

# Make me authentic, but not here: Reflexive struggles with academic identity and authentic leadership

Tomkins, L. and Nicholds, A.

**Author post-print (accepted) deposited by Coventry University's Repository**

**Original citation & hyperlink:**

Tomkins, L. and Nicholds, A. (2017) Make me authentic, but not here: Reflexive struggles with academic identity and authentic leadership. *Management Learning*, volume (in press)  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1350507616684267>

DOI 10.1177/1350507616684267

ISSN 1350-5076

ESSN 1461-7307

Publisher: SAGE

**Copyright © and Moral Rights are retained by the author(s) and/ or other copyright owners. A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge. This item cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the copyright holder(s). The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.**

**This document is the author's post-print version, incorporating any revisions agreed during the peer-review process. Some differences between the published version and this version may remain and you are advised to consult the published version if you wish to cite from it.**

Management Learning

**Make Me Authentic, But Not Here: Reflexive Struggles with Academic Identity and Authentic Leadership**

Journal:	<i>Management Learning</i>
Manuscript ID	MLQ-15-0044.R4
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	authenticity, resistance, teacher-leader, Leadership, Reflexivity, Identity
Abstract:	<p>This paper presents a reflexive auto-ethnography of the experience of teaching authentic leadership (AL) to MBA students. It traces parallels between the challenges of AL and the challenges of academic identity work, grounded specifically in the experience of having to teach something one does not fully endorse. Both AL and academic identity work emerge as struggle - riddled with false starts, best intentions and self-deception, and entwined in the politics of pragmatism, idealism, ambition and survival. The subject position of the mature entrant to academia who is also an 'early career scholar' is likened to an awkward adolescent, experimenting with shades of independence/dependence, resistance/compliance and voice/silence. Based on these reflections, having AL on the curriculum involves a particular kind of identity regulation for students and academics alike, running counter to philosophical notions of authenticity as striving for one's own way in the world. Authentic leadership will only flourish in the business school if academics muster the courage to acknowledge its relevance for our own role as teacher-leaders, rather than simply teaching or writing to its abstract, ideological appeal.</p>

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Make Me Authentic, But Not Here:  
Reflexive Struggles with Academic Identity and Authentic Leadership**

**Abstract**

This paper presents a reflexive auto-ethnography of the experience of teaching authentic leadership (AL) to MBA students. It traces parallels between the challenges of AL and the challenges of academic identity work, grounded specifically in the experience of having to teach something one does not fully endorse. Both AL and academic identity work emerge as struggle - riddled with false starts, best intentions and self-deception, and entwined in the politics of pragmatism, idealism, ambition and survival. The subject position of the mature entrant to academia who is also an 'early career scholar' is likened to an awkward adolescent, experimenting with shades of independence/dependence, resistance/compliance and voice/silence. Based on these reflections, having AL on the curriculum involves a particular kind of identity regulation for students and academics alike, running counter to philosophical notions of authenticity as striving for one's own way in the world. Authentic leadership will only flourish in the business school if academics muster the courage to acknowledge its relevance for our own role as teacher-leaders, rather than simply teaching or writing to its abstract, ideological appeal.

**Key words**

Authenticity; leadership; teacher-leader; identity; reflexivity; existentialism; resistance

## Setting the Scene

This paper is a reflexive exploration of some of the complexities of working with authentic leadership (AL) in management learning. This work began as a theoretical critique of the construct of AL, based on a thematic analysis of a group of MBA students' apparent resistance to a course which I (first author) was involved in teaching. Over time, this has evolved into an auto-ethnographic reflection on the implications of teaching something one does not fully endorse, and the disconcerting ways in which the challenges of authenticity are entangled with the choices we make about how we invest our energies. I hope to show how teaching something which runs counter to one's beliefs, or at least, instincts, is more than a 'local difficulty' of workload-management and unlucky scheduling; it highlights the vulnerability and elusiveness of authenticity in our own role as teacher-leaders, and the potential for hypocrisy when we teach authentic leadership to our students.

The paper concerns academic identity, so I provide some autobiographical detail to position myself in relation to certain discourses and experiences of selfhood. I am a mature entrant to academia, having spent many years in the management consulting sector before deciding to do a PhD in organisational psychology and try to forge a second career as a university scholar. In terms of my academic positioning, I am in that apprenticeship stage known, in the UK at least, as the period of the 'early career scholar'. I am also a woman.

My corporate background is in 'blue chip' companies with a 'high performance culture' and an 'up or out' policy for performance management. I think I was relatively successful in this world, and I certainly appreciate the skills of planning, management and stakeholder engagement that I developed there. However, it was a world where there was little time or space to reflect on something just because it was interesting; it felt like everything had to be for a *purpose*. Thus, one of the ironies of framing my academic identity struggles in terms of 'authenticity' is that my plucking up the courage to leave corporate life to spend time thinking and writing about the issues that really matter to me was a search for greater authenticity.

My PhD and much of my research draw on phenomenology and existentialism to explore the experiential complexities of organisation. I am drawn to writers who suggest that our organisations might be better places if we acknowledged the messy realities of the human beings who populate them, rather than trying to encapsulate human experiences into prescriptions for organisational performance, denying their contradictions and anxieties. I see phenomenology and existentialism as powerful frameworks for exploring such mess, but I also appreciate ideas from psychoanalysis, critical social psychology and post-structuralism. I am

1  
2  
3 hopeful about the potential for the best of human beings to emerge in their relationship with  
4 work and career, but suspicious about approaches which make this seem too easy or  
5 idealistic, for instance, in much of the Positive Organisational Scholarship (POS) movement.  
6  
7 Because of all this, one of the concepts I write about is 'authenticity' - a core concern in  
8  
9 existentialism, phenomenology and other philosophies of mess.

10  
11  
12 However, the connections between these autobiographical factors and my approach to  
13 teaching AL have emerged only gradually over the course of the work presented in this paper.  
14  
15 Initially, I had little sense of either experiential or theoretical connections between authentic  
16 leadership and academic identity work. Instead, the catalyst for this paper was that a  
17 leadership module which I taught received poor student feedback. I remember being  
18 disappointed, because I had taught other modules with this particular group of students, which  
19 had been received more positively. So, with university ethics approval, I asked the students  
20 whether they would be willing to be interviewed by me to get a greater understanding of their  
21 experiences. Five students agreed to an interview - three men and two women. All were  
22 British nationals, with ages ranging between early 30s and late 40s. All were in full-time  
23 employment and studying for the MBA part-time.

24  
25  
26 I include this biographical snapshot of the students to help contextualise my discussions with  
27 them. However, this paper does not present data from these interviews as a formal thematic  
28 synthesis of a complete data-set (although I did attempt this in an earlier draft). Rather,  
29 fragments from the interviews are used to reveal the students' dislike of this module and their  
30 attempts to make sense of it. These are then used as springboards for reflexive analysis of  
31 what their reactions might mean for my own authenticity and identity, and how they might be  
32 speaking to theoretical as well as experiential connections between these two concepts. The  
33 intention is to develop a 'reflexive ethnography' as an interweaving of perspectives of both  
34 author and subjects (Ellis, 2004).

35  
36  
37 Crucially, the interweaving of perspectives also involves a particular kind of dialogical  
38 reflexivity, in that the 'I' who is revealed in this paper is the product of conversations between  
39 myself (first author) and my colleague (second author). She is also a mature entrant to  
40 academia and 'early career scholar', and this biographical similarity supports a dialogical  
41 reflexivity which draws on the metaphor of the mirror (Finlay, 2003; Merleau-Ponty, 1968).  
42 Through the mirror, conversations with a concrete other develop into a conversation with self-  
43 as-other (Thomas and Davies, 2005), encouraging a more critical engagement with first person  
44 experience. [She] was not involved in teaching the module in question, and her relative  
45 detachment enabled a dialogical reflexivity not dissimilar to the mirroring function of the  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 therapist, that is, as a facilitator of my reflections. Dialogical reflexivity notwithstanding, I use  
4 the first person singular throughout this paper because, for me, the surprises and discomforts  
5 of this self-exposure require that I commit fully to the 'I' of this story.  
6  
7

8  
9 The paper is structured around two conceptual anchors, identity and authenticity. It begins  
10 with examples from the literature on identity in general and academic identity in particular.  
11 This leads to an overview of identity work in the classroom, and the ways in which reflection on  
12 our own identity as academics requires a sustained commitment to reflexivity to bridge the gap  
13 between the institutional worlds we critique and the institutional worlds we inhabit, especially in  
14 our role as teacher-leaders.  
15  
16  
17

