Introduction

Leah Tomkins

WHAT DOES IT MEAN FOR A LEADER TO CARE?

There is nothing new about a concern that our leaders may not be doing everything we expect or hope from them, whether in the institutions of public life or behind the closed doors of corporate organisations. For millennia, philosophers, poets, historians and artists have held up a mirror to leadership behaviour, and admired, but more often criticised, mocked or despaired of what they saw. What leaders do is significant, because of the power invested in them and the ability they have to affect people's lives – materially, politically and psychologically. Moreover, leadership is not something bestowed only on the very few at the top of society or on a single CEO of an organisation. Leadership is something in which most of us engage from time to time, whenever goals need to be set, actions need to be co-ordinated, and people need to be mobilised and motivated. In short, leadership matters.

In recent years, scholarly interest in leadership has focused increasingly on the notion of an ethics of care. When we think of popular archetypes of leadership, we often invoke leaders who seem to care – like Nelson Mandela, Mother Theresa, or even Princess Diana, all of whom were able to *connect* with people, willing to share both literal and metaphorical hugs. Such leaders inspire enormous devotion from those around them, who repay the care invested in them with often unquestioning support, adoration and even idolisation. In contrast, leaders who do not care suffer from a moral illegitimacy which tarnishes their other accomplishments and qualities (Gabriel, 2015). Not caring – or perhaps more accurately, *appearing* not to care – is an almost unforgivable transgression for leaders to make.

This was starkly brought to life in UK politics in the aftermath of the Grenfell Tower disaster in London. In June 2017, a fire broke out in a 24-storey apartment block in a relatively poor area of West London. With 72 deaths and more than 70 serious injuries, it was the most devastating residential fire in the UK since World War II. The fire's rapid spread was attributed to cheap building cladding, which contributed to the sense of outrage amongst the public and social and political commentators. The then Prime Minister, Theresa May, was

roundly criticised for her very low profile visits to the scene, and her apparent refusal to meet the families of the dead and the missing. In contrast, the leader of the opposition Labour party, Jeremy Corbyn, won praise for the personalised attention he gave to individual survivors and relatives, and the way he seemed to roll up his sleeves to take an active role in the search for the missing. His very visible, hands-on presence at the scene of the disaster was interpreted to mean that he was deeply and genuinely affected by what had happened; that he was able to acknowledge, but also contain, both his own and other people's distress. In this instance, Corbyn seemed to epitomise the 'caring leader' as someone who puts human beings and human relationships first. This meant being personally invested in other people's concrete experiences, in contrast to the behind-the-scenes, ivory-tower strategising associated with Theresa May, or indeed, to her successor, Boris Johnson's notorious preference for rhetorical flourishes over actual facts. Whatever one thinks of their politics, Corbyn seems to fit the template of 'caring leader' more readily than May, with her unease with people, or Johnson, with his unease with detail.

Care and caring leadership are attractive ideas, because they trigger associations with closeness, belonging and mattering to one another. In academic studies, care has been linked to increased organisational commitment (Lilius et al., 2012), enhanced workplace self-esteem (McAllister and Bigley, 2002) and improved organisational performance (Cameron et al., 2003). Focusing on care in organisational relations seems consistent, therefore, with leaders having (or developing) emotional intelligence and good relationship management skills. This tallies with a 'common sense' view of care as being associated first and foremost with emotions, and with the good emotions of love, empathy and compassion, rather than the bad emotions of disappointment, envy or hostility.

