

The Deputy Minister Condition

BY HANS PEDER KIRKEGAARD

Hermeneutic Phenomenology of Leadership in the Government of Greenland



AALBORG UNIVERSITET

Title page

Title: The Deputy Minister Condition: Hermeneutic Phenomenology of Leadership in the Government of Greenland.

Extent: 138.181 keystrokes

Date: April 28th, 2019

Supervisor: Kenneth Mølbjerg Jørgensen

Type: Master's Thesis

Institution: Department of Business and Management at Aalborg University

Author: Hans Peder Kirkegaard

Abstract

Hannah Arendt's concepts of Labor, Work and Action will be utilized to challenge the frustration with leadership, by analyzing the leaders on the deputy minister level in the Government of Greenland through the concepts of Hannah Arendt. Specifically by analyzing how leadership is exercised in the Government of Greenland. The concepts can be shortly explained thusly: Labor is the things that are done out of necessity, Work is done to achieve a goal, and Action is what shows the individuality of a person among a plurality of people in a space of appearance.

It was discovered that the frustration was unnecessary, when there is a possibility of Action within the organization of the Government of Greenland. But frustration is inevitable, if there is no clear goal, and there is no space for appearance.

Resume på dansk

Med Hannah Arendts koncepter Arbejde, Fremstilling og Handling, analyserer jeg ledelse på departementschefs niveau i Grønlands Selvstyre, specifikt hvordan ledelse udøves. Analysen baserer sig på fire ustrukturerede interviews med departementschefer som har været ansvarlige for Afdelingen for Selvstændighed, samt autoetnografisk metode, hvor jeg har fungeret som kilden. Frustration over jobbet bliver udfordret når koncepterne bruges til at analysere hvordan ledelse udøves i Grønlands Selvstyre. Kort fortalt, så er Arbejde det der gøres af nødvendighed, Fremstilling er det der gøres i forfølgelse af et mål, og Handling er at vise sit individualitet i et rum (Space of Appearance) blandt forskellige mennesker. Handling er særligt anvendt i analysen, da alle tre koncepter er nødvendige for at leve et fuldt menneske liv, og frustrationen har bundet i manglende anerkendelse af muligheden for Handling. Handling er nemlig evnen til at begynde noget nyt, og det er uforudseligt og ofte kaotisk, hvorfor det kan være svært at Handle som embedsmand i en regering, hvor der er en forudsætning af en anonym embedsværk, der mest fungerer som en maskine. Offentlig administrations teori anvendt i specialet, viser dog at den adskillelse af det politiske og det administrative er en falsk dikotomi, da embedsværket ofte har indflydelse over policy design, dog uden at have indflydelse på det parti-politiske. Det gør sig også gældende i Grønlands Selvstyre, hvor embedsværket rådgiver i forhold til det politiske på baggrund af faglig og professionel viden omkring love, regler og bekendtgørelse, samt ved at følge med i den politiske landskab. Det kan være gennem nyheder, debat i Grønlands Parlament, politiske dokumenter, såsom koalitions- og finanslovsaftaler mv. Frustration kan komme når embedsværket ikke har klare mål, og ikke har genskab til muligheden for Handling, altså muligheden for at begynde noget nyt. Pga. af uforudseeligheden og det mulige politiske natur af Handling, kan det dog vise sig at være enormt udfordrende for embedsværket, da man forsøger at være parti-politisk uafhængig, og nogle emner kan være enormt politiserede, såsom Selvstændighed. Den manglende politiske enighed omkring Selvstændighed, gjorde at det ikke var muligt at Fremstille mod et mål, og dette resulterede i frustration. Når man ikke er bekendt med muligheden for at Handle, så bliver man et rent Fremstillingsmenneske (Homo Faber), og verdenen bliver reduceret til materialer der skal bruges til Fremstilling, og for Fremstillingsmennesket mister verdenen mening når der ikke er noget mål. Derudover, så har Departementscheferne fundet det udfordrende at skulle skabe noget nyt, i form af Handling, indenfor fagområdet Selvstændighed, da det politiske landskab ikke var enige, og der var derfor risiko for parti-politiske Handlinger. Enkelte Departementschefer kunne dog finde rum for Handling ved at relatere Selvstændighed til deres øvrige ansvarsområder. Det er også i relationer og samtaler at ledelse bliver udøvet i Grønlands Selvstyre,

