Holvino, Evangelina. "Intersections: The Simultaneity of Race, Gender and Class in Organization Studies." *Gender, Work and Organization*, 17, no. 3 (2010): 248-273.

Hufton, Olwen. *The Prospect before Her: A History of Women in Western Europe, Volume I, 1500-1800*. London: HarperCollins Publishers, 1995.

Humdert, E.J. "The European Enlightenment and the History of the Self." In *Rewriting the Self: Histories from the Renaissance to the Present*, edited by Roy Porter, 72-84. London: Routledge, 1997.

Ibarra, Herminia, and Otilia Oboradu. "Women and the Vision Thing." *Harvard Business Review*, (January 2009): 1-9.

Irby, Beverly J., Genevieve Brown, Jo Ann Duffy, and Dianne Trautman. "The Synergistic Leadership Theory." *Journal of Educational Administration*. 40, no. 4 (2002): 304-322.

Kant, Immanuel. (1784.) "An Answer to the Question what is Enlightenment?" In *What is Enlightenment? Eighteenth-Century Answers and Twentieth-Century Questions*, edited by James Schmitt, 58-65. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1996.

_____. (1798.) *Anthropology from a Pragmatic Point of View*, translated by Victor Lyle Dowdell with an introduction by Frederick P. Van de Pitte. (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois Press, 1996).

Kellerman, Barbara, and Deborah L. Rhode, eds. *Women and Leadership: The State of Play and Strategies for Change*. San Francisco: John Wiley and Sons, 2007.

Kinsella, Anne. "Hermeneutics and Critical Hermeneutics: Exploring Possibilities Within the Art of Interpretation." *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 7, no. 3 (May 2006): 1-13.

Klenke, Karin. "Authentic Leadership: A Self, Leader, and Spiritual Identity Perspective." *International Journal of Leadership Studies,* 3, no. 1 (2007): 68-97.

Kristeva, Julia. *Hannah Arendt: Life is a Narrative.* Translated by Frank Collins. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001.

Kouzes, James M., and Barry K. Pozner. *The Leadership Challenge: How to Make Extraordinary Things Happen*. Fourth Edition. San Francisco: John Wiley and Sons, 2007.

Ladkin, Donna. "When Deontology and Utilitarianism Aren't Enough: how Heidegger's Notion of 'Dwelling' Might Help Organizational Leaders Resolve Ethical Issues." *Journal of Business Ethics*, 65 (2006): 87-98.

_____. "The Enchantment of the Charismatic Leader: Charisma Reconsidered as Aesthetic Encounter." *Leadership*, 2, no. 2 (2006): 165-179.

_____. *Rethinking Leadership: A New Look at Old Leadership Questions*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 2010.

Ladkin, Donna, and Steven Taylor. "Enacting the 'True Self': Towards a Theory of Embodied Authentic Leadership." *The Leadership Quarterly* 21, no. 1 (2010): 64-74.

Lawler. John, and Ian Ashman, "Theorizing Leadership Authenticity: A Sartrean Perspective," *Leadership* 8, no. 4 (2012): 327-344.

Levy, Lester, and Mark Bentley. "More 'Right' than 'Real': the Shape of Authentic Leadership in New Zealand." Auckland: The University of Auckland, 2007, 1-25.

Lindholm, Charles. *Culture and Authenticity*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2008.

Lugones, Maria, and Elizabeth Spelman. "Have We Got a Theory for You! Feminist Theory, Cultural Imperialism and the Demand for "The Woman's Voice." *Women's Studies International Forum*, 6, no. 6 (1983): 573-581.

McDonald, Paul. "Neurological Correlates to Authentic Leadership," Victoria Management School Working Paper Series, (2009): 1-23.

Maier-Katkin, Daniel. *Stranger from Abroad: Hannah Arendt, Martin Heidegger, Friendship and Forgiveness*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 2010.

Maier-Katkin, Daniel and Birgit Maier-Katkin. "Hannah Arendt and Martin Heidegger: Calumny and the Politics of Reconciliation." *Human Rights Quarterly*, 28, no. 1 (February 2006): 86-119.

Marturano, Antonio. "Understanding Leadership: Is it Time for a Linguistic Turn?" In *Leadership at the Crossroads, Vol. 3, Leadership and the Humanities*, edited by Joanne B. Ciulla, 117-131. Westport (NJ): Praeger, 2008.

Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *Phenomenology of Perception*, translated by Colin Smith. London and New York: Routledge, 2002.