18  
19 The second anchor is the concept of authenticity and its operationalisation as 'authentic  
20 leadership' (AL). A broad distinction is drawn between 'mainstream' definitions (associated  
21 with POS and/or the use of statistically-based instruments such as questionnaires) and 'critical'  
22 definitions (tending towards qualitative rather than quantitative approaches, and more  
23 concerned with inspiring reflection than with developing models). This distinction is, of course,  
24 a gross simplification, but it helps to navigate the competing interpretations of authenticity and  
25 the various claims made for its significance for leadership.  
26  
27  
28  
29

30  
31 From my autobiographical pen-portrait, it will be clear that, in my research at least, I myself  
32 lean towards critical philosophical understandings of authenticity. However, what will emerge  
33 over the course of this paper is that my own identity and authenticity work is more complex and  
34 unreliable than this positioning implies. The paper exposes and problematises this unreliability  
35 in relation to themes of identity prescription, resistance, experimentation and constructions of  
36 the 'real world', before concluding with reflections on the prospects for authenticity in  
37 management learning.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

### 43 **A Turn to Identity**

44  
45  
46 Identity has established itself as a key construct in the social and management sciences,  
47 stimulating a 'turn to identity' in organisation studies (Alvesson et al., 2008). Research has  
48 flourished on occupational, managerial and professional identities, and the ways in which  
49 these operate within and between personal and social domains (Ashforth and Mael, 1989).  
50 Issues of selfhood have been framed in terms of identity work (Watson, 2008), identity struggle  
51 (Sveningsson and Alvesson, 2003), identity insecurity (Knights and Clarke, 2014) and identity  
52 undoing (Nicholson and Carroll, 2013a), focusing on how these unfold within the power  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 relations of institutional life, and the notion that the self is a target for regulation and control  
4 (Alvesson and Willmott, 2002).  
5  
6

7  
8 A relatively recent development in this turn is the focus on the identity of the academic (Ford et  
9 al., 2010; Knights and Clarke, 2014). Amongst the academic identity positions that have been  
10 traced are Learmonth and Humphreys' (2011) purist versus careerist selves. The purist-self  
11 values knowledge for its own sake and sees academic work as an expression of one's moral  
12 and aesthetic concerns. The careerist-self, on the other hand, is calculating and pragmatic;  
13 this self teaches with a view to getting good feedback and writes in order to get published, both  
14 of which attract institutional approval. In a similar vein, Ford et al. (2010) discuss the idealised  
15 identity to which academics aspire as a 'hero self', bringing wisdom into the lives of lesser  
16 mortals. This version of selfhood is threatened by the demands of the administrator-self,  
17 whose energies are deployed in the service of making academic institutions tick. In making  
18 sense of their various selves, academics seem to move "swiftly between subject positions,  
19 their voices...lifting with ebullient joyfulness as they talked about research and falling into  
20 depressed cadences as they talked about administrative responsibilities" (Ford et al., 2010:78).  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

28  
29 Of particular relevance for management learning are experiences of identity in the classroom.  
30 For instance, Ford et al. (2010) report discomfort at their own ability to move easily in and out  
31 of critical and non-critical subject positions in their teaching, as they variously don and discard  
32 their metaphorical as well as their literal business suits. Insecurities appear to flourish in  
33 development settings, creating space for identities which are sanctioned institutionally to be  
34 promoted, even compelled (Gagnon, 2008). This applies to teachers as well as students, and  
35 we should not imagine ourselves immune from the sorts of pressures faced by those we  
36 instruct (Ashcraft and Allen, 2009). Indeed, Reedy (2008) argues that identity work amongst  
37 academics and participants in development programmes is interdependent. Thus, critical self-  
38 reflection is required to explore the ways in which identities are constituted, resisted, defended  
39 and reinforced within relationships between teachers and students.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46  
47 Much of this emphasis on critical self-reflection is linked to the concept of reflexivity. Cunliffe  
48 (2009) considers self- and critical-reflexivity vital to the identity of the academic as teacher. In  
49 this view, self-reflexivity involves a "dialogue-with-self about our fundamental assumptions,  
50 values, and ways of interacting" (Cunliffe, 2009:98), whereas critical-reflexivity incorporates a  
51 political dimension in examining the discourses and assumptions about the topics we teach.  
52 This work connects to a rich seam of theorisations of reflexivity in the fields of sociology and  
53 ethnography, which acknowledge both the personal and the political in the way we construct  
54 and absorb knowledge (Latour, 1988; Pollner, 1991).  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 Within management learning, I interpret the call for reflexivity as the need to cast a critical light  
5 on the ways in which our own identity work is intimately entangled both with that of our  
6 students, and with the demands and expectations of institution - both real and imagined. Such  
7 reflexive self-awareness is perhaps especially relevant in the context of leadership  
8 development for, in many ways, our role as teachers *is* a leadership role. Like it or not, as  
9 teacher-leaders we role-model the tussles of 'leadership'.

### 14 15 **A Turn to Authenticity**

16  
17  
18 In recent work in this space, there have been hints of a relationship between academic identity  
19 and the notion of authenticity. For instance, Cunliffe (2009) highlights the importance of  
20 reflexive self-awareness for both the teacher-leader and the authentic leader. Ford et al.  
21 (2010) consider authenticity in connection with the subject positioning of mature entrants to  
22 academia; a career in industry can lend weight to claims for legitimacy as a teacher of  
23 management studies. Humphreys (2005) invokes authenticity in relation to the mundanity of  
24 auto-ethnographic data from academia; if something is mundane, it must be real and therefore  
25 authentic.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

31  
32 To date, however, connections between academic identity work and authentic leadership have  
33 been suggested, but not elaborated. That academic identity work might invoke issues of  
34 authenticity has an intuitive resonance, because the concept of authenticity is generally  
35 'tethered' to identity (Ladkin and Spiller, 2013) and connections have been traced between  
36 authenticity, legitimacy and expertise (Goffee and Jones, 2013). Thus, authenticity may be an  
37 interesting framing for reflection on the identity struggles of the academic, particularly in  
38 relation to the authenticity of the teacher-leader.  
39  
40  
41  
42

43  
44 Authenticity draws attention to who a leader *is* - whether framed in terms of identity, character,  
45 personality, or any other construct of selfhood. As theories of transformational leadership have  
46 been scrutinised for their apparent absence of morality and their problematic emphasis on  
47 charisma (Tourish, 2013; Yukl, 1999), authentic leadership has gained traction as a powerful  
48 alternative (Bass and Steidlmeier, 2004). Authentic leaders are said to be self-aware and self-  
49 regulating individuals, whose beliefs and behaviours are anchored by a commitment to their  
50 'true self' (Avolio and Gardner, 2005). They role-model their personal convictions, maintaining  
51 consistency between inward beliefs and outward behaviours. From this 'mainstream'  
52 perspective, AL's core features have been encapsulated in the Authentic Leadership  
53 Questionnaire (ALQ) (Walumbwa et al., 2008). This defines AL as comprising four dimensions  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 - self-awareness, relational transparency, balanced processing and an internalised moral  
4 perspective.<sup>i</sup>  
5  
6

7 AL has been associated with a range of organisational benefits, including job performance  
8 (Walumbwa et al., 2008), openness of organisational culture (Hoy and Henderson, 1983) and  
9 increased employee commitment (Jensen and Luthans, 2006). For leaders, AL is associated  
10 with enhanced psychological well-being (Toor and Ofori, 2009) and sense of ethical purpose  
11 (Walumbwa et al., 2008). Indeed, so much faith is placed in authenticity that it is posited as  
12 the root for all positive forms of leadership, including transformational, charismatic, servant and  
13 spiritual approaches (Avolio and Gardner, 2005).  
14  
15  
16  
17

18  
19 From a more 'critical' perspective, AL's construction of the self is the subject of critique (Ladkin  
20 and Spiller, 2013; Shaw, 2010). 'Mainstream' AL tends to see the person as self-contained  
21 and self-controlled - a master of one's own reactions and of how these are presented to others.  
22 This view emphasises relatively stable character traits, clustered around a sense of  
23 psychological centredness - the anchor of the 'true self'. In post-modern conceptions of  
24 selfhood, however, the self is seen as fluid and contingent. Thus, there is no single core self  
25 for authenticity to be true to (Guignon, 2004).  
26  
27  
28  
29

