



Kent Academic Repository

Lewis, Patricia and Benschop, Yvonne (2023) *Gendered Hybridity in Leadership Identities: A Postfeminist Analysis*. *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, 38 (2). ISSN 1754-2413.

Downloaded from

<https://kar.kent.ac.uk/97064/> The University of Kent's Academic Repository KAR

The version of record is available from

<https://doi.org/10.1108/GM-07-2022-0238>

This document version

Author's Accepted Manuscript

DOI for this version

Licence for this version

CC BY (Attribution)

Additional information

For the purpose of open access, the author(s) has applied a Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) licence to any Author Accepted Manuscript version arising.

Versions of research works

Versions of Record

If this version is the version of record, it is the same as the published version available on the publisher's web site. Cite as the published version.

Author Accepted Manuscripts

If this document is identified as the Author Accepted Manuscript it is the version after peer review but before type setting, copy editing or publisher branding. Cite as Surname, Initial. (Year) 'Title of article'. To be published in ***Title of Journal***, Volume and issue numbers [peer-reviewed accepted version]. Available at: DOI or URL (Accessed: date).

Enquiries

If you have questions about this document contact ResearchSupport@kent.ac.uk. Please include the URL of the record in KAR. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our [Take Down policy](https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies) (available from <https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies>).



Gendered Hybridity in Leadership Identities: A Postfeminist Analysis

Journal:	<i>Gender in Management: an International Journal</i>
Manuscript ID	GM-07-2022-0238.R1
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	Postfeminism, Masculinity, Femininity, Leadership Identities, Authentic Individualism, Relatability

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Gendered Hybridity in Leadership Identities: A Postfeminist Analysis

Abstract

Purpose - This paper examines the discursive constitution of leadership identities by senior women leaders working in the City of London. We draw on postfeminism as a critical concept to explore this constitution, as it has produced the cultural conditions for the reconfiguration of masculine and feminine gender norms in leadership.

Design/Methodology/Approach – In a qualitative study, 13 women leaders in positions of power in the City of London were interviewed. Discourse analysis techniques were used to unpack the postfeminist shaping of leadership identities

Findings – At the heart of the leadership identities that senior women leaders construct is a gendered hybridity that is a multifaceted calibration of masculine and feminine attributes and behaviours. Postfeminist discourses of individualism, choice and self-improvement are entangled with discourses of authenticity, relatability, and connectivity as particular leadership assets. The gendered hybridity of leadership identities unfolds the possibility for a fundamental makeover of leadership by opening-up space for a transformative change that accommodates women leaders.

Originality/Value – This study is among very few studies that foreground the leadership identities that women leaders construct within the confines of postfeminist gender regimes. It shows how these women invoke authenticity, unfolding possibilities for the transformational change of and political challenge to traditional gendered leadership in their organizations.

Keywords – Postfeminism, masculinity, femininity, leadership identities, authentic individualism, relatability

Paper type - Research paper

Introduction

This paper examines the discursive constitution of leadership identities by senior women leaders working in the City of London. Leadership has conventionally been characterized as masculine with attributes, characteristics and behaviours of leaders culturally associated with men and masculinity (Ford, 2006). Gender critiques of this dominant masculine norm have contributed to the emergence of alternative ways of leading characterised as relational in orientation and aligned with the feminised characteristics of nurture and care conventionally associated with women (Fletcher, 2004). As such, masculinised and feminised forms of leading now co-exist. Studies report how men and women leaders enact masculine and feminine leadership identities (Byrne et al, 2021), and while masculinity still suffuses understandings and expectations of what to envisage when leading or being led, feminised forms of leadership are growing in importance. Increasingly, ‘good’ leadership now requires a type of ‘gender balancing’ – collaborative, caring, empathetic behaviours are expected alongside masculine-marked practices. Indeed, accounts of leadership highlight how leaders engage in both individualistic and relational practices when leading (Byrne et al, 2021; Khan et al, 2022; Powell et al, 2021). Nevertheless, significant issues persist in terms of who can enact ‘gender-balanced’ leadership in a way which is valued and recognised. The common-sense association of women leaders with feminised leadership or that a ‘gender-balanced’ form of leadership can be performed by both men and women and assigned equal value requires ongoing scrutiny. Indeed, Khan et al, (2022, p. 321-322) demonstrate how media representations in Australia suggest that ‘...only men (are) able to perform both masculinized and feminized attributes, despite the theoretical assertion that post-heroic leadership can be performed by both men and women’.

Against this background, we draw on postfeminism as an analytic device (Lewis et al, 2017) to examine how senior women leaders discursively constitute a leadership identity. Our

1
2
3 study is underpinned by poststructuralist principles whereby genders, persons and identities
4
5 are seen as neither natural nor stable. Rather, they are understood to be fluid, fragmented,
6
7 contradictory and ‘performatively constituted within norms and through interaction’
8
9
10 (Tassabehji et al, 2021, p. 1301). From this theoretical location we approach leadership
11
12 identity as inscribed and regulated from cultural raw material (Lees-Marshment and
13
14 Smolovic Jones, 2018) that is articulated through the constitutive force of postfeminist
15
16 discourses (Benschop and Lewis, 2022). Postfeminism has produced the cultural conditions
17
18 which have facilitated the reframing of leadership as contradictorily gendered. Within a
19
20 postfeminist gender regime, women are interpellated to enact postfeminist identities,
21
22 understood in the literature as femininities (McRobbie, 2009; Lewis, 2014), that are
23
24 discursively constituted around the dialectic co-existence of masculine and feminine norms.
25
26 Here, gender norms are interdependent forces and through their intermingling, adjustments
27
28 occur between them, with changes in masculine norms directly impacting feminine norms
29
30 and vice versa (Lewis et al, 2022). Given this, there is a need for an increased focus on the
31
32 way in which postfeminist incitements such as the need to calibrate masculine and feminine
33
34 behaviours are lived and negotiated at the level of subjectivity within a gendered leadership
35
36 terrain which is increasingly complicated. Nevertheless, while there is a significant literature
37
38 on the emergence of feminised leadership and women’s experiences of leading (Eagly and
39
40 Carli, 2003, Powell et al, 2008), few studies closely examine the kind of leadership identities
41
42 women construct in postfeminist gender regimes. Of those studies that have drawn on
43
44 postfeminism, less attention is directed at issues of identity per se, with the focus more likely
45
46 to be on experiences of being a leader and the enactment of feminine behaviours within the
47
48 realms of leadership. Our study contributes to this small body of work with its research
49
50 question centring on how women in senior leadership positions discursively constitute a
51
52 leadership identity within the confines of postfeminism. Drawing on interviews with 13
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 senior women leaders in the City of London and using postfeminism as a critical concept, we
4
5 reveal how women leaders constitute a hybrid leadership identity, drawing on a combination
6
7 of masculine and feminine behaviours and attributes. We argue that this discursive
8
9 constitution aligns with some elements of a traditionally gendered form of leadership but
10
11 ultimately acts as a challenge to it.
12
13