However, care is more complex than simply being kind or sympathetic to people, or being personally interested and invested in their affairs. Instead of always being expressed in niceness, care can manifest as sorrow, anger, frustration and anxiety. We see this shadow side of care in common expressions such as 'take care', which implies caution and the acknowledgement of threat and danger. Moreover, if we scratch beneath the surface of our understandings of care, we find that it challenges some of the things we take for granted about leadership – indeed, about organisational and institutional life in general. Some of care's strongest associations, for example, with feelings, femininity and domesticity, are extremely problematic for an institutional world which appears to value success, efficiency and delivery above all other qualities, and is often suspicious of emotions (except when they are the achievement-orientated emotions of pride or ambition). So, when we admire apparently caring leaders, we do not usually suspend our expectation that they should actually be able to *do their job*. We may crave warmth and compassion

from our leaders during moments of crisis and distress, but over the longer term, care is not usually a proxy for leadership competence.

CARING LEADERSHIP: AN ETERNAL REFRAIN

Over the course of this book, we will be pushing past the surface rhetoric of care to uncover some of the tensions and paradoxes of caring leadership, particularly in the context of leaders' relationships with other people. This will mean resisting the tendency to see care as simply another skill on the long list of attributes that leaders are expected to hone. In other words, the message of this book is not that leaders should aim to *be more caring*, as if care were merely a quantifiable commodity of unquestionable moral virtue. Rather, we hope that by exploring the dynamics of care, we might expose some of the often hidden dilemmas of institutional life, as well as highlight some as yet unfulfilled possibilities.

To do this, we will connect with debates in the modern care ethics movement and with philosophies of care which go back much further in the history of ideas. From a range of critical and philosophical perspectives, we will examine the moral and emotional politics of institutional relationships, focusing on how leaders both influence, and are influenced by, the people around them. For millennia, the dynamics of care have been helping *and* harming both those who give and those who are in need of care. In both its presence and its absence, care is implicated in our deepest concerns about the safety, protection and development of self, community, institution and nation.

Much of the rhetoric in leadership studies gives the impression that things are uniquely difficult or uniquely awful right here, right now, and that the solutions we come up with must, therefore, be based on discovering some hitherto secret or magic ingredient for leaders' greater effectiveness. Alvesson and Einola (2019) offer a timely reminder that the leadership models that come (back) to the fore at particular points in history say as much about the *Zeitgeist* as about the models *per se*. Certain approaches to leadership become particularly attractive during periods of social, economic and political turmoil as part of a relatively predictable identity crisis amongst the business and/or political elite. So, rather than assuming that caring leadership is the latest fad on the business school curriculum, this book encourages us to ask what it is about care that makes it surface as a priority at particular periods in time. What might our current age have in common with earlier times when the paradoxes of care have previously exercised intellectual, political and artistic minds?

Care goes to the heart of the relationship between those in charge and those in need. Decisions about how care should manifest are, therefore, enmeshed in the eternal fluctuations between strong, individualist leaders and more collaborative and participative forms of governance. Thus, whilst contempo-

rary organisational scholarship might assume that the call for ‘leadership, not leaders’ (Crevani et al., 2010) is a radical new departure, the broader historical sweep of this book would suggest otherwise. It invites us to reflect on the tides of political and institutional energy that have been ebbing and flowing for thousands of years, and the role of care in both galvanising and disturbing them.

CARE AS SOCIAL AND INSTITUTIONAL PHILOSOPHY

When I have discussed this book with friends and colleagues, they have often initially interpreted the idea of ‘caring leaders’ as meaning leadership of the caring professions, that is, they have assumed that it applies principally to the management of institutions providing health-care, social-care, elder-care and/or child-care. In this book, however, we are interested in how care ethics might be extrapolated from the spheres of domesticity and health/illness and into the wider world of organisation and institution. We use theorisations of care to frame negotiations between human beings in multiple walks of life, wherever these are between those able to provide support and those who need or desire such support, whether short- or longer-term.

We tend to use the term ‘followers’ to describe those in receipt of such care in organisational relations, because this is how the relationship is usually framed in leadership theory, despite the fact that most organisational practitioners do not think of themselves in such terms. The leader/follower distinction is useful simply as a heuristic to highlight the dynamics of organisational power; and the way these are usually assumed to be *asymmetrical*, positioning leaders as *care-givers*, who are the powerful, and followers as *care-recipients*, who are the relatively powerless.

