Journal of Critical Thought and Praxis

ISSN: 2325-1204. Journal homepage: https://www.iastatedigitalpress.com/jctp/

Volume 2, Issue 2, 2014, Article 7, https://doi.org/10.31274/jctp-180810-78

# Trans*Forming Authentic Leadership: A Conceptual Framework

T.J. Jourian, *Loyola University Chicago*

## Abstract

This conceptual framework examines how the evolving literature on authentic leadership and development can be problematized and further clarified by looking at the identity development of trans* and genderqueer students. It begins by examining the components and factors of authentic leadership, and its strengths and weaknesses. As a newly emerging leadership model, and one that is gaining attention within the fields of leadership and higher education, there are opportunities to refine and bolster it to make it applicable and useful for the leadership development of a diversity of student populations from the onset. With that in mind, this paper considers the developmental milestones of trans* individuals, specifically those who identify as genderqueer, and how some of those milestones and experiences, as well as other people's interpretations of them, might complicate how we define and understand authenticity.

The question posed here is if authentic expression of self and relational transparency are key components of authentic leadership, ones that need to be validated by leaders as well as followers, then how might binarist constructions of gender influence cisgender and gender-conforming followers to reject genderqueer people's authentic self-expression and thus them as leaders? The conceptual framework offered provides higher education and student affairs administrators a lens through which to support the authentic leadership development of trans* and genderqueer students.

## Recommended Citation

Jourian, T. (2014). Trans*Forming Authentic Leadership: A Conceptual Framework. *Journal of Critical Thought and Praxis, 2*(2), 113-125. https://doi.org/10.31274/jctp-180810-78



The *Journal of Critical Thought and Praxis* is published by the Iowa State University Digital Press (https://press.lib.iastate.edu) and the Iowa State University School of Education (https://www.education.iastate.edu)

## Introduction

As a model gaining attention within the fields of leadership and higher education, authentic leadership provides a unique opportunity to enhance the leadership development of a diversity of student populations. This paper begins by examining the components and factors of authentic leadership as well as its strengths and weaknesses. It then considers the developmental milestones of genderqueer individuals and how those milestones and experiences, as well as other people's interpretations of them, might complicate authenticity. This paper argues that researchers and practitioners of authentic leadership should consider how a binary construction of gender privileges the self-expression of cisgender and gender conforming students as more authentic than that of genderqueer students.

## Overview of Authentic Leadership

Authentic leadership is a relatively new and evolving model that emerged in the late 1990s and early 2000s from within transformational leadership, as scholars posited that transformational leadership can be practiced both authentically and non-authentically (Avolio, Walumbwa & Weber, 2009). The core idea behind authentic leadership is that authentic leaders aid in the development of authentic followers by being self-aware and self-regulating. They also engage in positive role modeling and, thus, invest in the followers' well-being and sustain their performance (Avolio & Gardner, 2005). Informed by positive psychology, authentic leadership is an example of a post-industrial leadership theory, meaning it is collaborative, relational, process-oriented, and not focused on the individual leader (Komives & Dugan, 2010). Authentic practices and leadership theory have provided many within higher education the challenge and opportunity to answer the call for social change in the academy, by acknowledging how their various and intersecting social identities impact and manifest in the work they do. Through a number of modes such as narrative and reflection, leaders can investigate the origins of their values, actions, and assumptions, and thus be better positioned to affirm and empower the leadership of others (Chávez & Sanlo, 2013).

## Components and Antecedent Factors of Authentic Leadership

Authentic leadership is comprised of four key components and three influencing factors (Northouse, 2012). *Self-awareness,* the first key component, is an "emerging process where one continually comes to understand his or her unique talents, strengths, sense of purpose, core values, beliefs and desires" (Avolio & Gardner, 2005, p. 324). Self-awareness is not an end in and of itself, rather it is continuously evolving and contextually-based. *Internalized moral*

*perspective* is a leader's ability to base actions and behaviors on internal morals and values, controlling for external influence and pressure. *Balanced processing* involves the exploration of other perspectives and their objective analysis in decision-making, necessitating one's awareness of one's biases. *Relational transparency* describes a leader's open and honest communication and relationships with others. Closely connected to the previously stated first key component, it assumes a level of self-awareness that allows for the presentation of an authentic self to others with the purpose of building trust in relationships. The latter three components are considered self-regulatory processes.