hvor Departementschefer er i samtale med embedsværket, politikerne, og i det mere abstrakte, er i samtale og relatere sig til politiske aftaler, debatter og Handlinger. I det autoetnografiske analyser, opdager jeg at muligheden for at Handle, altså det rum hvor man viser sig. Denne opdagelse blev sat i relation til departementschefernes historier, hvor de fortalte at ofte så kan initiativer komme fra embedsværket, hvor disse bliver beskrevet i et dokument og bliver forelagt ministeren til godkendelse eller kommentarer, da det er ministeren der har det endelig ansvar. Det er vigtigt at understrege at når man i forhold til konceptet Handling snakker om at vise sig, så handler det ikke om identitet, men om individualitet. Ligesom vi kan identificere at et kunstværk har en skaber selvom vi ikke kender navnet eller identiteten på kunstneren. I henhold til regeringsførelse, så er rummet for Handling mulige hver gang embedsværket er samlet. F.eks. hvis embedsværket bliver af det politiske niveau bebudet at udarbejde en strategi for overvægtige, så vil Fremstillingsmennesket kigge på WHO og andre anbefalinger og samle dem i en strategi dokument som forelægges det politiske niveau til godkendelse. Men hvis embedsværket i stedet indkalder til et møde med relevante personer der har det faglige kompetencer og *brainstormer* et udkast til et strategidokument, så er dette Handling. Dette er ikke nødvendigvis departementschefen der beslutter, men embedsværket selv, og dette viser tydeligt at ledelse i Grønlands Selvstyres udøves ikke i isolation, men i relation og samtale med alle relevante parter, inkl. det politiske landskab i det abstrakte, og i det konkrete.

Content

Title page	1
Abstract	2
Resume på dansk.....	3
Introduction.....	7
Problem formulation	9
Methodology	12
Ontology & Epistemology.....	12
Fore-structures	13
Methods	14
Interviews	14
Autoethnography	17
Theory.....	20
Public administration litterature review	20
Leadership literature review	21
Theoretical framework.....	24
Labor, Work and Action.....	25
The concept of Action.....	25
Labor.....	27
Work	28
Contemplation.....	28
Arendt in Use.....	30
Setting the scene – (or data by other words).....	32
Department of independence - an overview	32
Tales of leadership.....	33
The story of DM1 – The link	33
The story of DM2 – the technician	35
The story of DM3 – the protector	37
The story of DM4 – The dialogos.....	39
The stories of deputy ministers – A tale of leadership (conclusion)	41
Theoretical analysis	43
Dichotomy of public administration and politics in Government of Greenland	43
Labor, Work and Action in Government of Greenland	45
Autoethnographic fore-structure discovery.....	45

Labor vs. work.....	48
Autoethnographic interjection, not a slave	49
Labor vs. work continued	50
Action in the Government of Greenland	51
Auto-ethnographic interjection – Discovery of action	52
Action continued	53
Discussion	55
Conclusion	57
Acknowledgments	58
Bibliography.....	59

Introduction

In many ways, this thesis does not follow the format of a master's thesis. It experiments with the format of academic writing, based on methods of Autoethnography and phenomenological storytelling. I always have Polanyi's word in my mind "*We know more than we can tell*", and a sentiment expressed by Aristotle, through Hannah Arendt: "...but nous, *the capacity of contemplation, whose chief characteristic is that its content cannot be rendered in speech*" (Arendt, *The Human Condition*, 1998, p. 27) or in writing, if I might add. When I read this, I think of storytelling vs. exposition. Because stories often contain more than the story they tell, and we call this content the moral of the story. In 2017, I finished writing the first draft of my first novel called "*It for itself*", which is about a boy who learns that his parents are fighters in the war against the shadow. However, this is not the moral of the story. It is merely the premise of the story, not the telling of the story itself. Stating what happens in a story is not the same as telling it, nor does it make the moral of the story apparent. Stephen King uses the example of Little Red Riding Hood: A girl walks through the wood nearly gets eaten by a wolf, but runs away and arrives at the grandmother's home where she finds out that the wolf has eaten the grandmother and pretends to be the grandmother (King, 2000). I have not quoted Stephen Kings telling of the story, but I have told the story as boringly and unexciting as he did to prove his point. Explaining the story is not telling the story.

During the research of this thesis, I kept remembering passages and ideas that I expressed in my story, which have not been discovered fully by my friends who've read my story nor by myself. A key discovery, which I will attempt to uncover in the paper is expressed thusly in my novel:

I repeated what the general had said to my father that night:

- "*It is the life that is chosen for us, not by God, gods or destiny, but by the time we live in, that is the hardest to escape. If we are full humans, knowing of love and purpose, how can we ignore the needs of our time, without abandoning our humanity?*"

It seemed to make my father sad. His voice was heavy when he spoke:

- "*That is the choice you must make, William. Can you ignore what you know, can you abandon your humanity, and will you choose death? Or will you choose self-love and join the enemy? Or will you fight?*"

- "*I can't... I can't ignore. I can't let the shadow do that to others, not when I know what pain it*

causes. I must fight it, the enemy must be defeated."

Even though I had choices, it didn't feel like I had any. I understood now why the question couldn't be forced. That you can't force others to fight. They need to choose, otherwise they won't understand why they are fighting.

