

## Organization Studies



### Becoming the leader: Leadership as material presence

Journal:	<i>Organization Studies</i>
Manuscript ID	OS-15-0386.R3
Manuscript Type:	Article
Keywords:	Leadership < Topics, psychoanalysis, Bollas, materialities, Barad, appearance
Abstract:	<p>This paper seeks to understand leaders as material presences. Leadership theory has traditionally explored leaders as sites of disembodied traits, characteristics and abilities. Our qualitative, mixed method study suggests that managers charged with the tasks of leadership operate within a very different understanding. Their endogenous or lay theory understands leadership as physical, corporeal and visible, and as something made manifest through leaders' material presence. This theory-in-practice holds that leadership qualities are signified by the leader's physical appearance: the good leader must look the part. Actors consequently work on their own appearance to present an image of themselves as leader. They thus offer a fundamental challenge to dominant exogenous, or academic, theories of leadership. To understand the unspoken assumptions that underpin the lay theory of leadership as material presence, we interrogate it using the new materialist theory of Karen Barad and the object relations theory of Christopher Bollas. This illuminates the lay theory's complexities and sophisticated insights. In academic terms it offers a theory of how sentient and non-sentient actors intra-act and performatively constitute leadership through complex entanglements that enact and circulate organizational and leadership norms. The paper's contribution is thus a theory of leadership micro-dynamics in which the leader is materialised through practices of working on a corporeal self for presentation to both self and others.</p>

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

## Becoming the leader: Leadership as material presence

### Abstract

This paper seeks to understand leaders as material presences. Leadership theory has traditionally explored leaders as sites of disembodied traits, characteristics and abilities. Our qualitative, mixed method study suggests that managers charged with the tasks of leadership operate within a very different understanding. Their endogenous or lay theory understands leadership as physical, corporeal and visible, and as something made manifest through leaders' material presence. This theory-in-practice holds that leadership qualities are signified by the leader's physical appearance: the good leader must look the part. Actors consequently work on their own appearance to present an image of themselves as leader. They thus offer a fundamental challenge to dominant exogenous, or academic, theories of leadership. To understand the unspoken assumptions that underpin the lay theory of leadership as material presence, we interrogate it using the new materialist theory of Karen Barad and the object relations theory of Christopher Bollas. This illuminates the lay theory's complexities and sophisticated insights. In academic terms it offers a theory of how sentient and non-sentient actors intra-act and performatively constitute leadership through complex entanglements that enact and circulate organizational and leadership norms. The paper's contribution is thus a theory of leadership micro-dynamics in which the leader is materialised through practices of working on a corporeal self for presentation to both self and others.

### Keywords

Leadership, materialities, appearance, psychoanalysis, Barad, Bollas.

## Introduction

This paper explores how those charged with the task of being leaders *materialise* themselves as leaders within organizations. In some ways leadership theory, as an aspect of organization studies more generally, has always been a theory of materialities: it presumes leaders influence followers through the power of their necessarily material, corporeal presence, from where can be beheld their charisma (Bass, 1985; Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999), authenticity (Gardner, Cogliser, Davis, & Dickens [2011]; Ladkin & Spiller, 2013) and so on. Contemporary theories of distributed or shared leadership, that is leadership as group practices, similarly imply corporeal encounters (Ropo & Sauer, 2008). Yet the ever-expanding literature on leadership somehow de-materialises leadership, reducing leaders and followers to ‘a shapeless, hapless, colorless, lifeless condition’ (Hansen, Ropo & Sauer, 2007, p.545), where corporeality is an ‘unwanted and unwelcome guest’ (Hansen et al., 2007 p.553), and leadership appears as a ‘charisma emanating from nowhere’ (Harding, Lee, Ford & Learmonth, 2011), with its embodied, material and mundane aspects rarely accounted for (Sinclair, 2013).

A small but developing body of literature challenges this ontology of absence. Its focus is largely on leadership as an embodied, and thus material practice. It explores such issues as bodily presence, body language, body work and embodied knowledge (Fisher & Reiser Robbins, 2014; Ropo & Parviainen, 2001; Ropo & Sauer, 2008; Sinclair, 2005). Guthey and Jackson (2005) have explored how photographs of leaders provide iconic representations of (otherwise immaterial) organizations, while Melina, Burgess, Falkman and Marturano’s (2013) text on *The Embodiment of Leadership*, seeks both to conceptualise the relationship between the body and leadership and also to explore ways in which to articulate and translate leaders’

1  
2  
3 embodied knowledge. A special issue of *Leadership* (2013) focused on embodiment,  
4  
5 aesthetics and affect (Pullen & Vacchani, 2013). Its editors critique the dominance of  
6  
7 ‘disembodied, over-cognitived and pseudo-rational approaches’ (p. 318) to  
8  
9 understanding leadership and advocate research that embraces materiality,  
10  
11 embodiment and corporeality. Ladkin’s (2013) phenomenological account of felt and  
12  
13 bodily based experiences emphasises the invisible inter-subjective relations at the  
14  
15 heart of leadership, interactions in which bodies, presumed gender and gender  
16  
17 appearances are ‘markers’ used by employees to make sense of leaders and leadership  
18  
19 (Muhr & Sullivan, 2013). Leadership can thus be interpreted as an emergent and  
20  
21 creative process of inter-practices of leading and following (Kupers, 2013) that are  
22  
23 embodied within space (Ropo, Sauer & Salovaara (2013), in ways akin to a musical  
24  
25 performance where leader and follower bodies move and gesture to one another  
26  
27 (Bathurst & Cain, 2013). But because passions are embodied in leadership, followers  
28  
29 can become demoralised if they surface in non-charismatic ways (Thanem, 2013).  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 This body of work argues the merits of understanding leadership as corporeal  
35  
36 practice. However, there is a need for recognition of not only bodies but other  
37  
38 materialities such as technologies and places, as well as discourses, language, power  
39  
40 and resistance, in the emergence of leadership (Pullen & Vacchani, 2013). A few  
41  
42 theorists attempt this using Actor-Network theory. Fairhurst and Cooren (2009) for  
43  
44 example explore how the leader is constituted through the inter-actions of a plethora  
45  
46 of actants, including followers. In Hawkins’ (2015) study of the materialization of  
47  
48 leadership in the British Royal Navy the actants include ship, water and history. Her  
49  
50 study illustrates how non-sentient actors both limit and make possible various  
51  
52 leadership practices that may be unique to such configurations as a ‘Royal’ Navy.  
53  
54 Leadership studies, like organization studies more generally, is thus in the early stages  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 of understanding materialities in the constitution of organizational phenomenon such  
4 as leadership, and thus to giving substance to what has previously been insubstantial.  
5  
6 We turn now to our own study, that brings new materialist theory to leadership studies  
7  
8 by way of leaders' own understanding of how they materialise themselves as leaders.  
9  
10

11  
12 Our empirical research explored how people charged with the tasks of leadership  
13 materialise themselves as leaders through work on their embodied appearance. It was  
14 inspired by research into leadership training courses, attended by managers worldwide,  
15 which teach that leadership is something that can be *seen* (Burgoyne, 2004; Ford &  
16 Harding, 2007; Smolovic Jones & Jackson, 2015; Storey, 2011). Managers appear to  
17 take this understanding back to their daily practices: within companies 'metaphors of  
18 the visual, of looking, of being seen, and the light which facilitates seeing recur when  
19 people envisage leadership' (Harding, Ford, Lee & Learmonth, 2011, p.935). Our  
20 study therefore asked: if this is the case, how do participants make themselves visible  
21 and recognisable as leaders? Data analysis suggests that leaders draw on an  
22 endogenous (Pérezts, Fay & Picard, 2015) or lay theory of how to materialise  
23 themselves as leaders. Through interrogating this lay theory we show its sophisticated  
24 and complex underpinnings and how, through its location within micro-practices of  
25 leadership, it counters the ontology of absence in exogenous, or academic theories of  
26 leadership.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

45 Participants' accounts suggested the value of new materialities theory for  
46 organization studies in general, and leadership studies in particular, because it  
47 challenges the dominance of discursive approaches that explore only  
48 language/discourse in the constitution of organizational life, to the neglect of the  
49 actual experience of working as material subjects in physical places. New  
50 materialities theory explores the performative interactions of discourses, sentient  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 participants and non-sentient actors. It argues matter is not mute and inert but  
4  
5 agentive, immanent and lively: leadership, it follows, would be constituted as an  
6  
7 ‘emergent interplay’ (Tuana, 2008, p.189) between the cultural and the natural  
8  
9 (Hekman, 2010), an insight shared, as we will see, by leaders themselves.  
10

11  
12 This paper therefore contributes a new, endogenous theory of the material micro-  
13  
14 dynamics of leadership. It thus introduces new materialities theories to leadership  
15  
16 studies, and takes forward its contribution to organizational studies more generally.  
17  
18 We begin by outlining the academic theory we used to make sense of the endogenous  
19  
20 or lay theory of leadership that informs participants’ accounts. We draw specifically  
21  
22 on Karen Barad’s material theory of performativity, combining it with Christopher  
23  
24 Bollas’s understanding of the body in the psyche to address some shortcomings in the  
25  
26 new materialism literatures. We then turn to the analysis of the interview materials.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