The above components are influenced by three antecedents (Northouse, 2012). *Positive psychological attributes* refer to a leader's personal resources of confidence, hope, optimism, and resilience that they utilize to develop the components of authentic leadership. *Moral reasoning* is the lifelong process of developing one's ethical decision making capacity. *Critical life events* are catalyzing events, positive or negative, that shape a leader's life and perspective based on the meaning that the leader attaches to those events.

Despite being in its early developmental stage, authentic leadership has many strengths. One of these strengths is its flexibility in that it can be utilized both in an additive way with another leadership theory such as transformational leadership, as well as independently (Avolio & Gardner, 2005). Additionally, as a process-oriented relational model that is not leader-centric, it centers the bi-directional development that occurs between leaders and followers, giving followers their share of the power and responsibility in the leadership of a particular organization and the development of its members (including the leaders), rather than just being means to a production end (Dugan & Komives, 2011). Furthermore, authentic leadership is meant to fill an expressed societal need for trustworthy leadership at an uncertain time and its developmental approach means that anyone can learn to practice it and thus fill that void (Northouse, 2012).

Although some work has already been done to measure and determine the construct validity of authentic leadership, including the reliability of its components, it is still in its early stages, and thus exhibits some weaknesses. Researchers need to look at how authentic leadership works – or does not work – across cultures and identities (Avolio, Walumbwa & Weber, 2009). A weakness of authentic leadership is that it does not currently take context or identity into consideration, which this paper seeks to explore through the lived experiences of genderqueer students. With authentic expression as a key component, it is important to examine how environmental contexts impact one's expressions of their various identities, currently a missing piece of the model (Jones, Kim, & Skendall, 2012). Additionally, the moral dimension and what values inform it has not been fully explained (Northouse, 2012).

## Trans* Students and Developmental Milestones

Although visibility of trans*, genderqueer, and gender-variant students has increased in recent years (Beemyn, 2003; McKinney, 2005), there is still little research on their campus experiences and development (Beemyn, Curtis, Davis & Tubbs, 2005; Renn, 2010) and even less so on their leadership practices (Renn, 2007; Renn & Bilodeau, 2005). By focusing on them this paper highlights both the gap in research, and how gender construction can impact authentic expression, which authentic leadership requires and trans* students seek. This section introduces the latest of the developmental research on trans* people, discusses its merits and limitations, and the need to look at genderqueer students' milestones specifically.

A recent survey that included 3,500 diverse participants from across the US mapped out the developmental milestones for 4 gender groups – Female-to-Male transsexuals, Male-to-Female transsexuals, crossdressers, and genderqueer people – as depicted in Appendix A (Beemyn & Rankin, 2011). Although each gender group has their own set of milestones, which are not constructed within a stage or step model, there are some common themes across the groups, as they each progress from "confusion, guilt, and shame to self-acceptance and a sense of wholeness" (Beemyn & Rankin, 2011, p. 115). These include a sense of being different; self-acceptance; altering one's appearance and/or body (surgically, hormonally, and/or in presentation); meeting others 'like' them; and making decisions about disclosing to others.

## The Four Gender Groups

Trans* people name and identify themselves in a variety of ways. Even those whose experiences, sexes assigned at birth, and current gender presentations appear similar, choose to define their gender identities differently from each other. Thus, the definitions below do not exhaust the ways that trans* people self-identify or understand their gender identity, but are rather simplified and categorized in groups that share some similar life stories (Beemyn & Rankin, 2011).