- *"What will you do, William?" My father asked*

- *"I will be free, and to free myself I must free others." I said*

I also remember how Hegel's dialectics helped Martin Luther King, Jr. in his understanding of the world and the path towards universal justice. Specifically, Martin Luther King, Jr. used dialectics to understand how two seemingly opposite things can co-exist. A thesis and an anti-thesis becomes synthesis (Oates, 1994). The radical understanding that I have found is simply put: We must be in a constant state of discomfort, metaphysically speaking. Because for two seemingly opposite things to exist, we must accept seemingly impossible things. We can state the facts, but we may not be able to speak the moral of the story. We know more than we can say, but like with dreams, once we try to remember them, they disappear or are distorted. This is also what Leo Tolstoy wrote in "A Letter to a Hindu", when he argued that religions begin because someone saw the truth, but was incapable of explaining it to others (Tolstoy, 1908). The truth then becomes distorted and easily corruptible. It is also the reason why the truth cannot be retold, rather it is the process that must be explained. What happened, so that the truth became apparent? Meaning, that it is not possible to deliver the truth to others, nor is it possible to force them to see the truth. The only possibility is to guide them in their way to see the truth for themselves. So, I started thinking about what I consider to be the truth? I was thinking what assumptions do I have that are perhaps distorted, because I articulate the ideas in my head, or ideas that others have expressed which I have taken to be true? In thinking about this thesis, I knew that I wanted to write about my job in the Government of Greenland, and many of the things that frustrated me was the thought that there was no visionary leadership, that I often felt like we were just kind of drifting, with no direction. I began to think why did I feel this? What is causing it? I mean, is it really poor leadership? How can I know? It is full of assumptions about what is good or bad leadership based on theoretical readings, which are cultural or full of other types of assumptions about which metrics you use to measure good or bad leadership. But when the idea of leadership becomes a matter of traits and a list of attributes, it no longer becomes about leadership, rather it becomes about whether or not a leader has the traits or checks off the list of attributes (Grandy & Sliwa, 2017). Hannah Arendt said that the problem of *human nature* seems unanswerable in its individual and philosophical sense (Arendt,

The Human Condition, 1998), and what is a leader but a human? It becomes a problem when in search of answering the unanswerable, the seeker attempts to define it, which according to Arendt, always almost invariably results in some sort of deified ideal. There is a certain kind of passivity of the intellect, when I judged the leadership in the government against a deified ideal blindly, where I just compared the attributes of leadership from a list, or doing certain things, that are supposed to be what a “good leader” does or even comparing them to leaders such as Martin Luther King jr. and others. This is inaccurate, to say the least, in trying to understand the role of leadership in Government of Greenland, where I work.

Problem formulation

Wonderment of why the things are as they are, has fueled my personal philosophical thinking. I have made many assumptions about what leadership should be, or how it ought to be conducted. It is this that I am criticizing, because there is no ideal leadership, nor is there such a thing as an ideal leadership. So, as I begin to question my own assumptions about leadership, I began to wonder what is leadership in the Government of Greenland? How is it experienced? This becomes the basis of the main inquiry in this study:

How is leadership exercised in the Government of Greenland? This overall problem can be dissected into three sub-questions:

- How do the leaders story their leadership?
- How do their stories relate to public administration theory?
- What does their stories say about working in the Government of Greenland?

The study will be conducted through a combination of autoethnography and four interviews with four different leaders. This combination reflects the hermeneutic circle, where it requires the researcher to dwell and immerse themselves in the data, searching for a glimpse of the phenomenon (Crowther, Ironside, Spence, & Smythe, 2017). Through autoethnographic writing I tell about my own narratives of leadership in Greenland. These narratives disclose the fore-structures of understanding. These fore-structures are challenged and moved through the interviews and the analysis of the interviews, which then lead to a new understanding. After these hermeneutic circular process, I summarize my findings by relating the new understandings to

- 1) Public administration theory
- 2) Labor, Work, and Action by Hannah Arendt

In following Suze Wilson's argument that modern research of leadership has moved the philosophical inquiries about leadership to the margin of the field, this thesis will put them front and center.

"In pushing the value of philosophical and historical inquiry to the margins of contemporary leadership knowledge, we have, however, turned our backs on over 5000 years of thinking about leadership."

(Wilson, 2016, s. 19)

Hannah Arendt's concepts of Labor, Work and Action (Arendt, 1998) will be the theoretical framework in the analysis of the exercise of leadership, where it is the concepts that will be utilized to understand the tension between employee and employer, between the leader and the led. It will be utilized to challenge the frustration with leadership, by analyzing the job and the leaders in the Government of Greenland through the concepts of Hannah Arendt. The concepts can be shortly explained thusly: Labor are the things that are done out of necessity, Work is done to achieve a goal, and Action is what shows the individuality of a person among a plurality of people. These concepts will be expanded upon under the theoretical framework section. Which leads to the structure of the thesis. The structure the way I see it, starts with broader view, with the philosophical underpinnings of the thesis, narrowing down towards the methods, the theories within the subject, then the philosophical theories to used:

Firstly, I will position myself within the hermeneutic phenomenology, where the phenomenon of leadership occurs within the work that is organization, within the world of politics. This will be followed by methods of data collection, which will be based on unstructured interviews and autoethnography. Then the literature review will follow, first public administration theory then leadership theory. However, as this thesis is framing the analysis of leadership in philosophical terms, what will follow is the theoretical framework of analysis, namely Hannah Arendt's concepts of Labor, Work, and Action. The data will then be laid out, firstly a short overview of the Department of Independence, where I worked and the Government of Greenland in general. Then the interviews will be re-told, rather having the interviews transcribed, they will be used to create stories of leadership, four in total, based on the interviews. This is both to ensure the anonymity of the interviewees, but also to experiment with form, within the hermeneutic circle. The analysis section will have both autoethnographic interjections, where I write about my experiences of working in the Department of Independence as it relates to labor, work and action as well as

analysis of leadership. The analysis of the leadership will begin with labor vs. work, where there will be an attempt to understand what type of jobs there are within the Government of Greenland, and to place my job within that framework. Finally, the analysis will conclude with the utilization of the concept of Action, where the possibility of showing individuality will be explored. The thesis will finish with a discussion about the analysis and how it answers the research questions and how the analysis and the theoretical framework nuance the understanding of how leadership is exercised, before concluding with the conclusion.