30  
31 Instead, critical AL scholars invoke a model of selfhood which unfolds and evolves in  
32 relationship with the world and with others. For instance, Nicholson and Carroll (2013b)  
33 discuss authenticity as a social value, emphasising the role of dialogue in making sense of  
34 who we are. Taylor (2013) focuses on the vulnerability and self-exposure of authenticity,  
35 which necessarily unfurl within the context of relationship. Ford and Harding (2011) suggest  
36 that authenticity is invoked in intersubjective recognition and the ongoing negotiation between  
37 self and other. Thus, critical reflections on AL continue to see authenticity as 'tethered' to  
38 issues of identity, but these are viewed as intersubjective and fluid, rather than solipsistic or  
39 static.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46  
47 Pulling these threads together, this paper is located at the intersection of the 'turns' to identity  
48 and authenticity. Theoretically, my instincts towards these two anchors are consistent in that I  
49 see both as characterised by instability and contingency, rather than encapsulation and  
50 reification. However, it feels important to emphasise that the connections between authentic  
51 leadership and academic identity might not have emerged had it not been for the fact (a) that  
52 the module I was teaching was about 'authentic leadership', and (b) that it consisted of a mix of  
53 'mainstream' and more 'critical' elements, drawing on the breadth of AL definitions outlined in  
54 the literature review above (see Appendix A). It is the students' reactions to the content and  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2 approach of this module - and to me as teacher-leader - that ground this paper in the  
3 interstices of academic identity and authenticity.  
4  
5  
6

### 7 **Prescribed and Sanctioned Identities**

8  
9  
10 Several of the students I interviewed explicitly mentioned the notion of identity in their critique  
11 of the module. They disliked the way in which AL felt like a prescription for identity, because  
12 this made them feel as if they were being preached at. The thrust of this is captured in a  
13 discussion with Charles (a pseudonym):  
14  
15  
16

17  
18 *Charles: "I really disliked the whole idea of this course. No offense! [laughs] It*  
19 *seemed like we moved away from business and um...leadership...and into*  
20 *something else."*

21  
22 *Interviewer: "Something else?"*

23  
24 *Charles: "Yeah, not sure what...Some kind of moral preaching. I kind of*  
25 *resented that."*

26  
27 *Interviewer: "So, you said you resented being preached at?"*

28  
29 *Charles: "Yeah. Yeah."*

30  
31 *Interviewer: "And this wasn't the case on other modules?"*

32  
33 *Charles [long pause]: "Perhaps...I mean there was a bit of that on...what was it*  
34 *called, 'Business ethics'? 'Ethical leadership'? But that was different, I guess.*  
35 *I mean, you can do ethics without having to believe in it! Don't tell anyone!*  
36 *[laughs] But I don't think you can do authenticity in that sense."*  
37  
38

39  
40 Initially, I interpreted this and other similar reactions specifically in relation to the AL construct.  
41 I reflected on how it was not all that surprising that AL might stimulate a different kind of  
42 response from those topics with a more 'doing' flavour (such as the Research Methods course  
43 I had taught for the same group of students). If identity issues were being invoked in the  
44 context of pre-determined items on a questionnaire, it was perhaps to be expected that some  
45 students would react against being told who they were supposed to be.  
46  
47  
48

49  
50 I connected these reflections with the critique from existentialist scholars who argue that AL's  
51 fundamental flaw is that it relies on the dimensions of authenticity being defined by someone  
52 else. As Lawler and Ashman (2012:337) suggest, the "values imposed by others are  
53 necessarily alienating". From an existentialist perspective, authenticity has to be grasped as a  
54 personal project, even whilst it unfolds within the relational context of our engagements with  
55 the world. If authenticity is packaged into a questionnaire, it assumes the normative status of  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 'best practice', which takes us away from, rather than towards, authenticity in an existentialist  
4 sense (Tomkins and Simpson, 2015).  
5  
6

7 From this perspective, the prescribing and packaging of 'leadership' itself may be problematic,  
8 in that *any* codification of experience into a framework or model would compromise a person's  
9 efforts to develop his/her own stance towards the world and its possibilities. Models and  
10 templates imply a pre-determined solution to the leadership problem, and thereby undermine a  
11 person's ongoing efforts to work on his/her own way of dealing with the challenges of seniority,  
12 responsibility and relationships within the workplace. There is a special irony, of course, in the  
13 idea that the template for AL (of all things) might encourage us away from, rather than towards,  
14 authenticity in this philosophical sense.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

20  
21 Over time, however, I moved beyond such theoretical reflections about what the students'  
22 reactions said about AL, and towards more critically reflexive considerations about what they  
23 might also be saying about my own relationship with authenticity. I started to wonder whether  
24 it was not just the students who did not enjoy having their identity prescribed and sanctioned  
25 for them. Perhaps what the students were also picking up was a certain discomfort on my part  
26 with having to deliver this teaching in this particular way.  
27  
28  
29  
30

31  
32 In my willingness to teach this module, which included definitions of AL with which I had little  
33 affinity, I seemed to be bracketing my purist-self to perform the role of administrator-self. This  
34 meant approaching the task with the criterion of efficiency and a desire to help keep the  
35 institutional 'show on the road'. As I reflect back, I think the residual influence of corporate  
36 demands not to be seen as 'difficult' allowed me to suppress my distaste for using authenticity  
37 as a leadership template. I did not want to 'rock the boat' by being one of those academics  
38 who departmental heads consider 'stropy' or 'precious' when they refuse to teach a course  
39 which is incongruent with their research orientations.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

45  
46 In the university in question, great store was placed in the notion of 'consistency of student  
47 experience'. This idea was used to explain the need for every teacher to focus on meeting  
48 these (and only these) learning objectives, cover this (and only this) content, and thereby  
49 create the same 'student experience', irrespective of who was teaching a session and during  
50 which academic year. This emphasis on consistency originated because several  
51 undergraduate courses were attended by hundreds of students (and therefore taught by  
52 different teachers in parallel seminars), but it had spread to courses with fewer students, too  
53 (such as this MBA). Consistency had become synonymous with quality, and was justified in  
54 terms of pedagogic fairness.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 Challenging this instruction to deliver consistency would have been difficult, because the  
5 sanctioned identity of the academic - the 'perfect employee' of the business school - is surely  
6 the efficient, agreeable professional rather than the stropic plaintiff. The echoes of my  
7 corporate career make the 'perfect employee' and its close relation, the 'good corporate  
8 citizen', very poignant, particularly in combination with the label of 'early career scholar', aware  
9 of my position on a low(ish) rung of the academic ladder.  
10  
11  
12

13  
14  
15 Indeed, I think identity work is especially complex for those of us who are both mature entrants  
16 to academia and 'early career scholars', i.e., both experienced and inexperienced. Drawing on  
17 Harter's (2012) developmental view of authenticity, I wonder whether this particular  
18 combination of subject positions is akin to that of the adolescent, who *both* wants to be  
19 independent, speak his/her own mind and prove what he/she is capable of *and* faces constant  
20 reminders from the world that he/she is not yet a full member of the adult club. If adolescence  
21 is a cauldron for authenticity struggle (Harter, 2012), involving honing and questioning of one's  
22 opinions and instincts, then this might be a vivid metaphor for the identity and authenticity  
23 ambivalences of the mature entrant/'early career scholar'. Just as school is a stage on which  
24 the drama of adolescent authenticity is enacted (Harter et al., 1997), so the business school  
25 may be providing a similar stage for the dramas of academic maturation.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

### 33 **Resistance and Compliance**

34  
35  
36 Despite attempts at 'good corporate citizenship', I think my ambivalence towards AL leaked out  
37 in ways that contributed to the students' dislike of this module. I wonder whether they were  
38 detecting a certain disengagement on my part, despite my sense of professionalism at the  
39 time. The academic literature would probably consider such disengagement as a form of  
40 'resistance', whereby resistance is a banner heading for a range of active and passive  
41 behaviours, encompassing hostility, disobedience, cynicism, avoidance and withdrawal  
42 (Gabriel, 1999). I also wonder whether interpretations of resistance may be especially prone  
43 to displacement and projection; for quite some time, I interpreted the students' interviews in  
44 terms of *their* resistance to AL, rather than something which exposed aspects of my *own*  
45 resistance...and/or lack thereof.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

53 Many of the most vibrant discussions of authenticity see resistance at the very heart of the  
54 concept (Guignon, 2004), with dilemmas of resistance/compliance thereby core to the notion of  
55 authentic leadership (Costas and Taheri, 2012). Indeed, the nature of authentic resistance  
56 provides one of the sharpest dividing lines between 'mainstream' and 'critical' approaches to  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 AL. The 'mainstream' image of the authentic individual resisting the forces that might corrupt  
4 is replaced in the 'critical' literature by a view of authenticity as intimately and inescapably  
5 entangled in the ambivalences of control and complicity, and crucially dependent on  
6 biographical, social and political context (Ladkin and Spiller, 2013). In this view, it becomes  
7 much harder to make clean, unequivocal distinctions between resistance and its alternatives.  
8 The resistance of authenticity may seem like opposition or rebellion from one angle and  
9 accommodation or withdrawal from another.