*Female-to-Male individuals and Transsexual Men* – This group includes those who were female assigned at birth and who identify as men. *Male-to-Female and Transsexual Women* – This group includes those who were male assigned at birth and who identify as women. *Cross-dressers* – This group includes folks presenting in 'feminine'-designated clothing who were assigned male at birth. *Genderqueer* – This group includes individuals with fluid and/or non-binary gender identities regardless of sex assignment at birth.

**Strengths and Weaknesses**

The sample of the initial survey was limited to those with access to computers and the Internet, as it was entirely administered online (Beemyn & Rankin, 2011). Additionally, it was limited to those who the researchers could access and thus who were visible and out, at least on the Internet. The study sample also skewed heavily towards those who were more open about their identities and more connected to the trans* community, as well as a larger number of the sample identifying and/or presenting as female/feminine. Taking into account trans* people's high levels of experience with discrimination, homelessness, poverty, harassment, and violence, particularly trans*women of color, and working class trans* people (Grant, Mottet, & Tanis, 2011), it is likely that the researchers were unable to reach out to many who simply could not risk exposure, or had little to no means to complete the survey.

Despite these limitations, the size of the sample (3,474 individuals completed the survey), one of the largest ever conducted in the United States, makes the findings of this study useful in representing a vast proportion of experiences of trans* people. This is amplified by the richness in the stories contained within the 419 follow-up interviews conducted by e-mail, phone, and in-person. Additionally, the researchers did not leave out individuals who did not physically transition completely or at all, or who otherwise would not fit the psychological definition of a 'true' transsexual, thus expanding on the populations typically covered in research (Beemyn & Rankin, 2011).

**Focusing on Genderqueer Milestones**

The respondents in Beemyn and Rankin's (2011) study who identified as genderqueer were younger than the average of the overall survey population, and the reviewed literature suggested that younger trans* people are more comfortable with fluid and nonbinary identities. Additionally, for those wishing to physically transition, the college years might present barriers because of (i) the associated high costs, (ii) potential dependence on and lack of guardians' emotional and financial support, (iii) unwillingness or inability to take time during their academic career to undergo and recover from surgery, and (iv) lack of knowledgeable or accessible medical and counseling staff on or around campus. For these reasons, some trans* students, who might identify strongly with one gender or another, might share similar campus and peer-related experiences as their genderqueer and nonbinary counterparts. Thus, in wanting to focus on college student leaders, this section examines the developmental milestones of genderqueer individuals.

The majority of the genderqueer participants in Beemyn and Rankin's (2011) survey expressed *feeling and often presenting a different gender identity from a young age*. Unlike

many of the FTM and MTF identified participants, genderqueer individuals did not grow up expressing a feeling of being the 'other' gender, but also did not identify themselves with the gender that was expected of them based on their assigned sex. Clothing and mannerisms were "important ways through which many of the genderqueer participants expressed their gender identity and sought to destabilize traditional gender markers" (Beemyn & Rankin, 2011, p. 150).

Genderqueer individuals also reported *encountering resistance to a nonbinary gender expression or identity*. Although many trans* individuals talked about experiencing discrimination and hostility, genderqueer individuals discussed facing opposition even from those that seemed accepting of other trans* people, particularly when asking others to use a different name or gender-neutral pronouns. It is the negating of fluidity and the continuous social labeling of either male or female that Bilodeau (2009) describes as the first characteristic of genderism, a system of oppression rooted in the assumption that there are only two genders, and that gender identity is essentialized and based on sex assigned at birth.

In addition to facing this resistance from society at-large, genderqueer respondents also encountered opposition from other trans* people, particularly transsexual men and women who viewed them as not "transgender enough" (Beemyn & Rankin, 2011, p. 153), causing them to often feel like they *did not fit in with transgender or LGBT communities*. They reported facing ridicule, isolation, lack of acceptance or support, harassment, and violence. Many also felt like other transgender people often reinforced the gender binary that they sought to move away from or opposed entirely. The preceding milestones and experiences often meant that genderqueer individuals ended up making decisions about *creating a home within or outside of transgender/LGBT communities*, at times accessing communities online and having to construct their own spaces at greater rates than other trans* respondents.

