



Feminist futures in gender-in-leadership research: Self-reflexive approximations to intersectional situatedness

DOI:

[10.1108/GM-07-2022-0253](https://doi.org/10.1108/GM-07-2022-0253)

Document Version

Accepted author manuscript

[Link to publication record in Manchester Research Explorer](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Rodriguez, J. K., Guenther, E. A., & Faiz, R. (2022). Feminist futures in gender-in-leadership research: Self-reflexive approximations to intersectional situatedness. *Gender in Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/GM-07-2022-0253>

Published in:

Gender in Management

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on Manchester Research Explorer is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Proof version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Explorer are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Takedown policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please refer to the University of Manchester's Takedown Procedures [<http://man.ac.uk/04Y6Bo>] or contact uml.scholarlycommunications@manchester.ac.uk providing relevant details, so we can investigate your claim.



Feminist futures in gender-in-leadership research: Self-reflexive approximations to intersectional situatedness

Jenny K. Rodriguez (Alliance Manchester Business School, University of Manchester, Manchester, UK)

Elisabeth Anna Guenther (Centre for Teacher Education, University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria)

Rafia Faiz (University Canada West, British Columbia, Canada)

Abstract

Purpose

This paper introduces intersectional situatedness to develop inclusive analyses of leadership. Intersectional situatedness recognises the contextual and situated nature of experiences and their interaction with social categories of difference.

Methodology

The paper draws on memory work by three feminist academics who situate their understandings and experiences of leadership as part of socio-historical contexts.

Findings

Understandings and experiences of leadership are multifaceted and benefit from being examined in their intersectional situatedness. This way, the simultaneity of visible and invisible disadvantage and privilege, which accumulate, shift and get reconfigured across the life course and based on particular intersectional identity invocations can be integrated in narratives about leadership.

Research implications

Interrogating gender-in-leadership embedding intersectional situatedness helps to advance the field by embedding the recognition, problematization and theorisation of situated difference as critical to understand leadership, its meaning and its practice in management and organisations.

Practical implications

In embedding intersectional situatedness in the analysis of leadership, more inclusive understandings of leadership are qualified that recognise differences positively and can help change the narrative around the meaning of “leader” and “good leadership”.

Social implications

Intersectional situatedness helps to identify tangible ways to see how inequalities impact women's career progression to leadership and enable more nuanced conversations about privilege and disadvantage to advance feminist social justice agendas.

Originality

The paper reveals the narrow and restricted understandings of leadership, and how this influences who is regarded as a legitimate leader. In addition, it adopts a methodology that is not commonly used in gender-in-leadership research.

Feminist futures in gender-in-leadership research: Self-reflexive approximations to intersectional situatedness

“As your leader, I encourage you –from time to time and always in a respectful manner-- to question my logic. If you're unconvinced a particular plan of action I've decided is the wisest, tell me so. But allow me to convince you; and I will promise you, right here and now, no subject will be taboo. Except, of course, the subject that was just under discussion. The price you pay for bringing up either my Chinese or American heritage as a negative is, I collect your fuckin' head, just like this fucker here. Now if any of you sons of bitches got anything else to say, now's the fuckin' time.

I didn't think so”

O-Ren Ishii
Kill Bill Vol. 1
Dir. Quentin Tarantino, 2003

Introduction

Gender-in-leadership continues to be one of the most thought-provoking terrains in management and organisation studies (MOS) and has helped us to gain insight into how gender dynamics shape leadership experiences (Eagly and Karau, 2002; Lewis et al. 2017; Elliott & Stead, 2018; Mavin, 2021). This literature has given us a solid starting point to explore important differences in the conceptualisation and praxis of leadership and address the gender question in the constructs of leadership and leader. In line with feminist calls for societal and organizational change, gender-in-leadership scholarship has centred the struggles faced by women leaders.

However, despite the usefulness of gendering leadership (Marshall, 2011), this scholarship has historically polarised and essentialised subject positioning within leadership. For instance, one of the most influential debates in leadership scholarship (see Appelbaum et al., 2003; Herrera et al., 2012) has focused on whether there is a ‘women’s leadership style’ and the extent to which it breaks through gender barriers. At a time when there are calls for feminism to be more intersectional, gender-in-leadership also has to become more intersectional. There is much space for gender-in-leadership scholarship to develop situated analyses that embed specific social, historical and contextual nuances to understand leadership journeys (see Jogulu and Franken, 2022).

In this paper, we show how adopting an intersectional situatedness approach to understand experiences in/of leadership yields to a more inclusive analysis. We define intersectional situatedness as recognising the importance of spatial and temporal dimensions of intersecting social categories of difference in shaping the lived experiences of individuals and groups. We use a self-reflexive approach, adopting Frigga Haug's memory-work to locate understandings and experiences as part of our histories and socio-cultural backgrounds.

We start the paper with a quote in a scene from the movie *Kill Bill Volume 1* (Dir. Quentin Tarantino, 2003). The scene is set in a boardroom where O-Ren Ishii (played by actor Lucy Liu), becomes the official leader of the Tokyo Yakuza. She is celebrated by five of the six Yakuza clan bosses in the room. One of the men is visibly unhappy with her appointment. When the other men challenge him, she invites him to express his views, to which he responds: *"I speak of the perversion done to this council, which I love --more than my own children-- by making a Chinese Jap-American half breed bitch its leader!"*. No soon as he has uttered these words, O-Ren jumps on top of the boardroom table and runs across to him, unsheathes her samurai sword and decapitates him. She then delivers the quote that starts this paper.

This scene and dialogue helps us to, metaphorically, set the scene for the argument in this paper about the importance of the intersection of socially constructed categories of difference and the role they play in understanding inclusion, exclusion, and sense of self in leadership. To us, this quote illustrates the importance of understanding leaders' complex, multifaceted identities as they mobilise and transform them. As Anthias (2002) has noted, we must pay attention to the personal and political investments individuals have in their identity.

With this paper, we advocate for embedding an intersectionality lens to complicate the analysis of gender-in-leadership, to recognise and account for the impact of multiple, simultaneously intersecting socially constructed categories of difference on experiences of leadership. This approach offers important theoretical, methodological and empirical opportunities to gain more insight into how spatial and temporal intersectionalities shape women's experiences of and encounters with leadership. This is important, considering challenges gender-in-leadership scholarship faces with postfeminist narratives that claim that feminist struggles have been overcome. In reframing the role of structures and institutions as secondary to the self, these narratives present a monolithic view that neglects existing struggles of women leaders (Mavin and Grandy, 2018, 2019; Karmakar, 2022).