### 32 **Bringing materialism in from its exile**

33  
34 Unrest at the dominance of discourse has inspired the emergence in the social  
35  
36 sciences of ‘new materialism’ (called ‘new’ to differentiate it from Marxist theories of  
37  
38 materialism). This interweaves the material with the discursive: it regards matter as  
39  
40 immanent and lively, and understands both language and matter as agentive, living  
41  
42 energies (Colebrook, 2008). Language, matter, technologies and other elements are  
43  
44 understood to interact in the formation of subjects or ‘reality’, breaking down  
45  
46 classical divisions between culture/nature and sentient/non-sentient (Hekman, 2010).  
47  
48

49  
50 Two influential review essays (Ashcraft et al, 2009; Phillips & Oswick, 2012)  
51  
52 advocate a material turn in organization studies. An on-going but inconclusive  
53  
54 discussion (Hardy & Thomas, 2015; Orlikowski & Scott, 2015; Putnam, 2015) has  
55  
56 debated the merits of such a move, with Hardy and Thomas (2015) notable in their  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 resistance to the claim that the material turn is 'new'. Organization studies, they argue,  
4 has always been cognisant of materialities. Others disagree, including researchers  
5 whose empirical studies demonstrate the value of regarding the material as agentive.  
6  
7 For example, Symon and Pritchard's (2015) study of employees' use of smartphones  
8 indicates that identity does not determine the use of smartphones but emerges from  
9 the tangle of practices of employee and smartphone resulting in the co-emergence of  
10 employee and smartphone. A similar influence of technology on practices is seen in  
11 Orlikowski and Scott's (2014; 2015) exploration of how social media has changed  
12 ways of evaluating hotels and how this in turn shapes hotel owners' activities. Dale  
13 and Latham (2015) meanwhile show how it is not so much entanglements of flesh and  
14 prosthetics that constitute certain bodies as dis-abled and others as able, but  
15 discourses of choice and necessity that are entangled with flesh and prosthetics. In a  
16 classic move in new materialities theory, they argue there is 'no necessary or essential  
17 inside or outside between human and non-human bodies' (p.171) but a 'cut' is  
18 performed that creates boundaries between the two.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 Karen Barad's (2007) combining of quantum mechanics with poststructuralist and  
37 feminist accounts in developing a material-discursive theory of performativity is a  
38 major influence in new materialism. She builds on Judith Butler's highly influential  
39 theory of performativity that focuses on iterability, or 'constantly repeated "acts"'  
40 (Butler, 1990, 1993), but adds a materialist perspective that commentators argue is  
41 missing from, and thus weakens, Butler's thesis. Butler takes us to the level of the  
42 iterated movement carried out by a sentient actor but Barad invites us to analyse each  
43 of those re-iterated micro-movements and the influence of non-sentient actors. In  
44 Barad's thesis, the performative should be understood as 'intra-actions that  
45 reconstitute entanglements' (p 74). The more familiar term, 'inter-actions', refers to  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 relationships between distinct entities: for Barad there can be no such thing as  
4  
5 separate and distinct entities, hence the term ‘intra-actions’. This neologism captures  
6  
7 the idea that entities are not ontologically separable – each and every entity is  
8  
9 constituted within and through its meeting with numerous other entities, that affect it  
10  
11 and that it affects. In our case, entities may include actors, suits, mirrors, hair, and so  
12  
13 on, but each is not a singular phenomenon. Rather ‘each’ are phenomena that emerge  
14  
15 through complex entangled intra-actions in which all these seeming entities influence  
16  
17 and inform each other, and are entangled with and inseparable from each other.  
18  
19 Leaders, suits, mirrors and hair become understood as leadersuitmirrorhair.  
20  
21  
22

23 The term ‘entanglements’ explains this: it refers to the inseparability of subsystems.  
24  
25 Sub-systems are mutually informative (Barad, 2007, p. 283) and engaged in ‘intra-  
26  
27 actions’ in which each influences all others and is influenced by all other sub-systems  
28  
29 in the system (or phenomena) of which it is a part. For example, the business suit, the  
30  
31 office and discourses of leadership may ‘intra-act’ in the constitution of leader  
32  
33 identities, but they also intra-act to constitute business suit, office and discourse  
34  
35 (Harding, Ford and Lee, forthcoming). What appear to be distinct entities emerge  
36  
37 through their sub-systems and the sub-systems’ sub-systems, all of which are  
38  
39 entangled within and through each other. What we regard as ‘boundaries’ (such as  
40  
41 between suit and body) and ‘entities’ (e.g. the leader) are performatively constituted  
42  
43 through these complex intra-actions.  
44  
45  
46

47 Here ‘matter’ is an active participant: it is ‘neither fixed nor given ... [but] ... is  
48  
49 produced and productive, generated and generative. Matter is agentive, not a fixed  
50  
51 essence or property of things’ (Barad, 2007, p. 137). From a Baradian perspective,  
52  
53 therefore, the leader cannot be understood separately and distinctively from her  
54  
55 material presence, physical location, clothes worn, accessories, and so on: all these  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 affect her as leader even as she affects them as office/suit/briefcase. Barad's thesis  
4  
5 explains assumptions contained within the endogenous theory of leadership-in-  
6  
7 practice told to us by the research participants  
8

9  
10 However, Barad's thesis cannot account for how subjects emerge in entangled  
11  
12 intra-actions – Barad's human actor appears agentive but has no more consciousness  
13  
14 than non-sentient actors. How then do bodies and artefacts become agentively  
15  
16 incorporated within and through the subjectivities of leaders? Barad (2007, p. 374)  
17  
18 suggests that language or representations are lenses that mediate between the object  
19  
20 world and the mind of the knowing subject, but she does not explore this  
21  
22 assumption's implications. The version of object relations theory developed by  
23  
24 psychoanalyst Christopher Bollas does, however, do just that. Bollas's theory of  
25  
26 subjectivity highlights how encounters with objects are consciously thought about or  
27  
28 unconsciously absorbed via free associations, and become part of the internal texture  
29  
30 of the self. That is, Bollas explores how the voice that speaks in one's 'mind' is  
31  
32 stimulated into thought through its encounter with external objects that become  
33  
34 internalised as they enter the imagination. This provides the necessary link with  
35  
36 Barad's work.  
37  
38  
39

40  
41 The mind, for Bollas, is restless. It is occupied by constantly flowing streams of  
42  
43 thoughts evoked by the objects it encounters. In his poetic description, 'As we inhabit  
44  
45 this world of ours, we amble about in a field of pregnant objects that contribute to the  
46  
47 dense psychic textures that constitute self experience. ... [We] sort of think[...] ourself  
48  
49 out, by evoking constellations of inner experience' (1993, p. 3-4). This is done  
50  
51 through both deliberate choice of, and chance encounters with, people, things, and  
52  
53 events. 'Thus we oscillate between thinking ourself out through the selection of  
54  
55 objects that promote inner experience and being thought out, so to speak, by the  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 environment which plays upon the self” (Bollas, 1993, p. 4). Much of this is not  
4  
5 knowingly or consciously done, that it is ‘only ever partly thinkable’ (Bollas, 1993, p.  
6  
7 29). The ‘psychic intensities’ evoked by objects are full of latent thoughts that  
8  
9 become condensed into single images, much like dreams condense the events of an  
10  
11 entire day (Bollas 1995, pp. 51-55 *et passim*). Bollas’s theory makes sense of the  
12  
13 work-on-the-self reported by participants in this study and highlights how evocative  
14  
15 objects (such as ‘leader’) ‘ “drive a shaft” down into the self’s unconscious, where it  
16  
17 will join existent and moving lines of thought’ (Bollas, 2009, p. 83).

18  
19  
20 Bollas’s subject is, like Barad’s, heterogeneous and non-linear. His work  
21  
22 complements Barad’s in its recognition of the multiplicity of moment-to-moment  
23  
24 intra-actions between materialities, discourses, affect and, in Bollas’s case, psyches,  
25  
26 but it facilitates understanding of how suits, offices and so on become part of the  
27  
28 ‘inner structure’ of the leader. At the same time Bollas’s work is enhanced by Barad’s  
29  
30 much richer perspective on materiality, her emphasis that the encountered object is  
31  
32 agentive, and her questioning the taken-for-grantedness of ‘the suit’, ‘briefcase’ and  
33  
34 so on.  
35  
36

37  
38 This is the theoretical perspective that makes sense of interview materials in which  
39  
40 we discussed with people charged with the tasks of leadership their perspectives on  
41  
42 physical appearance, and the work they did or did not do to (re)present themselves as  
43  
44 leaders. We now discuss the study’s methodology.  
45  
46  
47

### 48 49 50 **The study**

51  
52 The aim of this study was to develop understanding of leadership as material practice  
53  
54 through engendering insights about if and how leaders manifest themselves as leaders  
55  
56 by and through their physical appearance. Research into organizational materialities is  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 bedevilled by the problem that the material can only be approached through the  
4  
5 discursive, so studies must infer from the spoken word how sentient and non-sentient  
6  
7 material actors intra-act. We were thus interested in exploring how participants talk  
8  
9 about appearance, how they judge it, its influence on them and the work they do on  
10  
11 their own appearance.  
12

13  
14 The study's objectives were to explore leaders' perceptions of the role of physical  
15  
16 appearance in leadership, how they judged appearance in others, and the work they do  
17  
18 or do not do on their own appearance as part of their materialisation of themselves as  
19  
20 leaders. Using qualitative research methods to explore subjective experiences, we  
21  
22 interviewed 20 managers who had been on leadership development programmes or  
23  
24 who otherwise described themselves as leaders, using snowball sampling techniques  
25  
26 to identify people from a range of positions, experiences, professions, organizations,  
27  
28 genders and ethnicities. We did not seek a representative sample, not only because  
29  
30 there is no standard population of leaders from which such a sample could be drawn,  
31  
32 but also because our aims as qualitative researchers are not generalisation from a  
33  
34 sample but theorising from 'knowing subjects'.  
35  
36  
37