**The Context of Genderism**

The developmental milestones and experiences of trans* and genderqueer individuals exist within a context of genderism (Bilodeau, 2009). Thus, it would be important to also examine this system of oppression as it informs how trans* and genderqueer students might perceive and be aware of themselves, as well as their relationships with others, influencing the components and factors of authentic leadership as it might be enacted by these students. In his study looking at the experiences of trans* students in higher education, Bilodeau (2009) identified four main characteristics of genderism as it played out for the study's participants:

1. There was a **forced social labeling process** that sorted and categorized all individuals into binary 'male' or 'female' identities, often at an institutionalized level.
2. There was **social accountability for conforming to binary gender norms** with related punishments. Individuals who failed to conform were viewed as deviant and/or having a disorder.
3. Marginalization was enacted through an **overt and covert privileging of binary gender identities and systems.**
4. Binary systems promoted **invisibility of gender non-conforming identities and isolation of transgender persons,** making transgender identities inaccessible.

It is worth noting that the study only involved 10 participants from two large Midwestern research universities. Although this group was diverse in terms of age, gender identity, sexual orientation, and involved both undergraduate and graduate students, it was made up of only white-identified participants. Thus, although it offers a first look at how campuses systemically oppress gender-variant students, it leaves room for further research.

**Discussion: Integrating Genderism, Genderqueer Milestones, and Authentic Leadership**

The existence and experiences of trans* people challenge traditional and even contemporary notions of gender and sex, how societies understand and interpret gendered terms such as male and female, and the "natural"-ness of the binary construction of the system of gender and their accompanying gender roles. Out of the four gender groupings, genderqueer individuals in particular challenge individuals to reexamine these concepts in ways that are not static or fixed, but rather fluid and ever-changing. Further, leadership research has begun to challenge the masculine-centricity of existing and past leadership theories and literature (Ayman & Korabik, 2010; Eagly & Chin, 2010; Sanchez-Hucles & Davis, 2010) and to add women leaders' contributions and styles (Eagly & Carli, 2007; Kezar & Moriarty, 2000; Rhode & Kellerman, 2007). As valuable and necessary as these are, they tend to reinforce a binary conception of gender, often rendering invisible the realities of trans* and especially of non-binary identifying people.

Studies that look at lesbian, bisexual, gay, transgender, and queer (LBGTQ) student leaders as a whole and how their leadership identity is informed by their LGBT and/or Q identity and vice versa (Fassinger, Shullman, & Stevenson, 2010; Renn, 2007; Renn & Bilodeau, 2005), include trans* student leader narratives, but do not examine how others' acceptance or rejection of their gender identities and expressions influence whether they are seen as authentic leaders.

Additionally, the clustering of trans* narratives with LGB narratives sets up trans* identity to be seen as equivalent to non-heterosexual sexualities, rather than centering them in their examination, while simultaneously rendering trans* students' sexualities invisible (Nagoshi, Brzuzy, & Terrell, 2012).

In effect, the ability to enact authentic leadership cannot be examined without considering privilege since it involves a reciprocally developmental relationship between leaders and followers, who likely experience a variety of power dynamics amongst themselves. That is to say, when leaders with non-dominant identities (e.g. trans* and genderqueer) interact with followers with corresponding dominant identities (e.g. cisgender and gender conforming), the interactions are vetted through a 'follower validation filter' (Appendix B) that is informed by the particular system of oppression in play. For trans* and genderqueer student leaders, genderism as an oppressive system contextualizes many aspects of their lives, including the validation or rejection they receive from followers as more campuses practice authentic leadership.

