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Ideas about leadership in education, as in other areas of professional practice, increasingly borrow from management and business thinking. In this article I provide a commentary and critique of contemporary leadership in the form of a narrative of my own experience as an educator in a business school. My experience as a woman teacher of largely male, adult management students has underscored my learning about and critique of leadership theory and my own aspirations as teacher and leader. Personal experience is interwoven with theoretical commentary to highlight the limitations of leadership discourses—too often disembodied, de-gendered and de-sexualized. By inserting my responses and feelings I also seek to subvert, or at least to add some different dimensions to, intellectualized and inert critiques of leadership. Learning about leadership, including engagement, reaction and contestation, is not just a cerebral undertaking, but emotion laden and thoroughly embodied. I sought to reflect these qualities in this article.

Introduction

In this article I provide a commentary and critique on recent leadership theory, particularly that version of it propagated in my own discipline of management. But rather than collude with the idea of leadership as the disembodied application of competencies and capabilities, I have anchored this paper in my experience. I seek to show how my evolving understanding, theorization and critique of leadership has hinged on, and at times been catapulted from, my experiences as a woman teacher, and sometime leader, in a traditionally male institutional setting.

My experience has been one of firstly embracing received wisdom about leadership—learning about it, including it in my teaching and to some degree trying to live leadership according to leadership ideology and discourse as I understood it. The article then charts my disaffection and interrogation of leadership dogma, my wrestles with how to position myself and what I do in the terrain of
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leadership. To some degree this paper is also about the death of Amanda as ‘Organization/University/Business School Woman’ and the birth of some other, still forming, incarnation of my professional, and perhaps leadership, practice.

The conclusion I draw, from both a theoretical and a personal point of view, is the importance of reflectiveness and contestation in any practice of leadership. Like other women researchers on educational leadership (Blackmore, 1999; Hall, 1996), I argue the value of mapping the ways in which we collude with, resist and subvert the complex and predatory managerial discourses of leadership which so saturate organizational life.

Looking for Leadership

I describe seven destinations or stops along my journey around leadership. Though these are roughly chronological, some of them and the theoretical insights arising from them are concurrent.

Destination 1. Harvard Business School Cases and “Neutron Jack” Welch

When I first joined the Melbourne Business School over a decade ago, I dutifully accepted that the lessons for leadership lay in Harvard Business School cases. These cases delivered exciting stories about blokes doing amazing things. Blokes such as Jack Welch or “Neutron Jack”, described as such because he laid the ground bare like a bomb. It was the scorched-earth philosophy of organizational change.

In one sense it didn’t take long for me to feel a bit disillusioned by these examples of so-called “leadership”. But being the good, approval-hungry woman I was (and still am in too many situations), I censored my own doubts and continued to try to find and extol the leadership that others seemed to be confident was there, in the actions of overpaid, sharp-talking American CEOs, fond of using baseball and basketball analogies of teamwork. I tried to keep pace with the tidal wave of texts on leadership which arrived in our libraries—most emanating from the United States and each more inflated than the preceding in its promises of being the last word on leadership, yet each thinner and more vacuous but simultaneously unapologetic about the lack of any semblance of theoretical framework (Ozga & Walker, 1995).

I was partially able to acidly grumble about the shortcomings of the great leadership canon because I wasn’t teaching leadership—this was left to someone else. I didn’t dare imagine I might have something to say about this weighty topic—my contribution was the more circumscribed areas of change or ethics. I had the unnerving experience again recently of watching, with a group of executives, a video of Jack Welch (former CEO of General Electric) being interviewed. I saw a controlling individual, but all around me others seemed to be seeing leadership.

My experience of not seeing leadership where others did led me to some useful insights, in particular about the importance of projection in the leader–follower transaction. I have subsequently argued that where we see leadership
lying depends on our own experiences and backgrounds (Sinclair, 1998). Part of the seduction in the leadership search is imagining and seeing in leaders a better self. This insight about the role of projection in creating leadership explains the entrancement that many male managers and observers feel for certain leaders at the height of their popularity. We see in leaders, perhaps all too briefly, a more perfectly desirable idealization of self.