Montesquieu. (1721.) *Persian Letters.* Translated by Margaret Mauldon with editorial remarks by Andrew Kahn. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

_____. *Persian Letters.* Translated, introduction and notes by C.J. Betts. London: Penguin, 1973.

Morley, Louise. The Rules of the Game: Women and the Leaderist Turn in Higher Education." *Gender and Education*, 25, no. 1 (2013): 116–131.

Northhouse, Peter. "Authentic Leadership." In *Leadership: Theory and Practice,* 253-286. Sixth Edition. Thousand Oaks and London: Sage Publications, 2013.

Novicevic, Milorad M., Michael G. Harvey, M. Ronald Buckley, Jo Ann Brown, and Randy Evans. "Authentic Leadership: A Historical Perspective." *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies,* 13, no. 1 (2006): 64-76.

Porter, Roy, ed. *Rewriting the Self: Histories from the Renaissance to the Present*. London: Routledge, 1997.

Roulston, Chris. *Virtue, Gender, and the Authentic Self in Eighteenth-Century Fiction: Richardson,Rousseau, and Laclos.* Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1998.

Roulston, Kathryn. *Reflective Interviewing: A Guide to Theory and Practice*. London: Sage, 2010.

Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. (1762). *Emile or on Education*. Introduction, translation and note by Allan Bloom. New York: Basic Books, 1979.

_____. *Julie, or the New Héloïse. Letters of Two Lovers Who Live in a Small Town at the Foot of the Alps.* (1760). Translated and annotated Philip Stewart and Jean Vache. Hanover and London: University Press of New England, 1997.

_____. *The Social Contract*. (1762). Translated and introduction by Maurice Cranston. Aylesbury: Penguin Books, 1968.

Sandberg, Sheryl with Nell Scovell. *Lean in: Women, Work, and the Will to Lead*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2013.

Scott, Charles E. "Care and Authenticity." In *Martin Heidegger: Key Concepts*, edited by Bret W. Davis. Durham: Acumen Press, 2011, 57-69.

Scott. Joan W. "Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis." *The American Historical Review*, 91, no. 5 (Dec. 1986): 1053-1075.

_____. *Only Paradoxes to Offer: French Feminists and the Rights of Man.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1996.

Sennett, Richard. *The Fall of Public Man.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, *1974.*

Shamir, Boas and Galit Eilam. "What's Your Story? A Life-Stories Approach to Authentic Leadership Development." *The Leadership Quarterly*, no. 16 (2005): 395-417.

Shaw, Jan. "Papering the Cracks with Discourse: The Narrative Identity of the Authentic Leader." *Leadership*, (2010): 89-108.

Sinclair, Amanda. "Body Possibilities in Leadership." *Leadership.* 1, no. 4 (2005): 387-406.

_____. *Leadership for the Disillusioned: Moving Beyond Myths and Heroes to Leading that Liberates*. Crow's Nest NSW: Allen and Unwin, 2007.

_____. "Not Just 'Adding Women In': Women Re-making Leadership." Melbourne Business School Working Paper (Jan 2013): 1-23.

Smith, Dorothy E. *The Conceptual Practices of Power: A Feminist Sociology of Knowledge*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990.

_____. *The Everyday World as Problematic*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987.

Smythe, Liz. "Yes We Are Prejudiced." *Community Development Journal*, (2003): 1-3.

Soper, Kate. "Feminism and Enlightenment Legacies." In *Women*, *Gender and the Enlightenment*, edited by Sarah Knott and Barbara Taylor, 705-715. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

Sparrowe, Raymond T. "Authentic Leadership and the Narrative Self." *The Leadership Quarterly,* no. 16 (2005): 419-439.

Stone Dan, "The Holocaust and the Human." In *Hannah Arendt and the Uses of History: Imperialism, Nation, Race, and Genocide*, edited by Richard H. King and Dan Stone, 232-250. Oxford and New York: Berghahn Books*,* 2007.

Taminiaux, Jacques. *The Thracian Maid and the Professional Thinker Arendt and Heidegger.* Translated and edited by Michael Gendre. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1997.

Taylor, Carman. "Authenticity." In *A Companion to Heidegger*, edited by Hubert L. Dreyfus and Mark A. Wrathall, 285-296. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2005.

Taylor, Charles. *The Ethics of Authenticity.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1991.

_____. *Sources of the Self: The Making of the Modern Identity*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989.

Terry, R. W. *Authentic Leadership: Courage in Action*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1993.

Thompson, Iain. "Heidegger and the Politics of the University." *Journal of the History of Philosophy.* 41, no. 4 (2003): 515–542.