In Bilodeau's (2011) study of genderism, a respondent described how others would reject his gender whenever he advocated for women, referring to him as a woman, and how this was something cisgender men did not have to worry about experiencing, privileging their advocacy and gender as more authentic than his own. Another respondent talked about being relieved about not being an resident assistant (RA) the following year and thus not having to be assigned to a 'women's' floor, even though the residential life department was aware that the student did not identify as a woman. The implication was that because the department did not expect men to accept the RA as 'one of them', the student could not be an effective leader in men's communities. This implication normalizes and privileges the leadership of cisgender male RAs in men's communities, particularly ones that present and express themselves as masculine.

**Authentic Leadership and Genderqueer Student Leaders**

Self-awareness, much like identity, cannot be a fixed construct, but is rather fluid, evolving, and socially constructed (Jones et al., 2012), and "if context shapes identity and identity shapes context, what does this mean for authenticity of self" (p. 711)? Within a genderist context, gender non-conforming identities are often inaccessible (Bilodeau, 2009), thus genderqueer and nonbinary students often do not have the language or examples to draw from to articulate to themselves or others how they identify. As these identities become available as viable options, then students have the opportunity to evaluate their genders, and come to a more authentic understanding of themselves (Beemyn & Rankin, 2011). This can mean using

different terms to describe themselves at different times, such genderqueer, grrlboi, boi, transgender, and trans*man, incidentally all terms I have used to describe myself at various times in my collegiate career. As self-awareness is predominantly an internal process, the follower validation filter is not likely to play a major role in it as a component of authentic leadership, whereas it does with the other three components that require a level of self-regulation and balancing of the internal and the external.

As students begin to question their gender identity and seek authentic expression of self as genderqueer (Beemyn & Rankin, 2011), they have the external pressures of gender conformity to contend with, which impacts their ability to base their behaviors on internal morals and values, (i.e., their internalized moral perspective). There is social accountability and punishment for those that do not conform to prescribed gender norms (Bilodeau, 2009), including ostracization or isolation, harassment, ridicule, and violence (Beemyn & Rankin, 2011). If genderqueer students do not feel safe on campus, they are likely to choose to conform to external pressures, and thus their internal morals and values guide them less. This is also true for their cisgender peers, who often unknowingly collude with the system to impose binarist thinking and behavior. So, although they may hold inclusivity as a value, for example, they may unintentionally practice exclusivity when assuming someone's gender pronoun and not asking so as to use the correct ones. The conflict and incongruence between the students' values and (in)actions underscores the pervasiveness of hegemonic norms and their insistence when gender is not understood through a critical lens (Connell, 1995; Gramsci, 1971; Schippers, 2007).

Students' collusion with genderism also affects awareness of one's own biases, a necessary piece of the balanced processing component. If genderism is invisible as a context, then cisgender – and even genderqueer – students are not aware of their genderist biases, which can assign gender-based roles, expectations, and behaviors to students that do not fit. Genderqueer student leaders' conceptualization of their gendered self and gender in general as fluid or blended or outside the binary norm provide them with unique perspectives, a strength they may not get to demonstrate if others continuously resist and disaffirm their identities (Beemyn & Rankin, 2011; Bilodeau, 2009).

The purpose of relational transparency in authentic leadership is to establish and build trust between leaders and followers. Trust is difficult to establish in settings that feel unsafe or when folks feel pressure to 'cover' (Yoshino, 2006), or conform because of real or perceived lack of support for their true selves. Beemyn and Rankin (2011) discussed how this can occur even within transgender or LGBT communities, where one might expect support for non-

normative expressions of sexuality or gender. Genderqueer student leaders might be unable to show up authentically and thus relate honestly with others. If their followers sense inauthenticity, then they are less likely to trust and see these students as leaders. On the flip side, as genderqueer students negotiate disclosing their authentic identities and asking people to refer to them utilizing different pronouns and names than what they previously went by, followers might still resist their nonbinary identities and refuse to adjust their gendered language and behavior (Beemyn & Rankin, 2011), marginalizing and isolating genderqueer student leaders (Bilodeau, 2009). The prevalence of a masculine leadership prototype (Ayman & Korabik, 2010) further engenders exclusion for those genderqueer students that do not meet the gender performative expectations often associated with leadership. Although genderqueer students might be showing up authentically, their validation and affirmation as leaders is contingent on followers' validation and affirmation of their authentic gender, something that cisgender student leaders need not necessarily consider.