The paper is organised in five sections. After this introduction, the first section provides an overview of gender-in-leadership scholarship, highlighting what we see as two important sources of theoretical fragmentations: its positioning within broader leadership scholarship and within post-feminist narratives. The second section develops the key proposition of this paper on the importance of accounting for intersectional situatedness in gender-in-leadership scholarship in order to capture how histories and socio-cultural features shape understandings, meanings and experiences with/of leadership and leaders. The third section discusses our use of memory work and how we engaged with our memories. This is followed by the findings, where we discuss two themes that emerged from our memories and help us to exemplify intersectional situatedness: the tensions between our intellectual and socio-cultural positioning in our understanding about leadership and leadership experiences as Othered outsiders/insiders. We close the paper with a concluding discussion that reflects on key takeaways and contributions of the paper.

Gender-in-leadership: Two theoretical fragmentations

Despite arguments that the concept of leadership remains diffuse and undefined (Alvesson 2019), one thing that remains somewhat clear is that theoretically and practically, we continue to ‘think leader, think male’ (Soklaridis et al., 2022). Fifty years of research on gender in leadership has highlighted how binary thinking in relation to femininity and masculinity pervades understanding(s) about leadership and leaders. Against this backdrop, gender-in-leadership scholarship (Lewis et al. 2017; Elliott and Stead, 2018) has been countering the ways in which men and masculinities have dominated articulations and narratives about good, effective leadership and leaders.

The vast array of literature in gender-in-leadership has paid special attention to the complexity of gender nuances in leadership, looking to explain the contrasting experiences of different groups. For instance, whilst women often encounter sticky floors, glass cliffs, glass ceilings or labyrinths (Carli and Eagly, 2016; Ryan and Haslam, 2007; Ryan et al., 2016) men tend to ride the glass escalator, which sees (white and able-bodied) men in feminised occupations advance more often to a leadership position within feminised work environments than women (Williams, 2013). These gender differences operate within a spectrum that cuts across individual, organisational and societal dynamics.

Gender stereotypes and the prevalence of ‘think manager - think male’ trope (Schein, 2001; Berkery et al., 2013), has been shown to affect the perception of role in-/congruity of women and leadership positions (Eagly and Karau, 2002). Similarly, different discursive patterns represent women leaders as less credible or authentic than men (Liu et al., 2015; Elliott and Stead, 2018). In addition, despite the existence of wider policy frameworks, such as corporate board quotas that shift policies toward greater gender equality in the workplace, their effectiveness as equality measures requires the backdrop of an overall inclusive culture (Humbert et al., 2019; Latura and Weeks, 2022).

In the next sections, we focus on the positioning of gender-in-leadership within leadership scholarship, and its positioning within post-feminist narratives to explain important limitations and fragmentations:

Positioning of gender-in-leadership within leadership

Gender-in-leadership scholarship has been developed in opposition to the dominant masculinist paradigm that has historically shaped leadership studies so it has been primarily preoccupied with demonstrating that women, too, can be effective leaders (see Hoobler et al., 2018 for a discussion of the business case for women leaders). Whilst this champions women, it does not dismantle masculine schemas as benchmark for leadership success (Dwivedi et al., 2018). These schemas are essential to understand one of the key aspects that dominates discussions in leadership, which is the difference between leaders and managers, and the relationship between leaders and followers.

It often appears as if the terms leader and manager are used interchangeably (Plachy and Smunt, 2022); however, Plachy and Smunt (2022) argue that a key difference lies in the source of authority: a manager’s authority comes from their position within the organisation, “whereas the

leader's (social and moral) authority derives from members' agreement with the organisation's vision, goals, and processes" (p. 402). From this perspective, a leader shares visions and goals in a way that others follow along. This is fundamental to appreciate the dilemma related to the positioning of women as managers and leaders; Appelbaum et al., (2013) noted that, despite being considered good managers because they are perceived to be fairer and more functionally oriented, women are not considered good leaders. The gender order pervades the understanding of both roles: a manager is expected to be structured and orderly, whereas the leader has the licence to be impulsive and act outside the box. Gender stereotypes frame the former as intrinsically feminine traits and the latter as intrinsically masculine traits (see Kite et al., 2008).

The patriarchal order furthermore shows in the conceptualisation of the leader/follower relationship. Most research is leader-centric and tends to neglect the role of followers within a leadership process (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). Implicitly, followers are imagined as passive, without agency (Ford and Harding 2018; Ladkin and Patrick 2022). Consequently, the construction of the 'ideal' follower builds on gender stereotypes, as typical female followers are expected to show more ideal task and person orientation and male followers to show counter ideal person orientation (Braun et al., 2017: 382).

Whilst there are some efforts to challenge the gender binary (see Patterson et al., 2014; Ashcraft and Muhr, 2018; Kimbu et al., 2021), this remains largely an emerging trend in the literature and most of the gender-in-leadership scholarship still reproduces the gender binary through the dichotomous framing that has historically dominated the field (Christman and McClellan, 2012).

Positioning of gender-in-leadership in and within post-feminist narratives

Gender-in-leadership has received a powerful backlash from postfeminist narratives that sustain corporate feminism (see Eisenstein, 2005). Postfeminism undermines the relevance of gender through narratives that centre "choice, individualism, opt-out, opt-in, merit [and] make-over" (Lewis et al., 2017:213; Lewis et al., 2022) and reproduce the masculine order of unquestioned privilege. These ideas have gained momentum claiming that men are now the most disadvantaged group. Radhakrishnan and Solari (2015) term this a new 'reverse gender order', characterised by two opposing narratives: empowered women and failed patriarchs.

Postfeminism promotes alternative explanations to gender inequality, claiming that women's underrepresentation in leadership is due to their lack of effort. Most prominently, Sheryl Sandberg, Chief Executive Officer of Meta Platforms (formerly Facebook), argued that women need to change their behaviour, to 'lean in' in order to obtain leadership positions (see Sandberg and Scovell, 2015). Ultimately, women are asked to just be confident, take control of gendered barriers and be courageous enough to push through them (Adamson and Kelan, 2019).

These narratives have enhanced prejudices against women, suggesting that they are responsible for their oppression and ought to change to overcome it. Postfeminist arguments have undermined struggles highlighted by gender-in-leadership scholarship because these narratives have been co-opted by women celebrity executives and normalised in the public arena (Gill, 2014; Lewis et al., 2017; Ronen, 2018). Thus, we see ideas about agency, empowerment and autonomy stripped from the realities of systemic, structural disadvantage that negatively impact women.

In sum, the analysis of gendered leadership norms has provided us with a robust starting point to interrogate and challenge some dominant leadership schemas. Whilst we face the postfeminist backlash, it is important to remember that whilst gendered structures still impact career trajectories, the sole focus on gender essentialises women. This reproduces, albeit with a gender undertone, a similar analytical logic to dominant leadership studies and does not suffice to capture existing inequalities. As Acker (2009) pointed out, it is not enough to discuss women in leadership from a gendered perspective; instead, the interplay of gender, race and class within an inequality regime should be examined.