Societies, I believe, also develop “archetypes” of leadership. Jung’s term “archetypes” is useful here because it captures the power of collective but largely unconscious images of leadership from a society’s history and mythology that dominate that society. In the Australian case, the archetype is of the lone frontier settler who is stoic but resolute in the face of hardship. Such an image renders improbable a garrulous, emotionally expressive or more collectively oriented leader—women and many migrants from more group-based societies instantly struggle to earn respect in this context. The study of social history is essential to plotting the influence of archetypes on social consciousness and yet leadership literature is largely ahistorical, relentlessly in the present, suffering under the delusion that we have nothing to learn from the past.

However, back then at the first destination, I just wondered what was wrong with me that the leadership exemplars and templates I was being offered left me stone cold.

Destination (or Deviation) 2. Being a Woman with Authority in a Business School

My first years as one of two junior female teachers at the Melbourne Business School were difficult, to put it mildly. I got caned (it felt literally) in student evaluations—most students in my classes expected that business school teachers would be tough, dominant males who knew it all, either from their research but more often from their extensive experiences consulting to industry. I have written elsewhere (Sinclair, 1995b; 1997; 2000) about my attempts to mimic the aggression and intellectual and physical dominance of the classroom that I observed in the “most successful” of my colleagues.

Not surprisingly, trying to be one of the blokes was pathetically unsuccessful. I was criticized for being too soft, or conversely too tough and too intrusive. I started to watch other women teachers of predominantly male groups and observed a range of tactics women used to camouflage their gender, as well as the responses from their audiences—often independent of those tactics. Men responded in their evaluations: “she reminded me of my mother”; “she was like a kindergarten teacher”. Out of desperation I started to undertake research and talk in forums about my experiences. I wrote and gave a paper called “A Woman’s Guide to Teaching in a Business School”. When I described my experiences of being undermined, feeling marginalized and, on occasion, harassed, my male colleagues thought I was imagining things. Thankfully, when I articulated these experiences to groups of university women, there was recognition and support.
At this point, as with many others in my career, research, particularly into disciplines beyond my own, and some female colleagues saved me. For the sake of my own survival, as I tried to make sense of what was happening to me, I looked at the psychological and psychoanalytic research on how people respond to female authority figures. I read with enormous relief that the tendency to be very threatened by women with power was part of a well-documented and increasingly theorized phenomenon—a fear of “the monstrous feminine”, to use Barbara Creed’s (1993) wonderful phrase. Standard responses to these fears and anxieties are to trivialize and reduce women’s power through sexualization and maternalization, sometimes infantilization (Thornton, 1998). As Maggie Kirkman and Norma Grieve (1984) conclude from their study of obstacles to women’s ordination, “we feel more comfortable when female power is trivial and female sexuality controlled … It is more reassuring when women collude by restricting their behaviour to a gratifying, non-judgemental and non-controlling nurturance that applauds male achievement” (p. 488).

The burgeoning work on pedagogy (see for example Luke & Gore, 1992; Luke, 1996) and on bodies in educational settings (for example Butler, 1993; Gallop, 1995) enabled me to understand better the performance space of teaching and gave me new tools to theorize cross-gender relations in business classrooms. My female body, in a position of power, interacted with the audience, predominantly males, who were in unaccustomed positions of subordination. Tuned into these dimensions of power, performance and bodies, I saw my experiences with fresh insight, as issues for analysis, rather than matters for castigating myself.

The experiences that I was having as a female teacher of students used to male teachers were not, then, my imaginings nor simple manifestations of bad teaching. A different and more complex set of phenomena and responses were invoked when I, a woman, was the one in charge. There were more associations and more negative associations, or in psychoanalytic terms, more transference with people unconsciously reapplying to their current interactions, primitive feelings about their mothers from childhood, such as dependency and then rage at those feelings of dependency. My body, as a woman’s body, was read in different ways to my male colleagues. A female student observed, “I always noticed and interpreted what you had on. I never did that with other lecturers.” Another visiting businessperson, disappointed when meeting me for the first time, said, “I thought professors had to be old and big. But, never mind, your reputation helps.”

At the time, it never occurred to me for a moment that any of this was about leadership. I read these psychoanalytic and feminist theories secretly, if voraciously, for personal nourishment, not because they had anything to do with what I taught, but because they helped me explain my experience.