14
15 Our contribution is twofold: first we make visible the gendered hybridity which is
16
17 central to the leadership identities constituted by women leaders. Second, as the normative
18
19 constraints around leadership are evolving, propelled by the presence of women and the
20
21 valorisation of feminine characteristics and behaviours, we make visible the transformative
22
23 potential which underpins senior women leaders' discursive constitution of their leadership
24
25 identities. We argue that this transformative potential can challenge gendered power relations
26
27 in the leadership field. The article is structured as follows: we begin by examining the
28
29 concept of postfeminism. Next, we outline the study's methodology and following that we
30
31 present the empirical sections. We conclude by discussing the implications of our study.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 **Postfeminism**

41
42 Postfeminism is a highly contested, malleable, polysemic concept which is interpreted
43
44 in multiple ways. Within the social sciences, postfeminism is mainly used as a critical
45
46 concept or analytic device to explore the reconfiguration of gender norms alongside the
47
48 persistence of inequality. Within the gender and organisation studies field, the dominant
49
50 interpretation of postfeminism is one which treats it as a discursive formation made up of
51
52 interrelated themes attached to a complex set of discourses around gender, feminism and
53
54 femininity that emphasise the end of gender discrimination and treat the principle of equality
55
56 as part of our contemporary common sense (Lewis et al, 2017). The cultural ideas and beliefs
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 associated with postfeminism that give rise to a taken-for-granted sense of equality, call
4
5 women away from a traditional femininity characterised by a sole focus on serving men and
6
7 caring for children, towards a reconfigured feminine subjecthood with educational and
8
9 economic capacity (McRobbie, 2009). Notwithstanding the claimed 'end' of discrimination,
10
11 this does not mean the obliteration of traditional femininity, rather what emerges is a co-
12
13 existence of gender equality norms with conventional gender norms which manifests in
14
15 reconfigured modes of femininity. This configuration is revealed as the fusion of masculine
16
17 and feminine behaviours such that together they form the central core of postfeminist
18
19 subjectivities connected to discourses of individualism, choice and the optimisation of self;
20
21 the pursuit of transformation and the manifestation of our 'best self'; the emphasis placed on
22
23 'natural' sexual difference; the prominence ascribed to femininity as a bodily and
24
25 psychological property; the emphasis placed on subjectification; and returning home to care
26
27 for children as a positive choice as opposed to a traditional duty (Gill, 2007). The
28
29 interpellation to invest in a postfeminist subjectivity is conventionally understood in terms of
30
31 an array of techniques which call individuals into subject positions characterised by the
32
33 calibration of masculine and feminine norms. There is no centrally located source for these
34
35 techniques. Instead, they emerge through the actions and influence of a range of semi-
36
37 autonomous institutions and individuals who deliver a similar message across public
38
39 discourse without organized co-operation (Riley et al, 2016). More recently, the affective and
40
41 psychic dimensions of postfeminism are increasingly recognised, calling attention to
42
43 postfeminism as a phenomenon which seeks to shape what women think and feel and how
44
45 their emotional states are displayed (Gill, 2017).
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 As postfeminism is centrally involved in the constitution of the contemporary
55
56 individualised subjectivity women are interpellated to take up, we draw on it as an analytic
57
58 device to investigate the ways in which women and a reconfigured femininity are now
59
60

1
2
3 included in the call to leadership. Constituting a leadership subjectivity within postfeminism
4
5 is not achieved solely through the disciplined take-up of a set of techniques. It is also
6
7 dependent on affective attachments which shape the way individuals orient to, articulate, and
8
9 manage the demands and contradictions of a leadership subject position within a postfeminist
10
11 context. Currently, there are a small number of studies which draw on postfeminism to
12
13 interrogate and understand women's leadership. This work includes a reanalysis of existing
14
15 studies of women's leadership through a postfeminist lens that highlight the importance of
16
17 individual choice and being the 'right' type of woman (Mavin and Grandy, 2018); a
18
19 consideration of how women leaders engage in feminine body-work to avoid alienating men
20
21 and other women in leadership positions (Mavin and Grandy, 2019a, 2019b); a review of the
22
23 autobiographies of celebrity businesswomen who offer themselves as postfeminist role
24
25 models and advocate individualist solutions based on confidence, control and courage to
26
27 address experiences of inequality (Adamson and Kelan, 2019); an interview study of English
28
29 football which draws out the postfeminist ideological dilemma faced by women leaders who
30
31 account for their success through recourse to choice and merit while also being fully aware of
32
33 persistent gender inequalities (Bryan, 2022); and finally, an interview study of women leaders
34
35 in STEMM who address a persistently unequal context through a focus on their own
36
37 psychology, adopting a postfeminist frame of internalization where working on self is
38
39 understood as the means to address inequality (Nash and Moore, 2019).

40
41
42 Viewed through the lens of postfeminism, we can complicate our understanding of the
43
44 'feminine leader' not as a leadership figure that is created solely around traditional feminine
45
46 norms and relational practice (Fletcher, 2001) but rather as a hybrid configuration
47
48 discursively constituted with respect to the dialectic coexistence of feminine *and* masculine
49
50 norms. **Understanding the 'feminine leader' as a hybrid subjectivity means that masculine**
51
52 **and feminine leadership are treated as a unity of opposites that reciprocally demarcate each**
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 other rather than as two approaches which develop and evolve separately (Lewis et al, 2022).
4
5 Accordingly, we move away from the hierarchization of an 'either-or' understanding of
6
7 gendered leadership to a 'both-and' orientation where the masculine and feminine are
8
9 together constitutive elements of leadership. Nevertheless, this interdependence of gender
10
11 norms is not without its challenges as deep-seated asymmetrical power relations between the
12
13 masculine and feminine can produce conflict and tension creating contradictory outcomes
14
15 and ongoing challenges (Collinson, 2020).
16
17
18
19

20 The emergence of hybrid forms of femininity based around the interlinking of
21
22 feminine and masculine behaviours, signals that women's engagement in masculine marked
23
24 behaviours and practices has become culturally normative. Accordingly, femininity can no
25
26 longer be understood in singular terms but rather as multiplicitous, with normative
27
28 femininities compulsorily interlocking with norms as well as social realms marked by
29
30 masculinity (Carlson, 2011, Lewis, 2014). As leadership discourses capture and constrain
31
32 women in terms of what can be said about leadership and reading this through the lens of
33
34 postfeminism, we draw out women's take-up and engagement with masculine leadership
35
36 norms alongside feminine relationality when constituting their leader identity.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 **Methodology**

45
46
47 This paper derives from an interview study of leaders working in the City of London
48
49 that sought to investigate how postfeminism calls men and women to calibrate masculine and
50
51 feminine norms in the constitution of leader subjectivities. From the broader study, we focus
52
53 in this paper on how women in senior leadership positions discursively constitute a leadership
54
55 identity within the confines of postfeminism. For the overall research project, 48 interviews
56
57 – 22 men and 26 women - were completed by the first author and ethical approval for the
58
59
60

1
2
3 study was granted by her university. Study participants were sourced using a purposive,
4
5 snowballing sampling strategy with use being made of a mixture of personal and professional
6
7 contacts to identify appropriate respondents across a range of organisations. For the purposes
8
9 of this paper, the focus is on interviews with 13 senior women leaders to address the question
10
11 of how a leadership identity is constituted by women in positions of power who engage with
12
13 the identity category of leader. As this paper focuses on senior women leaders, details of this
14
15 sub-section of the sample are presented in Table I below. Pseudonyms are used throughout
16
17 the data analysis and the specific roles of the interviewees are not identified to ensure that
18
19 confidentiality is not compromised either directly or indirectly.
20
21
22
23
24