Intersectional situatedness and gender-in-leadership

Whilst recognising the ground-breaking contributions made by gender-in-leadership scholarship, a focus solely on gender is too short-sighted and exclusive of diverse leadership experiences. In this section we make the case for interrogating gender-in-leadership in ways that bring to the fore the spatial and temporal shifts in the personal journeys of leaders, integrating histories and socio-cultural backgrounds, which are central to identity construction, positionalities and locations.

Gender-in-leadership is never just about gender and always about the complexity of intersectional identity: the simultaneity of privilege and disadvantage, and the fluidity of positionality across space and time. We term this “intersectional situatedness” and see its roots in what Anthias (2022) has referred to as narratives of location, positionality, and translocational positionality, which she sees as central to understanding how shifts and contradictions throughout the life course impact belonging and shape contemporary identity constructions.

Our interest stems from seeing intersectionality as key in helping us understand inequalities experienced by women. It is important to reject the literature’s implicit essentialism, where ‘woman leader’ is used to speak about all women leaders and ‘gender’ has been the sole category around which difference in leadership has primarily been discussed. Kezar and Lester (2010) have noted that we must move away from essentialism in leadership, which they claim is noticeable in the way certain aspects of identity are given exclusive attention.

In the following subsections we discuss racialized as well as classed issues in gender-in-leadership scholarship. We focus on race and class as markers of difference given their intersectional salience in shaping diverse experiences (see Davis, 1983; Acker, 2006). These two categories highlight the importance of examining and discussing individual situatedness. Showunmi et al., (2016, p. 917) argue that “regarding enacting leader identities, white women described historical gender and class barriers to enacting leadership, while minority ethnic women described current barriers linked to ethnic and religious identities.”

Consequently, experiences of discrimination and the existence of barriers are situated. For instance, despite its connection with racial privilege and its role in dynamics of exclusion and othering, whiteness is usually not interrogated in discussions about race (Liu, 2018). Conversely, the class positioning of minority ethnic women is usually linked to their Othered status in racialized and gendered terms (Anthias, 2022). If we aim to understand why only certain groups progress to leadership positions, we must problematise intersections of race, gender, class, as well as other socially constructed categories of differences that shape their lived experiences.

Gender-in-leadership and race

Thirty years ago, Stella Nkomo (1992) pointed out that much theory development in management studies --which includes leadership-- neglected the importance of race. Nkomo's (1992) point remains as relevant today as it was thirty years ago; only recently, scholars have started to interrogate whiteness in leadership (see Liu and Baker, 2016; Liu, 2018; Ladkin and Patrick, 2022) and its overall implication for diversity.

The concept of leadership perpetuates the stereotype of the 'white man leader'. Leadership theory, which implicitly promotes the unmarked, white norm (Liu, 2018; Sims 2022), furthers this racialisation by framing race as predominantly referring to Black people and people of colour, but not white people: As Nkomo (1992) has noted, "'race' becomes synonymous with other groups, and whites do not have 'race'" (p. 490). Ospina and Foldy (2009) argue that there is an "implicit bias in the mainstream literature to construct models that use Western views and "whiteness" as the referent from which to study and theorise leadership as a universal phenomenon" (p. 892). This ostensible race-'neutrality' of leadership theory promotes white privilege and with norms.

Ladkin and Patrick (2022) demonstrate this by highlighting the normative whiteness of transformational leadership theory. They problematise constructions of leaders as fully human with agency and high moral standards, contrasted with followers depicted as passive, directionless and less than fully human. Similarly, in public discourses, doing leadership is often equated with whiteness, where heroicising discourses of ethnic and moral leadership are conflated with whiteness and, as a consequence, white power remains untouched and preserved (Liu and Baker, 2016). To overcome this fundamental limitation of leadership theories, Lanier et al., (2022) propose a cultural lens to enable researchers to recognise the manifold ways through which Black women leaders are forced to engage in protective tactics, as they are exposed to microaggressions. Moreover, Black women leaders often feel they have to work twice as hard, adding to their experience of fatigue (Lanier et al., 2022).

Further evidence of the lack of understanding of Black women and women of colour in leadership can be seen in the absence of discussions about their leadership development (Sims 2022). When women advance to an elite leadership position, they often have to adopt their 'outsider' performance style and face heightened scrutiny, resistance and bias (Glass and Cook, 2020). However, the intersectional effects of stereotypes disproportionately affects Black women and women of colour, especially stereotypical tropes such as the 'Angry Black woman', and assumptions of universality of the Black experience (Coleman, 2003; Holder et al., 2015; Motro et al., 2022). These stereotypical tropes impact perceptions about Black women leaders, their performance, and evaluation. As noted by Rosette et al., (2008), racial biases favour white people, whose privilege then shows in better evaluation for leadership potential and effectiveness.

A similar discussion can be found in the examination of the experiences and practices of Asian women leaders (see Cho et al., 2017; Chao & Ha, 2019), which presents them as culturally siloed groups. For instance, South Asian Muslim women in leadership often are racialised in the context of their migration to the Global North (Tariq and Syed, 2017). This body of work often focuses on the negative aspects of their experiences --e.g., Islamophobia (Sekerka and Yacobian,

2017) -- and tends to ignore their agency and different approaches to leadership (Metcalf and Mutlaq, 2011).

In sum, it is time to consider different racialised structures and dynamics which impact both the career prospects of Black women and women of colour, exploring with more nuance their understandings of leadership and of themselves as leaders.

Gender-in-leadership and social class

Despite social class and class work being a central feature in workplace relations (Gray and Kish-Gephart, 2013), so far, there is scarce discussion on the link between social class and leadership. This gap is partly explained by the conceptual tension between both concepts. Acker (2006) defined class as “enduring and systematic differences in access to and control over resources for provisioning and survival” (p. 444). She then clarifies that, “in large organisations, hierarchical positions are congruent with class processes in wider societies” (ibid). Consequently, when research zooms in on top leadership positions, the working class are unlikely to be part of the picture. In addition, by only focusing on current class position, class transition is overlooked.

Studies examining the influence of childhood class experiences on obtaining a leadership position have shown that social class background influences both the chances of obtaining a formal leadership position as well as leadership style adoption (Martin et al., 2017; Lee et al., 2021). Due to enhanced self-confidence, members of a higher social class more readily claim a leadership position than individuals who grew up in a lower social class background (Martin et al., 2017; Loignon and Kodydek 2022). Even with similar education, those from upper class backgrounds tend to obtain higher leadership positions than their peers from lower classes (Lee et al., 2021). However, the specific strength of the link between social class and obtaining a management position depends on contextual factors such as a culture of individualism or the GDP (Ingram and Oh, 2022).