38  
39 Interviews lasted between 60-90 minutes and had three stages. Stage One used a  
40  
41 life history approach to develop understanding about the study's participants and their  
42  
43 career path (Crossley, 2000; Hatch & Wisniewski, 1995). We added to this a question  
44  
45 about their appearance and the work they invest in it.  
46

47  
48 The second stage involved an adapted repertory grid technique. Repertory grid  
49  
50 techniques are designed to facilitate people's translation of their mental  
51  
52 representations of the world into language (Kelly, 1955). They enable participants to  
53  
54 put into words what is abstract and difficult to articulate. Like many other users of  
55  
56 repertory grid techniques (Fransella, Bell and Bannister, 2004), we adapted the  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 approach to suit our study by recording and fully transcribing the interviews.  
4  
5 However, we used the traditional repertory grid approach of ‘triading’, that is, we  
6  
7 asked participants to think about two excellent, two average and two poor leaders they  
8  
9 have worked with. Through exploring what they saw as the differences and  
10  
11 similarities between random triads of the people they had chosen, they were able to  
12  
13 articulate thoughts they might otherwise not be able to put into language. We asked  
14  
15 them to describe the appearance of each of the people they had chosen as their  
16  
17 exemplars.  
18  
19

20  
21 In the final stage, we combined repertory grid and photo elicitation techniques so as  
22  
23 to mimic everyday responses to others’ physical presence and explore how  
24  
25 participants ‘read’ and interpret other’s appearance. Photographs (Banks, 2001; Pink,  
26  
27 2007; Rose, 2007) elicit an aesthetic response to visual stimuli, conjuring up sensory  
28  
29 experiences (Warren, 2008) and giving some approximation to the leader/follower  
30  
31 encounter. We presented participants with 50 photographs cut from newspapers and  
32  
33 magazines, of 25 men and 25 women in suits and less formal dress, covering all ages,  
34  
35 sizes and ethnicities. We asked interviewees to choose two photographs of people  
36  
37 they thought looked like ideal, mediocre and poor leaders. Again we asked them to  
38  
39 work with triads, that is, to compare and contrast excellent with excellent, average  
40  
41 and poor, average with excellent and poor, etc. We asked them to explain their  
42  
43 choices, and to imagine what would be said in an encounter with the persons in the  
44  
45 photograph, something they did without difficulty. This conversational element gave  
46  
47 insights into how participants interact with people they think are excellent, average or  
48  
49 poor leaders.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Data analysis required two stages: data reduction to make manageable the 200,000  
4 words in the transcripts, and in-depth analysis of the themes that emerged. Data  
5 reduction was achieved using template analysis (King, 2012). This approach involved  
6 the development of a coding template which summarises *a priori* themes identified in  
7 the literature review as important for the study and incorporated into the interview  
8 schedule. For this study, these themes included ‘work on appearance’, ‘the  
9 appearance of leaders they have worked with’, and ‘judgements about appearance’.  
10 Template analysis also allows for the emergence of unanticipated themes, so provides  
11 a flexible, experiential approach that researchers can tailor to their own requirements  
12 (King, 2012). King’s (2012) analytic framework led to the identification of two over-  
13 arching themes: ‘reading appearance’ and ‘work on the self’. A third theme was to  
14 emerge during the second, intense stage of analysis of the themes.

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  
The second stage involved intense exploration of these two themes. We turned for  
guidance to researchers who have worked with Barad’s perspective on performativity  
(Mazzei, 2014; Taylor & Ivinson, 2013). Their approach to data analysis focuses on  
data ‘hot spots’ (MacLure, 2013, in Ringrose & Renold, 2014) that ‘glow’ for the  
researcher, whether encountered during the fieldwork, analysis or later. Authors A  
and B each chose a transcript from one of the interviews they had themselves carried  
out and immersed themselves in it, exploring how each theme ‘spoke’ to them. All  
three authors then met and spent 15 hours together debating, discussing and exploring,  
with Author C interrogating her colleagues about the reasons why these specific  
transcripts had been chosen, and the feelings/responses these particular interviews had  
invoked in them. In this way the ‘hot spots’ were shown to be moments in each  
interview that had evoked chains of thought in the interviewers (Hollway & Jefferson,  
2012). These ‘hot spots’ were then subjected to stringent analysis, following

1  
2  
3 MacLure's (2013, in Ringrose & Renold, 2014) suggestion that we should not rush  
4 into fixing meaning but should adopt an 'affective' approach that can help slow down  
5 our processing and consider carefully what has captured our interest and fascinated us.  
6  
7

8  
9  
10 Through this long, intensive process of debate and discussion we recognized  
11 *something that did not make sense*. The multiple in-depth joint readings and  
12 discussions, paragraph by paragraph, of the two transcripts, resolved itself into  
13 recognition of the similarities between each interviewee's self-description and that of  
14 their ideal leader. We call this third theme, 'the self as ideal leader'. Checking  
15 showed it appeared in all 20 transcripts. We thus had three themes incorporating a  
16 range of material artefacts (clothes, hair, appearance more generally, and mirrors).  
17  
18

19  
20  
21 We turn next to the findings. In what follows we outline each of the three themes  
22 listed above and focus predominantly on the two participants whose transcripts we  
23 had studied so intensively, and who embody the organizational problematic (Clarke,  
24 2002). We draw on other participants to demonstrate how these two speakers  
25 articulate perceptions similar to all other interviewees. This stage of the research led  
26 us to recognising an endogenous or lay theory of the materialisation of leaders, that  
27 we discuss next.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

### 43 Findings

44  
45 Pen-portraits of Sasha and Richard (pseudonyms) written immediately after the  
46 interviews describe Sasha as a 40-something woman with well-cut hair, dressed  
47 neatly and fashionably. An upper-middle-level manager in the U.K.'s National Health  
48 Service, she is neither thin nor fat, pretty nor plain. Her voice is low and well-  
49 modulated; she is a little shy but projects warmth and competence. Richard is 45, a  
50 middle manager in the private sector. Slimly built and smart, he takes pride in his  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 appearance, is loquacious and enthusiastic, ambitious, passionate about leadership,  
4  
5 sometimes deliberate in his choice of language. He seemed an eager and enthusiastic  
6  
7 manager who wished to appear authentic and committed to his work. Both are white  
8  
9 and British.  
10

11  
12  
13  
14 *Theme one: Reading appearance*  
15

16 This theme that emerged from the photo-elicitation stage of the interviews provides a  
17  
18 context for the remaining themes. 'Appearance' here refers primarily to the  
19  
20 presentation of the self so as to 'look good' or 'look the part', but also to how  
21  
22 participants thought physical characteristics, such as 'cold eyes' signified personal  
23  
24 characteristics. The word 'appearance', used in this sense, is haunted by its other  
25  
26 meaning, of making one's self manifestly present.  
27  
28

29  
30 Participants were adept at attaching personal characteristics to people in  
31  
32 photographs. We asked them to select examples of poor, average and excellent  
33  
34 leaders from a pile of miscellaneous photos cut from magazines and newspapers. We  
35  
36 did not define 'poor', etc., but encouraged participants to use their own definitions.  
37  
38 They selected people whose looks, they felt, represented their leadership capabilities.  
39  
40 Asked to imagine a meeting with each person, they quickly articulated how  
41  
42 conversations might go. Dee (female chartered accountant), chose a 'guy from the  
43  
44 minority community' who is 'likely to be more sensitive erm but he's also more likely  
45  
46 to stand by what he believes in to an extent that other people might not be erm  
47  
48 because if you've worked hard to get somewhere you fight when you're there'. Chris  
49  
50 (female business owner) contrasted two photos, one of a woman she thought must  
51  
52 have 'an absolute passion for something' who would be 'just absolutely, totally  
53  
54 committed to what they're doing ... that can be infectious'; the other of a man with  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 'cold eyes' and a 'stern' face, who would 'be straight down to business so with no  
4 acknowledgement that you're a person underneath it all' and 'being quite critical and  
5 challenging as well ... he's right, he knows how it should be done, he knows what the  
6 answer is'.  
7  
8  
9  
10

11  
12 These speakers exemplify theories of looking in post-modern capitalism's 'looking  
13 culture' (Denzin, 1991), in which the visual representations of material subjects and  
14 objects have performative effects (Barad, 2007), and physical appearance presents an  
15 image that communicates identity (Ashforth & Johnson, 2001; Goffman, 1959;  
16 Roberts, Dutton, Spreitzer, Heaphy & Quinn, 2005; Roberts, 2005). People are  
17 visually literate, so physical appearance can be read not only like any other image  
18 (Rose, 1988), but in ways that are as 'complicated and indeterminate as any literary  
19 manuscript' (Grosz, 1994, p.117).  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

29  
30 Richard and Sasha help us understand this. Richard made direct links between  
31 objects (such as hands) and characteristics (such as authority), in the photo he had  
32 selected of someone who looked like an excellent leader:  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38  
39 *She has quite a casual look but still a look of quiet authority or, or you know, I*  
40 *think that you can have a good conversation with her and be quite opinionated*  
41 *... You know, not shabby, casual but very smart...Her stance, hands in pockets*  
42 *.... it looks quite authoritative (sic) there*  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49  
50 With scant, two-dimensional information he generates a description of the sort of  
51 person he imagines this woman to be.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 Sasha reacted similarly. She selected as examples of poor leaders two women who  
4  
5 were, she thought, dressed inappropriately for leadership – one *'looks like she isn't*  
6  
7 *particularly bothered about how she's looking'*, and the other

8  
9  
10  
11  
12 *'there is something about her expression that is. I wouldn't – her clothes*  
13  
14 *wouldn't seem, wouldn't be the sort of thing I would wear for work anyway'.*

15  
16  
17  
18 One woman pictured, Sasha said, *'looks rather arrogant'* and if she could speak  
19  
20 would *'be quite loud and quite opinionated, um and probably not not ready to listen*  
21  
22 *to other people's points of view'*. The other would not *'say anything at all'*.