25 **Insert Table I here**

26
27 Of the 13 interviews, 11 took place in the organizations of the respondents with one
28
29 interview taking place in a member's club in London and another being held in the home of
30
31 an interviewee. All respondents agreed to the interviews being digitally recorded and these
32
33 were transcribed by a professional transcription service which specialises in servicing
34
35 research projects. Topics covered during the interviews included the path to leadership, their
36
37 motivation for taking up a leadership position, the work they did on themselves as they
38
39 moved into leadership, their own account of how they lead and how this developed, their
40
41 view on what counts as 'good'/'poor' leadership and the challenges they have faced. While
42
43 the respondents were aware that men and women in leadership positions were being
44
45 interviewed, the questions were not couched in gender terms. Rather, questions posed related
46
47 to leadership in general in terms of their understanding, motivation, and experiences. The aim
48
49 in doing this was to provide as open a space as possible for individuals to speak about
50
51 leadership. Nevertheless, within this context, it was not unusual for the conversation to turn
52
53 to the issue of gender in relation to leadership.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The data analysis (summarised in Table II below) was informed by a Foucauldian
4
5 discursive approach with discourse analysis techniques being deployed to address the interest
6
7 of the study which is to explore how leadership identities are discursively constituted by
8
9 senior women leaders. In doing this we draw on Weedon's (1987, p. 12) conceptualization of
10
11 discourse as systems of text, concepts, beliefs, and signs that exist in written and oral form
12
13 and in the social practices of everyday life. Discourses are understood to offer subject
14
15 positions that individuals assume, the take-up of which is a discursive practice. While
16
17 discursive practices are activated by individual agency, people are 'subjected to the power
18
19 and regulation of discourse' (Weedon, 1987, p. 119). As such gender and leadership identity
20
21 are not understood as fixed properties of the individual but as discursive effects.
22
23
24
25
26

27 Our first step in the data analysis related to the identification of our object of study as
28
29 the postfeminist shaping of leadership subjectivities within the City of London and
30
31 problematised the common-sense association of men leaders with masculine behaviours and
32
33 women leaders with caring behaviours as a feminised way of leading. From here, we
34
35 completed the analysis by concentrating on what was said in the interviews with the emphasis
36
37 placed on *what* people say, *how* they say it and what they do *not* say. Thus, we concentrated
38
39 on the 'things said' as they have normative implications, functioning to invoke certain norms
40
41 and subject positions, '...establishing ways for people to be...' (Bacchi & Bonham, 2016, p.
42
43 115). As our theoretical location of poststructuralism understands interview talk as located
44
45 within discourses, the second step of our data analysis focused on locating traces of
46
47 postfeminist discourses connected to gender, feminism and femininity, so that the 'things
48
49 said' were read through the analytical lens of postfeminism. Thus, our data analysis focused
50
51 on identifying postfeminist constitutive discourses as delineated by Gill (2007) in her
52
53 explication of the cultural phenomenon of postfeminism. Through identification and analysis
54
55 of the words and phrases articulated by our interviewees, we traced the postfeminist
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 discourses that their utterances related to, were located in and which made them sayable
4
5 (Tassabehji et al, 2021). While many other discourses could be identified in the interview
6
7 data, our use of postfeminism as an analytic device influenced the discourses we focused on.
8
9 Accordingly, four postfeminist discourses were identified including individualism, choice
10
11 and empowerment, make-over and self-transformation, authenticity, and relatability (Banet-
12
13 Weiser, 2012; Gill, 2007). Such discourses make it possible for certain things to be said,
14
15 forming the limits and forms of the sayable, enabling the interviewees to speak of themselves
16
17 as particular kinds of subjects. Following Lewis (2014), we understand discourses of
18
19 individualism, choice and empowerment and make-over and self-transformation as connected
20
21 to masculinised attainment in the sphere of work, while discourses of authenticity and
22
23 relatability are associated with the feminised tradition of creating connection, focusing on the
24
25 needs of others, and providing support. We argue that these imbricated discourses call
26
27 women into a hybrid subject position, inviting them to interlink masculinised and feminised
28
29 behaviours, conventionally associated with work and the supportive environment of home
30
31 respectively (Lewis et al, 2022). As such we argue that the contemporary 'feminine leader' is
32
33 socially constituted within these discourses and their associated discursive practices.
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 Accordingly, the third step of the data analysis focused on identifying the discursive
41
42 practices present in the accounts of the respondents. As a poststructuralist term, discursive
43
44 practice refers to the way in which a discourse is practiced and circulated within a culture.
45
46 Through discursive practices individuals can reproduce or challenge taken-for-granted social
47
48 norms. Discursive practices can have transformative potential whereby subject formation can
49
50 open-up possibilities for change in a subject position such as 'leader'. While this subject
51
52 position is produced within multiple discursive practices, we (as the analysts) determined
53
54 what discursive practices are relevant to the 'things said' as they encapsulate how
55
56 (postfeminist) discourses 'practice' and the set of relations that characterise them (Bacchi and
57
58
59
60

Bonham, 2016). The next section is organised around the identified discursive practices: choosing work, changing and enhancing self, being true to self and building connection. In presenting the findings, we include excerpts from individual interviews which clearly articulate and are illustrative of the discursive practices, resonating across the wider data set. Referred to by Pratt (2008) as ‘power quotes’, these extracts of data effectively and persuasively illuminate our argument. Overall, we treated the interview data as providing us with an opportunity to examine the contours of postfeminist discourses in women leaders’ discursive accounts and not as a precise outline of the experience of leadership within the City of London. Given this, it is important to note that the identified discursive practices make visible what can be said but not exhaustively about leading at this postfeminist historical juncture (Lewis et al, 2022).

Insert Table II here

Findings

Choosing work

A significant consequence of the emergence of postfeminism, is the way in which it calls women ‘...to assume the position of an individual (as opposed to being) a member of a disadvantaged group’ (Budgeon, 2014, p. 323). In being interpellated in this way, women assimilate masculine attributes and ‘do’ masculinity as the latter is conflated with individuality. One way in which this manifested was the emphasis placed by all respondents on their willingness to go the ‘extra mile’ for their organization. Long working hours which are a well-known characteristic and requirement of the masculine world of work were treated as normal and necessary. Choosing work by putting it before other aspects of life is one of the main ways by which individualised masculine attributes and behaviours were assimilated by the respondents. In a postfeminist discourse of individualism, choice and empowerment,

1
2
3 respondents were constituted as having a strong sense of loyalty to their organization and
4
5 choosing work as follows:

6
7
8 '...at the time I just didn't really think about it, I just thought this is what you did, you
9
10 just worked hard. I suppose I could see that I was always the person that sort of
11
12 worked late, I was always somebody that did more than others, but I didn't think
13
14 actually, it took a lot more effort for people to sort of see that you were making an
15
16 effort if you know what I mean? I didn't...I suppose I am competitive, but I didn't
17
18 think about it as being, you know, I've got...I'm going to do more because that's in
19
20 my nature, I just, I'm just somebody that, I just kind of take things on and I'm the
21
22 person that takes responsibility...
23
24
25