The previous discussions highlight that gender-in-leadership scholarship has had limited engagement with socially constructed categories of difference. When it does, it conceptualises them as rigid, flat and constant, which fits into the neoliberal imaginary of diversity that can be managed, moulded and controlled. In paying scarce attention to intersectional aspects of leadership, gender-in-leadership misses out on the ways in which the intersection of socially constructed categories of difference like gender, race, social class and religion, among others, shape understandings and experiences of leadership and leaders. The importance of understanding intersectional situatedness is related to grasping nuance and fluidity in the construction and interpretation of leadership and leaders.

Discussing the state of the art on intersectional research in leadership, Carter and Sisco (2022) have pointed out that, “[m]ore research needs to be done that include critical leadership theories that are explicitly intersectional, anti-racist, and anti-sexist.” (p. 4). With this in mind, we set out to illustrate the potential of intersectional situatedness to support a more nuanced understanding of experiences of women in leadership.

Methodology

Our interest to collaborate in writing this paper emerged from feelings of intersectional invisibility in relation to discussions in gender-in-leadership scholarship. Our starting point was our epistemic distance from dominant discourses and the intersectional ways the literature neglects histories, locations and positionalities. With this paper, we contribute a lens that enables gender-in-leadership scholarship to see “women like us”. It is important to note that, even as the three of us identify as women, we are not a homogenous group. We have different socio-spatial locations, diverge in personal histories, and inhabit different spaces of simultaneous intersectional privilege and disadvantage. In framing what it meant to bring to the fore our intersectional locations and positionings, we discussed whom we are among others (see Cameron, 1983), reflected on how we relate to ideas of hegemonic femininity and what this means for our own positioning. These ideas, as Collins has noted (2015) are racialized, classed and gendered.

In this paper, we were inspired by collective biography (Gannon and Gonick, 2019) and memory work (Haug, 1999ab, 2008) and use our intersectional bodies, experiences and memories to discuss leadership. Women’s collective writing efforts highlight commonalities in their diverse experiences and create knowledge that emerges from the encounter between theory and the lived experience. We started with discussions about our different understandings and experiences of leadership, which was challenging because our own sensemaking of leadership was situational and shaped by our personal histories. Our distinctive disjointment energised us as it highlighted the importance of writing this paper. Our journey brought its own complexity as we sought to balance our individual and collective understandings non-judgmentally and non-defensively. We did not see ourselves in the dominant narratives about gender-in-leadership and speaking critically about this made us also reflect about our own insecurities and perceived inadequacies in relationship to leadership.

Method, data sources and analysis

Our analysis uses individual written accounts of 5-7 pages long, which we wrote using memory work (Haug, 1999ab, 2008), a feminist method with a focus on collective understanding of individual experiences through the analysis of memories. Memory work provides an excellent framework to centre emotions associated with memories to explore “the process whereby individual women become part of society” (Onyx and Small, 2001: 773). Crawford et al., (1992:37) have noted that the underlying theory underpinning memory work is that “subjectively significant events, events which are remembered, and the way they are subsequently constructed, play an important part in the construction of self”. Memories are central to the construction and narration of ourselves and our sensemaking of our historical place in the social world.

We followed Haug’s (1999a) protocol to explore our relationship, understanding and previous experiences of/with leadership and leaders, and how this shaped our sensemaking about what it means to be a leader. Memory work has a collagist, fragmentary and timeless quality that allows understanding of the historicity of the self and reassessment and reconstitution of it as it plays out in our daily social practices (Kuhn, 2010). An important part of this process was facing our disadvantage and privilege in the ways our lives intersected with ideas about leadership and

leaders, helping us to unveil how knowledge production about leadership has essentialised, invisibilised and silenced us.

Through memory work, we reclaimed our voices as intersectionally complex subjects who inhabit simultaneous tensions that are not fully captured in the theoretical and conceptual traditions of gender-in-leadership scholarship. We engaged with memory work following Haug's (2008) principle of a process that allows for "a certain meaning and sense of the world produced" (p. 540). Accordingly, we structured our memory work following a three-step process that involved individual and collective discussions, negotiations, decisions and interpretations.

First, we collectively discussed the meaning of leadership to identify a prompt that would help us to set the focus of our memory work. The very nature of this paper and its key argument proved challenging as we recognised that we had different ideas about what was important to reflect upon. For example, was it important to explore memories about our experiences with leadership that involved engaging with leaders or being leaders? Following our initial discussions, we left the thematic scope for writing our individual memories broadly defined and decided on the prompt: "memories of experience(s) with leadership" as this encompassed our burning issue and what motivated our joint work for this paper (see Haug, 1987).

Our second step involved individual work where each of us wrote a detailed account of our memories about our experiences of leadership and leaders. Following Haug (1999a), we wrote in the third person; however, we struggled with this practice as it appeared counter-intuitive to the feminist commitment to ownership and voice. The exercise was useful, though some of us still wrote our accounts using our names rather than third person pronouns as a way of reclaiming ourselves in our accounts.

Third, we undertook collective readings and conversations, where we highlighted excerpts from each other's memories and asked questions to each other. Collective engagement with individual written accounts sits at the heart of memory-work (Haug, 1999a, 2008) and supports the idea of unveiling and unravelling, through conversation and questions, the emotions that lie within written texts that remain otherwise unspoken. The iterative process of interrogating each other also helped to interrogate ourselves and through the discussion of individual memories, we re-discovered and made sense of our recollections. As we interacted with each other's stories, we too became entangled in the convictions, tensions and contradictions of our understandings of leadership and leaders.

From the discussions of our memories, we identified two dimensions where our positionalities, histories and trajectories influenced our sensemaking about leadership and leaders. The first relates to our intersectional invisibility, which emerges from a clash between our intellectual positioning (i.e., our academic engagement with ideas about leadership and leaders) and our socio-cultural positioning (i.e., our situated experiences of leadership and leaders in our everyday lives) and how each of us saw those processes in relation to ourselves. The second relates to our experiences of being Othered outsiders/insiders, where our intersectional identities are marginalised in conversations about leadership, and we simultaneously experience the complexity of invisibility and recognition.

Findings and reflections

Intersectional complexity in narratives about leadership

Our engagements and entanglements are shaped by our positionalities. Two of us are from the Global South and one of us is from the Global North. We are all based in different countries in the Global North across two continents. Two of us have held formal roles that would be considered positions of leadership and one of us has not. We all have a conflicted relationship with the gender-in-leadership literature.

Reflecting on our different positionalities, our intersectional situatedness came to light with initial tensions where two positionalities (intellectual and socio-cultural) appeared to sit in opposition. For instance, in terms of our intellectual positioning, our ideas about leadership and leaders have been shaped by our engagement with the literature primarily developed in the Global North, where we have different experiences. We all recognise simultaneous intersectional privilege and disadvantage; for instance, Authors 1 and 3 are highly educated migrant women of colour and Author 2 is a highly educated white woman from a working-class background.