23  
24  
25  
26  
27 These statements contain judgements located in assumptions that looks reflect  
28  
29 behaviour. Bollas's philosophy explains how images evoke such understanding: the  
30  
31 mind is like a film director, taking the self through imaginary adventures and  
32  
33 anticipated encounters. Freud's ideas of free association inspire his argument that 'we  
34  
35 think by not concentrating on anything in particular – moving from one idea to the  
36  
37 next in an endless chain of associations...' (Bollas, 2009, p.6). That is, a photo may  
38  
39 spark a train of thought that leads to endless further trains. Importantly, those trains of  
40  
41 thought are part of the work of constituting the self, of finding answers to the  
42  
43 question: who am I? Barad's thesis suggests it is not only photos (and artefacts  
44  
45 represented therein) that set off such trains of thought, but other artefacts such as desk,  
46  
47 interviewer, interviewee, audio recorder, the office and its furniture, and so on. Each  
48  
49 sets off multiply-branching trains of thought, so many they barely influence the  
50  
51 conscious mind and remain unspoken. The numerous objects will be defracted  
52  
53 through one another, that is, they will engage in an endless play of intra-acting images  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 and discourses that challenge boundaries (such as between subject and objects) even  
4  
5 whilst they are active in making the 'cut' through which 'real' entities emerge. Bollas  
6  
7 and Barad thus complement each other. Interview participants were inundated by  
8  
9 objects and discourses that were all thrown into the melting-pot of the mind, as it  
10  
11 were, where some sort of sense is made of this bombardment as the subject makes  
12  
13 sense of itself, because an 'illusion of understanding is essential to the creation of  
14  
15 meaning' (Bollas, 1995, p. 20). In the particular space-time of these interviews,  
16  
17 participants configured themselves as people able to judge a leader's characteristics  
18  
19 through extrapolating from their visual representation.  
20  
21  
22

23 This theme suggests leaders have a theory that physical appearance signifies  
24  
25 leadership abilities. How then does categorisation takes place: what heuristic defines  
26  
27 excellence, mediocrity or inability? We explore this question in the third theme, but  
28  
29 first we explore how participants work on their own appearance.  
30  
31  
32

#### 33 34 *Theme two: Work on the self*

35  
36 Theme one proposes that managers charged with the tasks of leadership believe  
37  
38 appearance signifies leadership qualities. Theme two suggests they apply this  
39  
40 judgemental gaze to themselves: they work on their own appearance to present an  
41  
42 image of themselves that they believe will influence others. Typical statements  
43  
44 include 'when you're meeting people for the first time you think about what  
45  
46 impression you're going to make on them' because 'it's about playing the role so that  
47  
48 people are not taking their eye off who you are and what you do' (Jo, female,  
49  
50 assistant director); 'I think appearance is really important.... But I think from an  
51  
52 impact point of view I think it's important that you take care and attention over your  
53  
54 clothes' (Leslie, female, senior administrator); 'For me appearance is very, very  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 *important. I think it sets an impression straight away of the person that you are and .*  
4  
5 *what you want to achieve’ (Laurie, army captain and environmental manager).*  
6  
7  
8

9  
10 Sasha and Richard similarly judge others by their appearance, presume others will  
11 judge them correspondingly, and aim to dress accordingly. When Sasha says:  
12  
13

14  
15  
16 *If I see somebody who looks together and fairly smart, not too trendy or way*  
17  
18 *out, I tend to think that that’s maybe their approach to life in general.*  
19  
20

21  
22 She makes an epistemological claim that materialities (clothes and other aspects of  
23 appearance) reflect that other’s entire being. Both Sasha and Richard constitute  
24 themselves as leaders within the terms of this claim. Sasha, asked what style of  
25 clothes she wore to work, answered:  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

31  
32  
33  
34 *I do think that how you appear is very important. And because my job relies*  
35 *on me influencing people ..... I need to develop a respect and understanding*  
36 *with them very quickly and I’m very conscious that when I meet somebody for*  
37 *the first time I’m very aware of the impression they create and I assume that’s*  
38 *what’s happening with other people as well.*  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

47  
48 Sasha’s answer starts with an unprompted measure of the value of appearance,  
49 followed by an insight into her personal theory of why appearance is important. This  
50 is: appearance is a material signification of a person’s ‘character’; people possess the  
51 skills of being able to read another’s visual presentation of itself; when people meet  
52 they judge the other through extrapolating from appearance to character. This,  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

perhaps, is a lay version of Grosz's (1994) and Kirby's (1997) arguments that flesh and bodies are themselves texts, and, in our case, of how appearance is also a text.

Richard's answer to the same question expands upon the agentive aspects contained within this theory. He describes using appearance as a tool for leading change:

*[T]wo years ago when I joined the production facility ... I turned up with a new suit. And I'll wear white shirts ... but people say 'You can't run production like that' and I say 'well why not?' ... These guys have seen something you know one way for the last five years, maybe part of the step change is I look different and I act different to the previous manager.*

Both knowingly use dress to aestheticise themselves and project an image they believe will work upon and influence others. They check their success at achieving the necessary guise through looking in the mirror every morning:

*every day before I go out of the house, even though I'm working in a manufacturing environment I'll still look and take a second look or say to my wife 'Do I look alright?' (Richard).*

Sasha is emotionally affected by the image reflected back at her:

*I'm obviously very conscious about appearance. Um, I hate going to work on a bad hair day (laughs). I do my hair.*

1  
2  
3 Sasha's and Richard's lay theory of the signification effects of appearance is shared  
4  
5 by all participants in this study. Indeed, other studies have explored how staff  
6  
7 knowingly choose clothes that portray a desired image (Rafaeli, Dutton, Harquail &  
8  
9 Mackie-Lewis, 1997), although conscious image management is often achieved  
10  
11 without knowledge of the multiple layers of meaning embedded in their clothes (Pratt  
12  
13 & Rafaeli, 1997). However, such studies presume it is the clothes-wearers who are  
14  
15 agentive; we explore below the agency of business-wear and accompanying artefacts.  
16  
17

18  
19 These first two themes suggest a lay or endogenous theory of leadership, a theory-  
20  
21 in-practice, which states that work on one's physical appearance is important because  
22  
23 self-presentation signifies leadership capabilities. Bollas's emphasis on the  
24  
25 importance of sight in forming the self helps explain this. Following Winnicott (1967)  
26  
27 he argues that being seen (via the parental gaze and the reflection of the infant in the  
28  
29 face of the mother/father) is important in the initial emergence of the infant as an 'I'  
30  
31 with a sense of itself as a self. This continues throughout life – one emerges as an 'I',  
32  
33 from moment to moment, through recognition given when subjecting oneself to the  
34  
35 gaze of the other. That is, the subject (me, the leader) works on itself to present itself  
36  
37 as an object (the embodiment of leadership) that requires approbation and thus proof  
38  
39 of success from other objects (colleagues, followers, customers and clients).  
40  
41  
42

43  
44 Barad agrees: subject and object are inseparable and co-emergent. Rather than  
45  
46 fixing subject and object in advance, we should 'read insights through one another in  
47  
48 ways that help illuminate differences as they emerge: how different differences get  
49  
50 made, what gets excluded, and how these exclusions matter' (2007, p. 30). That is,  
51  
52 participants should be understood not as subjects (me) describing objects (hair, suits,  
53  
54 shirts) but as co-emerging and multiply intra-acting actants. If this is the case, then  
55  
56 language, clothes, hair, make-up, discourses and the norms they carry, including those  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 of gender, organizations and hierarchies, technology, mirrors, assessments, and so on,  
4  
5 all intra-act so that the leader-self performatively emerges within moment-to-moment  
6  
7 intra-actions with, say, clothes that are performatively constituted as 'business wear'.  
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

Bollas shows us the importance of the witness, *the judgmental gaze of the other*, in this emergence. We expand on this below, when we interrogate this endogenous theory of leadership's materialization.

The third theme explores the gauge against which participants assess how they look.

*Theme three: The self as ideal leader*

We asked participants to define what they understood as 'poor', 'average' and 'excellent' leaders in a separate part of the interviews from that which asked them to describe themselves. Cross-checking their definitions of themselves with their definitions of leadership illuminated that leaders' own self-concept is the measure against which they define 'excellent' leadership and against which they judge others. That is, 'excellent' leaders are similar to, and poor leaders different from, how they see themselves. There is thus much variation in definitions of leadership qualities.