26
27 (Linda, Senior Woman Leader)
28

29
30 In articulating this view, Linda expresses a masculinised attachment to work which she
31
32 understood as just 'what you did'. Across the interviews, the emphasis placed on making an
33
34 effort and the minimisation of 'the effort' taken to do this was common among the
35
36 respondents. Being available and ready for (extra) work was seen as normal and treated as a
37
38 straightforward way to get noticed, a means to differentiate yourself as an individual from
39
40 others. Similarly, within the same discourses, individual behaviours in relation to work are
41
42 understood as choices, where working longer is perceived as something anyone can easily do,
43
44 if they choose this path. Additionally, such choices in relation to work were seen as
45
46 empowering as the following illustrates:
47
48
49

50
51
52 But also, I was prepared to work really hard, you know, I sacrificed a lot for my work
53
54 ...work was my number one priority...it was work, work, work. But I wasn't in a bad
55
56 mental state over it because I was really enjoying it...But the reality is that it becomes
57
58 a huge part of how you see yourself, particularly if you're leading or are successful
59
60

1
2
3 because you start to describe yourself “I’m a leader, I’m successful” and then if
4
5 you’re not successful or a leader anymore what are you? And if you haven’t got a big
6
7 friendship circle because you’ve been working the whole time and you know you
8
9 don’t know people in your area because you commute, you don’t know your children
10
11 that well because you hardly see them, it is who you are you know, reality is your job
12
13 is who you are
14
15

16
17
18 (Simone, Senior Woman Leader)
19

20
21 Drawing on postfeminist discourses around individualism, choice and empowerment,
22
23 Simone is constituted as having a masculinised attachment to work in the way that she put it
24
25 before all other elements of her life. While she has experienced this positively, she is also
26
27 aware that her identity is centred on work and that there are consequences to the constitution
28
29 of self as a committed, work-centred employee. Further to this, in drawing on the discourses
30
31 of individualism and choice and considering what it takes to be positioned as a conventional
32
33 ‘successful leader’, she acknowledges but also distances herself from the negative elements
34
35 of her dedication through her use of the pronoun ‘you’, expressed as ‘you’ve been working
36
37 all the time; you don’t know your children’. As such, while doing masculinity and
38
39 acknowledging that work is at the centre of her identity, she is also conscious of the
40
41 femininity she has foregone or even sacrificed – connection to home, children, and
42
43 friendships outside of work.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 *Changing and enhancing self*
59
60

1
2
3 The interviewees point to the self-work they do to be in their leadership roles. They
4 reflect on the changes they make, which resonates with a postfeminist discourse of make-over
5 and self-enhancement. We observe how women senior leaders engage with a discourse of
6 change and self-transformation:
7
8
9
10
11

12
13 So, I've had two different coaches in the last five years. So, I've done a number of
14 things, I have done things like, it's all about increasing self-awareness. I think a big
15 key to it is having self-awareness, because if you kind of know who you are, what
16 motivates you, what drives you, how you react to things, why you react to things, it's
17 you know, if you know yourself you have a better chance of kind of harnessing the
18 good, for want of a better word, restricting the bits that you're not as keen on or
19 maybe the bits that might not work in all situations. So, mine has been about
20 understanding myself, so I've done things like Myers Briggs, I've done things like
21 Disc, you know, read the reports with interest, you know, kind of trying to see if they
22 correlate. I've done maybe four of those over the past seven, eight years. And I don't
23 hold, right, that's the truth and nothing but the truth. But it's useful...some things get
24 pulled out
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 (Victoria, Senior Woman Leader)
42
43

44 Victoria discusses how she invests in coaching and training to come to a better understanding
45 of herself, of how she can bring out the best in herself and remedy those parts that are not
46 useful. Self-awareness is seen as very valuable, as key even, and she accepts that self-
47 awareness takes work and needs to be maintained repeatedly. This constant work on knowing
48 and changing the self is a well-known trope for women, contributing to the emergence of vast
49 industries – women's magazines, self-help books, coaching websites – that are built on
50 making women work on themselves in line with postfeminist femininities (Swan, 2017). As
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Elaine Swan notes, women are seen as the perfect malleable subjects in postfeminist gender
4 regimes, and for these women senior leaders the feminine make-over work and the leader
5 self-awareness work go together seamlessly.
6
7
8
9

10 I guess I've changed quite a bit even in my leadership role...I have become more
11 feminine in my dress in the last five years...I've moved away from your very
12 traditional you know, navy trouser suit or navy skirt suit or black...the more I've
13 moved up the ladder the more I've realised that I have to actually be quite outspoken
14 in my opinion because I think sometimes as a woman you're not heard unless you're
15 willing to be just very direct and not beat around the bush on a topic and I think if I
16 look at my boardroom experiences I think women are a lot better at actually really
17 getting to the root of the issue rather than skirting around an issue and maybe that's
18 because traditionally this old boy's network thing, you scratch my back, I'll scratch
19 yours, that's diluting, that's diluting
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 (Diana, Senior Woman Leader)
35
36

37 Diana's reflections illustrate how much work goes into constructing a leader identity as a
38 woman and how this construction entails a careful combination of masculinity and
39 femininity. She notes how she explicitly worked on her appearance (dress more feminine)
40 and on being outspoken to be seen and heard as a woman leader. She emphasizes femininity
41 as she connects women to a superior boardroom performance, reiterating the female
42 advantage in leadership thesis. At the same time, this illustrates how it is not self-evident that
43 women are seen and heard in leadership positions that have been male dominated
44 traditionally, even for senior women leaders themselves. We note how Diana can move away
45 from masculine navy suits, but not from masculine connotated leader behaviour in her
46 emphasis of having to 'be outspoken and just very direct and not beat around the bush' to be
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 heard as a woman leader. The construction of leadership identities by senior women entails
4
5 continuous work and changes of the self to get the right gender mix, to master a 'balance' of
6
7 both masculine and feminine behaviours.
8
9

10
11
12
13
14 *Being true to self*
15

16
17 As we have seen above, postfeminist themes of masculine individualism are strongly
18
19 present in interviewees' accounts of how they 'choose' long working hours alongside a
20
21 willingness to take responsibility for transforming themselves by engaging in continuous
22
23 processes of self-improvement. Nevertheless, while positively engaging with discourses of
24
25 individualism, choice and self-transformation, there was also an awareness that there are
26
27 constraints around doing masculinity in terms of engaging in certain behaviours as the
28
29 following illustrates:
30
31

32
33 But yeah, I think there's still in certain environments, you get labelled with being a
34
35 particular type of women if you're ambitious. The amount, of times people have said
36
37 to me things like...you know "you're so ambitious or you're not aggressive but sort of
38
39 a similar very assertive or something where it's been said to me in a way as if to say
40
41 "bit too pushy" you know that kind of way. Whereas a man doing the same would be
42
43 "oh he's a bit too hot-headed, don't worry about him" and I'm being pushy, yet
44
45 they're being what we would call disgracefully rude...If I behaved like that no one
46
47 would tolerate me. I've got less ability to behave badly
48
49
50