Our extrapolation of care goes beyond the boundaries of individual organisations and into the wider social and political realm. The leadership we consider in this book is also leadership in the public arena, and we explore some of the ways in which both elected and non-elected leaders affect us as citizens. In short, we are interested in the challenges and opportunities for caring leadership as they apply to relations of authority and responsibility in any sector, occupation or realm of coordinated, organised activity. In this book, these include business, finance, law, higher education, leadership development, politics, the military, the prison service, social policy and social movements, as well as the more overtly caring contexts of health services and the family.

One way to extrapolate care into this broader realm is via care ethicists’ distinction between caring-for and caring-about. Caring-for occurs in the face-to-face encounter between care-giver and care-recipient, that is, in the activities of tending directly to another person’s needs, often within the

intimacy of the domestic sphere. Caring-about, on the other hand, takes us away from the face-to-face encounter and into the broader social, cultural and institutional world. Caring-for prioritises action and the meeting of another person's particular needs, and does not necessarily have anything to do with feelings or principles. By contrast, caring-about usually does involve feelings, and probably principles, but need not have anything to do with either action or needs. For instance, we may care-for another person's child when we baby-sit, because both parents and child need someone to just be there; but when we care-about the state of our politics, say, this takes us beyond the meeting of specific, immediate needs, and says something about who we are and how we relate to the world. So, the distinction between caring-for and caring-about suggests how care might generalise from the home and into the wider social and institutional world, for: 'Chronologically, we learn first what it means to be cared for. Then, gradually, we learn both to care for and, by extension, to care about others. This caring-about is almost certainly the foundation for our sense of justice.' (Noddings, 2002, p. 22).

THE KEY THEMES OF THE BOOK: PARADOX AND POWER

As the authors in this collection illustrate, caring leadership is a concept which juxtaposes what we admire most (agency, authority, control) with what we fear most (vulnerability, incapacity, dependency), highlighting the paradoxes which infuse our everyday experiences of our social, institutional and political worlds. Care entails, but also complicates, emotions. It exceeds, but also naturalises, gender. It demands that we acknowledge the sometimes excruciating choice between what is best for one particular person and what is best for everyone. With its links with compassion and empathy, care may seem a highly attractive quality but, with its roots in the family and the familiar, it involves the somewhat less attractive trait that we are usually more comfortable with who/what we know than with who/what we do not know.

Above all, care's significance for leadership rests on the suggestion that care is a relationship of *power*. This might initially seem surprising, because the concept of the 'caring leader' probably conjures up a world far removed from popular conceptualisations of power as Machiavellian manoeuvring and greasy poles. But, as these chapters highlight, power is everywhere implicated in relations of care, whether through the dynamics of the family as archetypal organisational entity, as exemplified by *Yiannis Gabriel*; or through the power of discourse to construct and constrict our understandings of the leader identity, as considered from a range of different perspectives by *Vinca Bigo*, *Joanne Ciulla*, *Ann Cunliffe* and *Matthew Eriksen*.

In terms of familiar framings of power in organisation studies, the dynamics of care reveal elements of power-over, power-to and power-with. *Liz Gloyn's* chapter on caring leadership through the prism of Roman Stoicism offers us the idea of the power-to-not. *Liz* and *Ben Sawyer* suggest caring leadership as the power-to-not inflict moral injury, and to restore justice where such injury occurs. The power-to-not damage or disadvantage others is often a kind of power-over the self. This emerges in *Peter Bloom's* interlinking of care and existential freedom; *Michèle Lowrie's* control of the self for the sake of a necessary yet impossible security; *Charlotte von Bülow* and *Peter Simpson's* exploration of negative capability as the power-to do without; and *Donna Ladkin's* caring leadership as resilience, fortitude and absorption of criticism. *Carol Attack* emphasises followers' power-to either give or withhold the consent to be led; and *Helen Mussell* suggests that increasingly active shareholders in business are exercising the power-to demand to be consulted.