Jay, for example, described herself as short and looking too young for her job. Overall her self-talk is of androgyny: *I dress very neutrally for work erm and that's very conscious. [...] My clothing is not a statement in any way, my jewellery is not a statement in any way. Erm my hair, makeup, it's extremely neutral. [...] I don't wear sexual clothing at all so I don't wear tight skirts*'. She chose ideal leaders who were similarly androgynous: *'My ideal ... leader is neither a man nor a woman and ... they wouldn't wear clothes that were sexualised in any way'*. One of her choices of an excellent leader, *'was [like her] quite short. He ... was very concerned to be very neutral at work'*. Jo, meanwhile, was consciously surprised that all her choices of

1  
2  
3 leaders were men, but her self-description is of someone who strips all signifiers of  
4 femininity from her appearance – she does not wear high heels, wears little make-up  
5 and emphasizes that she does not ‘*have my finger nails painted, I don't really show*  
6 *my nails at work*’. Leslie, on the other hand, does a great deal of work on her  
7 appearance, describing it in depth: everything has to look right. She distinguished her  
8 ideal from mediocre leaders by the amount of attention they paid to detail: ‘*those two*  
9 *[excellent leaders] have a quality of appearance and care over their appearance*’.  
10 Ray, passionate about his work and wearing suits only when he has to, specified that  
11 excellent leaders were similarly not bothered about appearance but were highly  
12 engaged in their work; like him they focused on ‘substance’ rather than ‘surface’.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25 Thus for the androgyne the excellent leader is an androgyne; for the masculine  
26 female the ideal leader is masculine; for the enthusiast the ideal leader is enthusiastic;  
27 and so on. We explore the significance of this below.  
28  
29  
30

31 Richard is the only participant who *specifically* stated that excellent leaders looked  
32 like him: ‘*what would they look like? Mmm. Me!*’ Others did not appear consciously  
33 aware of the similarities between their self-definitions given at the start of the  
34 interviews and their later descriptions of excellent leaders. However, Richard gives us  
35 insights into the relationship between self-concept and the excellent-leader concept.  
36 Richard identified only one person as an excellent leader: himself, but defines himself  
37 in relation to others he regards as bad leaders. He focused on bullies: one ex-boss was  
38 the: ‘*Absolute biggest bully I've ever met in my life. ... you thought, I'm dealing with*  
39 *... a barrow boy who can rip me to pieces if I step out of line*. His predecessor in his  
40 current job was a ‘bad’ leader because of his bullying and destructive behaviour.  
41 Richard sees his role as protecting staff from bullies: he took his team with him when  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 he left a firm run by a bully, and is changing the bullying culture bequeathed by his  
4  
5 predecessor in his current job.

6  
7 Richard defines poor leaders as the opposite of himself: he is compassionate, they  
8  
9 are bullies; he dresses smartly, they are unkempt. However, he refused to identify  
10  
11 anyone except himself as an excellent leader, always turning the discussion back to  
12  
13 himself if asked to describe excellence in leadership:  
14  
15

16  
17  
18 *'an ideal leader ... would pass [their] knowledge on, they would share that*  
19  
20 *knowledge ... They don't take over and take the glory ... You know, I could*  
21  
22 *take tools off some of my workers, in fact I have you know taken a saw off*  
23  
24 *someone as recently as three weeks ago and I said 'look, you're going to hurt*  
25  
26 *yourself, this is how you use a saw'. ... That is coaching. If I completed the job*  
27  
28 *and finished it and polished it all up and stood back and said what a good job*  
29  
30 *I've done, that would be totally wrong.*  
31  
32

33  
34  
35  
36  
37 Richard consciously articulates what appears in other participants' talk to be an  
38  
39 'unthought known' (Bollas, 1987), that is something that is apprehended but not yet  
40  
41 consciously articulated. Sasha typifies this. She denies that she is a leader:  
42  
43

44  
45  
46 *I certainly don't think of myself as charismatic. I think I am (long pause) I*  
47  
48 *think I'm reliable and I provide reassurance, um, I provide a (long pause) I*  
49  
50 *think I probably lead from the side rather than lead from the front, so um I'll*  
51  
52 *be a very good lieutenant for the charismatic leader ... Um (long pause). In*  
53  
54 *fact I'm not sure that I'm much of a leader at all really.*  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 However contradictions between this statement and her self-concept and definitions  
4  
5 of excellent leadership emerge in the transcript. An excellent leader:  
6  
7

8  
9  
10 *would be somebody who gets results, because you can talk until the cows*  
11 *come home and you can be full of good i.. good visions and you can (laughs)*  
12 *um pontificate at great length but unless there's actually some substance*  
13 *behind it and you can see that things are changing and you're achieving what*  
14 *you're trying to achieve then, um. ....*  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23 Sasha dismisses theories of leadership. The talk that, say, transformational leaders  
24 should do in sharing their vision is something she denigrates as 'pontification': she  
25 prefers 'seeing' changes happen in the present. She emphasises 'doing' as the ideal  
26 leadership characteristic. It is interesting then that she described herself as:  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

32  
33  
34 *I'm more a doer and a person that does the background, the spadework to*  
35 *make things happen....*  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 For Sasha, getting things done distinguishes excellent from poor leaders, and she  
41 describes herself as someone who gets things done. She may not admit it, may not be  
42 consciously aware of it, but her understanding of the excellent leader is mimetic of  
43 her image of herself.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 In these accounts the speakers talk of 'character' and 'personality' rather than  
50 appearance. In Bollas's terms 'character' and 'personality' are woven into one's  
51 physical presence, that is, into a 'personal idiom' or aesthetic of being, an 'itness' that  
52 distinguishes one person from another (Bollas, 2007). This includes the voice,  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 manners of speech, how the person moves and uses their bodies, the texture added  
4  
5 when occupying spaces and the shape of their absence after they leave. Elusive, it is  
6  
7 an important feature of unconscious communication (Bollas, 1993 64-5 *et passim*).  
8  
9 Bollas thus expands upon Barad's understanding of materialities in an important way.  
10  
11 Barad includes specific human actors, such as Ronald Reagan and Alan Turin, in her  
12  
13 accounts of intra-action and entanglement (see model in Barad, 2007, p.389), but she  
14  
15 does not 'deconstruct' them, as it were. Introducing Bollas's understanding of the  
16  
17 complexities of individuals is therefore invaluable in illuminating how individual's  
18  
19 affect, aesthetics, sensory signals and responses are entangled in intra-actions of  
20  
21 'personal idiom' and materialities.  
22  
23

24  
25 This third theme suggests that, conscious of it or not, individual's definitions of  
26  
27 leadership qualities reflect perceptions of their own self. In some ways this echoes  
28  
29 long-standing research by social psychologists that suggests people are attracted to  
30  
31 those who resemble themselves (e.g. Bretz, Ash & Dreher, 1989). But in the terms of  
32  
33 this study, the direction of influence is unclear: do people define leadership based on  
34  
35 their self-perception, or do they model themselves on their definition of leadership?  
36  
37 Barad would rule this question inadmissible: self-definitions are not prior to  
38  
39 conceptions of leadership, nor conceptions of leadership prior to self-definitions: each  
40  
41 is complexly entangled and intra-acting.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

#### 48 **Summary: an endogenous theory of the materialisation of leaders/ship**

49  
50 In aiming to understand how leadership is made palpably, materially present, this  
51  
52 paper has analysed interview materials that suggest managers charged with  
53  
54 be(com)ing leaders work within the terms of an endogenous theory of the  
55  
56 materialisation of leadership. Their lay theory, or theory-in-practice, is that: other's  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 leadership qualities can be read off from how they look; one's own physical  
4 presentation therefore must represent one's own leadership abilities; and so physical  
5 appearance must be worked on to project images of the self's qualities as a leader.  
6  
7 Participants' own self-image, consciously or unconsciously, matches their image of  
8  
9 the ideal leader. Pérezts, Fay and Picard's (2015) distinction between exogenous and  
10  
11 endogenous theories of ethics is useful in locating this lay theory. That is, rather than  
12  
13 exogenous perspectives that dominate leadership theory through prescribing how  
14  
15 leadership *should* be practised, this *endogenous* leadership theory is subjective and  
16  
17 conceives of leadership, like ethics, as an 'ongoing organizational phenomena ...  
18  
19 pertaining to being' and thus leadership, like ethics, is 'an epicentre ... embedded in ..  
20  
21 subjects' (p. 218) rather than in academic or management consulting theories.  
22  
23 However, where Pérezts et al explore embodiment, our focus is on appearance, that is,  
24  
25 on what covers over the flesh of bodies.  
26  
27

28  
29  
30  
31  
32 This endogenous theory's focus is on a morphology of the material self as  
33  
34 something that can be manipulated through working on one's appearance. There was  
35  
36 no mention of flesh or bone, illness or disability in the interviews, so the body itself  
37  
38 was absent from the discourses through which participants articulated their accounts  
39  
40 of leadership (Leder, 1987). References focused on those aspects of appearance that  
41  
42 are amenable to being worked upon by the subject – her/his clothes, hair, and so on –  
43  
44 and presented to others (and the self) as if it were the literal embodiment of leadership  
45  
46 qualities.  
47  
48

49  
50 However, there was no overt theorising by participants about *how* working on one's  
51  
52 appearance makes one's leadership qualities, and thus leadership, manifest. We have  
53  
54 indicated above certain similarities between lay accounts and Barad's new  
55  
56 materialities theory, albeit that participants' accounts, unsurprisingly, use simpler  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 language. We next draw on Barad and Bollas to explore how the concepts embedded  
4  
5 in this endogenous theory explain how it ‘works’. This shows how sophisticated and  
6  
7 complicated it is, and thus how the theory we develop in this paper offers a new,  
8  
9 experiential account of leadership as material micro-practices.  
10