Now, these insights have become an important part of my understandings about how the leadership of women is different from that of men—not because they necessarily do things differently but because what they do is perceived differently. There is an extensive managerial literature that documents this
pattern of response (for example Eagly, 1992); and it is regularly seen in the
distinctively punitive, sadistic and dismissive responses we witness in reactions
to women with power. Yet, interestingly enough, with a few exceptions, none
of this is recognized in mainstream leadership literature, which continues to
speak as if leadership is an objectively defined set of capabilities, discharged
similarly regardless of whether one is white or black, man or woman. And this
is part of the problem, and the deeply unsatisfactory nature of much of leader-
ship literature.

Destination 3. Discovering Gender in Leadership: The revelation of masculinities and
sexualities

My career at the Melbourne Business School continued—my research was
increasingly focused on gender, i.e. women’s experience, while my teaching and
managerial responsibilities remained pretty unconnected to this research. I was
living two lives—the public organizational existence and the much more satisfy-
ing one in the closet, doing the gender work that a number advised would be the
death of my career.

A revelatory research moment came for me with the Trials at the Top (Sinclair,
1994) research, which involved a group of academics and business people
convened at the University of Melbourne’s Australian Centre. We were inter-
viewing CEOs about the obstacles to women in ascending to senior manage-
ment. In this research, I and my colleagues were focused on women, until the
moment I realized that you couldn’t understand leadership in the Australian
 corporative context without recognizing masculinities and the way in which two
identities—as leader and as man—worked together. I also started to see sexuali-
ities at work in leadership (Sinclair, 1995c). The leadership literature is silent on
the subject of sexualities—a device that theorists recognize as a very good way
of keeping its presence concealed and unproblematised.

There is now an extensive body of work theorizing sexualities in organizations
(for example, Hearn et al., 1989; Collinson & Hearn, 1994; Whitcher &
Moodley, 1999; Hook, 2001) but very little examining sexualities and leader-
ship—again revealing much about how leadership discourses contribute to the
idea of leadership as asexual. Yet my own observations from studying Australian
CEOs and MDs was that a strong sense of sexual identity as manly and hetero-
 sexual was a reinforcing part of the leadership identity for men. Through not
recognizing or theorizing this sexual identity, leaders are portrayed as above sex
and, therefore, immune from associations that might contaminate their great-
ness. On the other hand, women learn in most leadership roles to strenuously
 conceal and camouflage their sexual identity as women. Any evidence of their
sexual appetites (affairs, children) or sexual sense of themselves is absolutely
taboo (Marshall, 1984; 1995).

Gender theory, including the emerging study of masculinities (Connell,
1995), feminist theory and critical management theory all helped me begin to
deconstruct leadership and leadership commentary. In management literature,
leadership is widely accepted as an uncontested good, an ideal to which we should all strive. And the leadership ideology copes with the “bad apples” by describing such people in formal positions of power as not “real” leaders. They may have obsequiously scraped or entrepreneurially lucked their way to the chief executive’s office but they haven’t really got what it takes. This insight often comes with hindsight, when someone who had been hailed as the great white (and typically they are) hope goes off the rails and is shown to be flawed. This kind of post hoc rationalization of leadership is clearly unsatisfactory. We need concepts of leadership which not only encompass but put at their centre the fragile boundary many leaders tread with their dark sides. Leaders are, by definition, more narcissistic, prone to inflating their own importance and influence, and adept at dismissing doubts and doubters. Few leadership theories or theorists give proper account of such omnipresent qualities in the ranks of leaders (exceptions include Kets de Vries, 1993; 2001; Gronn, 1999).

My recent research has been focused on showing how the whole way the discourse of leadership is constructed perpetuates a particular ideology about what leadership looks like. It advances the tough, heroic performance as the entire category and, in so doing, maintains a particular set of power and social relations. The performance and production of leadership have political intent and effects, that is, the concentration of power. Leadership scholars and commentators have captured and coopted the language of leadership to render some aspects, such as physicality and sexuality, invisible and undiscussable and other aspects so banal as to appear benign: “toughness”, “commitment” and sacrifice of family.

Destination 4. My Organizational Work: Abdicating leadership or doing leadership differently?

Leadership was now exposed as a highly suspect construct, but one located within a broader managerial and corporate discourse that was going from strength to strength (Blackmore, 1999). How was I to position what I did? In my interviews with women leaders I would often come across those who simply refused to put themselves in the leadership category. Behind this refusal is a range of motivations from humility through to a more active rejection of leadership as too dripping with white patriarchy to even remotely associate with.