Through the prism of care, we confront the power of emotions to both enhance and distort our organisational experiences. *Amanda Sinclair* and *Donna Ladkin* explore the power of embodied feelings and intuitions to guide us towards moral maturity. *Iain Munro* and *Torkild Thanem* consider the power of affect to mobilise collective leadership within and beyond the realm of formal organisation. In contrast, both *Jen Jones* and *Gerardo Abreu Pederzini* emphasise the power of feelings of love and altruism to deceive us, with quite startling implications for leaders and followers alike. As *Rita Gardiner* suggests, the seductive powers of transformational leaders are something to be especially wary of, especially when associated with Philosophers of Care!

Where the authors connect explicitly with other leadership models, these are seen through the prism of the power and paradoxes of care – its deceptions and dangers as well as its attractions and potential. Whether servant leadership, authentic leadership, transformational leadership, relational leadership, charismatic leadership, or indeed, any other prevailing theory, analysing leadership through the lens of care emphasises that power relations are never stable, settled or one-dimensional. In the dynamics of care, we see the shifting politics of privilege and disadvantage, of obligation and need; and we are forced to confront both the security we crave and the vulnerability we fear.

THE ORGANISATION OF THE BOOK

The chapters are organised into the following sections:

- I. Setting the scene: Power, privilege and disadvantage;
- II. The roots of care: Kinship, feelings and bodies;
- III. The risks of care: Dependency, exploitation and vulnerability;
- IV. The caring leader at work: Security, sacrifice and self;
- V. Reshaping the contours of leadership: Relationship, community and democracy.

These are by no means discrete categories, of course, and the individual chapters overlap and criss-cross with each other. There are other ways in which these chapters could have been clustered, and I am sure readers will find their own threads and patterns amongst the various discussions and perspectives.

I have avoided creating mini disciplinary ghettos by grouping, for instance, all the classical scholars' contributions together. As Tronto (1993) suggests, care ethics demands that we redraw conventional boundaries between politics and morality, between abstract ethical theory and grounded, idiographic approaches, and between public and private life. In my view, this also means challenging the contours of disciplinary boundaries to benefit from the insights of those working in different disciplinary silos but on similar moral, political and intellectual problems. Working with these authors from very different fields has been hugely rewarding, and I hope that readers get a sense of the joy of these cross-disciplinary collaborations.

Part I: Setting the Scene: Power, Privilege and Disadvantage

In the opening chapter, I deepen the analysis of the power relations of care to create context for the chapters to come. Connecting with care ethicists' elaborations of the relationship between care and justice, I explore some of the ways in which care can involve and inscribe *injustice* for both leaders and followers. Through the prism of care, I challenge some prevailing assumptions about who is privileged and who is disadvantaged in leader/follower relations.

Part II: The Roots of Care: Kinship, Feelings and Bodies

The authors in this part of the book consider the complex relations between caring leadership and emotions, especially feelings of closeness and familiarity which stem from the origins of care in the home, the family and the body. Connecting with real and metaphorical families, the authors reflect on the deceptive and the productive power of feelings.

Joanne Ciulla asks whether leaders need to feel warm emotions when discharging their duties towards others. Suggesting that the ethical distinctiveness of leaders may lie in the question of who has first claim on one's care, she reflects on the tension between looking after family (whom one knows and supposedly loves) and looking after followers (whom one may not know or like, let alone love). Leaders can honour their duties towards followers even if they do not like them all that much. This might mean that, in order to care-for an unlikeable follower, one gets strength from caring-about one's duty and identity as leader. Proposing that duty-based care is probably morally sufficient for leaders (though not as emotionally satisfying for followers), Joanne suggests that leaders' moral conflicts reflect the ways in which leadership itself is socially constructed. Ultimately, leading with care means acting in accordance with constructions of social and institutional duty more than by the dictates of the heart.