We understood our Western(ised) intellectual location (two of us completed doctorates in the UK and one of us completed a doctorate in Austria) as shaping our academic understandings of leadership and leaders in ways that connect with the key messages found in dominant literature. We used descriptions such as “a combination of credibility and power that someone uses to get others to do what they want them to do” (Author 1), “to inspire people and be a good role model, to provide orientation and help others along the way” (Author 2) and “a designation, formal position in an organisation” (Author 3) to refer to leadership and leaders. In this respect, our intellectual understandings reflect mainstream ideas of leadership, which is largely articulated as a gender-neutral social construction that prioritises hierarchy, power and influence: From Author 1’s implicit tone of leadership as coercion (see Hogg and Reid, 2001), to Author 2’s importance of leading-by-example (see Eisenkopf, 2020), to Author 3’s idea of leadership as authority (see Leavitt, 2005).

Our socio-cultural positionings presented a more nuanced and complex interrogation. Our memories showed how the dominance of Global North understandings of leadership clashed with and would not allow capturing our intersectional life experiences:

“She remembers the story that one of her PhD participants who was a woman leader told her. This woman said that her greatest accomplishment was to know that she had raised her children whilst also doing her leadership role. She implied she never dropped the ball with her responsibilities as a mother, so her success was full. That story made sense to her culturally and personally because her own mother had been a hands-on mother and a senior civil servant. However, when it came to making sense of that experience as part of her data analysis, the story did not fit in with what she read about women leaders. This made her question her understanding of leadership and leaders and she remembers thinking that maybe those women she interviewed were not really leaders because leaders were more grandiose and rose above the everyday stuff like children and the home” (Author 1)

It is striking that in her first analysis of these women leaders, Author 1 did not recognise them as leaders as they did not fit the image of a hero-leader. We see this as a moment of intersectional dissonance that highlights that the gender order is neither universal nor similar in shaping women's lives. Thus, understanding what it means to be a woman leader is about situating the woman in the context of their own sensemaking. These understandings would provide broader insight into 'leaderships' and move beyond the post-feminist hero-narrative of the courageous leader (Adamson and Kelan, 2019).

The intersectional complexity of the leader/follower relationship also emerged in our memories. Dominant narratives construct leaders as having much agency, while followers are presented as weak and passive (Ford and Harding 2018; Ladkin and Patrick 2022; Alvesson, 2019). Author 2 elaborated on her difficulty reconciling the authoritative leader/passive follower narrative:

“Actually, since she was little; it may be due to her upbringing, to different experiences and observations of stigmatisation; she does not like to obey orders and to just follow [...] She does not want to follow guidelines or restrictions put forward just because someone says so. For her it is important that these make sense, and then she is happy to follow along. She remembers when she was a teenager, she liked to listen to music that questions following people just because a leader told them.” (Author 2)

In the context of this discussion, Author 2 was taken back to situations where she did not like to follow along, just because someone said so, hence “For her it is important that it makes sense to her (...) then she is happy to follow along”. The presentation of leadership as a leader/follower binary excludes many forms of agency that can be used to carve out one's own path, which is neither captured by the image of a hero leader nor by the conceptualisation of a passive follower.

The dominant narrative of the effective, strong leader who transforms followers and has a high moral standing did not resonate with our experiences of leadership and, in some cases, how we saw ourselves being a leader:

“She sees herself as a leader as she did a number of things that are unusual for women to do back home: studying MBA instead of medicine, going outside of home country for a PhD, upcycling her sister's wedding dress for her wedding ceremony, leaving her husband, immigration to the West. She thinks some people see her as a role model for these big steps [...] At the same time, she feels a disconnect from the way leadership is generally defined in the literature” (Author 3)

Author 3 identifies a disconnect between her leadership actions and how leadership is discussed in the literature, which reinforces our claim of a lack of inclusive understanding of leadership. Glass and Cook (2020) make reference to the performance style necessary for outsiders to adopt in order to gain and maintain legitimacy in elite leadership roles, which they term 'performative contortions' (p. 1233). These performative contortions are essential to leadership but also to carving its path, and emerge from histories, positionalities and locations. We do not see many stories addressing the 'process of becoming' as most stories focus on the 'front stage' of leadership and leader praxis with little to no insight into what is happening 'backstage'. This misses the richness of the 'backstage', which allows for more situational framing. The focus of scholarship on women's survival in leadership presents leadership with a linearity that misses the

experiences of those who do not operate like the dominant narrative. Therefore, diverse forms of agency and sensemaking remain neglected and the production of knowledge about gender-in-leadership perpetuates essentializing views of women and their struggles.

Leadership experiences as an Othered outsider/insider

All of us have different experiences with leadership, even when not all of us see ourselves as leaders. The discrepancy between seeing ourselves as a leader and being in a leadership position is explained by intersectional situatedness, which made us feel as outsiders within:

“She once had a role attached to a leader narrative and she attended a leadership course. She recalls that when discussing leadership, the focus was on “bringing people along”. She raised the issue of legitimacy and its racialised nature. As a woman of colour, her otherness is ever present. She knows she thinks, speaks and acts differently so she wondered whether others would recognise her as a leader. She wanted to discuss ‘leader performativity’ and ‘leader credibility and legitimacy’. She asked about the impact of the gendered and racialised nature of leadership. There was silence and one of the tutors re-framed the question as a statement: “we all want the same thing... to lead to achieve the goals of the organization”. She felt silenced by the whiteness in the room but also felt there was no point in saying anything further (Author 1).

Author 1’s experience highlights that questioning the gendered and racialized nature of leadership dynamics is not part of leadership training. Rather, it is perceived as disruptive. The focus on common goals and traditional views of leaders and followers perpetuates the impossibility of claiming an analytical space that includes different backgrounds, such as being a woman of colour from the Global South. It highlights how the intersection of gender, race and foreignness is silenced and delegitimized.

Our memories highlighted similar experiences of intersectional Otherness. Author 2 received an award for her academic work. During the award ceremony, Author 2 felt a strong disconnect between her upbringing in a poor working-class family and the pompous award ceremony in the palace halls of the ministry where she was being recognised as a leading scholar in her field:

“she felt that this was so out of touch with where she comes from, and she also felt kind of lost. (...) At the same time, she was overwhelmed, as her hard work, all those years studying and doing research had been recognized with the prize. And when she took the stage, she had a hard time saying her thank you speech and only managed to do so with tears in her eyes (which made other people cry). Later on she felt kind of embarrassed while at the same time she was also defiantly thinking, why shouldn’t emotions and different ways of talking also have their place in palace halls during award ceremonies?” (Author 2)

We go back to the idea of the impossibility of leadership as a defining feature of this moment. Author 2’s feeling that different social worlds collided is rooted in beliefs about how leaders should act and the class markers they should demonstrate (see Martin et al., 2017). Perhaps more poignantly is that salience of the class transition (Author 2 establishes a difference between her current class position as academic and her class position during childhood) which we hardly ever

see problematised in the literature, but which shows the impact of intersectional histories on the construction of present possibilities and highlights those personal histories influence perceptions and actions about/in leadership and leaders.