But do we just abandon the leadership domain to the huns of the Harvard Business Review, since it is such an authoritative discourse? In Doing Leadership Differently (Sinclair, 1998) I argue that scholars should not exit but be present in the territory in a much more critical way. For example, comparative studies of female versus male leaders should be eschewed because they only serve to further entrench the dominant assumptions and norms of leadership against which women are measured.

But how does one put critically reflective leadership into practice? Organizations provide opportunities, platforms and challenges that can teach one a great
deal about oneself as well as enable one's influence over others. In my experience this drew me into doing things I felt uneasy and uncomfortable about, as well as a lot of other things that were consummately time wasting but full of their own importance. These experiences can turn you into someone you don't recognize and someone you don't like. I found myself with a title and fulfilling "leadership" expectations but with the uneasy feeling that I had been coopted into a system endorsing values of competition, materialism and achievement at the cost of relationships. Perhaps I should be more blunt: organizations provide a revealing stage on which sides of yourself become exposed. In my case these include the desire for approval and the need to be liked, a fear of saying "no", a belief that I can control things, and my difficulty fitting in with the male team or being a team player. These have certainly got in the way of my "doing leadership differently". When I have caught sight of myself getting deeply sucked in, I have heard myself say, "I'll just do this for now or until I can resolve these pressing issues. The real me isn't far away, just in cold storage for a short time" (see also Limerick & Anderson, 1999).

Psychoanalytic writers have shown that among our earliest and most enduring paradoxical impulses are the desire to belong and the desire to be autonomous. The urge to belong and be included is so strong that it can induce behaviours and actions that otherwise seem out of character. At the same time, relinquishing too much of ourselves to the group threatens to extinguish our autonomy (Sinclair, 1995a). We engage in an endless dance of securing enough belonging while holding on to our uniqueness and autonomy. This seems to be a particularly tough task for women in organizations. The belonging is not taken for granted or easily earned. Sometimes everything I say or do seems to put people's (the men around me) backs up. Frequently, in the organizations of which I am a part I don't feel as if I belong and I suspect this is a common experience for women. On the other hand, the lure of belonging is an aphrodisiac for men and the women who find themselves accepted by the group, and it encourages a high level of conformity, as we have seen in the complicit silence against bad practice in boardrooms in Australia and the United States.

*Destination 5. The Death of Organization Woman*

In many ways I feel that I have steadily extricated myself from "a leadership role", really since about 1996. Before that, I was ramping up—full-time academic, newly appointed professor, on my way to positions of power and influence. My partner used to call me "Wonderwoman" and Organization Amanda was a bit like that—everything to everybody, doing it all. From the outside I was balancing academic leadership, career, family, etc. Inside, it wasn't a pretty picture.

In 1997, a year after my brother's death and with an unexpected but delightful new baby, I went "part time" (I use this idea of "part time" as a boundary, a protection, an excuse). Since that time I have steadily divested myself of as many activities as I can in the area of university and business school demands. I
resolutely try to ration myself to those very few opportunities where I think I can make a difference, change a situation for the better for people, provide some really useful new insights that will be heard. Now the Vice Chancellor no longer rings me up when he wants an extra person, or the required woman, for a committee. I say “I’m not available” to almost all the requests I get to sit on bodies and talk at things.

Does this mean I have opted out of leadership? Or am I doing leadership differently?

If we are to believe the leadership theorists, then change is the one key requirement of leadership. But to be able to envision and live change, one needs to go against standard leadership practice. This is one of the great paradoxes of leadership—that leaders (i.e. those with power and privilege in society) are probably in the worst position to be agents of change and, more importantly, to be leaders who change themselves.