In our next chapter, *Yiannis Gabriel* presents a psychodynamic view of caring leadership through the eyes of followers, proposing that followers' expectations are rooted in fantasy and myth, along with early-life experiences that leave enduring, if mostly unconscious, traces. The caring leader is associated with the maternal archetype, evoking followers' desire to feel connected, cherished and special. Like good mothers, caring leaders are expected to be genuinely concerned with followers' well-being, and prepared to go beyond the call of duty on their behalf. In family and organisation alike, too intense a care for one's children can stifle their growth and lock them in dependency, apathy and immaturity; and too much favouritism for one's own children over others can result in nepotism. The maternalist roots of care may appeal to our primal need to belong, but they also invoke the distortions and abuses of familial power.

The connection with the archetypal family also underpins *Gerardo Abreu Pederzini's* chapter on caring leadership through the prism of evolutionary theory, whereby life evolves as the endurance of some genetic instructions over others. From this perspective, attentiveness from parent to offspring – from leader to follower – is seen as one of the behavioural traits selected for its strategic evolutionary usefulness. Any connection between caring leadership and genuine feeling or concern is, therefore, a trick of nature. This trick is played on both leaders and followers, making the former able and willing to care and the latter open to receiving and responding to care. In a phenomenal feat of magic realism, we are drawn to the idea of caring leadership, because we have to try to make sense of reality in ways that make its evolutionary brutality tolerable. However, the feelings associated with both giving and receiving care are genetic ruthlessness masquerading as love.

Amanda Sinclair and *Donna Ladkin* explore the embodied dimensions of caring leadership. If care involves anticipating and meeting the needs of both

self and others, then many of these needs originate with the gendered body. Caring leaders tap into the wisdom of their bodies through experiences such as gut-feel, and use this corporeal data to guide their actions and decisions. Connecting with feminist care ethics, Amanda and Donna argue that attending to the body is not some ‘airy fairy’ alternative to ‘proper’ leadership in the cut and thrust of the institutional world. Rather, feelings of care foster meaning, connection, common purpose and moral maturity, especially during times of trouble. Through embodied care, we might disrupt what the authors call the disembodied logic and mental mastery of mainstream leadership discourse, which privileges tools and checklists over an appreciation of the visceral demands of being a leader, and the often gut-wrenching conflicts between claims on a leader’s care.

Part III: The Risks of Care: Dependency, Exploitation and Vulnerability

The chapters in this part consider whether care creates, reinforces and legitimises inequality or disadvantage for followers, exposing the problems of both too little and too much care. They reflect on the possibilities for a leadership which recognises differences of capability and experience, but without impoverishment or exploitation.

Carol Attack draws on Plato and Xenophon to explore the analogy of the shepherd king and his flock – a relationship depicted explicitly as one of caring, but potentially exploitative, leadership. Reflecting on the eternally complex interplay of power, agency and well-being, she asks how much followers can and should exchange autonomy and agency for the experience of being led well. The contrast between human and animal flocks exposes crucial issues for leader/follower relations, including the significance of consenting to be led and the distinction between articulated and assumed needs. Carol highlights the intriguing paradox of Athenian society, notionally based on equality (amongst free men, that is), being more, rather than less, concerned with the qualities of the individual leader: the more we seek to distribute power, the greater the requirement to examine what we need from our leaders. And in the Socratic shift from the person of the leader to the craft of leadership, there is a fascinating foreshadowing of contemporary debates about ‘leaders’ versus ‘leadership’.