Methodology

This section will outline the structure of the thesis, through discussions of the different theories and methods used to provide a hermeneutic phenomenology of Leadership in the case of the Government of Greenland. It begins with outlining the ontology and the epistemology, followed by the data collection process, then a literature review of the relationship between politics and administration, which will be discussed under the “public administration” term, and that will be followed by a literature review of leadership theory before a section that deals with the idiographic theory of the analysis. The theory section will contain theoretical discussion that will not complete the discussion, rather they will be expanded upon throughout the analysis. Furthermore, the data is based on interviews of 4 deputy ministers and an auto-ethnographic collection, which is written on the basis of the author’s own experiences. The autoethnographic method is a way to immerse the researcher in the lived experience, as the research was prompted by wondering why the things are the way they are in the author’s place of work.

Ontology & Epistemology

This is a hermeneutic phenomenological study, because it does not seek to find an explanation, but rather attempts to understand. There is an objective world, where inherent quality of some things exists, and within this world, there are several realities. There is no transcendental reality, where there are ideal versions of the reality or an overall truth. Some things are required for other things to exist. Such as food and water for humans to survive. Within these realities, a plurality of people create a shared world, a common world, or a public world, which is constructed by the different experiences of each of the subjects in the objective world. Meaning that the subjective experience is only subjective, it is not objective. However, through looking at different subjective realities, one can gain an understanding of the objective world. Not a true, full understanding, but an inquiry that articulates and interrogates the “always ready” understanding (Heil, 2010). One assumption about the relationship between leadership and those being led, which is that they are organized in some manner. This means that there is an organization. It is a hermeneutic phenomenological ontological approach, which is understanding an organization as a type of work, in Heidegger’s sense (Heil, 2010). Work in Heidegger’s sense refers to an entity that creates a world, in which being is possible. For example, the war memorial is a work of Art, but is not the material from which it is made that makes it a work, rather the way it is understood to be in the world that it creates, in this example a war that is being memorialized (Heil, 2010). In the example of relationship between leader and those being led, it means that for it to be called an organization that relationship has to exist, not

simply be a gathering of people. The people are simply the material, not the work itself. In this paper, the focus of analysis is leadership of the organization in the Government of Greenland, which sets up the world of politics in Greenland. It is a world where the properties are laws, elections, buildings, people and other things that makes up the world of politics. These properties are “made” by the Government of Greenland. However, it is not possible to understand the work or the world by listing the properties, one must “attend” to the work in an effort to understand the world that it sets up (Heil, 2010). So, in this understanding, to understand leadership in the Government of Greenland, it is not the leaders that will be studied, but the phenomenon that is Leadership.

Hermeneutic phenomenology deals with the life world (or the human experience) as it is lived (Lavery, 2003). In this view, the world is to be understood, and understanding is human existence, and thus the attempt to understand is connected to “*a given set of fore-structures, including one’s historicity, that cannot be eliminated*” (Lavery, 2003, p.24). The ontological assumptions made above are what can be called a set of fore-structures. It is necessary to be aware of these fore-structures, and account for them in the interpretation. The hermeneutic interpretation is achieved through a circle, where one goes back and forth between the experiences to deepen the understanding of the text, as if circling in a spiral, until the center is reached where it is possible to have a sensible understanding without inner contradiction (Lavery, 2003). There are thus epistemological implications, because to gain an understanding of the world, it is necessary to be in the world, to become a part of it. Therefore, it is possible to make knowledge based on subjective experience and insight. Heidegger believed that the experiences and the understanding of the world are interlinked, so it is not possible to separate them. So to understand a World, one must know from which it consists, furthermore understand how the things that makes up the World are to be understood through the experiences in the context of that World. As opposed to critical realism, there is no attempt to explain the world or to find a causal law (Bhaskar, 1998), but to understand it, or as opposed to positivism (Bryman, 2004), it is not statistical analysis. And unlike social constructivism (Berger & Luckmann, 1991), there are assumptions that are fore-structures of the social world, meaning that not everything is socially constructed.

Fore-structures

Fore-structures are the things that are not subjectively understood, but rather are the pre-requisite for the phenomenon to exist. These are things that are common to all, rather than subjective experiences. The hermeneutic phenomenology is appropriate view of the world in this thesis, as it is

an attempt to understand a phenomenon that is lived. The researcher is part of world of politics where the work of organization exists, and thus it is an entity where the researcher attends to the work. As explained earlier, it is research that was prompted by asking questions about why the Department of Independence is as it is. Specifically, it is the experience of leadership of the Department of Independence, which is happening within a fore-structure that makes up the world. In this paper, this means that there will be a section in the analytical section where there is a description of the history of the department, and what has happened. This will be interjected with autoethnographic reflections and stories. Analytical autoethnography is explained further below.