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15 An interesting aspect of the resistance of authenticity is the notion of voice. Earlier I suggested  
16 that the mature entrant/early career scholar' might be seen as a troubled adolescent, with  
17 authenticity struggle as a framing for the drama of maturation. The difficulties of adolescence  
18 involve the tendency - especially amongst girls - not to speak up for what one really thinks,  
19 feels or believes (Harter, 2012). Finding one's voice and overcoming gendered expectations  
20 about how 'feminine' it is to speak up are thus important markers of authenticity struggle. To  
21 speak up about my difficulties with this module would have involved overcoming gendered  
22 associations with acquiescence, as well as discourses of 'good corporate citizenship'.

23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29 Gardiner (2011) urges a multi-faceted engagement with the notion of voice in authenticity. For  
30 Gardiner's subjects, afraid of the possibility of attack if they spoke out and betrayed  
31 themselves by their own accents, authenticity is sometimes to be traced in the decision to keep  
32 quiet, for "silences...have a revelatory quality for our understanding of authenticity" (Gardiner,  
33 2011:103). Thus, choices over whether to stay quiet or speak up have a connection with  
34 authenticity which is contingent on one's place in the world, and the personal, societal and  
35 institutional politics influencing that place.

36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41 Perhaps it is no wonder that we usually protect ourselves from the fact and implications of our  
42 inclination to go with the flow of institutional life. I admit to a huge temptation to interpret my  
43 behaviour as an authenticity of pragmatism (Alvesson and Sveningsson, 2013), an authenticity  
44 of silence (Gardiner, 2011), an authenticity of counter-resistance (Kärreman and Alvesson,  
45 2009), or an authenticity of self-preservation (Costas and Fleming, 2009). I can also interpret  
46 my apparent disengagement in the classroom in terms of the rhetoric of experiential learning,  
47 whereby teachers can lapse into a 'laissez faire' approach for fear of disturbing students' own  
48 sense-making (Tomkins and Ulus, 2016). In short, I increasingly think that academic identity  
49 work may be a space for vibrant self-deception, because we have access to arguments that  
50 justify all sorts of behaviour if we need them to; and moreover, that deconstructing this power  
51 and urge to justify might just be a crucial aspect of one's own authenticity work.

## Spaces for Experimentation

One of the most startling ideas in the student interviews was that their dislike of this module seemed to shore up their adherence to more traditional, functionalist leadership approaches. Even though much of the module was based on 'mainstream' definitions of AL (Appendix A), there seems to have been enough of a sense of alternativeness to trigger a dislike of reflective and experiential approaches in general:

*Joanne: "It completely pushed me over the edge! I mean, I kind of went with it when we had to do those reflective diaries, was that what they were called? Even though I couldn't help thinking it was a waste of time. But with authentic leadership, that was too much! Just too much! [laughs]"*

Ashraf had been contemplating doing his MBA dissertation on a topic related to ethical leadership, but his dislike of AL has contributed to a change of heart, provoking a rejection of all the subjects perceived as 'soft' (which I interpret as a generic term for non-rigorous, often meaning non-scientific):

*Ashraf: "Can't wait to get back to economics now! A proper subject after all this soft stuff!"*

*Interviewer: "But you said you were thinking of doing something with ethics?"*

*Ashraf: "Yeah, yeah, but not any more! Not likely! [laughs]"*

My initial readings of passages like these focused on the students' apparent allowance for experimentation, dovetailing with the literature on the importance of experimentation in management learning (Petriglieri et al., 2011). I reflected on the significance of the notion that students have some sort of allowance for trialling new ideas or approaches, and that course designers should therefore try to use this 'window' wisely. These students had come into the MBA prepared to experiment a little, but if a topic does not chime, the shutters come down and they retreat into more functionalist, more traditional subject areas.

Harter (2012) suggests a fundamental connection between experimentation and authenticity, positing that the testing of various self-representations is a central feature of the adolescent struggle for an authentic sense of self. In this view, experimentation highlights the inherent instability of subject positions, creating anxiety and doubt about which might come closest to one's 'true self'. As she elaborates, a further difficulty may be that "experimentation with one's self-presentation across roles may be identified as hypocrisy by peers and thus met with

1  
2  
3 derision” (Harter, 2012:332). Thus, the experimentation of authenticity can be fraught both  
4 personally and interpersonally.  
5  
6

7  
8 Over time, I have come to believe that I was experimenting, too. Although my instincts were  
9 sceptical towards the packaging of leadership into AL, this was my intuition rather than a  
10 definitive, confident stance. Like an awkward adolescent, my views and opinions do ebb and  
11 flow in terms of their certainty and stability. I think I hoped I might be able to ‘teach myself  
12 into’ the topic. After all, my most enjoyable teaching experiences have provided an opportunity  
13 to explore my own uncertainties - my own ‘blind-spots’ - in a less threatening space than many  
14 other academic conversations. As Cortese (2005:108) suggests, “unlike learning through  
15 experience, learning through teaching involves the presence of a ‘third element’ (the pupil) who  
16 intervenes in the relationship between oneself and one’s own way of being and of acting within  
17 the organization”.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24 For both the students and myself, when our limits for experimentation were reached, there was  
25 a retreat to the familiar. The students retreated to more functionalist models of organisation  
26 and ‘proper subjects’ such as economics. I retreated to familiar subject positions of ‘good  
27 corporate citizen’ and ‘perfect employee’, which had felt relatively safe and reliable (if  
28 somewhat inauthentic) in my corporate career, and were now proving popular with university  
29 managers and administrators in my new career. We had all tried to work with ideas that felt  
30 different and uncomfortable, but been unable to create a learning space in which such  
31 discomfort could be acknowledged and explored productively.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 This notion of a retreat to familiarity chimes with Ford and Harding’s (2011) discussion of  
39 authenticity. They suggest that the capacity to handle both familiarity and strangeness is vital  
40 to any elaboration of AL which hopes to see leader and follower as fellow subjects, rather than  
41 subject/object. From this perspective, the authenticity of the subject can emerge only in  
42 relation to others in an “intersubjective dynamic in which the other whom the self meets is also  
43 a self, a subject in his or her own right, who is different and yet alike and is capable of sharing  
44 similar mental experiences” (Ford and Harding, 2011:471). A retreat to familiarity is a denial of  
45 strangeness and a denial of the other as subject. In a sense, therefore, I was ‘othering’ my  
46 students in my retreat to subject positions that were safe and sanctioned. This is extremely  
47 uncomfortable to acknowledge, given warnings against ‘othering’ managers (Reedy, 2008) and  
48 ‘mainstream’ colleagues (Ford et al., 2010), and the resultant diminishing of empathy, mutual  
49 recognition and - ironically - authenticity.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### The Problematic of the 'Real World'

Somewhat counter-intuitively, the familiar was also felt to be less 'real' than other spaces in which authenticity may thrive more readily. The students focused much of their critique on the notion that the module lacked credibility because it did not feel grounded in the 'real world':

*Ashraf: "I don't want to upset anyone, 'cause I know you have different skill-sets and stuff. But I couldn't stop myself thinking, who are you to tell me about this kind of thing?! You've never been anywhere near this stuff in the real world! [laughs] Sorry, I probably shouldn't have said that."*

AL will only resonate if learning conversations are based on a shared understanding of organisational life, that is, if they involve recognition of the difficulties of authenticity when one is enmeshed in delivery-focused institutional practices and priorities. Moreover, tensions between aspiration and reality emerge in the construction of AL as 'political correctness':

*Joanne: "It was like political correctness gone mad! No sense of what actually goes on in the real world!"*

Again, initially I interpreted these reactions specifically in relation to the AL construct. I reflected on how the students' responses seemed to reinforce authenticity as a worldly phenomenon (Bathurst and Cain, 2013) more powerfully than versions of AL which focus on immunity from situational pressures (Gardner et al., 2011) or control of self-presentation (Walumbwa et al., 2008). These students were locating the hunt for authenticity in the messy realities of their working lives, thereby reinforcing the suggestion that authenticity unfolds as struggle (Nyberg and Sveningsson, 2013). Such a view punctures the idealism of 'mainstream' AL, for if authenticity is fundamentally related to struggle and the politics of institution, it must surely be relative and contingent, not pure and absolute.

As I lingered with the data, however, I began to find it very disconcerting that the students were constructing the 'real world' as somewhere - anywhere - other than here in the classroom with me. The students' sense that the classroom was the space for anodyne 'political correctness' rather than honest engagement with the challenges of their working lives struck me especially forcibly because of my own identity as a mature entrant to academia. As someone who had 'been there, done that' in corporate life, surely the students could not be referring to *me* when they criticised the module and/or its teachers?! I *knew* these students, and had thought they



1  
2  
3 knew *me!* Had I not established my credentials as someone with a track record in industry  
4 who could therefore still make claims to belonging to the 'real world'?!