### 11 12 13 14 **Discussion: Towards a theory of leadership as material micro-practices of the** 15 16 **self**

17  
18 The long history of exogenous or externally-imposed theories of leadership has been  
19  
20 based on presumptions about leadership that are unsupported by in-depth exploration  
21  
22 of leadership-in-practice. Indeed, some have questioned whether there is such a thing  
23  
24 as ‘leadership’, with difficulties in observing it in practice leading to suggestions of  
25  
26 leadership as a negative ontology (Kelly, 2014). However, the ubiquity of the term  
27  
28 itself, its incorporation in business school degrees and participation by numerous  
29  
30 managers in leadership training courses suggest the performativity of the term brings  
31  
32 that very thing, leadership, into being (Ford & Harding, 2007). But definitions of  
33  
34 leadership are ambiguous and conflicting (Harding et al, 2014), and ‘so we go – as  
35  
36 language permits – repeating a never ending chain of ambiguous signifiers, attached  
37  
38 to other ambiguous signifiers, and so on, as if there were somewhere an original –  
39  
40 fully present to itself’ (Calas, 1993 p. 323). Calas is here talking about charisma, but  
41  
42 her arguments can be applied to leadership more generally. We have seen in this study  
43  
44 that the ambiguity of definitions of excellent and poor leadership is resolved by  
45  
46 participants drawing on their self-image as a way of achieving clarity about this  
47  
48 identity they have been told they must adopt. They turn themselves into leaders  
49  
50 through making themselves look like how they think leaders should look.  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 We next explore this lay theory's explanatory power. We read it through Barad's  
4  
5 and Bollas's work, thus suggesting this endogenous theory's complexity. It is a theory  
6  
7 of how non-sentient actors convey a multiplicity of complex and even chaotic images  
8  
9 that are condensed, in the mind's melting pot, into what appears as a deceptively  
10  
11 simple account: by looking like the kind of leader I rate, I become more that kind of  
12  
13 leader.  
14

15  
16 We follow our speakers' focus on dress and mirrors, understanding them as agentive  
17  
18 actors that performatively materialise leaders. New materialism understands objects  
19  
20 as agentive – they act upon the world. This is echoed by the participants in this study:  
21  
22 appropriate appearance signifies their leadership qualities. That is, clothes, hair,  
23  
24 make-up, etc., are, in academic terms, themselves morphologically active and  
25  
26 generative agents. This does not negate or reverse the sentient actor's agency, but  
27  
28 leads to an understanding of the constitutive interaction of sentient and non-sentient  
29  
30 actors. Sasha put this graphically in referring to a 'bad hair day' – on such days her  
31  
32 work on her hair fails because it refuses to present itself as she desires. In some ways  
33  
34 the intra-actions of self and 'bad hair' constitute her as 'not-leader' or 'not-good-  
35  
36 leader', at least for a day. The rarity of such direct references to materiality's agency  
37  
38 necessitates exploration through other avenues.  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 Barad suggests (2007, p. 370) that a specific body's 'differential materialization is  
44  
45 discursive – entailing causal practices reconfiguring boundaries and properties that  
46  
47 matter to its very existence'. In our study this reconfiguration involves the  
48  
49 transcendence of flesh, as seen in the absence from the interviews of any mention of  
50  
51 bodies and flesh. No doubt water, deodorants, soap, showers, shampoo, scissors,  
52  
53 emery boards and so on were used by participants to achieve contemporary standards  
54  
55 of hygiene, but their absence from the interviews signifies that in lay theory leaders  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 transcend nature and the disruptive aspects of bodies (Kem, 1974). Bodies and  
4  
5 embodiment appear in lay leadership theory only as an absent presence, controlled  
6  
7 and then forgotten about.  
8

9  
10 The non-sentient actor of most importance in the interviews is business dress. It is  
11  
12 here understood as agentic, influencing the materialisation of leaders through what  
13  
14 Barad (2007) terms causally productive forces of knowing and being. That is, in  
15  
16 putting on the suit, as participants described it, they *became* leaders. But *why* does  
17  
18 business dress signify professionalism (Kelan, 2013) and ‘the business leader’ while  
19  
20 other forms of clothing do not (Mavin & Grandy, 2016)?  
21  
22

23  
24 The business suit’s discourse constitutes wearers through its imposition of these  
25  
26 norms. Leaders, looking in mirrors at their besuited reflections, may have little  
27  
28 conscious awareness of these instructions beyond somehow knowing what is ‘right’:  
29  
30 they swim in the discourse of the suit with its sedimented layers of meanings, and, as  
31  
32 Barad argues, are performatively evoked within and by its subtexts.  
33

34  
35 Bollas explains this through a theory of ‘object relations’ or relationship between  
36  
37 the psyche and objects. This provides a means for understanding how ‘leader’ and  
38  
39 ‘business suit’ constitute each other. Bollas understands individuals as a unique set of  
40  
41 evolving theories that articulates its theory of who it is by selecting, using and being  
42  
43 used by objects. The object here is the reflection of the putative leader, seen in a  
44  
45 mirror. A glance in a mirror is an extraordinarily complex soliciting of the self  
46  
47 through an experience (of endless ‘free associations’) that involves a dense  
48  
49 condensation of known, half-known and unknown stimuli experienced in the  
50  
51 encounter with the object (Bollas, 1992, p.29). It is only ever partly thinkable, a  
52  
53 tumble of virtually simultaneous thoughts evoked by the glance in the mirror and  
54  
55 rendered comprehensible through an image (me, the leader, in a suit) that simplifies  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 radically all that is absorbed in that single glance. In reducing complexity to  
4  
5 simplicity the mind does not eradicate the multiple meanings that are communicated  
6  
7 in that glance in the mirror – they are there as sub-texts, unconscious but agentive.  
8

9  
10 Business dress and mirror together thus act, *effecting* the leader through the tumble  
11  
12 of meanings represented and encapsulated within it. So the answer to the question  
13  
14 posed above, of why it is the business suit or its equivalent and not other forms of  
15  
16 dress that constitutes leadership, is that business-wear forms a visual discourse  
17  
18 encapsulating norms, histories, cultures, economics, class, gender, etc., that other  
19  
20 forms of dress typically do not offer. In other words, when dressing so as to look the  
21  
22 part of the leader, the actor is immersed in norms that have evolved over decades, if  
23  
24 not centuries. New labels may be attached to the suit-wearer: ‘leader’ rather than  
25  
26 ‘manager’ or ‘administrator’ (Learmonth, 2005), but the norms encapsulated in the  
27  
28 suit inform wearers how to look, how to act, and how to take on the identity of  
29  
30 ‘leader’, through these every-day, material micro-practices of the self.  
31  
32

33  
34 A certain agency is permissible within these norms: we saw that participants chose  
35  
36 their own self-image as a reflection of the excellent leader. Some, for example, were  
37  
38 androgynes, some highly disciplined, some masculine and others rebels who defined  
39  
40 themselves through refusing to wear suits. They worked on their appearance to project  
41  
42 the desired image of the leader-self. So, for example, the masculine female chooses  
43  
44 short hair, severe suits and no ornamentation, each of these carrying norms that,  
45  
46 entangled, spoke of her as a masculine leader. But none defined themselves as very  
47  
48 feminine, or dishevelled, or casual – such clothing and its related manifestations do  
49  
50 not inherit the centuries of meaning of the business suit, and cannot therefore do  
51  
52 service in the materialisation of the leader.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 It is curious then that there was so little reference to charisma in any of these  
4 interviews, even though, as Calas (1993) reminds us, it has been integral to dominant  
5 (exogenous) theories of leadership since Weber identified charisma as a legitimate  
6 form of authority (Weber, 1946). Calas points out indeed (1993, p.324) that  
7 'transformational' and other theories of leadership are 'surrogates' of Weber's theory  
8 of charisma. Participants demonstrated their knowledge of theories of leadership  
9 through speaking of their desire to be transformational or authentic, yet the word  
10 'charisma' was only mentioned in one interview as part of a claim by Sasha that she  
11 did not perceive herself as charismatic.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23 Could it be then, as Weber wrote in his later work, that charisma has become  
24 *routinized*, or domesticated (Calas, 1993)? In other words, rather than it  
25 encapsulating an aesthetic encounter between leader and follower as Ladkin more  
26 recently (2006) suggested, is charisma incorporated into that every-day glance in the  
27 mirror when the putative leader checks that s/he looks like the leader they desire to  
28 be? Ladkin (2006) writes, following Weber, that the 'follower must *believe* in the  
29 leader's charisma'. Our study implies that *leaders* must believe in their own charisma  
30 if they are to be leaders. Borrowing again from Pérezts, Fay and Picard (2015), could  
31 we say that charisma is now so routinized that it is 'an epicentre ... embedded in ..  
32 subjects' (p. 218). The glance in the mirror, in this reading, becomes a sublime  
33 encounter (Ladkin, 2006) in which the putative leader not only persuades themselves  
34 that they look like a leader should look, but that those looks mark them out as special  
35 enough to be excellent leaders.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51 This is only speculation: it suggests that the next stage in exploring this endogenous  
52 theory of leadership is a study of those who feel themselves incapable of being  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 leaders, or who can report as having failed at leadership. What do *they* see when they  
4  
5 look in the mirror?  
6

7  
8 In summary, the seemingly mundane tasks of preparing for work through showering,  
9  
10 dressing and making the self presentable can be understood as complexly-coded acts of  
11  
12 *materialisation* of norms, codes, cultures, histories, economics, legal systems, and so on,  
13  
14 all of which coalesce as rules about how ‘the leader’ should look. Participants in this  
15  
16 study encapsulated this themselves in an endogenous theory that understands that  
17  
18 leadership emerges through work on the self.  
19