It is critical to understand the developmental milestones of genderqueer students (Beemyn & Rankin, 2011), when seeking to develop authentic leadership among college students or studying their leadership experiences, as non-dominant identities can be interpreted as inauthentic when viewed from unexamined dominant lenses. Situating students' relationships within the context of corresponding systems of oppression, in this case genderism, allows for more intentional and critical examination of non-dominant and dominant narratives, so that one's authenticity is not judged based on what is socially considered normative and acceptable. In the end, when students and student affairs professionals talk about leading authentically, it is important to reframe authenticity by asking what that means for each student across their identities and how those identities are differentially permitted to demonstrate authenticity within dominant norms (Jones et al., 2012).

## Implications on Leadership Theory and Practice

The conceptual framework offered provides higher education and student affairs administrators a lens through which to support the authentic leadership development of trans* and genderqueer students. As leadership literature is challenged to move from being informed from a predominantly masculine-centric perspective to one that considers two gendered conceptions of leadership, this framework further challenges researchers to move beyond the gender binary altogether. This not only benefits trans* and genderqueer leaders and their leadership development, but also that of cisgender identified folks that defy gendered norms and gendered ways of leadership. It can be further argued that even students who conform to

gendered expectations of leadership, can stand to benefit from an environment that allows all to bring their full selves and identities to processes.

This framework takes one particular dimension of identity into consideration, that of genderqueer students, and one particular system of oppression as context, that of genderism, and as such is limited in its application. Although it does not account for multiple and intersecting identities and systems of oppression, it can be used as a springboard from which to build an authentic leadership development model that does. Additionally, other singular dimensions of identity and systems of oppression could potentially similarly be integrated into authentic leadership development. For example, by featuring ableism as the environmental context and utilizing development models for students with disabilities, a conceptual framework can be created to account for and develop authentic student leaders with disabilities.

Recognizing that genderism and other systems of oppression have an impact on student leaders' ability to lead and to lead authentically provides scholars with avenues to explore in their research and practice that might otherwise have been invisible to them. For example, a researcher might investigate how American University students characterized their student body president's leadership before and after she disclosed her transgender identity (McBride, 2012). Does genderism play a role in whether students describe McBride's leadership as authentic or not? How does McBride's decision to express her gender authentically impact how she sees herself as a leader? How did her expressed inability to do so previously impact her approach to leadership and whether she felt she could lead authentically?

Understanding the systemic oppression that impacts the lives of genderqueer and trans* students, student affairs administrators tasked with leadership development can better build leadership development opportunities and activities that do not exclude nonbinary students, and in turn model inclusive practices for all student leaders. As previously mentioned, even transgender and LGBT student organizations might not offer supportive and affirming environments for nonbinary students, and additionally nonbinary students have a multitude of interests and identities they may wish to explore within other student organizations and campus engagement opportunities. As an example, as a former Residence Director, I often facilitated meetings and workshops that included Resident Assistants (RAs) and residents alike. During introductions, I would state my name, as well as my gender pronoun, and ask that each person do the same when going around. With a quick explanation of why that is important, I (a) sent a message to any trans* or genderqueer students in the room that I might be a supportive staff member, (b) offered those students the opportunity to disclose a gender pronoun to the whole group if they chose to that they might otherwise have had to correct individually, and (c)

provided a tool for cisgender students who value inclusivity and social justice to incorporate in their own spheres.