51
52 (Simone, Senior Woman Leader)
53
54

55
56 The power effects of gendered discourses in relation to leadership emerge strongly in the way
57
58 Simone assesses how she has been perceived and the limits that are put on her engagement in
59
60 behaviours which are socially marked as masculine. Ambition and being assertive through

1
2
3 strong articulation of her opinions are all perceived as displays of masculinity and women's
4
5 latitude in engaging in such behaviours is much narrower than the leeway given to men. As
6
7 their room for (masculine) manoeuvre is restricted within a postfeminist gender regime,
8
9
10 women leaders, no matter what their characteristics, are called into femininity as the
11
12 following illustrates:

13
14
15 I always make sure that I am well turned out, so I'm well groomed...So in terms of
16
17 you know what experience has told me is that, if you don't look as you're expected to
18
19 look, they don't even care what you say after that. So, it's a sad fact, but then you are
20
21 kind of climbing a hill to get your, it's almost like they look at you, and go, yeah, tick.
22
23 Like she's well presented, she's got the right amount of jewellery on, you know kind
24
25 of lipstick on, you know, there's an image that they expect you to have. If you turn
26
27 up, and you know, I know some females who are brilliant technically, but they're
28
29 almost they're ignored because they kind of, I mean, I know one, she wears male suits
30
31 because that's what she likes to do. She never has any make-up on, you know, she and
32
33 that, unfortunately, is, she's judged on it. And people comment more about that than
34
35 they do about her technical brilliance.
36
37
38
39
40

41 (Victoria, Senior Woman Leader)

42
43
44 What Victoria demonstrates here is that feminine attributes and behaviours cannot be refused
45
46 as being perceived as a credible leader is dependent on successful engagement with feminine
47
48 gender norms (Khan et al, 2022). Clothing plays an important role in calibrating masculine
49
50 behaviours with displays of femininity. The physical embodiment of feminine norms is
51
52 necessary for credibility and women who reject the material accoutrements of femininity in
53
54 their dress are 'ignored'.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 This awareness of the limits of being an autonomous individual in terms of
4
5 engagement in masculinised behaviours was evident across all the interviews. Yet despite
6
7 this, senior women leaders did not forego the call to individualism or personal
8
9 transformation, rather they interpreted it in terms of a feminised authenticity of being ‘true to
10
11 self’. This meant the focus of their individualism and work-on-self shifted towards
12
13 engagement in behaviour that felt ‘right’ for them. Drawing on the notion of authentic
14
15 individualism was a key means by which women’s identities as leaders took shape and their
16
17 attachment to leadership was articulated through a discourse of authenticity. Here, it is
18
19 important to note that in alignment with the poststructuralist principles which underpin this
20
21 study, we do not understand our respondents as unitary individuals who present a ‘true’ self,
22
23 manifest in possessing and displaying ‘authentic’ traits. Rather, we understand them as
24
25 individuals who ‘do’ authenticity as part of the constitution of their leadership identities. As
26
27 such this discourse of authenticity is not to be confused with the notion of authentic
28
29 leadership which is dominated by an understanding ‘that assume(s) a disembodied genderless
30
31 individual who exhibits a ‘true’ fixed self’, securely delimited from the external world (Liu et
32
33 al, 2015, p. 240).

34
35
36
37
38
39
40 As we see below, doing authenticity in terms of authentic individualism facilitated the
41
42 calibration of masculinity and femininity as they discursively constituted their leadership
43
44 identities. It is also notable that being authentic was expressed as being important by women
45
46 interviewees but was not given similar attention by the men interviewed in the wider study.
47
48 Authentic individualism tended to be articulated in terms of refusing to separate who they are
49
50 at home in their private life and who they are at work with efforts made to integrate them.
51
52 Building connection between the feminised space of home and the masculinised space of
53
54 work was seen as key to being ‘true to self’ as the following illustrates:
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 One of the things that I try to be is open and honest and not have a work persona and a
4 home persona. There's a business (name) and a home (name) but they're not
5 completely different...I try to humanise everything that I do so that people can be
6 comfortable and I'm not, you know, I'm not one of the team per se, I am part of the
7 team and my job is to lead the team, so what I try to do is I try to be caring,
8 approachable, understanding and understandable, but not one of the girls or boys...
9 I'll tell a stupid joke as part of my presentations, which I will do at home...it's really
10 hard to create two versions of yourself...you know, my true character is not different
11 at home as it is at work. I talk about my children, about my husband...the trials and
12 tribulations, at the right level

(Kelly, Senior Woman Leader)

13 Kelly's claim that there is no significant difference between who she is at home and who she
14 is at work, demonstrates that the discursive constitution of her leadership identity entails a
15 capacity to dwell within and between masculine and feminine norms (Lewis et al, 2022).
16 Being a leader starts with who she 'really is' – a wife, a mother, a woman. Nevertheless, she
17 knows that engaging in feminine behaviours associated with home without calibrating them
18 with masculinity by controlling their expression will be problematic. While she places an
19 emphasis on relational behaviours - being caring, humanising work, making people feel
20 comfortable – she also places a limit on the connection she builds with those she works with
21 by leading the team but not being 'one of the girls or boys.' In other words, she knows that
22 performing authenticity must be done 'at the right level', requiring a negotiation between the
23 masculine norms associated with work and the feminine norms she draws on from her life
24 outside her organization. Drawing on a discourse of authenticity and engaging in authentic
25 individualism was how the interviewees address the challenges that go with leadership

Building connection

The emphasis placed on performing authenticity as an individual, provided women leaders with a framework to discursively mobilise behaviours that are conventionally marked as feminine when leading. From this vantage point, an important part of the leadership identities of the senior women leaders derives from the emphasis they place on building connections and relationships with the people they lead. From Lorraine's comments below, we can see how she displays feminised leadership attributes by engaging in feminine behaviours that felt authentic to her. She articulates a willingness '...to listen and to share...' her own experiences, bringing together her private life and work life as follows:

I was making a huge effort to build relationships with all the teams, just going out with them and showing them, I was a human being and wasn't some...walking around with a clipboard and stopwatch which some had previously done. I think that made me a better leader because people responded to that a lot more clearly and saw me as more authentic and more willing to listen and to share my own experiences of what had happened to me and as a result I ended up getting an awful lot more loyalty and people wanting to work for me... those experiences genuinely changed me and entirely changed my approach to my leadership style and calmed me the hell down. But you're not authentic if you can't visibly live it. So that's what it means, from my perspective, is visibly living it

(Lorraine, Senior Woman Leader)

Drawing on a discourse of authenticity, Lorraine rejects the traditional masculine displays of authority, described as '...walking around with a clipboard and stopwatch...'. She found that engaging in a more relational form of leadership and building connections with her team, changed her understanding of who she is as a leader. She became calmer and this enhanced

1
2
3 how she led people, with the result that in return she received loyalty and people wanting to
4
5 work for her.
6
7

8 A similar important discourse in this respect is the discourse of relatability. We
9
10 observe how women leaders use discursive resources which emphasise warmth and care for
11
12 others, signalling traditional communal femininities and working these qualities into their
13
14 accounts of leadership identity as the following illustrates:
15
16