Mapping the leader/follower dynamic onto the relationship between legal trustees and beneficiaries, *Helen Mussell* highlights how the fiduciary relationship – often referred to as a duty of care – is premised on an unequal distribution of power. Trustees have traditionally not been required to consult with their beneficiaries, but can simply assume what their needs might be, reflecting a benign paternalism at best and a profound exploitation of the already disenfranchised at worst. Through a fiduciary lens, care is implicated *both*

in subjugation (through its historical association with women and children, deemed incapable of economic agency and hence in need of care) *and* in the possibility of liberation. Drawing on feminist legal philosophy, Helen explores leaders' obligation to *care well*, that is, to exercise their influence in ways which neither assume nor institutionalise the beneficiary's inferiority. With increasing shareholder activism demanding greater consultation in legal and financial fiduciary matters, this is a call for care ethics without exploitation.

Liz and Ben Sawyer focus on the costs for followers of insufficient or inadequate care. Drawing on Ben's first-hand experiences of army leadership, including in Northern Ireland, Iraq and Afghanistan, they reflect on what it means for military leaders to care, both in and beyond combat. They connect with the psychiatrist, Jonathan Shay's work with soldiers with post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), which juxtaposes the ancient myth of Homer's *Iliad*, and the figure of Achilles in particular, with modern veterans' narratives of vulnerability. From this standpoint, they suggest that one of the most damaging aspects of followers' experiences is the notion of 'moral injury', which can occur when carelessness is intertwined with injustice. Caring leadership involves the ethical responsibility to prevent, or at least minimise, moral injury; and, if someone has suffered such injury, the caring leader must help them towards recovery by ensuring that justice is both done and seen to be done.

In the final chapter in this part, *Jen Jones* presents a reading of Kafka's *Metamorphosis* to underscore the dangers of the power asymmetries of care. Kafka's protagonist, Gregor Samsa, wakes up one morning to find himself transformed into an enormous insect. Drawing on Hazel Barnes' existentialist philosophy, Jen explores this development as Gregor's punishment for having cared-for his family in bad faith. As leader of the family unit, he has made them unhealthily dependent on him, denying them the space to work things out for themselves. What has been delivered in the name of care, and presumed, therefore, to be for the sake of others, has turned out to be precisely not in their interests. Paradoxically, Gregor becomes ethically human and able to relate to others only when he is ontologically no longer human. Despite his apparently good intentions, Gregor's fate reveals the agony and absurdity of the distortions of care, and of having cared-for, but not really cared-about.

Part IV: The Caring Leader at Work: Security, Sacrifice and Self

These chapters consider how leaders' care both underpins and undermines their own and other people's security – political, physical and psychological. Recalling care ethicists' discussions of the morality of self-sacrifice, they reflect on care as a kind of power-over self.

Michèle Lowrie explores the relationship between care, security and power in Vergil's epic poem, the *Aeneid*. Aeneas, the Trojan prince and founder of Rome, is a paradigmatic leader, whose successes and failures stand for the moral, political and psychological challenges of empire. With Aeneas' leadership, national security is at once pursued and undermined through care; the Latin for security (*securitas*) means being without care (*se + cura*). Exposing the force of care in its absence, that is, as the *careless* opposite of tending and the *carefree* opposite of anxiety, Aeneas' leadership reveals security to be at once necessary, impossible and dangerous. Although national security is at stake, it is impossible to be permanently *carefree* and dangerous to be *careless*. When Aeneas sacrifices both his own and Queen Dido's feelings for the sake of the mission, this 'se + curity' sows the seeds for Rome's future political crises. The warning that security measures may backfire – and precisely because of the conflict of cares within – has an arresting contemporary resonance.

In our next chapter, *Charlotte von Bülow* and *Peter Simpson* use Keats' concept of negative capability and a particular reading of Foucault's care of the self to discuss the leadership of a prison governor, responsible for the security of prisoners, officers, public and self. Connecting with care ethicists' accent on attentiveness, they emphasise the *quality* of this attention, seeing care as an attitude of both receptiveness and inquiry which entails living with paradox, uncertainty and mystery. Effective leadership involves visceral attunement to atmosphere, and the containment of people's emotions, including anger and despair. Through the prism of self-care, this requires an asceticism which is not about abstinence, so much as honing the capacity to *be or do without*. This means leading without the power-to remove anxiety and risk, and sacrificing the security afforded by so-called best, that is, universal, practice. For Charlotte and Peter, this is leadership 'on the pulses', not 'by the book'.