Migration experiences also influence the perception of changing and belonging to different social locations, as the memory of Author 3 shows. She elaborates on her distance to the narrative of the hero-leader and the resources they have. In discussing this, she explores how difficult is as a migrant, single mother in the Global North to balance work and care responsibilities:

“She feels she has been trekking in isolation, in the dark, without any instruction manual or notes, learning by doing, trial and error, more like a scavenger hunt. For example, she was recently invited to an important work-dinner and she spent a number of days thinking how to arrange affordable childcare for her kindergartener on a weekday evening. The leaders that she has read about or heard of seem to have babysitters or grandparents or partners etc, which she doesn’t readily have in her current situation” (Author 3)

The discrepancy between Author 3’s situation and the heroic women leaders she reads about highlights the situated nature of possibilities. In the context of complex histories and personal journeys, everyday regimes emerge as relevant to understand that leadership and its possibilities are not detached from managing life and shape opportunities of becoming. For example, the realities of migrant women in the Global North presents different nuances related to binary categorizations such as local/foreign. Our memories highlighted how the insider can also be Othered through incomplete representations of leaders in the literature. For example, Author 2 identified some connection with her own understandings:

“When she reads the literature on gender/woman in management, there is (...) something she feels easy to connect with. Discussions about role incongruity, stereotypes and so on are something that add to her understanding on how careers work and are impacted by social dynamics; as she knows those stereotypes. (...) At the same time, she has to be clear that it might be easier for her to identify with aspects of the literature as she is a white woman in Europe, and much of the literature refers to white women. Knowing that ‘privilege is invisible for those who have it’ she wonders whether this also plays a role in her perception of the literature.” (Author 2)

An important nuance of this memory is that whilst feeling represented by the literature can be seen as the privilege of a white woman, which gives her some guidance on how to navigate gendered organisations, this literature fails to capture or explain Author 2’s own intersectional situatedness, as it misses out on working class background trajectories and their implications for a woman leader.

The latter is also complicated in the problematization of social class for Author 1 and Author 3. Their class positioning has been impacted by transnational location and their attributed class positioning in the Global North is linked to histories of colonialism that Other them in the ways that gender, racio-ethnicity, nationality, and citizenship intersect. In particular, being Global South migrants added a layer of Othering to their class positioning as the class system from their country of origin is belittled and not recognised as valid in the Global North.

As we reflected on our differences in positionality and location and what they told us about ourselves and our relationship with the literature, we recognised that articulations of leadership and leaders seem linear in ways that do not account for the everyday, for example, spatial and temporal positionalities and translocations, or binaries like East vs West that do not interrogate histories of coloniality.

Concluding discussion

“I find I am constantly being encouraged to pluck out some one aspect of myself and present this as the meaningful whole, eclipsing or denying the other parts of self”
Audre Lorde (1984:120)

In this paper we present the case for adopting an intersectional situatedness approach to the discussion and analysis of gender-in-leadership. The tendency in the scholarship to contrast the experiences of women leaders to those of men leaders sees women’s experiences requiring constant legitimization in relation to their leadership styles and sees women as an essentialised category that must fit within particular ideas to be understood as leaders. There is also a more fundamental problem with how the essentializing of women, ignores and erases diverse histories and socio-cultural backgrounds that shape different paths of leadership.

We argue that it is important to broaden the picture and recognise that a meaningful whole would actually allow for all parts of the self to be included (see Lorde, 1984). Gender-in-leadership scholarship needs to become multidimensional (Christman and McClellan, 2008). We see intersectional situatedness as an approach that centres the understanding of the locational and positional shifts. This offers possibilities to contextualise praxis and understand experiences as part of a fluid historicity of agency, action and resistance.

To illustrate both the complexity as well as the usefulness of this task, we used memory work to engage with our memories of leadership and leaders. Our starting point was that we do not see ourselves represented in the gender-in-leadership literature. In engaging with our memories, we individually and collectively explored meaning, sensemaking, tensions and contradictions associated with the situated nature of our intersectional lives. The dominant story of a hero-leader is prevalent in leadership studies (Alvesson 2019) and, to some extent, reproduced in gender-in-leadership scholarship in ways that exclude experiences that do not reproduce the singularity of the hero-leader.

We reflected on how our differences were presented as “the mythical norm” (see Lorde, 1984: 116) in what we read as our histories, our journeys and our experiences of/with leadership and leaders appeared unaccounted for. This lack of representation has meant that we have, throughout our careers, adjusted our analyses of ourselves and of other women against leadership constructs we/they do not relate to. For instance, there is little discussion about different gender orders; how role expectations for women who are mothers differ across the globe or how regional-cultural manifestations of the patriarchal order (Safdar and Yasmin, 2020) impact our understanding of women leaders.

Forms of silencing and disconnect are part of intersectional histories that remain largely unaccounted for in dominant gender-in-leadership scholarship. This misses the complexity highlighted by intersections of race, gender, class, religion and other social categories with histories of coloniality and the Othering of experiences. Ultimately, Western understandings of leadership exclude and invisibilise women leaders in other contexts. Our findings also show that Othering is not limited to the intersection of race and gender and should include other socially constructed categories --e.g., migration status, citizenship-- as well as colonised histories.

Equally, there is limited work on class and class transition or the Othering of class positions; for instance, class mobility (e.g., changes in social class based on career progression) and class re-positioning (e.g., loss of social class positioning as a result of migration). This work speaks to intersectionally situated experiences that we need to understand further.

Discussions in this paper lead us to reiterate Fitzsimmons and Callan's (2020) call for more diversity in leadership but also for more criticality regarding the heroic narratives of women leaders. This paper highlights the importance of recognising different conceptualisations of leadership to explore and elaborate on the history and the socio-cultural positioning of heterogeneous leaders, including complex, contested and at times contradictory journeys of becoming a leader.

Incorporating intersectional situatedness in gender-in-leadership research can help to reclaim the future of feminism. Reclaiming the future of feminism requires a move from the so-called second-generation forms of gender bias (see Ely *et al.*, 2011) to what we would term third-generation forms of intersectional bias. It is overdue - as we show in this paper - to recognise the multilayered, complex and nuanced nature of feminist struggles and to engage actively with solidarity in difference. This paper offers an analytical avenue for gender-in-leadership scholars to do so. Adopting a situated perspective which incorporates histories and trajectories that shape what constitutes leadership will help us to develop a more inclusive vocabulary of leadership and recognise diverse dynamics of inequality that stand in the way of social justice in leadership.