By integrating genderism and the identity development of genderqueer and nonbinary students into leadership practice, administrators can evaluate many gendered aspects of campus leadership and assess how they might be reconstructed to include more students. This can include language on websites and in written materials (brochures, templates for student organization constitutions), locations for workshops and retreats that have accessible gender-neutral facilities and restrooms, gender-based organizations such as Greek organizations, activities and icebreakers that arbitrarily divide groups by gender, demographic sections on program evaluation surveys, bringing nonbinary and genderqueer identified folks to campus to speak about leadership, to name a few.

## Conclusion

This conceptual framework examines how the evolving literature on authentic leadership and development can be problematized and further clarified by looking at the identity development of trans* and genderqueer students. As a newly emerging leadership model, and one that is gaining attention within the fields of leadership and higher education, there are opportunities to refine and bolster it to make it applicable and useful for the leadership development of a diversity of student populations early on. It also reminds us that concepts such as leadership, authenticity, morality, and self-awareness do not exist in a power-neutral vacuum and we need to critically examine how privilege and oppression influence whose version of authenticity we default to otherwise.

## References


Avolio, B.J., & Gardner, W.L. (2005). Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership. *Leadership Quarterly, 16,* 315-338.

Avolio, B.J., Walumbwa, F., & Weber, T.J. (2009). Leadership: Current theories, research, and future directions. *Annual Review of Psychology, 60,* 421-449.

Ayman, R., & Korabik, K. (2010). Leadership: Why gender and culture matter. *American Psychologist, 65*(3), 157-170.

Beemyn, B. (2003). Serving the needs of transgender college students. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Issues in Education, 1*(1), 33-50.

Beemyn, B.G., Curtis, C., Davis, M., & Tubbs, N.J. (2005). Transgender issues on college campuses. In R.L. Sanlo (Ed.), *Gender identity and sexual orientation: Research, policy, and personal perspectives* (pp. 41-49). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Beemyn, G., & Rankin, S. (2011). *The lives of transgender people.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Bilodeau, B.L. (2009). *Genderism: Transgender students, binary systems and higher education*. Germany: VDM Verlag.

Chávez, A.F., & Sanlo, R. (Eds.). (2013). *Identity and leadership: Informing our lives, informing our practice.* Washington, DC: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA).

Connell, R. W. (1995). *Masculinities*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Dugan, J.P., & Komives, S.R. (2011). Leadership theories. In S.R. Komives, J.P. Dugan, J.E. Owen, C. Slack, W. Wagner & Associates, *The handbook for student leadership development* (2nd ed., pp. 35-57). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Eagly, A.H., & Carly, L.L (2007). *Through the labyrinth: The truth about how women become leaders*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Eagly, A.H., & Chin, J.L. (2010). Diversity and leadership in a changing world. *American Psychologist, 65*(3), 216-224.

Fassinger, R.E, Shullman, S.L., & Stevenson, M.R. (2010). Toward an affirmative lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender leadership paradigm. *American Psychologist, 65*(3), 201-215.

Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks of Antonio Gramsci.* New York, NY: International Publishers.

Grant, J.M., Mottet, L.A., & Tanis, J. (2011). *Injustice at every turn: A report of the national transgender discrimination survey* [Executive Summary]. Washington: National Center for Transgender Equality and National Gay and Lesbian Task Force. Retrieved from http://transequality.org/PDFs/Executive_Summary.pdf

Jones, S.R., Kim, Y.C., & Skendall, K.C. (2012). (Re-)framing authenticity: Considering multiple social identities using autoethnographic and intersectional approaches. *The Journal of Higher Education, 83*(5), 698-724.

Kezar, A., & Moriarty, D. (2000). Expanding our understanding of student leadership development: A study exploring gender and ethnic identity. *Journal of College Student Development, 41*(1), 55-69.

Komives, S.R., & Dugan, J.P. (2010). Contemporary leadership theories. In R.A. Couto (Ed.), *Political and civic leadership: A reference handbook* (Vol. 1, pp. 111-120). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.