Methods

This section will explain the data collection process as well as theory. It begins with the interview method, where the selection of the interviewees is limited to the deputy ministers who have had the responsibility of the Department of Independence. The limitation of interviewees have been set because of the Autoethnographic method, which will be discussed below. The autoethnography is based on the researcher's lived experience as part of the Ministry in which the deputy minister's were the administrative heads.

Interviews

The Department of Independence has had five different deputy ministers, and each person has been reached out for an interview, however, it has been possible with only four of the Deputy Ministers due to scheduling conflict. The interviews were conducted through an unstructured interview. There are three in-depth unstructured analysis types: oral history, creative interview and postmodern interviews (Fontana & Prokos, 2016). The interviews with the deputy ministers was that of oral history, where it is the study of memory (Fontana & Prokos, 2016), in the sense that when asked the below questions, they give a historical account of their role. Oral history captures different forms of life, and this thesis concerns with phenomenon of leadership in government. Unstructured interviews are also appropriate when the interviewer has developed an understanding of the setting and the topic of interest, because within phenomenological ethnography it is necessary to be attuned to the views and presentations of the group being studied (Fontana & McGinnis, 2015). The starting point of the interviews were from two key questions:

“How do you view your role as a leader in the Ministry as a whole?”

“How do you view (viewed) your role as a leader for the Department of Independence?”

And from these questions the interview progressed where they were asked to reiterate their points through follow up questions using the concepts and ideas they have expressed. An unstructured interview is about understanding, rather than explaining (Fontana & Prokos, 2016). Despite its unstructured nature, there is a methodology to “*scientize*” (Fontana & Prokos, 2016). Fontana & Prokos presents 7 steps to achieve that goal:

- Accessing the setting
- Understanding the language and culture of the respondents
- Deciding how to present oneself
- Locating an informant
- Gaining Trust
- Establishing rapport
- Collecting empirical material

The setting is my workplace, and it was from the onset of the inquiry already the setting to which I had access. In a way, the setting came before the methodology for the research. According to Fontana & Prokos, the way to “get in” the setting varies according to the group one is attempting to study. Though, it is my workplace, I understand that the level of leadership is not where I have my daily access, which leads to the next step, of understanding the language and culture of the respondents. It being my workplace, and I am studying organization and strategy, I already have understanding of the language and culture, so there were no need for interpreters or to attempt to understand the jargon and shorthand’s used by the administration in the Government of Greenland. This also framed the way I decided to present myself, because I understood that I am both an employee, meaning subservient, but also researcher, where I have the power over what they tell me. So, I decided to frame myself in terms of a researcher, doing research for the sake of understanding leadership in Government. Prior to the interviews, I prepared what I was going to say about my research, explaining the theories I use, and what is my area of interest, namely, the role of leadership, and not leaders per se. So each interviewee were not singular subject of study, rather each interviewee was part of a larger whole of Leadership in Government of Greenland. It needed to be clear that I was not evaluating their leadership as individuals, nor was I going to make any judgment of their style of leadership.

As a case study, the method for locating research participants was based on the highest level of leadership that have had the responsibility of the Department of Independence without reaching the

political leadership. During the existence of the department of independence, the department has been moved to five different ministries. Thusly all five Deputy Ministers (Departementschef) were asked to participate in the interviews. The interviews were recorded with the permission of the participants, and it was conditioned to be anonymous. Due to relative small size of the group as well as the whole Greenlandic Government, this necessitates that the interviews are kept out of the paper in transcribed form, as there may be identifying markers. Therefore, during the analysis, only anonymized quotes will be used. This ensures that the trust I have gained remains intact. At times it may be necessary to omit some words, when the interviewees give example from the specific ministries, or when the sentence is edited for clarity, f.ex. by removing the pausing or thinking words such as “Uh, eh, mmm,”. This is in keeping with the traditions in the hermeneutic phenomenological research, where the need for an environment of trust and safety is required (Lavery, 2003). The type of question is also in line with the tradition in this type of research, where it is questions open in nature that are asked (Lavery, 2003) (Fontana & Prokos, 2016). The method of choosing participants is also based on the tradition, where it is participants with a lived in experience of the subject of study, in this case leadership in a political organization. In this thesis, there is a relationship that is created between the researcher and the interviewee that is based on a pre-existing relationship of employer and employee. As such, there may be a level of openness that may or may not be achieved, considering the prior relationship, where the interviewees may not be forthcoming with certain information, depending on the rapport I have with them. It is here that the silences in the interview may be important, as it is here that the taken for granted or the self-evident show themselves (Lavery, 2003). Furthermore, as the interviews of the deputy ministers did not take place at the same time, but over several weeks, the depth of analysis during the interviews grew from the first to last interview. The deputy ministers were not individually interviewed over several weeks. The first deputy minister was interviewed in January, the last deputy minister in February. It was challenging to schedule interviews, because the deputy ministers needed to find time in their calendar, and often required several back and forth e-mails. However, the two starting questions remained the same, though the discussions grew more in depth, where the researchers follow up question were informed, not just by the occurring interview, but by prior interviews and intervening experiences of leadership. It is because of this fore-structure of a relationship between the interviewees and interviewer that the next section describes the second process of data collection.