References

- Acker, J. (2006). Inequality Regimes. *Gender & Society*, 20(4): 441–464.
- Acker, J. (2009). From glass ceiling to inequality regimes. *Sociologie Du Travail*, 51(2): 199–217.
- Adamson, M. and Kelan, E.K. (2019). 'Female Heroes'. *British Journal of Management*, 30(4), pp.981–996.
- Ali, F., Malik, A., Pereira, V. and Al Ariss, A., 2017. A relational understanding of work-life balance of Muslim migrant women in the west. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 28(8): 1163-1181.
- Alvesson, M. (2019). Waiting for Godot. *Leadership*, 15(1): 27–43.
- Anthias, F. (2002). Where do I belong?. *Ethnicities*, 2(4): 491-514.
- Anthias, F. (2022). *Ethnicity, class, gender and migration*. Taylor & Francis.
- Appelbaum, S.H., Audet, L. and Miller, J.C. (2003), Gender and leadership? *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 24(1): 43-51.

- Appelbaum, S.H., Shapiro, B. T., Didus, K., Luongo, T., & Paz, B. (2013). Upward mobility for women managers. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 45(2): 110-118.
- Ashcraft, K. L., & Muhr, S. L. (2018). Coding military command as a promiscuous practice? . *Human Relations*, 71(2): 206-228.
- Berkery, E., Morley, M. and Tiernan, S. (2013). Beyond gender role stereotypes and requisite managerial characteristics. *Gender in Management*, 28(5): 278–298.
- Braun, S., Stegmann, S., Hernandez Bark, A.S., Junker, N.M. & van Dick, R. (2017). Think manager-think male, think follower-think female. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 47(7): 377–388.
- Bullock, C.L. (2019). Driving new narratives. *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, 34(3): 200–216.
- Cameron, B. (1983) Entering the lives of others. In Moraga, C & Anzaldúa, G. (eds) *This Bridge Called My Back*. New York: Kitchen Table: Women of Color Press.
- Carli, L.L. and Eagly, A.H. (2016). Women face a labyrinth. *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, 31(8): 514–527.
- Carter, A.D. and Sisco, S. (2022). The Hill We Climb. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 24(3), pp.208–219.
- Chao, C.C., & Ha, L. (Eds.). (2019). *Asian women leadership*. London: Routledge.
- Cho, Y., Ghosh, R., Sun, J. & McLean, G. N. (2017). *Current perspectives on Asian women in leadership*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Christman, D.E., & McClellan, R.L. (2012). Discovering middle space. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 83(5), 648-670.
- Chrobot-Mason, D., Hoobler, J.M. and Burno, J. (2019). Lean In Versus the Literature *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 33(1): 110–130.
- Coleman, M. (2003) Gender and the orthodoxies of leadership. *School Leadership and Management*, 23(3): 325-339.
- Collins, P.H. (2015) Intersectionality’s Definitional Dilemmas. *Annual Review of Sociology* 41(1):1–20.
- Crawford, J., Kippax, S., Onyx, J., Gault, U. & Benton, P. (1992). *Emotion and gender*. London: Sage.
- Davis, A.Y. (1983). *Women, Race, Class*. Vintage Publication.
- Dwivedi, P., Joshi, A., & Misangyi, V. F. (2018). Gender-inclusive gatekeeping. *Academy of Management Journal*, 61(2): 379-404.
- Eagly, A.H. and Karau, S.J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review*, 109(3): 573–598.
- Eisenkopf, G. (2020). Words and deeds—Experimental evidence on leading-by-example. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 31(4), 101383.
- Eisenstein, H. (2005). A dangerous liaison? *Science & Society*, 487-518.
- Elliott, C. and Stead, V. (2018). Constructing Women’s Leadership Representation in the UK Press During a Time of Financial Crisis. *Organization Studies*, 39(1): 19–45.
- Ely, R. J., Ibarra, H., & Kolb, D. M. (2011). Taking gender into account. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 10(3): 474-493.
- Fitzsimmons, T. W., & Callan, V. J. (2020). The diversity gap in leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 31(4): 101347.
- Ford, J. and Harding, N. (2018). Followers in leadership theory. *Leadership*, 14(1): .3–24.

- Gannon, S., & Gonick, M. (2019). Collective biography as a feminist methodology. In *Strategies for Resisting Sexism in the Academy* (pp. 207-224). Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.
- Gill, R. (2014). Unspeakable inequalities. *Social Politics*, 21(4): 509-528.
- Glass, C. and Cook, A. (2020). Performative contortions. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 27(6):1232–1252.
- Gray, B., & Kish-Gephart, J.J. (2013). Encountering social class differences at work. *Academy of Management Review*, 38(4): 670-699.
- Haug, F. (Ed.). (1987). *Female sexualization*. London: Verso
- Haug, F. (1999a). Memory-work as a method of social science research. Available at: <http://www.friggahaug.inkrit.de/documents/memorywork-researchguidei7.pdf> [Accessed 1 March 2022]
- Haug, F. (1999b). *Female sexualization* (Vol. 25). Verso.
- Haug, F. (2008). Memory work. *Australian Feminist Studies*, 23(58): 537-541.
- Herrera, R., Duncan, P.A., Green, M.T. & Skaggs, S.L. (2012). The effect of gender on leadership and culture. *Global Business and Organizational Excellence*, 31(2): 37-48.
- Hogg, M.A., & Reid, S.A. (2001). Social identity, leadership, and power. In A.Y. Lee-Chai & J.A. Bargh (Eds.), *The use and abuse of power* (pp. 159–180). Psychology Press
- Holder, A., Jackson, M.A., & Ponterotto, J.G. (2015). Racial microaggression experiences and coping strategies of Black women in corporate leadership. *Qualitative Psychology*, 2(2): 164-180.
- Hoobler, J.M., Masterson, C.R., Nkomo, S.M., & Michel, E.J. (2018). The business case for women leaders. *Journal of Management*, 44(6): 2473-2499.
- Humbert, A.L., Kelan, E.K. and Clayton-Hathway, K. (2019). A rights-based approach to board quotas and how hard sanctions work for gender equality. *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 26(4): 447–468.
- Ingram, P. & Oh, J.J. (2022). Mapping the Class Ceiling. *Academy of Management Discoveries*, 8(1): 56-76.
- Jogulu, U. & Franken, E. (2022). The career resilience of senior women managers. *Gender, Work & Organization*. DOI:10.1111/gwao.12829.
- Karmakar, G. (2022). Feminism and Intersectionality. *Journal of International Women's Studies*, 23(1): 388-395.
- Kezar, A., & Lester, J. (2010). Breaking the barriers of essentialism in leadership research. *Feminist formations*, 163-185.
- Kimbu, A.N., de Jong, A., Adam, I., Ribeiro, M.A., Afenyo-Agbe, E., Adeola, O. & Figueroa-Domecq, C. (2021). Recontextualising gender in entrepreneurial leadership. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 88. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2021.103176>.
- Kite, M.E., Deaux, K. & Haines, E.L. (2008). Gender stereotypes. In Denmark, F.L. & Paludi, M.A. (eds) *Psychology of Women* (pp. 205-236). New York: Praeger.
- Kuhn, A. (2010). Memory texts and memory work. *Memory Studies*, 3(4): 298-313.
- Ladkin, D., & Patrick, C.B. (2022). Whiteness in leadership theorizing. *Leadership*, 18(2): 205-223.
- Lanier, D.A., Toson, S.J. and Walley-Jean, J.C. (2022). Black Women Leaders. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 24(3): 193–207.
- Latura, A.S., & Weeks, A.C. (2022). Supplementary Information Appendix Corporate Board Quotas and Gender Equality Policies in the Workplace. Available at: https://scholar.harvard.edu/files/anacweeks/files/latura_weeks_si.pdf [Accessed 17 July 2022]