### 20 21 22 **Conclusion: Future research?**

23  
24 Leadership theories have omitted materialities such as the physical presence of  
25  
26 leaders from their understanding of how, say, the transformational leader emanates  
27  
28 charisma (Bass, 1985), the authentic leader makes her authentic self available for the  
29  
30 emulation of followers (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999), the servant-leader provides a  
31  
32 model to inspire followers (Greenleaf, 1977), and so on. In these dominant exogenous  
33  
34 theories leadership is understood to be something peculiar to certain individuals who  
35  
36 possess the desired characteristics (Collinson, 2014; Ladkin, 2010), but these  
37  
38 individuals seem disembodied (Pullen & Vacchani, 2013), as if they have no material  
39  
40 presence. Such perspectives have recently been radically challenged by  
41  
42 constructionist accounts (Fairhurst & Grant, 2010) that explore how leadership  
43  
44 emerges through interactions between leaders and followers (Bligh, Kohles & Pillai,  
45  
46 (2011). This implies the presence of physical selves in material places, but as yet the  
47  
48 materialities of such encounters between leaders and followers remain unexplored.  
49  
50  
51  
52

53  
54 Our study however sets out an endogenous theory of leadership in which the leader  
55  
56 emerges as a material presence through intra-actions between the subject and non-  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 sentient actors such as the business suit and the mirror. That is, before appearing on  
4  
5 the organizational stage in which interactions between leaders and followers can  
6  
7 occur, those who must take on the mantle of organizational leadership have worked  
8  
9 on themselves through micro-practices of the self to constitute themselves as material  
10  
11 articulations of leadership. In this perspective, there is no leader who pre-exists  
12  
13 leadership practices, as the long history of leadership theory has presumed. Rather,  
14  
15 the leader must constitute him/herself as leader and then perhaps practise leadership.  
16  
17 However, leadership's long history has informed leaders about what 'the leader'  
18  
19 should be: the business suit and other aspects of their appearance encapsulate and  
20  
21 articulate these norms and discourses of leadership.  
22  
23  
24

25 This study, in contributing to leadership theory and thus to organizational theory  
26  
27 more generally, did not explore intra-actions between leader-selves and organizational  
28  
29 space, where buildings, technology, furniture and décor intra-act with suits, hair,  
30  
31 brief-cases and individuals constituting themselves as leaders, so further study is  
32  
33 needed. Power has appeared only implicitly in this paper – it needs explicit  
34  
35 exploration. For example, the absence of bodies from leadership theory, which we  
36  
37 observed in the introduction to this paper, is a form of architectural regulation that is  
38  
39 an operation of power (Butler, 2015) and needs to be understood through further  
40  
41 research.  
42  
43  
44

45 This paper thus offers a new theory of leadership that emerges from practitioners'  
46  
47 own experiential understanding of leadership in everyday practice. This endogenous  
48  
49 theory challenges the terms of exogenous theories, and suggests the need for further  
50  
51 studies of how leaders articulate and understand leadership in the everyday of  
52  
53 organizational life.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## References

- Ashcraft KL, Khun TR & Cooren F (2009) Constitutional amendments: materializing organizational communication. *The Academy of Management Annals* 3, 1–64.
- Ashforth, B., & Johnson, S. (2001) Which hat to wear? The relative salience of multiple identities in organizational contexts. In: Hogg M, Terry D (eds) *Social identity processes in organizational contexts* (pp.31-48). Philadelphia: Psychology Press.
- Banks, V.M. (2001) *Visual Methods in Social Research*, London: Sage.
- Barad K. (2007) *Meeting the Universe Halfway*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Bass B. (1985) *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations*, New York: Free Press.
- Bass B & Steidlmeier P (1999) Ethics, Character, and Authentic Transformational Leadership Behavior, *Leadership Quarterly*, 10, 181-217.
- Bathurst, R. & Cain, T. (2013) Embodied Leadership: The aesthetics of gesture. *Leadership*, 9, 358-377.
- Bligh, M. Kohles, J. & Pillai, R. (2011) 'Romancing leadership: past, present and future', *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22, 1058-107.
- Bollas, C. (1987) *The Shadow of the Object*. London: Free Association Books.
- Bollas, C. (1993) *Being a Character: Psychoanalysis and Self Experience*. London: Routledge.
- Bollas, C. (1995) *Cracking Up: The Work of Unconscious Experience*. London: Routledge.
- Bollas, C. (2007) *The Freudian Moment*. London: Karnac.
- Bollas, C. (2009) *The Evocative Object World*. London: Routledge.
- Bretz, R.D., Ash, R.A. & Dreher, G.F, (1989) Do people make the place? An examination of the attraction-selection-attrition hypothesis. *Personnel Psychology*, 42, 561-581.
- Burgoyne, J. (2004) *How certain are we that management and leadership development is effective?* Paper presented at the Management Learning and Leadership Workshop, Lancaster University, July 2004.
- Butler, J. (1990) *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge.
- Butler, J, (1993) *Bodies that Matter*. New York: Routledge.

1  
2  
3  
4 Butler, J. (1997) *The Psychic Life of Power*. Stanford, Calif: Stanford University  
5 Press.  
6

7 Butler, J. (2015) *Notes toward a performative theory of assembly*. Harvard: Harvard  
8 University Press.  
9

10 Calas, M. (1993) Deconstructing charismatic leadership: re-reading Weber from the  
11 darker side. *Leadership Quarterly*, 4, 305-328.  
12

13 Clarke, S. (2002) Learning from experiences: Psychosocial research methods in the  
14 social sciences *Qualitative Research*, 2, 173-194.  
15

16 Colebrook, C. (2008) On not becoming man: the materialist political of unactualized  
17 potential. In Alamo, S. & Hekman, S. (Eds) *Material feminisms* (pp.52-84).  
18 Bloomington: University of Indiana Press.  
19

20 Collinson, D. (2014) Dichotomies, dialectics and dilemmas: New directions for  
21 critical leadership studies? *Leadership*, 10, 36-55.  
22

23 Crossley, M. (2000) *Introducing Narrative Psychology: Self, Trauma and the*  
24 *Construction of Meaning*. Buckingham: Open University Press.  
25

26 Dale, K. & Latham, Y. (2015) Ethics and entangled embodiment: Bodies-  
27 materialities-organization. *Organization*, 22, 166-182.  
28

29 Denzin, N.K. (1991) *Images of Postmodern Society: Social Theory and*  
30 *Contemporary Cinema*. London: Sage.  
31

32 Entwistle, J. (1997). 'Power Dressing' and the Construction of the Career Woman. In  
33 *Buy this Book* (pp.311-324). M. Nava, A. Blake, I. MacRury & B. Richards. London,  
34 Routledge.  
35

36 Fairhurst, G. & Cooren, F. (2009) Leadership as the hybrid production of presence(s).  
37 *Leadership*, 5, 469-490.  
38

39 Fairhurst, G.T. & Grant, D. (2010) The social construction of leadership: a sailing  
40 guide. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 24, 171-210.  
41

42 Fisher, K. & Reiser Robbins, C. (2014) Embodied leadership: moving from leader  
43 competencies to leaderful practice. *Leadership*, 11, 281-299.  
44

45 Flugel, J.C. (1930) *The psychology of clothes*. London:Hogarth Press.  
46

47 Ford, J., & Harding, N. (2007) Move over management: We are all leaders now?  
48 *Management Learning*, 38, 475-493.  
49

50 Fransella, F., Bell, R. & Bannister, D. (2004) *A manual for repertory grid technique*.  
51 *Second edition*. London: John Wiley.  
52