17
18 You want to carry on being friendly with people, you want them to sort of see who
19
20 you are...And my thing was always that I never wanted to have to say to people,
21
22 come on, you know we've got to work, I wanted them just to read me, so that it just
23
24 happened...over the years, without realising it I have a face, and so they'd go "she's
25
26 got that face on, right we better get on then" and so it would just all happen, and that
27
28 was always much more suitable for me because I never wanted to have confrontation
29
30 with people...It was just about trying to be the kind of leader that people wanted to
31
32 work with
33
34
35
36

37 (Linda, Senior Woman Leader)
38
39

40 In this excerpt, we see how Linda carefully steers away from a form of leadership that
41
42 requires her to tell people what to do. Her emphasis is on wanting to be the kind of leader
43
44 who is friendly with people and who people want to work with. We can see the emphasis she
45
46 places on a form of relational leadership, culturally associated with femininity, whereby the
47
48 connection between her and those she leads, is such that followers 'read the leader' and the
49
50 work 'just happens'. She juxtaposes this relational leadership to a masculine, authoritative or
51
52 'confrontational' leadership. Women leaders drawing on a discourse of relatability and
53
54 incorporating connectivity into their leadership identities signal the value that they attach to
55
56 this feminised, non-normative leadership behaviour. It serves as a way to make gender
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 matter, invoking classic femininities as a form of gender capital and leadership asset. This
4
5 emphasis on connectivity and relatability was emphasized by all women leaders as follows:
6
7

8 I mean I think people are always happy to meet a normal person...I mean maybe
9
10 people come out of meetings and think 'oh my God how did she get that job?' or
11
12 something but I do think it's you know, I think people want to work with a person that
13
14 they can have a normal conversation with and who cares about the same stuff that
15
16 they do and that's what I've said to everyone about the merger...These people aren't
17
18 nutjobs, I mean maybe some of them are, there'll be people who care about exactly
19
20 the same stuff we do. You know, we just have to figure it out and then the hard part of
21
22 it is, it's all about the humans. You know there's nothing else to say, it would be great
23
24 to go sit in a cupboard and move assets around but unfortunately, it's all about the
25
26 humans
27
28
29
30

31
32 (Bethany, Senior Woman Leader)
33
34

35 The challenge for women leaders is that they must be credible in conventional (masculine)
36
37 leadership terms without transgressing gendered expectations. However, in emphasizing the
38
39 importance of connecting to people ('humans') and taking their concerns seriously, Bethany
40
41 tempers the masculine emphasis on keeping a distance as one means to maintain authority.
42
43 Instead, she identifies herself as a normal person, ready to make 'normal conversation'. She
44
45 does not position herself in the hierarchy above people but seeks to make a connection on the
46
47 same level, saying she 'cares about the same stuff'. The traditional feminine qualities of care
48
49 and building connections are normalized in her account and integrated in a leadership that is
50
51 'all about the humans'. As such, she places an emphasis on the superior value of these
52
53 feminine leadership behaviours through the implicit contrast with masculine leadership that
54
55 emphasises the human *resources* over the *human* resources.
56
57
58
59
60

Discussion

This article investigates the discursive constitution of leadership identities by senior women leaders within the postfeminist context of the City of London. In doing this, we contribute to the small but developing corpus of research which mobilises postfeminism as an analytic device, to draw out the complexity of women's work experiences – here leadership – within contemporary organizations. Our contribution is twofold: first we make visible the *gendered hybridity* – a dialectic calibration of feminine and masculine behaviours - which lies at the heart of the leadership identities constituted by women in senior positions and the multifaceted form this takes. We acknowledge that there is existing research which highlights how women draw on a range of gendered discursive resources driven by their contextual needs when constituting identity. This includes studies which conceptualise the display of and engagement in normatively masculine and feminine attributes and behaviours when leading, in terms of 'androgyny' and 'gender' neutral prototypes', opening-up leadership to women (Powell, 2021). Contrastingly, a study by Muhr (2011) suggests that simultaneously drawing on masculine and feminine norms in an excessive way to achieve success can reinforce gender inequality. Other studies in different empirical settings – exotic dancers (Mavin and Grandy, 2013) and women business owners (Lewis, 2013) – demonstrate how masculine norms are drawn on strategically in tandem with femininity to maintain social status in those contexts, and to counteract any negativity that attaches to constituting a feminised identity. However, we argue that our use of postfeminism as a critical concept does something different as we diverge from the indeterminate consensual stance of 'androgyny' while also demonstrating how the calibration of masculinity and femininity is not just done as a 'strategic choice' but rather as a normative requirement. Drawing on postfeminism as a critical concept, enables an analysis that draws out the complexity and challenges women

1
2
3 leaders face when called to engage in contradictory gender-marked behaviours as normative
4
5 conduct.
6
7

8
9 In drawing on postfeminist discourses of individualism, choice, and self-
10 transformation, we note how the senior women in this study construct a classic masculine
11 leader identity in their adherence to the priorities of work over other things in life, yet they do
12 not take this prioritization for granted, as they remark on the sacrifice to their relationships
13 outside of work. Using postfeminism as an analytic device, we highlight the pressures women
14 face to engage in feminine displays not only for general social acceptance but to ensure that
15 they are listened to when operating in conventionally masculine ways, in conventionally
16 masculine spaces such as the board room. Thus, doing masculinity when leading necessarily
17 and unavoidably requires the doing of femininity, resulting in a gendered hybridity that needs
18 constant work. For the senior women in this study who work in a masculinised environment,
19 authenticity is fundamental to their understanding of who they are as leaders. We argue that
20 drawing on a discourse of authenticity allowed them to strategically present their own
21 calibration of required masculinized behaviours – authority, competitiveness, exercising
22 control – while also invoking feminised behaviours – care, empathy, connection. In
23 postfeminist gender regimes, traditional feminine qualities such as being relatable and
24 building connections remain important normative markers for women leaders, allowing them
25 to build identities in a way which feels ‘right’ and ‘true to themselves’. Nevertheless, as we
26 see throughout the analysis above, these women leaders are aware of the need to calibrate
27 with masculine marked practices of authority. While engagement in masculine behaviours is
28 not possible without conforming to attributes and behaviours coded as feminine, compliance
29 with femininity is framed as a form of authentic individualism, bringing masculine and
30 feminine gender norms together as interdependent forces.
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