- Leavitt, H.J. (2005). Hierarchies, authority, and leadership. *Leader to Leader*, 2005 (37): 55-61.
- Lee, M.K., Kish-Gephart, J.J., Mizruchi, M.S., Palmer, D.A., & Useem, M. (2021). Social class in organizations. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 30(4): 385-394.
- Lewis, P., Benschop, Y., & Simpson, R. (2017). Postfeminism, gender and organization. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 24(3), 213-225.
- Lewis, P., Rumens, N. & Simpson, R. (2022). Postfeminism, hybrid mumpreneur identities and the reproduction of masculine entrepreneurship. *International Small Business Journal*, 40(1): 68-89.
- Liu, H. (2018). Redoing and abolishing whiteness in leadership. In Carroll, B., Firth, J. & Suze, W. (Eds) *After leadership* (pp. 101-111). London: Routledge.
- Liu, H., & Baker, C. (2016). White Knights, *Leadership*, 12(4): 420-448.
- Liu, H., Cutcher, L. & Grant, D. (2015). Doing Authenticity. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 22(3): 237–255.
- Loignon, A.C. and Kodydek, G. (2022). The Effects of Objective and Subjective Social Class on Leadership Emergence. *Journal of Management Studies*, 59(5): 1162–1197.
- Lorde, A. (1984). *Sister outsider*. Trumansburg, NY: The Crossing Press.
- Marshall, J. (2011). En-gendering notions of leadership for sustainability. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 18(3), 263-281.
- Martin, S.R., Innis, B.D. & Ward, R.G. (2017). Social class, leaders and leadership. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 18, 49-54.
- Mavin, S. (2022). Women leaders' work-caused trauma. *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management*.
- Mavin, S. & Grandy, G. (2018). How postfeminism plays out for women elite leaders. In Lewis, P., Benschop, Y., & Simpson, R. (Eds.) *Postfeminism and organization* (pp. 161-177). New York: Routledge.
- Mavin, S. & Grandy, G. (2019). Women leaders, self-body-care and corporate moderate feminism. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 26(11), 1546-1561.
- Metcalf, B.D., & Mutlaq, L. (2011). Women, leadership and development. In B. Metcalfe & F. Mimouni (Eds) *Leadership development in the Middle East* (pp. 328-370). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Motro, D., Evans, J.B., Ellis, A.P., and Benson III, L., (2022). Race and reactions to women's expressions of anger at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 107(1): 142–152.
- Nkomo, S.M. (1992). The Emperor Has No Clothes. *Academy of Management Review*, 17(3): 487–513.
- Oakley, J.G. (2000). Gender-based barriers to senior management positions. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 27(4): 3213-3234.
- Onyx, J. & Small, J. (2001). Memory-work. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 7(6): 773-786.
- Ospina, S. and Foldy, E. (2009). A critical review of race and ethnicity in the leadership literature. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20(6): 876–896.
- Padavic, I., Ely, R.J. and Reid, E.M. (2020). Explaining the Persistence of Gender Inequality. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 65(1): 61–111.
- Patterson, N., Mavin, S. & Turner, J. (2012). Unsettling the gender binary. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 36(7): 687-711.
- Plachy, R.J. and Smunt, T.L. (2022). Rethinking managership, leadership, followership, and partnership. *Business Horizons*, 65(4): 401–411.

- Radhakrishnan, S., & Solari, C. (2015). Empowered women, failed patriarchs. *Sociology Compass*, 9(9): 784-802.
- Ronen, S. (2018). The postfeminist ideology at work. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 25(5): 514-530.
- Rosette, A.S., Leonardelli, G.J. and Phillips, K.W. (2008). The White standard. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(4): 758-777.
- Ryan, M.K. and Haslam, S.A. (2007). The Glass Cliff. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(2): 549-572.
- Ryan, M.K., Haslam, S.A., Morgenroth, T., Rink, F., Stoker, J., & Peters, K. (2016). Getting on top of the glass cliff. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 27(3): 446-455.
- Safdar, M. and Yasmin, M. (2020). COVID-19. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 27(5): 683-694.
- Sandberg, S. and Scovell, N. (2015). *Lean in*. London: WH Allen.
- Schein, V.E. (2001). A Global Look at Psychological Barriers to Women's Progress in Management. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(4): 675-688.
- Sekerka, L.E. and Yacobian, M.M. (2017). Understanding and addressing Islamophobia in organizational settings. *International Journal of Public Leadership*, 13(3): 134-150.
- Showunmi, V., Atewologun, D. and Bebbington, D. (2016). Ethnic, gender and class intersections in British women's leadership experiences. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 44(6): 917-935.
- Sims, C. (2022). Women of Color and Leadership Journal. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 24(3): 163-172.
- Soklaridis, S., Lin, E., Black, G., Paton, M., LeBlanc, C., Besa, R., ... & Kuper, A. (2022). Moving beyond 'think leadership, think white male'. *BMJ Leader*, 6, 146-157.
- Tarantino, Q. (2003) Tanaka Loses His Head, Movie Clip. *Kill Bill Vol 1*. <https://youtu.be/OLvz5E61UNs>.
- Tariq, M. and Syed, J., (2017). Intersectionality at work. *Sex Roles*, 77(7): 510-522.
- Uhl-Bien, M., Riggio, R.E., Lowe, K.B. and Carsten, M.K., (2014). Followership theory. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25(1): 83-104.
- Williams, C.L. (2013). The Glass Escalator, Revisited. *Gender & Society*, 27(5): 609-629.