- 1  
2  
3 Gardner, W., Cogliser, C., Davis, K., & Dickens, M. 2011. Authentic leadership: A  
4 review of the literature and research agenda. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22, 1120-  
5 1145.  
6  
7 Goffman, E. (1959) *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Anchor  
8 Books Doubleday.  
9  
10 Greenleaf, R. (1977) *Servant Leadership*, New Jersey: Paulist Press.  
11  
12  
13 Grosz, E. (1994) *Volatile Bodies: Toward a Corporeal Feminism*. Bloomington,  
14 Indiana: Indiana University Press.  
15  
16 Guthey, E. & Jackson, B. (2005) CEO portraits and the authenticity paradox. *Journal*  
17 *of Management Studies*, 42, 1057-1082.  
18  
19 Hansen, H., Ropo, A., & Sauer E (2007) Aesthetic leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*  
20 18, 544-560.  
21  
22 Harding, N. (2002) On the manager's body as an aesthetics of control. *Tamara: Jo.*  
23 *Critical Postmodern Organization Science*. 2, 63-76.  
24  
25 Harding, N., Lee, H., Ford, J., & Learmonth, M. (2011) Leadership and charisma: A  
26 desire that cannot speak its name? *Human Relations* 64, 927-950.  
27  
28 Hardy, C. and Thomas, R. (2015) Discourse in a material world. *Journal of*  
29 *Management Studies*, 52, 680-96.  
30  
31 Hatch, J.A., & Wisniewski, R. (1995) *Life History and Narrative*. London: The  
32 Farmer Press.  
33  
34 Hawkins, B. (2015) Ship-shape: Materializing leadership in the British Royal Navy.  
35 *Human Relations*, 68, 951-971  
36  
37 Hearn, J. & Parkin, W. (1986) *'Sex' at 'Work': The Power and Paradox of*  
38 *Organisation Sexuality*. Brighton: Wheatsheaf Books Ltd.  
39  
40 Hekman, S. (2010) *The Material of Knowledge: Feminist Disclosures*. Bloomington,  
41 Indian: Indiana University Press.  
42  
43 Hird, M. (2000) Gender's nature. Intersexuality, transsexualism and the 'sex'/'gender'  
44 binary. *Feminist Theory*, 1, 347-364.  
45  
46 Hollway, W. & Jefferson, T. (2012) *Doing qualitative research differently*. London:  
47 Sage.  
48  
49 Kelan EK (2013) The becoming of business bodies: Gender appearance and  
50 leadership development. *Management Learning* 44, 45-61.  
51  
52 Kelly, G. (1955) *The Theory of Personal Constructs*. New York: Norton.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Kelly, S (2014) 'Towards a Negative Ontology of Leadership'. *Human Relations*, 67,  
4 905-922.  
5  
6  
7 Kem, S. (1974) Olfactory ontology and scented harmonies: on the history of smell.  
8 *The Journal of Popular Culture*, 6, 816-824;  
9  
10 King, N (2012) 'Doing template analysis' in Symon, G. & Cassell, C. *Qualitative*  
11 *Organizational Research: Core methods and current challenges* (pp.426-450).  
12 London: Sage.  
13  
14 Kirby, V. (1997) *Telling flesh: the substance of the corporeal*. London: Routledge.  
15  
16 Kupers, W.M. (2013) Embodied inter-practices of leadership. *Leadership*, 9, 335-357.  
17  
18 Ladkin, D. (2010) *Rethinking leadership: a new look at old leadership questions*.  
19 Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.  
20  
21 Ladkin, D. (2013) From perception to flesh: A phenomenological account of the felt  
22 experience of leadership. *Leadership*, 9, 320-334.  
23  
24 Ladkin, D. & Spiller, C. (2013). *Authentic leadership: Clashes, convergences and*  
25 *coalescences*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.  
26  
27  
28 Learmonth, M. (2005) Doing things with words: the case of 'management' and  
29 'administration'. *Public Administration*, 83, 617-637.  
30  
31 Leder, D (1987) *The absent body*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.  
32  
33  
34 Mavin, S & Grandy, G (2016), A theory of Abject Appearance: Women elite leaders'  
35 intra-gender 'management' of bodies and appearance. *Human Relations*, 69, 1095-  
36 1120.  
37  
38 Mazzei, L.A. (2014) Beyond an Easy Sense: A Diffractive Analysis. *Qualitative*  
39 *Inquiry*, 20, 742-746.  
40  
41  
42 Melina, L.R., Burgess, G.J. , Falkman, L.L. & Marturano, A. (Eds). (2013) *The*  
43 *embodiment of leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.  
44  
45  
46 Muhr, S.L. & Sullivan, K.R. (2013) 'None so queer as folk': gendered expectations  
47 and transgressive bodies in leadership. *Leadership*, 9, 416-435.  
48  
49 Orlikowski, W.J., & Scott, S.V. (2014) What happens when evaluation goes online?  
50 Exploring apparatuses of valuation in the travel sector. *Organization Science*, 25,  
51 868-891.  
52  
53 Olikowski, W.J. & Scott, S.V. (2015) Exploring Material-Discursive Practices.  
54 *Journal of Management Studies*, 52, 697-705.  
55  
56 Pérezts, M., Fay, E., & Picard, S. (2015) Ethics, embodied life and *esprit de corps*: an  
57 ethnographic study with anti-money laundering analysts. *Organization*, 22, 217-234.  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4 Phillips, N. & Oswick, C. (2012) Organizational discourse: domains, debates, and  
5 directions. *Academy of Management Annals* 6, 435-481.  
6  
7  
8 Pink, S. (2007) *Doing Visual Ethnography: Images, Media and Representation in*  
9 *Research*, 2nd edn. London: Sage.  
10  
11 Pratt, M.G. & Rafaeli, A. (1997) Organizational dress as a symbol of multilayered  
12 social identities. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40, 862-898.  
13  
14 Pullen, A & Vacchani, S. (2013) 'The materiality of Leadership', *Leadership*, 9, 315-  
15 319.  
16  
17 Putnam, L. (2015) Unpacking the dialectic: alternative views on the discourse-  
18 materiality relationship. *Journal of Management Studies*, 52, 706-16.  
19  
20  
21 Rafaeli, A., Dutton, J., Harquail, C.V., & Mackie-Lewis, S (1997) Navigating by  
22 attire: the use of dress by female administrative employees. *Academy of Management*  
23 *Journal*, 40, 9-45.  
24  
25 Reynolds, M. (1999) Critical reflection and management education: Rehabilitating  
26 less hierarchical approaches. *Journal of Management Education* 23, 537-553.  
27  
28 Ringrose, J. & Renold, E. (2014) "F\*\*k Rape!": Exploring Affective Intensities in a  
29 Feminist Research Assemblage. *Qualitative Inquiry* 20, 772-80  
30  
31  
32 Roberts, L.M. (2005) Changing faces: professional image construction in diverse  
33 organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review* 30, 685-711.  
34  
35 Roberts, L.M., Dutton, J.E., Spreitzer, G.M., Heaphy, E.D., & Quinn, R.E. (2005)  
36 Composing the reflected best-self portrait: Building pathways for becoming  
37 extraordinary in work organizations. *Academy of Management Review* 30, 712-736.  
38  
39 Ropo, A. & Sauer, E. (2008) Corporeal leaders. In D. Barry and H. Hansen (Eds.)  
40 *The SAGE handbook of new approaches in management and organization* (469-478).  
41 London: SAGE.  
42  
43  
44 Ropo, A. & Parviainen, J. (2001) Leadership and bodily knowledge in expert  
45 organizations: epistemological rethinking. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 17,  
46 1-18.  
47  
48 Ropo, A., Sauer, E., & Salovaara, P. (2013) Embodiment of leadership through  
49 material place. *Leadership* 9, 378-395.  
50  
51  
52 Rose, G. (2007) *Visual Methodologies: An Introduction to the Interpretation of Visual*  
53 *Methods*. London: Sage  
54  
55 Rose, J. (1988) Sexuality and vision. In: H. Foster (Ed) *Vision and Visuality:*  
56 *Discussion in Contemporary Culture* (115-130). Seattle, WA: Bay Press.  
57  
58  
59  
60



- 1  
2  
3 Silverman, K. (1988) *The Acoustic Mirror. The Female Voice in Psychoanalysis*  
4 *and Cinema*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.  
5  
6  
7 Sinclair, A. (2005) 'Journey around Leadership' *Working Paper, 10 March 2005*,  
8 Melbourne: University of Melbourne.  
9  
10 Sinclair, A. (2013) A material dean. *Leadership*, 9, 436-443.  
11  
12 Smolovic Jones, O. & Jackson, B. (2015) 'Seeing leadership: becoming sophisticated  
13 consumers of leadership', in Carroll, B. Ford, J. & Taylor, S. (eds) (2015)  
14 *Leadership: Contemporary Critical Perspectives* (pp.253-271). London: Sage.  
15  
16 Sobchack, V. (2004) *Carnal thoughts: embodiment and moving image culture*.  
17 University of California Press.  
18  
19 Solomon-Godeau, A. (1997). *Male Trouble. A Crisis in Representation*. London:  
20 Thames and Hudson Ltd.  
21  
22 Storey, J. (Ed.). 2011. *Leadership in Organizations: Current Issues and Key Trends*,  
23 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. London: Routledge.  
24  
25  
26 Symon, G. & Pritchard, K. (2015) Performing the responsive and committed  
27 employee through the sociomaterial mangle of connection. *Organization Studies*, 36,  
28 241-263.  
29  
30  
31 Taylor, C. A., & Ivinson, G. (2013). Material feminisms: New directions for  
32 education. *Gender and Education*, 25, 665-670.  
33  
34 Thanem, T. (2013) More passion than the job requires? Monstrously transgressive  
35 leadership in the promotion of health at work. *Leadership*, 9, 396-415.  
36  
37  
38 Trethewey, A. (1999) Disciplined bodies: women's embodied identities at work.  
39 *Organization Studies*, 20, 423-450.  
40  
41 Tuana, N. (2008) Viscous porosity: witnessing Katrina. In S. Alaimo and S. Hekman  
42 (Eds). *Material feminisms* (pp.188-213). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.  
43  
44 Turner, B.S. (1992). *Regulating bodies: Essays in medical sociology*. London:  
45 Routledge.  
46  
47  
48 Van der Tuin, I. (2014). 'Diffraction as a Methodology for Feminist Onto-  
49 Epistemology: On Encountering Chantal Chawaf and Posthuman Interpellation.'  
50 Parallax special issue 'Diffracted Worlds - Diffractive Readings: Onto-  
51 Epistemologies and the Critical Humanities' eds. Birgit M. Kaiser & Kathrin Thiele  
52 20, 231-44.  
53  
54  
55 Warren, S. (2008) Empirical challenges in organizational aesthetics research.  
56 *Organization Studies* 29, 559-580.  
57  
58  
59  
60



Weber, M. (1946) Bureaucracy. In Gerth, H.H. & Mills, C.W. (eds.) *From Max Weber: Essays in sociology* (pp. 196-244). New York: Oxford University Press.

Winnicott, D.W. (1967) *Playing and Reality*. London: Tavistock Press

For Peer Review