Liz Gloyn draws on Seneca's Stoic philosophy to consider the relationship between care and *clementia* (an idea more nuanced than the English clemency), on which Seneca bases his 'leadership development' of the Emperor Nero. For Seneca, *clementia* is crucial as a check on absolute power, that is, as a way for power to unfold, somewhat counterintuitively, through not being exercised. Connecting with distinctions between power-over and power-to, Liz proposes the power-to-not as a way of crystallising the interplay of *clementia* and care. Such power-to-not is nurtured through care (both for/about and from others), and practised through the self-restraint of *clementia*. Care is thereby implicated in symmetry, because it helps to deliver fairness and justice, but also in asymmetry, because it reinforces the absolute dominion of the Emperor, keeping him secure from the threat of rebellion or assassination. Both *clementia* and care are thus vital, if paradoxical, sources and stabilisers of power.

In the final chapter in this part, *Peter Bloom* draws on the philosophy of Jean-Paul Sartre to reflect on leadership, care and existential freedom. Taking

care is the ability to choose how one lives in a socially and institutionally constructed world, and not be trapped in a socially prescribed identity or condition. This existential care of the self is contrasted with Sartre's particular articulation of bad faith, which is the continual embrace of a life and a self that one has not chosen freely. From this perspective, the caring leader is not some pastoral figure associated with religion or any other prohibition on morality. Rather, caring leaders use care as *resistance* to proscription, leading the way for both themselves and others to explore their own evolving priorities and concerns. Taking care of our existential self means securing the freedom to choose both who we are today and who we could be in the future.

Part V: Reshaping the Contours of Leadership: Relationship, Community and Democracy

The chapters in this part see care as fundamentally relational. This refers to relationships between people, but also between ideas, highlighting that the way we structure and legitimise knowledge is itself a practice of power. The authors engage with care ethics to cross boundaries and dissolve binaries, including binary distinctions between leaders/followers, ethics/politics and particular/universal.

Ann Cunliffe and *Matthew Eriksen* discuss the education of caring leaders, suggesting that the way we organise knowledge about human beings is fundamental to management education as a moral endeavour. An objectivist approach, seen in discourses of Human Resources and typologies of leadership competences, means that we categorise, generalise and measure people in ways that are *careless*. A more *careful* approach is subjectivist, focusing on the human being as a person, not a resource, a role or a thing. Ann and Matthew argue for an *intersubjective* approach, which focuses not only on the human being, but the human being in relation with others. Crystallising this as 'relational leadership', they suggest that care invigorates leaders' efforts to be attentive to others as they individually *are*, rather than in terms of their categorisation. An ethics of care emphasises our collective uniqueness, where each person is seen as deserving of particularised attention, but is also embedded in community, with responsibilities towards, and expectations of, others.

Collective responsibilities also underpin *Rita Gardiner's* chapter on the contrasting care philosophies and experiences of Hannah Arendt and Martin Heidegger. Rita makes Heidegger her 'fall guy', suggesting that his stint as university leader made him the ultimate 'transformational leader' in his emphasis on mission and vision, drawing on discourses of excellence and ambition which feel strikingly contemporary. But Heidegger's leadership was an unqualified disaster, for he was unable or unwilling to put his majestic vision to one side to attend to the human and the mundane. Rita considers

Arendt a better exemplar of caring leadership, with her concern for collective well-being over singularity of vision. From an Arendtian perspective, deconstructing our institutions into the binary of 'leaders' and 'followers' is a particular risk for 'followers', who are assumed to be more interchangeable than 'leaders', who are supposedly more special. But it creates categories out of all of us, denying us the possibility of giving and receiving care as humans, each of us unique in a plural world.