Instead of transcribing the interviews, stories will be written for each deputy minister, based on the interviews. These stories will be the basis of analysis, where in the actual analysis there may be quotes, as explained above. The act of retelling their stories is based on the hermeneutic circle, and this is co-construction with the interviewee (Lavery, 2003). This methodology also invites imagination in attempting to understand the phenomenon in inquiry, which is why that the re-telling of the interviews will be told as actual stories, as one might tell a fairy tale, but grounded in the interviews. According to Lavery, it is necessary to account for one's position throughout the research. So, there will be multiple stages of interpretation of data, where this is the first stage, and the other stages will be based on the below described methods. In order for the interviewees to remain anonymous, and for the purpose of creating a narrative story, each deputy minister will be addressed with the pronoun She/Her, the uniform pronoun use will mask the interviewees by hiding the gender, and narratively, the continued use of their title will make it easier to read.

Autoethnography

Autoethnography is a method to gain new knowledge and understanding of social structures and conditions through personal perspective and narrative (Löwenheim, 2010). In this thesis, it fits into the epistemological understanding of the gaining of knowledge, where the personal reflection of the researcher can be considered data (Lavery, 2003), and where attending to the work in the Heidegger sense means to be involved in the World that is the subject of study (Heil, 2010). Autoethnography has been a method in qualitative sociological research for some time, where it is closely linked to autobiographical and biographical analytic writing (Anderson, 2006). The history of autobiographic ethnography was exemplified by David Hayano's research in *Poker Faces* (1982), which was grounded in his personal experiences (Anderson, 2006). This is the basis of the potentiality of autoethnographic method in realist or analytic tradition. But evocative autoethnography has been identified mostly with autoethnographic research, which places emotions in an epistemological setting, arguing that this places the reader in the studied experiences and thus creates a better understanding of the research (Anderson, 2006). However, analytic autoethnography is different, where the researcher is (1) a full member of the research setting, (2) visible as such in the text, and (3) committed to developing a theoretical understanding of the broader social phenomenon (Anderson, 2006). It is different than evocative autoethnography in such a way that there is an epistemological understanding that it is possible to gain knowledge from subjective

experience without experiencing the subjective. It is also an ongoing method, where the data collection is littered with analysis when conducting interviews especially.

Autoethnography has been criticized for being self-indulgent and narcissistic, and it has been questioned as a sole source for analysis (Holt, 2003), so in this thesis the autoethnographic data will be supported by the interviews as well as drawing of the fore-structures from political documents, such as memoranda, coalition agreements and such. The way that autoethnography will be utilized is by using the analytic autoethnography proposed by Anderson (Anderson, 2006). It means that I will be a complete member researcher (CMR), in the sense that I am not just an observer of the research setting, but a complete member, specifically the more common type, the Opportunistic CMR, because I was already a complete member of the Department of Independence, when I decided to do the research, rather than going into the position when I decided to do the research, or what would be a “convert”, where it is through the research process a researcher is converted to a CMR (Anderson, 2006). What this thesis studies is Leadership, specifically Deputy Ministers’ leadership in the Government of Greenland, and as I am not a deputy minister, I cannot be CMR, which is why that the autoethnographic method is used to describe the Fore-structures, in which the Deputy Ministers have their leadership. Specifically, it is an autographic account of the Department of Independence. This necessitates the second aspect of Anderson’s model, the analytic reflexivity, where the understanding of one owns influence on the researched subject is visible in the analysis and the text (Anderson, 2006), which directly connects to the next aspect, that the researcher be visible and active in the text. The researchers perspective, feelings and influence is also part of the data collected from the observed social world. However, since these three aspects runs the risk of making the analysis self-centered, meaning that general understanding is formed from understanding one, it is necessary to have a dialogue with informants, which the prior section of interviews attempts to mediate (Anderson, 2006). This is the fourth aspect of Anderson’s model, and he explains that ethnography, including autoethnography, requires a dialogue with the data, and that reflectivity is even a relational activity. It should be noted here, that the subject of analysis in this thesis is not the experience of working in the department of independence, which is why that there is no interviews with my colleague or the head of the department. Instead, I have in the interviews followed up questions, where they were informed by my own experiences. For example, in the process of trying to understand the work at hand, I will find information in the coalition agreement, news articles and debates in parliament. And as to not ask leading questions, I asked how the deputy ministers will attempt to understand the work, when the minister gives an