Leadership is cast in much of the literature as a forward progression—a unidimensional “thrust” in the modernist directions of “growth”, “market dominance”, “expansion”. This unites leadership with the global capital agenda—leadership becomes a tool of capital’s advance. But from where I am standing, leadership of any value has a more complex stance towards change. Leaders should not be the unthinking agents of a corporate agenda but should use a variety of strategies to question, reshape, perhaps even undermine that agenda. There are times when leadership requires reactions of resistance and detachment, subversion and antagonism. Heifetz (1997) argues the value of leaders who remove themselves by “getting up on the balcony” and not necessarily protecting their organizations from necessary crises nor from conflict (Heifetz & Linsky, 2002). In the interests of real transformative change, leaders may need to adopt tactics such as resistance and subversion (Bradshaw & Wicks, 1997). Sometimes just being different and holding against pressures to fit the expected leadership performance can constitute leadership. Admitting to not having answers, to needing time or the opportunity to seek counsel are examples of this kind of passive resistance. Recasting leadership to include oppositional and conflict strategies is also a way to avoid the shortcomings of much of the “women in leadership” literature. Although there is some excellent research on feminist organization and leadership (see for example Martin, 1989; Ferree & Martin, 1995), much of the managerially oriented work ends up colluding with the stereotypical view of women as all-collaborative, conflict-avoiding, endlessly empathic and, in the end, ineffectual. When I came upon these idealistic lists of “how women lead”, my heart sank. My own practice was very far from this ideal, but nor do the lists capture the complex and multifaceted leadership of women I admire.

Destination 6. Looking for Inspiration for Unconventional Leadership

Equipped with a focus on leaders who do real change, including unsettling institutions and changing themselves, I set out looking for inspiration in
different places. I have found much to observe and admire in the approach and strategies of Christine Nixon, the Victorian Police Commissioner who happens to be the first women to lead a large police force in either Australia or the United States. I had been in the Chief Commissioner’s Office before under her two predecessors—forbidding, silent, wood panelled places with rows of photos of serious men in uniform. Secretaries were hunched and submissive, security arrangements tightly controlled. When I arrived on the top floor under Christine’s leadership, the atmosphere was dramatically different: a lot of chat and laughter, open doors, many people coming and going. Nixon’s leadership is not designed to terrify people with her status and authority—yet she is very direct on matters that count. She has faith in her own instincts and a sense of humour about herself. I watch as people routinely underestimate her and reveal their own inadequacies in this underestimation. I also watch as others grow with her trust in them. When asked in her job interview by the Premier what her vision for the police was, she answered that she didn’t know, she would first want to talk to police members, the community and other stakeholders. Volunteering that she didn’t have the answer to the inevitable vision question is an example of Nixon’s leadership, but she brings her integrity and intuition to knowing how to move forward in difficult or ambiguous situations. Don’t be afraid to be yourself—Christine’s example has taught me this.

Another source of inspiration has been some work investigating Aboriginal leadership with my co-researcher Lillian Holt, former Director of the Centre for Indigenous Education at the University of Melbourne. While I would not want to stereotype or impose a false unity on Aboriginal leaders, I have observed some impressive and unconventional leadership in this research. Qualities include a readiness to speak directly and with emotion, a respect for silence and listening (fewer words, more impact) and a strong belief in the value of historical and cultural meanings. Lillian herself has taught me a lot, again with her own example. In her case as in others, leadership is often about resisting the expectations of institutions and not conforming to standardized ideas of what leaders and managers do—as she describes it, organizations are very adept at “stealing your spirit”. Rather, the emphasis should be on new ways to provide leadership: disturbing complacency, confronting difficult issues and saying the unsayable. Lillian has also—gently and tactfully—helped me take a tour of my own whiteness—and the unexamined and assumed privilege that come with being white in Australian society—that has only just begun.

Despite the absorbing research journey that I have described, I continue to feel the power of the leadership canon. I have fallen on more than one of the “handbooks of leadership”, thinking, “Here is the answer; I could just prescribe this as a text and then my students would feel content that they knew about leadership without any of my contortions.” The educational context and requirement to “teach” leadership continue to challenge our capacity to put critically reflective theorization into practice.
Destination 7. Within

The journey I have described has swept me along on a wave of ostensible leadership success. But all the time I have been conscious of the risk that, in any even partially successful mobilization of a critique on the edge of leadership, I was probably rendering the canon more robust. Enlarging leadership theory to encompass critique makes it all the more resistant to demolition.

In 2003, I took a year's leave with an official agenda of sabbatical but more accurately a desire to stop and allow space for other possibilities to emerge for me. Part of this year was spent qualifying as a yoga teacher, and this has drawn me to new destinations—Eastern philosophies that maintain that the source for leadership lies within. The path of going inwards and finding new opportunities for growth reminds us that we are not our jobs and that we can begin to learn again about taken-for-granted phenomena.