1
2
3 Our second contribution concerns the implications of the bringing together of
4 postfeminist authenticity work (not just be yourself but be your *best* self) with leadership, by
5 senior women leaders. An emphasis placed on authenticity and being the ‘real me’ is often
6 associated with a disavowal of structural change in favour of a focus on the individual.
7
8 However, when senior women leaders draw on a discourse of authenticity, are they only
9
10 concerned with their own unique inner compass and leading authentically in accordance with
11
12 it (Calder-Dawe and Gavey, 2017)? Considering the emphasis placed on authenticity, we can
13
14 see that the same individualising logic informs masculinised and feminised leadership
15
16 behaviours as both concentrate on personal transformation. Nevertheless, we argue that this
17
18 does not mean that there is no challenge to conventional leadership with its deep
19
20 embeddedness in traditional masculinised images and behaviours. In drawing on the
21
22 discourse of relatability and seeking to build connection with those they lead, these senior
23
24 women leaders change leadership: they reduce hierarchy, open-up channels of
25
26 communication with their followers and emphasise common purpose.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 Further, from our analysis, we suggest that in discursively constituting their
37
38 leadership identities, these senior women leaders are doing more than just ‘be themselves’.
39
40 Embedded in these senior women’s ‘authenticity talk’, is an engagement with power relations
41
42 and a desire to change leadership within their organizations. As such there is an ethical
43
44 sensibility attached to their account of who they are as leaders focused on changing ‘how
45
46 leaders do things’. The discourse of authenticity provided them with ‘...a more intelligible
47
48 and liveable framing...’ for their leadership identities. For these women leaders, being
49
50 authentic was not just ‘...an inwards looking project of the self...’ (Calder-Dawe and Gavey,
51
52 2017, p. 792). Rather, it provided them with a space to be non-conformist within a traditional
53
54 masculine environment, unlocking an opportunity to challenge this masculinity through
55
56 calibration with leadership behaviours which fall within the realm of femininity.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Accordingly, we suggest that the emphasis they place on being authentic when leading is as
4
5 much a political as an individualised project of 'building your best self'. It provides these
6
7 senior women leaders with transformative potential (Bonham and Bacchi, 2016), opening-up
8
9 possibilities for a fundamental makeover of leadership and a challenging of the prevailing
10
11 wisdom within their organizations. It provokes cultural change and through the value placed
12
13 on relatability, builds connection and engagement on the same level with those they lead.
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 **Conclusion**

21
22
23 Drawing on postfeminism as an analytic device, this paper makes visible the way in
24
25 which the entanglement of discourses of individualism, choice, and self-transformation with
26
27 discourses of authenticity and relatability provides the senior women leaders in this study
28
29 with an intelligible and liveable framing of their leadership identities. Through recourse to the
30
31 notion of the 'authentic self' they can conform to the demands of leading in a long-standing
32
33 masculine business environment. At the same time, they create an opportunity of stepping
34
35 outside the masculine orthodoxy of command and control, advocating change through a
36
37 feminised relational form of leadership. Being a postfeminist authentic leader, provides these
38
39 senior women leaders with '...a politicized framework to make sense of the difference and
40
41 distance between their experiences of self on the one hand, and the cultural conditions of
42
43 recognition (as a leader) on the other' (Calder-Dawe & Gavey, 2017, p. 792). As we have
44
45 shown, being called to engage in a calibration of masculine and feminine behaviours when
46
47 leading, is not just about achieving a correct balance between a set of contradictory gender
48
49 norms. Rather developing the capacity to manage and challenge the gender constraints they
50
51 are subject to is more than a 'project of the self', it also opens-up space to transform how
52
53 leadership is practiced within their organizations. While other studies have emphasised how
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 postfeminist subjectivities ultimately reinforce the masculine status quo, this study
4
5 demonstrates that transformative agendas have not been prevented. Rather, postfeminism as a
6
7 discursive formation and the authentic individualism it promotes, can serve as a gateway for
8
9
10 more radical change (Benschop and Lewis, 2022).
11
12
13
14
15

16 **References**

17
18
19 Adamson, M. and Kelan, E. (2019), ““Female heroes’: celebrity executives as postfeminist
20
21 role models”, *British Journal of Management*, Vol. 30 No. 1, pp. 981-996.
22
23

24 Bacchi, C. and Bonham, J. (2016), “Poststructural interview analysis: politicizing
25
26 personhood”, in Bacchi, C. and Goodwin, S., *Poststructural Policy Analysis*, Palgrave Pivot,
27
28 New York, pp. 113-121.
29
30

31
32 Banet-Weiser, S. (2012), *Authentic: the politics of ambivalence in a brand culture*. New York
33
34 and London: New York University Press.
35
36

37 Benschop, Y. and Lewis, P (2022), “The revolutionary potential of postfeminism? Dialogues
38
39 on re-radicalizing feminism in a postfeminist and neoliberal age”, *Organization Studies*
40
41 *Summer Workshop, Crete 18 – 21 May*.
42
43

44 Bryan, A. (2022), “A view from the top: an examination of postfeminist sensibilities in
45
46 women leaders’ constructions of success and response to gender inequality in English
47
48 football”, *International Journal of Constitutional Law*, DOI: 10.1093/icon/moac010.
49
50

51
52 Budgeon, S. (2014), “The dynamics of gender hegemony: femininities, masculinities and
53
54 social change”, *Sociology*, Vol. 48 No. 2, pp. 317-334.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Byrne, J., Radu-Lefebvre, M., Fattoum, S. and Balachandra, L. (2021), "Gender gymnastics
4 in CEO succession: masculinities, femininities and legitimacy", *Organization Studies*, Vol.
5
6 42 No. 1, pp. 129-159.
7

8
9
10 Calder-Dawe, O. and Gavey, N. (2017), "Authentic feminist? authenticity and feminist
11 identity in teenage feminists' talk", *British Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 56 No. 2, pp.
12
13 752-798.
14
15

16
17
18 Carlson, J. (2011), "Subjects of stalled revolution: a theoretical consideration of
19 contemporary American femininity", *Feminist Theory*, Vol. 12 No. 1, pp. 75-91.
20
21

22
23 Collinson, D. (2020), "Only connect!: exploring the critical dialectic turn in leadership
24 studies", *Organization Theory*, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 1-22.
25

26
27
28 Eagly, A.H. and Carli, L.L. (2003), "The female leadership advantage: an evaluation of the
29 evidence", *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 14 No. 6, pp. 807-834.
30
31

32
33
34 Fletcher, J. (2004), "The paradox of postheroic leadership: an essay on gender, power, and
35 transformational change", *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 15 No. 5, pp. 647-661.
36
37

38
39
40 Ford, J. (2006), "Discourses of leadership: gender, identity and contradiction in a UK public
41 sector organization", *Leadership*, Vol. 2 No. 1, pp. 77-99.
42
43

44
45 Gill, R. (2007), "Postfeminist media culture: elements of a sensibility", *European Journal of*
46
47 *Cultural Studies*, Vol. 10 No. 2, pp. 147-166.
48

49
50 Gill, R. (2017), "The affective, cultural and psychic life of postfeminism: a postfeminist
51 sensibility 10 years on", *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, Vol. 20 No. 6, pp. 606-626.
52
53

54
55 Khan, M.H., Williams, J., Williams, P. & French, E. (2022), "Post-heroic heroism: embedded
56 masculinities in media framing of Australian business leadership", *Leadership*, Vol. 18 No. 2,
57
58 pp. 298-327.
59
60

1
2
3 Lees-Marshment, J. and Smolovic Jones, O. (2018). "Being more with less: Exploring the
4 flexible political leadership identities of government ministers", *Leadership*, Vol. 14, No. 4,
5 pp. 460-482.
6
7

8
9
10 Lewis, P. (2013), "The search for an authentic entrepreneurial identity: difference and
11 professionalism among women business owners", *Gender, Work & Organization*, Vol. 20,
12 No. 3, pp. 252-266.
13
14

15
16
17 Lewis, P. (2014), "Postfeminism, femininities and organization studies: exploring a new
18 agenda", *Organization Studies*, Vol. 35 No. 12, pp. 1845-1866.
19
20

21
22
23 Lewis, P, Benschop, Y. and Simpson, R. (2017), "Postfeminism, gender and organization",
24 *Gender, Work & Organization*, Vol. 24 No. 3, pp. 213-225.
25
26