5  
6  
7 These reflections illuminate my tendency to stake a claim to a certain kind of credibility from  
8 having 'been there' (Ford et al., 2010). Perhaps I use my track record in corporate life as a  
9 shield against criticism in the classroom, and as a way of counterbalancing the insignificant  
10 'early career scholar' with a more impressive 'corporate leader'. However, by relying on what  
11 has happened 'over there', in the 'real world', and in the past, rather than on what is happening  
12 'in here', in the classroom, and in the present, I both contributed to these students' discomfort  
13 with the module and revealed some of my own.

14  
15  
16 Thus, there was a collective sense that this was not an authentic space. The students  
17 preserved a sense of the relevance of authenticity for their own 'real worlds', whilst I drew on  
18 my identity as a corporate practitioner and efficient course deliverer to survive this teaching  
19 and preserve the notion of authenticity for my research. Despite my theoretical allegiance with  
20 arguments for authenticity as the concrete particular rather than the abstract universal (Lawler  
21 and Ashman, 2012), I had only partially engaged with the concrete particular of the classroom.  
22 In short, this learning space was one in which the desire for authenticity was crowded out by  
23 the dynamics of identity sanction, strategies of coping and self-deception, a retreat to  
24 familiarity, and a displacement of authenticity to places other than this - whence the title of this  
25 paper - make me authentic, but not here.

### 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 **Prospects for Authenticity in Academia**

37  
38  
39 The theoretical contribution of this paper is to elaborate parallels between academic identity  
40 work and authentic leadership, and the ways in which both identity and authenticity unfurl in  
41 our relationships with others, both real and imagined, both institutional and interpersonal. As  
42 Ladkin and Spiller (2013) suggest, the core debates in the critical literature on AL concern the  
43 nature of the self and issues of performance, pragmatism, idealism, power, presence and  
44 relationality. If one were summarising the contemporary critical view of identity - academic  
45 identity, in particular - one might draw up a very similar list. Authenticity work and identity work  
46 have so much in common that the two bodies of literature on AL and academic identity would  
47 benefit from greater cross-fertilisation in future research.

48  
49  
50 Developing the concept of the teacher-leader might be one way to enhance our understanding  
51 of the parallels between academic identity and authentic leadership traced in this paper. There  
52 is a vibrant literature in primary and secondary education where the teacher-leader is one  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 whose sphere of influence operates both within and beyond the classroom, without having a  
4 formally appointed leadership position (Barth, 2004; York-Barr and Duke, 2004). Indeed,  
5 Lambert (2003:422) addresses many of the dilemmas of authenticity in suggesting that  
6 teacher-leaders “know themselves and their intentions enough so that they are not intimidated  
7 into silence by others. They are open to learning and understand the major dimensions of  
8 learning in schools: the learning of students, learning of colleagues, learning of self, learning of  
9 the community.”  
10  
11  
12

13  
14 I might not have seen these connections if I had remained working at a purely theoretical level.  
15 It is only through the increasing reflexivity of this analysis that I have become aware of the  
16 hideous ironies of my own identity and authenticity work. By attempting a “self-conscious  
17 relation with ‘self as other’ and with the subject positions offered in discourse” (Thomas and  
18 Davies, 2005: 687), I now believe that two types of packaging have taken me away from the  
19 authenticity that I write about in my research - the packaging of authenticity into AL and the  
20 packaging of me into the ‘perfect employee’, ‘good corporate citizen’, ‘mature entrant’ and  
21 ‘early career scholar’. It is quite shocking to acknowledge the difficulties of my own  
22 authenticity work, and only slightly reassuring to see others also admitting to finding academia  
23 more challenging than they had imagined it would be from the corporate side of the fence  
24 (Learmonth and Humphreys, 2011).  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 For many of us, it seems, the classroom is not the place for “the activist wing of CMS” (Reedy,  
34 2008:62). In principle, management learning ought to be where we have the greatest  
35 opportunity to influence corporate practitioners to be more critically reflexive about the  
36 interweaving of power and subjectivity in their organisational worlds. In practice, however,  
37 what we bring to these learning spaces is our own issues of power and subjectivity which, if  
38 unacknowledged or underestimated, mean that we can role-model compliance with subject  
39 positions of ‘good corporate citizenship’ and try to suppress any niggling feelings that things  
40 are not quite right. Framing these issues in terms of *authenticity* is perhaps one way of alerting  
41 ourselves to the risk and implications of role-modelling this kind of ‘leadership’.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48 When I taught this module, I took it for granted that I could not refuse to teach it (for fear of  
49 letting colleagues down, as well as gaining the ‘stropky’ label and using up valuable energy on  
50 battles I could not win). Nor could I secretly teach it differently from how it appeared on the  
51 module specification once the classroom doors were closed (for fear of compromising  
52 ‘consistency of student experience’, as well as a Kafkaesque fear of being caught out). The  
53 risks associated with taking a personal stance against what I felt was probably (but not  
54 definitely) a poorly-conceived module would have been enormous, in my imagination at least.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 It is disconcerting to realise how much I seem to have absorbed the challenge of an excessive  
5 workload as a personal problem for me to solve. I must have felt that it was my responsibility  
6 to do everything possible to manage my energy levels so that I could preserve some time and  
7 space for research, and that if I did not manage this, I would have had my poor 'time  
8 management' skills to blame. Spicer (2011) argues that such individualised responsibility is  
9 part of the contemporary 'authenticity trap', which nurtures an idealised notion of self and  
10 inevitably creates guilt that we have never managed to be good enough. As Spicer (2011:48)  
11 explains, "instead of personal authenticity connecting an individual with broader 'ideals' which  
12 are shared in a society, it pushes an individual back onto themselves". From this perspective,  
13 having 'authentic leadership' on the curriculum might be seen as a form of identity regulation  
14 (Alvesson and Willmott, 2002), for academics and students alike. The rhetoric of authenticity  
15 as an idealised project of selfhood seems to foster organisational conditions in which it is  
16 especially difficult to break out of the 'trap' of self-management and start holding our  
17 institutions to account.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

27 So, how might we try to influence university management to foster more satisfying student and  
28 academic experiences? It feels naïve to suggest this, but surely part of the problem is that  
29 many academics are simply too busy? If our workloads were not so crowded, we might have  
30 space to actually *enjoy* teaching, rather than feeling that the only sensible thing to do is get  
31 through it as efficiently and painlessly as possible in order to preserve a smidgeon of energy  
32 for research. Despite the impression I have probably created in this paper, I do actually *like*  
33 teaching. What I do not like is having to teach when I am so exhausted I can barely stand up;  
34 when students are asked for feedback in such a way that it reinforces their subject position as  
35 consumer; and when the curriculum consists of topics that are fashionable, with high  
36 ideological appeal and an implicit promise of delivering The Solution to whatever problems  
37 present. This does not feel like an environment in which any sort of authentic leadership is  
38 going to flourish.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

47 With the benefit of reflexive hindsight, it is not surprising that it should be specifically with AL  
48 that these dilemmas emerged, because AL is arguably the most fashionable, promise-laden  
49 topic currently on the business school curriculum (Nyberg and Sveningsson, 2013). If  
50 authenticity carries an imperative for political action (Guignon, 2004), then its politics are  
51 grounded in the institutions of academia as well as the corporate settings with which we more  
52 usually associate the notion of 'leadership'. We should not, therefore, be surprised to find AL  
53 evoking various intermingled forms of resistance, compliance and coping, and various  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 emotional fusions of anxiety, frustration and cynicism, amongst *all* the institutional players who  
4 are exposed to it.  
5  
6