assignment that might not immediately be understood. Consistently, with different wordings, they all told me that they look at the coalition agreement, follow the news and look at other political agreements that might exist, such as the budget agreement. This showed the fore-structures of political debate that is outside the immediate political statements given by the minister. The final aspect of Anderson's model is the commitment to analytic agenda, meaning that it is not just a recounting of personal experience, or to provide an insiders perspective, but a commitment to gain insight into some broader set of social phenomena than simply describing the date (Anderson, 2006). Anderson uses the term *analytic* to refer to work that is directed towards a sort of theoretical understanding, which is beyond the data. In my case, it is trying to create an insight into the fore-structures of the world of politics in Greenland, where the Department of Independence is a part. Again, it is important to point out that it is not an attempt to discover a transcendental truth, but in keeping with the phenomenological, it is to understand the phenomenon of leadership in the Government of Greenland, which while not a undebatable conclusion, it is not just a representation of events in the Government of Greenland. Now that I have explained the model, I will explain how the autoethnographic data will be gathered. Autoethnographic data often consist of personal memories, musings, as well as field notes, personal documents and interviews (Anderson & Glass-Coffin, 2016). Field notes are interesting, as they are usually the representation of a social reality through one owns lenses (Anderson & Glass-Coffin, 2016). In my case, the field notes, are my work notes as well, as I have been taking notes whenever I have been in a meeting with the leadership, and whenever I am in any meeting throughout my entire employment, so even though these notes are not field notes per se, they will function the same. However, the notes are not taken with analysis in mind, so the lack of analytical observation, which is part of the CMR will not be part of them. It is a note writing practice, which is suitable for autoethnographic, despite the lack of analytical observation, because field note writing is varied within the field (Anderson & Glass-Coffin, 2016). What my work notes will contain will be notes taken immediately after the events, or in the event of my role as taking minutes of a meeting, as the event unfolds. Some autoethnographers presents their field notes in a chronological order, as the research setting is often their study (Anderson & Glass-Coffin, 2016), however, as mine are extensive work notes, they will not be chronological, and since this thesis is not a chronological study of the events of leadership, but rather a study of the phenomenon Leadership. And as the autoethnographic method is utilized, not to analyze the Leadership, but to understand the fore-structures of Leadership in Government of

Greenland, the writing will not be chronological, but rather have the character of discussion and musings.

Theory

This section discusses the theories that underline the analysis in the thesis. There will also be some literature review on leadership, and on political organizations under the term “public administration”, focusing on the relationship between administration and politics.

Public administration literature review

The idea of public bureaucracy to be viewed as a political organization, where the idea of analyzing it as an organization, came about early 80's and late 70's, moving away from viewing the bureaucracy as a monolithic entity (Jenkins & Gray, 1983). It was seen as homogenous structure and process environment, much like a machine, with roots in Weber's descriptions (Jenkins & Gray, 1983). These early studies showed that the bureaucracy began to be viewed as an organization, where there are structures and power interactions, which influence policy, meaning that bureaucracy is not a machine that processes the inputs given by politicians without influencing it (Jenkins & Gray, 1983). However, the dichotomy concept of the separation of the administration and public has not entirely gone away (Svara J. H., 2006). According to Svara, it is more as a principle of how administrator ought to behave, namely not be involved in political affairs, and the other side is that politicians ought not to be involved in the administrative affairs. Svara goes on to criticize the dichotomy, as it does not describe how politicians and administrators typically interact. The argument that he criticizes the defenders of using, is that administrators ought to be politically neutral, though political neutrality and the political-administrator dichotomy are independent, meaning that political-administrator dichotomy does not ensure political neutrality. This has been found already in 1983, and in earlier studies (Jenkins & Gray, 1983). The political-administrative dichotomy has a long history and is sometimes understood as the complete separation as the principle described above, other times it is understood that the administration are involved in the policy design, but not in partisan politics, causing a confusion as to what the dichotomy actually means (Svara, 2006). The second part has been identified as a role that administrators have had early on in the study of public administration, where the role of the administrators play in shaping public policy design and implementation was acknowledged, even expected as part of the responsibilities and duties of the administrators (Svara J. H., 2001). Much of the early research in the area of political-administrative interface was at times ideological to the idea that politics ought

to be for politicians, and administration for administrators, despite researchers acknowledging the policy implementation role of the administrators (Svara J. H., 2001). But through the 80's and 90's researchers have been studying that interface and it is generally accepted that administrators have a role in policy design, though there is an emphasis on avoiding party-particularism (Svara J. H., 2001). Even though that the dichotomy continues to hold its place in academia as a model, the model has proved to be incapable of capturing the reality of public administration (Bello & Spano, 2015). Much of the earlier work, discussed by Svara and Jenkins & Gray, focused on the influence that administrators have on policy, but it should also be noted that there are also concerns about the interference of politicians in the administration (Bello & Spano, 2015). This is compounded by worries that politicians will use public resources to their own benefits (Jacobsen, 2006). It is thus understood within the field that there is some influence and interaction between politicians and administrators, and that the bureaucracy is not insulated from the politics. As a result, there has been more and more research into the overlapping roles of the administrators, and particularly the senior civil servants (Miller & McTavish, 2012). This paper contributes to the focus of senior civil servants relationship to the politicians, which many researches show the overlapping role of the civil servants with that of the politicians (Miller & McTavish, 2012).