27
28
29 Lewis, P., Rumens, N. and Simpson, R. (2022), "Postfeminism, hybrid mumpreneur identities
30 and the reproduction of masculine entrepreneurship", *International Small Business Journal*,
31 Vol. 40 No. 1, pp. 68-89.
32
33

34
35
36 Liu, H., Cutcher, L. and Grant, D. (2015), "Doing authenticity: the gendered construction of
37 authentic leadership", *Gender, Work & Organization*, Vol. 22, No. 3, pp. 237-255.
38
39

40
41
42 Mavin, S. and Grandy, G. (2013), "Doing gender well and differently in dirty work: the case
43 of exotic dancing", *Gender, Work & Organization*, Vol. 20, No. 3, pp. 232-251.
44
45

46
47 Mavin, S. and Grandy, G. (2018), "How postfeminism plays out for women elite leaders", in
48 Lewis, P., Benschop, Y. and Simpson, R. (Eds), *Postfeminism and Organization*, Routledge,
49 London, pp. 161-178.
50
51

52
53
54 Mavin, S., Elliott, C., Stead, V. and Williams, J. (2019a), "Economies of visibility as a
55 moderator of feminism: 'Never mind Brexit. Who won Legs-it!'", *Gender, Work &*
56
57
58
59
60
Organization, Vol. 26 No. 8, pp. 1156-1175.

1
2
3 Mavin, S. and Grandy, G. (2019b), "Women leaders, self-body-care and corporate moderate
4 feminism: an (im)perfect place for feminism", *Gender, Work & Organization*, Vol. 26 No.
5 11, pp. 1546-1561.
6
7

8
9
10 McRobbie, A. (2009), *The Aftermath of Feminism*, Sage, London.
11
12

13
14 Muhr, S.L. (2011), "Caught in the gendered machine: on the masculine and feminine in
15 cyborg leadership", *Gender, Work & Organization*, Vol. 18, No. 3, pp. 337-357.
16
17

18
19 Nash, M. and Moore, R. (2019), "'I was completely oblivious to gender': an exploration of
20 how women in STEMM navigate leadership in a neoliberal, postfeminist context", *Journal of*
21 *Gender Studies*, Vol. 28 No. 4, pp. 449-461.
22
23

24
25
26 Powell, G.N. Butterfield, D.A. and Bartol, K.M. (2008), "Leader evaluations: a new female
27 advantage?", *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, Vol. 23 No. 3, pp. 156-174.
28
29

30
31
32 Powell, G.N., Butterfield, D.A. and Jiang, X. (2021), "The "good manager" over five
33 decades: towards an androgynous profile?", *Gender in Management: An International*
34 *Journal*, Vol. 36 No. 6, pp. 714-730.
35
36
37

38
39
40 Pratt, M.G. (2009), "For the lack of a boilerplate: tips on writing up (and reviewing)
41 qualitative research", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 52, No. 5, pp. 856-862.
42
43

44
45 Riley, S., Evans, A. and Mackiewicz, A. (2016), "It's just between girls: negotiating the
46 postfeminist gaze in women's 'looking talk'", *Feminism & Psychology*, Vol. 26 No. 1, pp.
47 94-113.
48
49

50
51
52 Swan, E. (2017), "Postfeminist stylistics, work femininities and coaching: a multimodal study
53 of a website", *Gender, Work & Organization*, Vol. 24 No. 3, pp. 274-296.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Tassabehji, R., Harding, N., Lee, H. and Dominguez-Pery, C. (2021). "From female
4 computers to male computers: or why there are so few women writing algorithms and
5 developing software. *Human Relations*, Vol. 74, No. 8, pp. 1296-1326.
6
7
8

9
10 Weedon, C. (1987), *Feminist Practice and Poststructuralist Theory*, Blackwell, Oxford.
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

Table I – Senior Women Leader Interviewees

Pseudonym	Interview Details	Type of Organization
Linda	1 hour 10 minutes, Interview 3	Insurance Market Expert
Bethany	46 minutes, Interview 6	Broker
Lorraine	1 hour, Interview 10	Insurance Organization
Katherine	55 minutes, Interview 11	Insurance Organization
Kelly	1 hour 2 minutes, Interview 15	Company associated with insurance market
Charlotte	59 minutes, Interview 16	Underwriter
Simone	1 hour 8 minutes, Interview 22	Company associated with insurance market
Christine	58 minutes, Interview 31	Underwriter
Diana	40 minutes, Interview 38	Underwriter
Rebecca	42 minutes, Interview 40	Underwriter
Phoebe	58 minutes, Interview 45	Underwriter
Victoria	1 hour 50 minutes, Interview 46	Underwriter
Vanessa	58 minutes, Interview 48	Underwriter

Table II – Summary of the Data Analysis

What women leaders say – the things said	Postfeminist Discourses	Postfeminist Discursive Practices
I was always someone who did more than others		
I suppose I am competitive	Individualism, choice, and empowerment	
I was prepared to work really, really, hard		
I sacrificed a lot for my work		Choosing work
The reality is your job is who you are		
I had strong ambition, a hunger to be different		
My observation is that most people do change		
You have to be a Rubik's Cube, not just one colour	Make-over and self-transformation	
I did a lot of self-exploring		
You learn to harness the best bits		
You have to take the blows and be able to still get up		Changing & enhancing self
Being authentic and just being yourself		
You want them to see who you are		
I was doing authentic before it was a word		
It's really hard to create two versions of yourself	Authenticity	
Let people see enough to appreciate who you are		
I find it quite hard to be something I'm not		Being true to self
It's a constant struggle to stay true to who you are		
I never wanted to have confrontation with people		
I am naturally empathetic		
What I've done is always be nice, try to be helpful	Relatability	
You want to carry on being friendly with people		
I think people are happy to meet a normal person		Building connection
Show them I was a human being		
I care about the same stuff that they do		
Show them your vulnerabilities		

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

Gender in Management: an International Journal

Table II – Summary of the Data Analysis

What women leaders say – the things said	Postfeminist Discourses	Postfeminist Discursive Practices
I was always someone who did more than others	Individualism, choice, and empowerment	Choosing work
I suppose I am competitive		
I was prepared to work really, really, hard		
I sacrificed a lot for my work		
The reality is your job is who you are	Make-over and self-transformation	Changing & enhancing self
I had strong ambition, a hunger to be different		
My observation is that most people do change		
You have to be a Rubik's Cube, not just one colour		
I did a lot of self-exploring	Authenticity	Being true to self
You learn to harness the best bits		
You have to take the blows and be able to still get up		
Being authentic and just being yourself		
You want them to see who you are	Relatability	Building connection
I was doing authentic before it was a word		
It's really hard to create two versions of yourself		
Let people see enough to appreciate who you are		
I find it quite hard to be something I'm not		
It's a constant struggle to stay true to who you are		
I never wanted to have confrontation with people		
I am naturally empathetic		
What I've done is always be nice, try to be helpful		
You want to carry on being friendly with people		
I think people are happy to meet a normal person		
Show them I was a human being		
I care about the same stuff that they do		
Show them your vulnerabilities		

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

Gender in Management: an International Journal