McBride, S. (2012, May 1). Op-ed: The real me. *The Eagle.* Retrieved from http://egl.ame.stage.getsnworks.com/article/2012/05/the-real-me

McKinney, J. (2005). On the margins: A study of experiences of transgender college students. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Issues in Education, 3*(1), 63-76.

Nagoshi, J.L., Brzuzy, S., & Terrell, H.K. (2012). Deconstructing the complex perceptions of gender roles, gender identity, and sexual orientation among transgender individuals. *Feminism & Psychology, 22*(4), 405-422.

Northouse, P.G. (2012). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (6th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Renn, K.A. (2007). LGBT student leaders and queer activists: Identities of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer identified college student leaders and activists. *Journal of College Student Development, 48*(3), 311-330.

Renn, K.A. (2010). LGBT and queer research in higher education: The state and status of the field. *Educational Researcher, 39*(2), 132-141.

Renn, K.A., & Bilodeau, B.L. (2005). Leadership identity development among lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender student leaders. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice, 42*(3), 604-629.

Rhode, D.L., & Kellerman, B. (2007). Women and leadership: The state of play. In B. Kellerman, D.L. Rhode (Eds.), *Women and leadership: The state of play and strategies for change* (pp. 1-62). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sanchez-Hucles, J.V., & Davis, D.D. (2010). Women and women of color in leadership: Complexity, identity, and intersectionality. *American Psychologist, 65*(3), 171-181.

Schippers, M. (2007). Recovering the feminine other: Masculinity, femininity, and gender hegemony. *Theory and Society, 36*(1), 85-102.

Yoshino, K. (2006). *Covering: The hidden assault on our human rights.* New York: Random House.

Appendix A

**Milestones For Each Gender Group** (Reproduction from Beemyn & Rankin, 2011, p. 116)

| Female-to-Male (FTM) Milestones | Male-to-Female (MTF) Milestones | Cross-dressers (CD) Milestones | Genderqueer (GQ) Milestones |
|---|---|---|---|
| Feeling and often expressing a male gender identity from a young age | Feeling and often expressing a female gender identity from a young age | Attraction to "women's" clothing and cross-dressing from a young age | Feeling and often expressing a different gender identity from a young age |
| Repressing or hiding one's male gender identity in the face of hostility and/or isolation | Repressing or hiding one's female gender identity in the face of hostility and/or isolation | Buying or obtaining one's own "women's" clothing | Realizing that genderqueer is a viable identity |
| Thinking of oneself as lesbian, but realizing it was not a good fit | Learning about and meeting other transsexual women | Repressing the desire to cross-dress and purging clothing because of shame | Deciding how to express oneself as a genderqueer person |
| Realizing that there are FTM individuals and that transition is possible | Recognizing oneself as a transsexual, rather than as a cross-dresser | Learning about and meeting other cross-dressers | Encountering resistance to a nonbinary gender expression or identity |
| Learning about and meeting other transsexual men | Overcoming denial and internalized genderism to accept oneself as female | Overcoming shame to accept oneself as a cross-dresser | Not fitting in with transgender or LGBT communities |
| Overcoming denial and internalized genderism to accept oneself as male | Taking hormones and perhaps having surgery to look more like self-image | Cross-dressing in public for the first time and adopting a feminine name | Creating a home within or outside of the transgender/ LGBT communities |
| Taking hormones and having top surgery to look more like self-image | Whether and when to tell others, and developing new relationships after disclosure | Whether and when to tell others, and developing new relationships after disclosure | |
| Whether and when to tell others, and developing new relationships after disclosure | Having a sense of wholeness even when unable to be seen as a woman | Arriving at a comfortable place with cross-dressing | |
| Having a sense of wholeness as a different kind of man | | | |

Appendix B

**Authentic Leadership Within a Genderist Context** (Adapted from Northouse, 2012)