Todres, Les. *Embodied Enquiry: Phenomenological Touchstones for Research, Psychotherapy and Spirituality*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

Tomaselli, Sylvana. "The Death and Rebirth of Character in the Eighteenth Century." In *Rewriting the Self: Histories from the Renaissance to the Present*, edited by Roy Porter, 84-96. London: Routledge, 1997.

Trilling, Lionel. *Sincerity and Authenticity*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972.

Uhl-Bien, Mary. "Relational Leadership Theory: Exploring the Social Processes of Leadership and Organizing." *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17 (2006): 654-676.

Van Manen, Max. *Researching Lived Experiences: Human Science for an Action Sensitive Pedagogy*. London: The Althouse Press, 1997.

Vasterling, Veronica. "Cognitive Theory and Phenomenology in Arendt's and Nussbaum's Work on Narrative." *Human Studies,* 30 (2007): 79–95.

Vickery, Amanda. *The Gentleman's Daughter: Women's Lives in Georgian England*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press 1998.

Villa, Dana R. *Arendt and Heidegger: The Fate of the Political*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.

Walumbwa, Fred, Bruce J. Avolio, William Gardner, Tara Wernsing, and Suzanne Peterson. "Authentic Leadership: Development and Validation of a Theory-Based Measure." *Management Department Faculty Publications* (2008): Paper 24. Digital Commons at University of Nebraska-Lincoln. http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/managementfacpub/24.

Wollstonecraft, Mary. 1792. *Vindication of the Rights of Woman*. Edited and introduction by Miriam Brody Kramnick. London: Penguin Books, 1985.

Wolin, Richard. *The Politics of Being: The Political Thought of Martin Heidegger*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1990.

Yammarino, Francis J., Shelly D. Dionne, Chester A. Schriesheim, and Fred Dansereau. "Authentic Leadership and Positive Organizational Behavior: A Meso, Multi-Level Perspective." *The Leadership Quarterly*, no. 19 (2008): 693-207.

Young-Bruel, Elizabeth. *Hannah Arendt: For the Love of the World*. Second Edition. Princeton: Yale University Press, 2004.

8   Appendix A

Letter of Information and Consent Form

PROJECT: Women and Authentic Leadership

I invite you to participate in a university-based research projected entitled "Women and Authentic Leadership." This project involves conducting, recording, and transcribing interviews with senior women administrators in higher education who have expertise in the theory and practice of authentic leadership, as a supplement to a review of the relevant literature. The project's main goal is to consider how gender may have an influence on the practice of authentic leadership.

If you agree to participate in this study, you will have one interview with me during which you will be asked questions about (1) what authentic leadership means to you; (2) your experience of authentic leadership; (3) the efficacy of this approach to leadership; and (4) your observations regarding how gender may have an influence on the practice of authentic leadership. This study has the potential to lead to insights related to gender and authentic leadership which may be of interest to society at large.

The interview will last between 90 and 120 minutes and will be conducted either by telephone at a time convenient to you, via email, or in person at a time and location convenient for you. As researcher, I will audio-record the interview to ensure the accuracy of data, and provide you with a transcript of the recorded interview so that you may authorize its contents (i.e., delete or revise any part of it) before the researcher makes any use of it as a source of information or quotations within the study. It may be necessary to connect with you once more to ensure that I have a deep understanding of your viewpoint. You will have final say with regard to discrepancies within the transcript.

Recordings and transcripts will be safely stored throughout the period of this doctoral study. I anticipate that results from this study may be published in academic journals or books. If this research results in publication, I will provide you with a copy upon request.

Any personal identifying information will be removed from transcripts unless you have authorized the retention of such information in the transcript (1) insofar as it directly pertains to your work and (2) the use of the transcript as a source of quotations or information for study purpose.

This letter is yours to keep for future reference. Please read this letter carefully to ensure you understand all the implications of participation. Participation in the study is voluntary, and you may refuse to participate, decline to answer specific questions, or withdraw from the study at any time. For further details about this research, you may contact me.

If you have questions about this study with regard to your rights as a participant, you may contact the Office of Research Ethics at The University of Western Ontario, by telephone at (519) 661-3036, or via email at ethics@uwo.ca.

Sincerely,

Rita A. Gardiner

INTERVIEW CONSENT FORM

Principal Investigator:

Researcher:

I have read the Letter of Information, have had the nature of the study explained to me and I agree to participate. All questions have been answered to my satisfaction.