7  
8 Some commentators suggest that authenticity might be introduced into leadership  
9 development without using the AL label (Cooper et al., 2005; Shaw, 2010). If we do use this  
10 label, I think we have to pay more explicit attention to its political and ideological dynamics.  
11 We could work with students on questions such as: Why is AL so popular with curriculum  
12 designers, if what we are experiencing here in the classroom is aversion to its preaching tone?  
13 Why do we keep hankering after recipes for leadership? Why does it feel so crucial for both  
14 teachers and students to establish their 'real world' credentials, and to resist 'softness' in  
15 discussions or performances of leadership? Such questions might enable discussion of the  
16 unattractive aspects of the authenticity discourse and the siren-call of self-fulfilment in the  
17 'authenticity trap'. But they are not easy questions, and it would take time, space and  
18 institutional support for us to take such risks with personal disclosure.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24  
25 Because of the wide range of definitions of AL, I think the course design we followed  
26 (Appendix A) created particular challenges. This combination of models, tools, reflection and  
27 discussion was undoubtedly an attempt to be integrative, that is, to allow space for both  
28 'mainstream' and 'critical' sensibilities and both theoretical and experiential approaches.  
29 However, I now think this combination of potentially incompatible elements (unproblematised  
30 as such a combination) created too much muddle for students and teachers alike. If the  
31 ontological and epistemological foundations of a particular course are as varied as they were  
32 here, I think we have to create space to surface this and discuss its implications with our  
33 students, without resorting to the inaccessible language of ontology and epistemology.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40  
41 One possibility is that we might avoid teaching 'mainstream', functionalist AL, i.e., if  
42 authenticity is invoked in connection with leadership, it could be an explicitly critical, reflective  
43 approach which does not rely on tools such as the ALQ. As a result of my experiences here, I  
44 now try to avoid not only the ALQ, but all instruments of self-encapsulation full-stop. Asking  
45 students to complete questionnaires feels easy and fun; it is a good time-filler; it supports the  
46 discourse of 'consistency of student experience'; and it has a quasi-scientific rigour. But how  
47 can we write about the philosophical absurdity of converting human experience into a checklist  
48 and expecting it to emerge as ethical or compassionate or authentic leadership, whilst going  
49 along with precisely this checklistification in our teaching? I draw only a little comfort from the  
50 existentialist argument that confronting one's own inauthenticity is an inescapable element of  
51 the authenticity journey (Tomkins and Simpson, 2015).  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### Webs As Yet Unspun

This paper has evolved in unexpected ways, and the story presented here is not the only one which could have been told. This is a reminder that authenticity is at stake in narrative (Shamir and Eilam, 2005; Sparrowe, 2005), where people spin “an authentic living story web when they integrate their past experiences, their future expectations, and their own potentiality for being a whole-Self while deconstructing their inauthentic selves” (Boje et al., 2013:272). Such living stories are not comprehensive factual accounts, and I have highlighted some aspects of my own politics of identity and authenticity at the expense of others.

For instance, the students’ laughter suggests they felt the need to temper their criticisms of the module and its teachers. Also, the fact that only a handful of students were prepared to be interviewed implies unease amongst subject positions of ‘good student’, ‘student as consumer’ and ‘honest research participant’. And of course, these particular students may or may not have held views that were representative of the class as a whole. As I outlined at the start, I have not used their data to present a formal thematic synthesis, but rather, to bring to life the notion that this reflexive auto-ethnography has emerged in and through relationship.

It is worth clarifying that I did not teach this module alone, and that my two co-teachers (Appendix A) did not want to be involved in any further investigations. A different story could well have been spun if the three of us had worked together to explore our identity struggles both inside and outside the classroom in the university in question. Instead, the relative detachment of a colleague (second author) who was *not* involved in this teaching has perhaps enabled a suspension of the defensiveness and/or competitiveness that can be felt amongst colleagues who work together, but may be reflecting separately on issues of performance, coping and compromise. However, it has not been easy to work with this dialogical reflexivity to develop and present this sense of self-as-other (Thomas and Davies, 2005), because the enhanced visibility of the one who looks into the mirror creates a certain invisibility for the one behind the mirror, and leaves a great deal of the reflexive experience tacit (Finlay, 2003).

This paper is also relatively quiet on gender. In reflecting on the academic as adolescent, I referred to Harter’s (2012) proposition and Gardiner’s (2011) implication that this might be especially relevant to women. There is more to be said about how perceptions of authenticity depend on whether leaders conform to gendered expectations (Eagly, 2005; Liu et al., 2015), and how gender may shape and reproduce academic identities (Harris et al., 1998). Gender may well expose further contradictions at the heart of the AL construct. For instance, authenticity carries masculine connotations in connection with the Enlightenment’s rational

1  
2  
3 subject (Gardiner, 2011), and it can also be feminine, especially when the discourses of  
4 authentic and caring leadership are interwoven (Tomkins and Simpson, 2015).  
5  
6

7 Relatedly, I have not explored the corporeality of these teaching, learning and research  
8 experiences. This would provide an interesting focus for future research, given depictions of  
9 AL as an embodied phenomenon (Guthey and Jackson, 2005; Taylor, 2013) and of  
10 management learning as the space for embodied encounters (Tomkins and Ulus, 2016). A  
11 starting point might be the proposition that the problems with both the packaging of authenticity  
12 into AL and the packaging of me into the 'good corporate citizen' arise directly from the  
13 absence of the body; for any sort of packaging surely privileges abstraction and sanitisation  
14 over the viscera of affective, corporeal and heart-felt experience.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

### 20 21 **Concluding Thoughts** 22 23

24 I have often heard it said that AL is a great topic to teach, because it is based on current, not  
25 outdated, research; it is popular with students; it invokes the nicer qualities of human beings;  
26 and it is easy to teach because it invites illustrations from personal experience, not necessarily  
27 requiring a track-record in corporate leadership. For me, however, teaching AL has exposed  
28 some extremely uncomfortable things about my attitudes towards authority, ambition and self-  
29 preservation, and the ways in which these unfurl in my relationships with other people, not  
30 least my students.  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 Nevertheless, I remain hopeful that authenticity can play some sort of role in the business  
37 school and in the working lives of institutional leaders. As Guignon (2004:161-162) suggests:  
38  
39

40 "One crucial reason why we value authenticity is because we believe that being  
41 authentic plays a fundamental role in nurturing and sustaining the kind of society in  
42 which something like authenticity as an ideal can be possible...To be fully authentic  
43 is to recognize the need to be constantly vigilant in one's society, to be engaged in  
44 political action aimed at preserving and reinforcing a way of life that allows for such  
45 worthy personal life projects as that of authenticity...The authentic individual cannot  
46 be thought of as someone who is simply reflective and candid in acting in the world.  
47 Such a person must also be attentive to what is going on in the political arena."  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

54 If we are to be thought of as teacher-leaders, then going along with what we sense might be  
55 'bad teaching' is more than just a minor, short-term irritation in our busy working lives. It raises  
56 the question of the authenticity of our passions and commitments, and the extraordinary  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2 potential for hypocrisy in our work. The very things we are supposed to be teaching our  
3 students are the things that are tripping us up. If we want a world in which institutional leaders  
4 at least attempt to blend achievement, ethics, values and authenticity, then somewhere in the  
5 political arena of the identity projects of academia, we have to do a better leadership job  
6 ourselves.  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For Peer Review

## References

Alvesson M, Ashcraft KL & Thomas R (2008) Identity Matters: Reflections on the Construction of Identity Scholarship in Organization Studies. *Organization*, 15(1): 5-28.

Alvesson M & Sveningsson S (2013) Authentic leadership critically reviewed. In D Ladkin & C Spiller (Eds.). *Authentic Leadership: Clashes, Convergences and Coalescences* (pp.39-54). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing

Alvesson M & Willmott H (2002) Identity Regulation as Organizational Control: Producing the Appropriate Individual. *Journal of Management Studies*, 39(5): 619-644.

Ashcraft KL & Allen BJ (2009) Politics even closer to home: Repositioning CME from the standpoint of communication studies. *Management Learning*, 40(1): 11-30.

Ashforth BE & Mael F (1989) Social Identity Theory and the Organization. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(1): 20-39.

Avolio BJ & Gardner WL (2005) Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(3): 315-338.

Barth RS (2004) *Learning By Heart*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bass B & Steidlmeier P (2004) Ethics, character and authentic transformational leadership behaviour. In JB Ciulla (Ed.) *Ethics, the Heart of Leadership* (pp.175-196). Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

Bathurst R & Cain T (2013) From authenticity to communitas: an ecology of leadership. In D Ladkin & C Spiller (Eds.). *Authentic Leadership: Clashes, Convergences and Coalescences* (pp.195-207). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Beddoes-Jones F & Swales S (2015) Authentic leadership: development of a new three pillar model. *Strategic HR Review*, 14(3): 94-99.

Boje DM, Helmuth CA & Saylor R (2013) Spinning authentic leadership living stories of the self. In D Ladkin & C Spiller (Eds.). *Authentic Leadership: Clashes, Convergences and Coalescences* (pp.271-278). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.