Vinca Bigo examines three persistent binaries in Western conceptualisations of leadership and care: mind/body, self/other and action/non-action. She engages with Eastern philosophies of non-separation in the Advaita Vedanta, a school in Hinduism, to explore caring leadership as a way of being, a practice of self and a profound commitment to others. This involves accepting that distinction and polarity are illusionary and temporary representations of a single underlying consciousness. From this perspective, leaders are inseparable from followers, which means caring for both ourselves and others without differentiation. Tracing connections between Vedantic philosophy and the European phenomenologists, Heidegger and Merleau-Ponty, along with other Eastern traditions of Daoism and Zen Buddhism, Vinca argues that transcending binaries is particularly challenging in a world which privileges the mind and those senses which are apparently located in the head. Through Advaita Vedanta, grasping the deeply relational nature of the world is a very real condition for caring both for and about it.

Engaging head-on with the 'leadership, not leaders' debate, *Iain Munro* and *Torkild Thanem* consider the possibility of care and organisation without leaders. They are critical of the ways in which the 'caring leader' has been absorbed into managerialist ideology, reinforcing hierarchical organisation and a paternalist, pastoral and exploitative understanding of care. Drawing on the philosophy of Spinoza, they explore the idea of 'affective leadership', which involves fostering our collective capacities to act and care for one another. Such capacities are stifled by an emphasis on the qualities of individual leaders, and more likely to flourish in leaderless organisations. Grounding their arguments in social movements, including the anti-Vietnam protests, the Occupy movement, and Black Lives Matter, they argue that these organisations may have been formed in response to injustice, but they transform the pain of injustice into joyous affect and action. For Iain and Torkild, this shows what the relationship between care and justice can be when it is leaderless.

Donna Ladkin draws on the work of social reformer, Jane Addams, to consider an ethics which is not universal in the sense of abstract principles, but rather, a universal commitment to social justice. For Addams, care is not care unless it results in action. Moreover, action should be based on a genuine attempt to discover, not assume, what other people need, want or would find comforting. This entails loosening the hold of the familiar to actively seek out

difference, thereby breaking the connection between particular and familiar which harks back to care's roots in the family. Rather than seeing equality and particularity as binary opposites, caring leadership involves working with what makes people *both* equal *and* special. This takes curiosity, creativity, courage, resilience and, as Addams' own experience suggests, an acceptance that care does not necessarily make one popular. This final chapter in our collection offers a hard-hitting, but profoundly optimistic take on caring leadership. In suggesting that any one person's problem is a problem for us all, Addams' care ethics becomes the very life-blood of democracy.

REFERENCES

- Alvesson, M. and Einola, K. (2019). Warning for excessive positivity: Authentic leadership and other traps in leadership studies. *The Leadership Quarterly*, **30**(4), 383–95.
- Cameron, K.S., Dutton, J.E. and Quinn, R.E. (2003). *Positive Organizational Scholarship: Foundations of a New Discipline*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Crevani, L., Lindgren, M. and Packendorff, J. (2010). Leadership, not leaders: On the study of leadership as practices and interactions. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, **26**(1), 77–86.
- Gabriel, Y. (2015). The caring leader – What followers expect of their leaders and why? *Leadership*, **11**(3), 316–34.
- Lilius, J.M., Kanov, J., Dutton, J.E., Worline, M.C. and Maitlis, S. (2012). Compassion Revealed. In K.S. Cameron and G.M. Spreitzer (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Positive Organizational Scholarship* (pp. 273–88). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McAllister, D.J. and Bigley, G.A. (2002). Work context and the definition of self: How organizational care influences organization-based self-esteem. *Academy of Management Journal*, **45**(5), 894–904.
- Noddings, N. (2002). *Starting at Home: Caring and Social Policy*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Tronto, J.C. (1993). *Moral Boundaries: A Political Argument for an Ethic of Care*. New York: Routledge.