So leadership now, for me, has got less and less to do with the organizational route. I want to take leadership out of the organizational context and put it in the life context. My experience of striking out into new territories has resonated for others and reinforced my conclusion that leadership can take surprising forms. The contribution I can make as a leader is to encourage people, especially those who might not have had lots of opportunities, to grow and take risks. Women are particularly responsive to this, because they are unlikely to have been asked to think of themselves as leaders or to reflect on their own leadership practice (Limerick & Heywood, 1993; Limerick, Heywood & Ehrich 1995). If I think about where I might have made a difference, it is not in the committees or the meetings, it is in the classroom, in relationships with students and managers, in my writing and in specifically offering a couple of ideas that have opened up new ways of seeing for people.

My recent thinking has also included going back, facing and unpacking the parts of my self that I was so desperate to leave behind and out of the picture of the successful professor. Valerie Hall (1996) in her research with female principals also found that women sought to make their leadership an extension of self rather than to enact an inflated or overly manufactured self in the leadership role. An important part of refinding lost or marginalized selves can include, for women, one's identity as a woman. We have failed if, to demonstrate leadership, we have lost connection with our gender and sexual identity. How do women bring their sense of womanliness, femaleness and sexuality into the way they lead? It is nothing as overt as dress or body language (Sinclair 1995c; 1998). But I believe this leadership implies an integrity of values and practices, a sense of the whole person (not a disembodied intellect or a single agent without family or responsibilities), a sense of ownership of the privileges of one's race or class. Leadership for me grows out of seeking to understand the impact of these things on the way we do our jobs, influence others and go about our lives.

In practice for me, working towards this integrity of self involves not allowing my own instincts about what is important to get swamped by bureaucratic demands or extinguished by the exhaustion of trying to do everything. I need to
accept that I am not good at many things and to support others in doing these things. My contribution is to not become trapped by institutional pressures, to not go into camouflage, to get reduced in what I do by the urgent, but profoundly trivial clutter that occupies much of organizational life.

This going-inward stage of the journey is packed with its own hazards. I start to sound very new-age, like those reconstructed life coaches who’ve seen the light and preach, with audacious vacuity, discovery of the inner self. The postmodernists are sensibly sceptical of the illusion of a single authentic identity, and all of us juggle and have imposed on us multiple and conflicting identities, some privileged, others marginalized. On the other hand, to have too big a gulf between the self we are outside work and the self-as-leader has always felt to me like a dangerous place to be. Leadership is an extension of self and when the work one does as a leader starts to feel like someone else’s overcoat, then it’s time to reassess.

Conclusion

Leadership, as we understand it in contemporary societies and organizations, is undoubtedly a white, male idea, a motif manufactured and embroidered by managerial elites to legitimize habits and advance their interests. An important part of leadership scholarship and, I would argue, the practice of leadership is to critique and subvert imposed and received notions of leadership. As Blackmore argues, “The lens of privilege … requires women in leadership to consider their position, to better understand how and why they came to be in that position and how they can use that position to challenge and transform exclusive images of leadership into more inclusive ones” (1995, p. 35).

Finding a space for leading, given these concerns and constraints, is no easy task. As others have researched and written about powerfully, it is challenging indeed to pursue a path and a practice that recognizes and usefully engages with the structural constraints of societies and organizations but still finds ways of empowering oneself and others. Nevertheless there are people, and particularly women, working at these frontiers of innovative leadership practice, and I have cited two examples here. Scholarship and learning will be made richer by casting the net for leadership exemplars in radically different places.

My journey around leadership has left me with little appetite to participate in the conventional debate about, or schooling in, leadership. In too many accounts, leaders are treated as the given who sit above the dramatic processes of change that they set in train for their organization. In my view, leaders are not leaders if they are immune from personal change themselves. I have also tried to resist a scholarly temptation in this article—to mount a critique of leadership that is theoretically robust but dry and unencumbered by the emotions that are at the heart of our attachments to leaders and our own aspirations to leadership. For this is to fall into another discourse—not as hegemonic, but repressive in its own way.
Rather I hope that some contribution may be made by my writing about leadership in a way that resists the objectified, disembodied, de-gendered and positivist tradition of the vast bulk of leadership research. The account I have offered here may be judged too personal a narrative but I have sought to build theorization from reflexivity. My intention is to be in the leadership space, as chronicler and sometime participant, in an owned and critically reflective way, showing that it is what is left out of most leadership accounts that is most deserving of our attention.
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