1  
2  
3  
4 Cooper CD, Scandura TA & Schriesheim CA (2005) Looking forward but learning from our  
5 past: Potential challenges to developing authentic leadership theory and authentic leaders.  
6 *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(3): 475-493.  
7  
8

9  
10 Cortese CG (2005) Learning through Teaching. *Management Learning*, 36(1): 87-115.  
11

12  
13 Costas J & Fleming P (2009) Beyond dis-identification: A discursive approach to self-alienation  
14 in contemporary organizations. *Human Relations*, 62(3): 353-378.  
15  
16

17  
18 Costas J & Taheri A (2012) 'The Return of the Primal Father' in Postmodernity? A Lacanian  
19 Analysis of Authentic Leadership. *Organization Studies*, 33(9): 1195-1216.  
20  
21

22  
23 Cunliffe AL (2009) The philosopher leader: On relationalism, ethics and reflexivity - A critical  
24 perspective to teaching leadership. *Management Learning*, 40(1): 87-101.  
25  
26

27  
28 Eagly AH (2005) Achieving relational authenticity in leadership: Does gender matter? *The*  
29 *Leadership Quarterly*, 16(3): 459-474.  
30  
31

32  
33 Ellis C (2004) *The Ethnographic I: A Methodological Novel about Autoethnography*. Walnut  
34 Creek: AltaMira Press.  
35

36  
37 Finlay L (2003) Through the looking glass: Intersubjectivity and hermeneutic reflection, in  
38 Finlay L & Gough B (Eds.) *Reflexivity: A Practical Guide for Researchers in Health and Social*  
39 *Sciences* (pp.105-119). Oxford: Blackwell.  
40  
41

42  
43 Ford J & Harding N (2011) The impossibility of the 'true self' of authentic leadership.  
44 *Leadership*, 7(4): 463-479.  
45  
46

47  
48 Ford J, Harding N & Learmonth M (2010) Who is it that would make business schools more  
49 critical? Critical reflections on critical management studies. *British Journal of Management*,  
50 21(1): 71-81.  
51  
52

53  
54 Gabriel Y (1999) Beyond Happy Families: Re-evaluation of the Control-Resistance-Identity  
55 Triangle. *Human Relations*, 52(2): 179-203.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Gagnon S (2008) Compelling identity: Selves and insecurity in global, corporate management  
4 development. *Management Learning*, 39(4): 375-391.

5  
6  
7 Gardiner RA (2011) Critique of the discourse of authentic leadership. *International Journal of*  
8 *Business and Social Science*, 2(15): 99-104.

9  
10  
11 Gardner WL, Cogliser CC, Davis KM & Dickens MP (2011) Authentic leadership: A review of  
12 the literature and research agenda. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22(6): 1120-1145.

13  
14  
15 Goffey R & Jones G (2013) Authentic followership in the knowledge economy. In D Ladkin &  
16 C Spiller (Eds.). *Authentic Leadership: Clashes, Convergences and Coalescences* (pp.208-  
17 219). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.

18  
19  
20 Guignon CB (2004) *On Being Authentic*. Abingdon: Routledge.

21  
22  
23 Guthey E & Jackson B (2005) CEO portraits and the authenticity paradox. *Journal of*  
24 *Management Studies*, 42(5): 1057-1082.

25  
26  
27 Harris P, Thiel B & Currie J (1998) Success, Gender and Academic Voices: Consuming  
28 Passion or Selling the Soul? *Gender and Education* 10(2): 133-148.

29  
30  
31 Harter S (2012) *The construction of the self: Developmental and Sociocultural Foundations*, 2<sup>nd</sup>  
32 edition. New York: Guilford Press.

33  
34  
35 Harter S, Waters PL & Whitesell NR (1997) Lack of Voice as a Manifestation of False Self-  
36 Behavior Among Adolescents: The School Setting as a Stage Upon Which the Drama of  
37 Authenticity is Enacted. *Educational Psychologist*, 32(3): 153-173.

38  
39  
40 Hoy WK & Henderson JE (1983) Principal authenticity, school climate, and pupil control  
41 orientation. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 29(2): 123-130.

42  
43  
44 Humphreys M (2005) Getting personal: Reflexivity and autoethnographic vignettes. *Qualitative*  
45 *Inquiry*, 11(6): 840-860.

46  
47  
48 Jensen SM & Luthans F (2006) Entrepreneurs as authentic leaders: Impact on employees'  
49 attitudes. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 27(8): 646-666.

1  
2  
3 Kärreman D & Alvesson M (2009) Resisting resistance: Counter-resistance, consent and  
4 compliance in a consultancy firm. *Human Relations*, 62(8): 1115-1144.

5  
6  
7 Knights D & Clarke C (2014) It's a bittersweet symphony, this life: fragile academic selves and  
8 insecure identities at work. *Organization Studies*, 35(3): 335-357.

9  
10  
11 Ladkin D & Spiller C (Eds.) (2013) *Authentic Leadership: Clashes, Convergences and*  
12 *Coalescences*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.

13  
14  
15  
16 Lambert L (2003) Leadership redefined: An evocative context for teacher leadership. *School*  
17 *Leadership & Management*, 23(4): 421-430.

18  
19  
20  
21 Latour B (1988) The Politics of Explanation, in Woolgar, S. (Ed.), *Knowledge and Reflexivity:*  
22 *New Frontiers in the Sociology of Knowledge* (pp. 155-176). London: Sage.

23  
24  
25  
26 Lawler J & Ashman I (2012) Theorizing leadership authenticity: A Sartrean perspective.  
27 *Leadership*, 8(4): 327-344.

28  
29  
30 Learmonth M & Humphreys M (2012) Autoethnography and academic identity: glimpsing  
31 business school doppelgängers. *Organization*, 19(1): 99-117.

32  
33  
34  
35 Liu H, Cutcher L & Grant D (2015) Doing Authenticity: The Gendered Construction of Authentic  
36 Leadership. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 22(3): 237-255.

37  
38  
39 Merleau-Ponty M (1968) *The Visible and the Invisible* (A.Lingis trans.). Evanston:  
40 Northwestern University Press.

41  
42  
43  
44 Nicholson H & Carroll B (2013a) Identity undoing and power relations in leadership  
45 development. *Human Relations*, 66(9): 1225-1248.

46  
47  
48  
49 Nicholson H & Carroll B (2013b) So you want to be authentic in your leadership: to whom and  
50 for what end? In D Ladkin & C Spiller (Eds.). *Authentic Leadership: Clashes, Convergences*  
51 *and Coalescences* (pp.286-301). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.

52  
53  
54  
55 Nyberg D & Sveningsson S (2013) Paradoxes of authentic leadership: Leader identity  
56 struggles. *Leadership*, 1742715013504425.

1  
2  
3 Petriglieri G, Wood JD & Petriglieri JL (2011) Up Close and Personal: Building Foundations for  
4 Leaders' Development Through the Personalization of Management Learning. *Academy of*  
5 *Management Learning and Education*, 10(3): 430-450.  
6

7  
8  
9 Pollner M (1991) Left of Ethnomethodology: The Rise and Decline of Radical Reflexivity.  
10 *American Sociological Review*, 56, 370-380.  
11

12  
13 Reedy P (2008) Mirror, Mirror, on the Wall: Reflecting on the Ethics and Effects of a Collective  
14 Critical Management Studies Identity Project. *Management Learning*, 39(1): 57-72.  
15

16  
17  
18 Shamir B & Eilam G (2005) "What's your story?" A life-stories approach to authentic leadership  
19 development. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(3): 395-417.  
20

21  
22  
23 Shaw J (2010) Papering the Cracks with Discourse: The Narrative Identity of the Authentic  
24 Leader. *Leadership*, 6(1): 89-108.  
25

26  
27 Sparrowe RT (2005) Authentic leadership and the narrative self. *The Leadership Quarterly*,  
28 16(3): 419-439.  
29

30  
31  
32 Spicer A (2011) Guilty lives: The authenticity trap at work. *Ephemera: Theory and Politics in*  
33 *Organization*, 11(1): 46-62.  
34

35  
36  
37 Sveningsson S & Alvesson M (2003) Managing managerial identities: Organizational  
38 fragmentation, discourse and identity struggle. *Human Relations*, 56(10): 1163-1193.  
39

40  
41  
42 Taylor SS (2013) Authentic leadership and the status trap. In D Ladkin & C Spiller (Eds.).  
43 *Authentic Leadership: Clashes, Convergences and Coalescences* (pp.176-187). Cheltenham:  
44 Edward Elgar Publishing.  
45

46  
47  
48 Thomas R & Davies A (2005) Theorizing the Micro-politics of Resistance: New Public  
49 Management and Managerial Identities in the UK Public Services. *Organization Studies*,  
50 26(5): 683-706.  
51

52  
53  
54 Tomkins L & Simpson P (2015) Caring Leadership: A Heideggerian Perspective. *Organization*  
55 *Studies*, 36(8): 1013-1031.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Tomkins L & Ulus E (2016) 'Oh, Was *That* "Experiential Learning"?!' Spaces, Synergies and  
4 Surprises with Kolb's Learning Cycle. *Management Learning*, 47(2): 158-178.

5  
6  
7 Toor S & Ofori G (2009) Authenticity and its influence on psychological well-being and  
8 contingent self-esteem of leaders in Singapore construction sector. *Construction Management*  
9 *and Economics*, 27(3): 299-313.

10  
11  
12  
13 Tourish D (2013) *The Dark Side of Transformational Leadership: A Critical Perspective*.  
14 London: Routledge.