    ☐   Please check this box if you are willing to allow direct quotes from the transcript to be used.

_____

Date

_____

Interviewee Name (please print)

_____

Interviewee Signature

9 Appendix B

Interview Guide

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this study on women and authentic leadership. The purpose of this interview is to discuss your experiences – as a successful female leader – of authenticity and leadership. I have a number of questions to guide the interview, but these are only guides. I am interested in understanding your experience as a woman leader. Therefore, anything that you would like to share with me that will help my understanding would be most welcome.

1. What does the term authenticity mean to you?

2. Similarly what comes to mind when you think about authentic leadership?

3. In your experience, what makes a leader authentic?

4. Can you think of any leaders you have known, or worked with, that exemplify authentic leadership? If so, what qualities exemplified these leaders?

5. Could you give an example that exemplifies how you try to lead authentically?

	Prompt: What impact do you think this type of leadership has on others?

6. Can you describe how your personal background has influenced your views on authenticity and leadership? Is there a particular story that springs to mind?

7. What makes you feel comfortable or "at home" in your role as a leader?

8. Do you recall any physical or emotional sensations you experienced at this time?

9. Alternatively, what makes you feel ill at ease in your leadership role?

	Prompt: Did you experience any physical or emotional sensations when you feel ill at ease in your leadership role?

10. As a woman leader, have you experienced challenges to your desire to be true to yourself? Is there any instance that comes to mind?

11. Conversely, have you felt, that being a woman has given you any advantages in your ability to lead authentically? Can you describe these?

12. Can you describe a time when your desire to be true to yourself was at odds with institutional needs? How did this make you feel?

As we've spoken, have any other thoughts related to the theme of authenticity, gender leadership come to mind that you would like to share?

Over the next few weeks, I will be transcribing the interview which I will send to you. I may need to contact you in case of clarification. As well, I will send you the interview transcript. I would like to do a follow up – either by telephone or email. Is that okay?

It's been a pleasure talking with you. Enjoy the rest of the summer.

10 Curriculum Vitae

Name:	Rita Ann Gardiner

Post-secondary Education and Degrees:

Open University
Milton Keynes, England
198 -1990 B.A.

University of York
York, North Yorkshire, England
1990-1993 M.A.

Memorial University of Newfoundland and Labrador
St. John's, Newfoundland and Labrador, Canada
1995-1998 M. Phil.

Department of Women's Studies and Feminist Research
The University of Western Ontario
London, Ontario, Canada
2009-2013

Honours and Awards:

Province of Ontario Graduate Scholarship
2011-2012

Social Science and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC)
Doctoral Fellowship
2012-2013

Related Work Experience

Teaching Assistant
The University of Western Ontario
2010-2012

Instructor, "Home and Belonging," Winter 2011 and Fall 2013.
Department of Women's Studies and Feminist Research

Instructor, "Sociological Theory," Fall 2013.
Department of Sociology, The University of Western Ontario.

Instructor, "Introduction to Women's Studies," 2013/14
King's University College at The University of Western Ontario

Publications:

Refereed Articles and Essays

 "Pursuing Freedom: Simone de Beauvoir and Hannah Arendt." *Sapere Aude*. (Special Issue on Simone de Beauvoir.) 3-6 (2013): 116-125.

 "Leadership, Authenticity and the Arendtian World." *The Woard Hoard*, 1.1: (May 2012), 64-71. Available at: http://ir.lib.uwo.ca/wordhoard/vol1/iss1/8.

 "A Critique of the Discourse of Authentic Leadership." *International Journal of Business and Social Science*. II.15 (Aug. 2011): 99-105.

"Rethinking Classroom Participation," *Teaching Innovation Projects.* 2.1: (2012).Available at: http://ir.lib.uwo.ca/tips/vol2/iss1/3.

Book Chapter

"Hannah Arendt, Authenticity and Uniqueness." In *Reflections on Authentic Leadership: Concepts, Coalescences and Clashes,* edited by Donna Ladkin and Chellie Spiller. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing. (Forthcoming, 2013).

Book Review

Women in Academic Leadership: Professional Strategies, Personal Choices, edited by Diane R. Dean, Susan J. Bracken, and Jeanie K. Allen. *In Journal of Women and Intercultural Leadership, 2.I (2011). Available at http://www.centerforwomeninleadership.org/jwil/.*

 Fictional Leaders: Heroes, Villains and Absent Friends, edited by Jonathan Gosling, and Peter Villiers. London: Palgrave Macmillan. In *Leadership for the Humanities*, Second issue (Forthcoming).