15  
16  
17  
18 Walumbwa FO, Avolio BJ, Gardner WL, Wernsing TS & Peterson SJ (2008) Authentic  
19 leadership: Development and validation of a theory-based measure. *Journal of Management*,  
20 34(1): 89-126.

21  
22  
23  
24 Watson TJ (2008) Managing identity: Identity work, personal predicaments and structural  
25 circumstances. *Organization*, 15(1): 121-143.

26  
27  
28  
29 York-Barr J & Duke K (2004) What do we know about teacher leadership? Findings from two  
30 decades of scholarship. *Review of Educational Research*, 74(3): 255-316.

31  
32  
33 Yukl G (1999) An evaluation of conceptual weaknesses in transformational and charismatic  
34 leadership theories. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2): 285-305.

## Appendix A: The AL Module

The module was six weeks long, with two hours face-to-face time each week. It was one of several on the topic of leadership, alongside leadership in the public sector, leadership of change, and ethical leadership. The module was not formally assessed, but AL was one of the topics students could choose to develop further in their final assessed dissertation. We had 23 mature, part-time students - a mix of British nationals and foreign students - all of whom I had taught previously. I taught the module with two colleagues. The module had been running for two years when we inherited it, and none of us had been involved in the module design. We delivered the opening session together (week one), and divided up responsibility for teaching subsequent sessions. I took the lead for the final component (weeks five and six).

Weeks one and two were based largely on 'mainstream' AL theory, emphasising the importance of articulating personal values; consistency between those values and behaviour; links with theories of transformational leadership; and the notion of being true to oneself.

In weeks three and four, students were asked to rate themselves against criteria in a leadership inventory. This asked both how they saw themselves at the present time and how they would like to be in the future. It was loosely based on the ALQ, but with the dimensions re-worded slightly for a UK audience into (a) Self-awareness (b) Openness and transparency (c) Considering all the angles (d) Ethics – e.g.,

(a) Self-awareness: I have a good understanding of my strengths and limitations as a leader

(b) Openness and transparency: I openly share issues and challenges with my subordinates

(c) Considering all the angles: Even if I feel sure of something, I take time to consult others

(d) Ethics: My behaviour at work is guided by my personal values and beliefs

In weeks five and six, students were asked to think about a specific instance in their own experience which either reflected what they saw as their authentic responses and behaviours, or represented a failure to achieve such authentic responses and behaviours. They were asked to complete an individual, written assignment in between weeks five and six. During the final session, there was a structured debrief, where students were invited, but not compelled, to share their stories with the group. From memory, most of the students shared at least some of their story. They were encouraged to reflect on any common themes amongst the stories, as well as any interesting points of departure. The final summary session attempted to link these themes back to the theory that had been presented at the start of the module.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

---

<sup>i</sup> Some of the statistical evidence in support of the ALQ has recently been challenged, and a number of papers from well-known AL theorists retracted - see [www.retractionwatch.com](http://www.retractionwatch.com). However, there are other examples of questionnaire-based work on AL which do not appear to suffer from these issues (e.g., Beddoes-Jones and Swailes, 2015).

For Peer Review

1  
2  
3 Dear Ann  
4  
5  
6

7 Thank you for the very good news that this paper has been conditionally accepted for publication in  
8 Management Learning. I have looked at the comments from the reviewers, and made some final  
9 minor revisions, as you requested. Several of the comments from Reviewer 1 spark reflections that  
10 could be developed into a whole new section, or even a whole new paper, but I have tried to follow  
11 your steer to deal with these points briefly – not least because this paper is in danger of being far  
12 too long (again!).  
13

14 In response to several of Reviewer 1's individual points, I have tried to strengthen the overall  
15 'thread' of the argument by making more explicit in the Abstract, the Introduction, the Discussion  
16 and the Conclusion that (expressed more baldly here than in the paper itself!):  
17

- 18 - We are teacher-leaders (like it or not)
- 19 - Therefore, when we are asked to teach something we do not endorse, this is a leadership  
20 challenge
- 21 - This leadership challenge has parallels with ideas in 'authentic leadership'
- 22 - Therefore, how can we teach/preach 'authentic leadership' in our classrooms if we ignore the  
23 equivalent challenges of authenticity in our own practice and our own profession?  
24  
25

26 It has taken me a long time to get to this point where I can trace this 'thread' so baldly (and boldly),  
27 but I think I am there now!  
28

29 In response to the individual points:  
30

- 31 1. The invisibility of the 2<sup>nd</sup> author. On p.19, I have added something about the challenges of  
32 working in this dialogically reflexive way to elicit the 'self-as-other', because the enhanced  
33 visibility of the one looking into the Merleau-Pontyan mirror contributes to a certain invisibility  
34 for the one behind the mirror. I have wondered whether there was any way in which I could  
35 bring this process to life and describe it, but I have concluded that this would be too complex  
36 and difficult to do in the space available in the current paper. Working through what 'self-as-  
37 other' looks and feels like may well be something I attempt in a future paper.  
38  
39
- 40 2. Spelling out up-front what the readers can learn from this experience. I have placed a stronger  
41 emphasis on the 'thread' and the 'so what?' in the first paragraph in the Introduction (p.2). I  
42 hope this gives a bit more navigation for the unusual nature of what is to come!  
43  
44
- 45 3. Concept of the teacher-leader. I agree that this is a notion with the potential to 'hold' the  
46 various strands of critique together. I have discovered quite a flourishing literature on the  
47 notion of the teacher-leader in primary and secondary education, some of which I now  
48 reference in this paper (3 new references). I have added a paragraph highlighting these  
49 connections in the Prospects for Authenticity section (pp.15-16). I know that word-length is  
50 tight, but I have used up any 'leeway' I have for these final amendments on trying to address this  
51 point, because I think it underpins several of Reviewer 1's suggestions.  
52  
53

54 I will also ensure that teacher-leader is one of the key words in the submission (the Scholar One  
55 on-line version of the list of key words).  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



- 1  
2  
3 4. Critique of mainstream AL. This is quite a tricky point to address, because in a way, it feels as if it  
4 is taking the paper backwards, i.e., this was the main thrust of the very first version (with a  
5 different reviewer 1). Over the course of the different versions, I have discovered a vibrant  
6 seam of papers which do a much better job at critiquing mainstream AL than I was doing, and  
7 which I reference extensively throughout the paper (e.g., Ford and Harding, 2011). That, allied  
8 with the increasingly reflexive focus of this submission, has meant that I have nudged some of  
9 this theoretical critique into the background somewhat. What I am trying to do with this paper  
10 (now, as opposed to originally) is let mainstream AL hang itself a little.

11  
12  
13 That said, I now make a bolder statement than previously on p.18, where I say that I think we  
14 should avoid using instruments of self-encapsulation full-stop, whether the ALQ or any other  
15 kind of 'LQ'. As an aside, in practice, I am finding this an enormously difficult thing to do. I can't  
16 tell you how often I have to fight back when asked / told to include a 'little questionnaire to mix  
17 it up a bit'.

- 18  
19  
20 5. Unpacking the authenticity trap. I have added a sentence fleshing out my understanding of the  
21 authenticity trap (p. 17). Whilst tempted to write more on this, I am reining myself back – and  
22 spending any 'allowance' on word length on the notion of the teacher-leader, instead (see point  
23 3 above).  
24  
25  
26 6. Making clearer the 'so-what' for the reader in the Conclusion. As part of strengthening the  
27 'thread' (ref point 2 above), I have included three additional sentences in the very final  
28 paragraph of the paper (pp. 20-21), which are explicit about why I think this matters to all of us  
29 who teach 'leadership' to others.  
30  
31

32  
33 I hope that my amendments are satisfactory to address these points – even whilst I am aware that  
34 several of them could easily invite a much longer, richer treatment. Perhaps developing the notion  
35 of the teacher-leader, for instance, is the next paper to write!

36  
37 I know you said that you would not be sending this final version back to the reviewers. But if you do  
38 communicate with them regarding this paper, please do pass a genuine 'thank you' to them from  
39 me! I have had (am having) a similar experience this term to the one that triggered these reflections  
40 – i.e., I am being asked – yet again – to teach something in a way which goes against every instinct in  
41 my body. Being able to think about this within this framing of 'authentic leadership' is helping me to  
42 make sense of this situation – and at least try to work out what is at stake in the way I do – and do  
43 not – decide to approach it. I have actually started to fight back! Not easy for one steeped in the  
44 discourses of the 'perfect employee'...

45  
46  
47 Thank you for your support in bringing this paper to fruition. The experience of submitting to  
48 Management Learning is a very constructive and developmental one!

49  
50 Best regards

51  
52 The author (in case you still need anonymity!)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For Peer Review