Leadership literature review

The research on leadership has been moving away from the leadership as vested in or possessed by leaders in recent years, and moved more towards relational, discursive and practice based theories of leadership (Wilson, 2013). Theories about leaders grounded in an ideal type has been around since ancient Greece, when Aristotle, Plato and others describe the ideal leader as almost a god (Wilson, 2013). The abilities of the leader were divine gifts, rarely given and thus the leader was expected to be unselfish and work for the good of the people. The leader is expected to be wiser and more knowledgeable of all things than the followers, who must obey the leader due to the wisdom and knowledge. The follower are less than the leader, less divine so to speak (Wilson, 2013). The leader is described through attributes that the leader must have to be the ideal leader, where it is based on the leaders' service to those led by the leader. The leader knows more than those led. This is not an altogether perspective on leadership that remains in Ancient Greece. The idea of the leader as an individual is being questioned by several scholars, such as Freeman and Auster, when they argue against the individualistic idea of a leader and the leader's ability to be authentic through introspection (Freeman & Auster, 2011). They argue for a relational approach, understanding the leader's role as relational. Despite the critique of the leader as some sort of ideal

type, there is no general theory of leadership, which may be adopted for analysis (Wilson, 2016). According to Wilson, there is at best a broad agreement that leadership is relational or a process of influence. The mainstream leadership studies today, what Wilson identifies as 'new leadership' theories:

“‘New leadership’ theories, which emphasize a leader’s ‘visionary’, ‘transformational’ and ‘charismatic’ qualities and behaviours, have achieved widespread acceptance amongst mainstream leadership scholars as being fundamentally sound, desirable and valid. The sheer ‘monotony’ of this discourse, of this way of thinking about leadership, however, makes it particularly worthy of critical scrutiny.”

(Wilson, 2016, p.22)

The theories are leader focused, and leader centric, and the leaders are a combination of intellectual, moral and emotional influencers, moving the followers in a certain direction (Wilson, 2016). The positive effects of these types of leaders have been shown through many empirical studies, according to Wilson. She says that much of the theories, including the more recent one of “authentic leadership” contain the key ideas of a visionary, transformational and charismatic, each of is not new, but they have matured into the mainstream today. However, she criticizes it for being too narrowly focused on the leader, one who is somehow above normal, the leader as a visionary, transformational and charismatic. This view, she argues, is ‘heroization’ of the leader, where some are set up as superior to others, that implicitly characterizes leader as superior beings.

“but also the idea and the ideal of the exceptional few directing the ordinary many.”

(Wilson, 2016, p. 26)

There is no equality, or democracy in this view of the leader, and it is this view that is most dominant in the mainstream leadership discourse, where the different kinds of “new leadership” theory has the basic same assumption. It is this that has caused Alvesson and Kärreman to depict the mainstream leadership studies as ‘intellectual failures, whose appeal and success are founded in ideology alone’ (Wilson, 2016, p.24), and according to Wilson there is a need to examine the philosophical underpinnings of the leadership theories. The assumptions here within, relies on very limited ontological and epistemological assumptions, which have problematic implications, one of which is that leadership is naturally occurring, as well as inherently “good” (Wilson, 2016). She criticizes this, because critically oriented studies reveal that leadership is ambiguous, struggle and tension, none of which the “new leadership” theories reveal. It is leadership theories, that focus on

the leader, and very little has been considered as to why and how leadership is understood, independent of the leader (Wilson, 2016). Instead, there is an idea that continues to promote leadership as coming from the leader, and that each situation has the right leader, that there is some inherent traits that a leader must possess, be they learned or given (Wilson, 2016). This view of leadership, that is personal, becomes problematic, because when leadership is called for in response to arising problems, it renders many passive and waiting for someone to step up with a vision (Wilson, 2016). An example of such a view is by Groves and LaRocca (Groves & LaRocca, 2011), where they assume that transformational leadership is inherently good, and that it is not real transformational leadership when its result are not good. However, the assumption that a leader with certain qualities is inherently good is starting to be questioned, though some are merely questioning the content of the qualities, meaning that they are questioning how it is possible to know what ethics are good and others less so (Levine & Boaks, 2014) (Skubinn & Herzog, 2016). Skubinn and Herzog argue that this has been brought on by corporate scandals in recent years, including the 2008 financial crisis. They argue against a trait based leadership view, and questions the ability to be an ethical leader simply by doing the ethical things that are ascribed elsewhere other than within the self, when they wrote in their paper that leaders who view ethical leadership as a method, would merely adopt the role of an ethical leader to achieve an end, and not necessarily become ethical. They do continue to maintain that an ethical leader is a good leader. Wilson also critiques mainstream leadership theories for not capturing the reality of leadership, because they too narrowly focus on the leader, and not the organization, context, teamwork or other factors that might influence leadership. It can be difficult to identify certain type of leadership practically, as it is only possible to observe outside behavior (Skubinn & Herzog, 2016). Even if it is possible to identify the ethics of a leader, it is problematic, because it might lead to thinking that a certain combinations of ethics are necessary to be a leader, and thus disregarding other factors again (Levine & Boaks, 2014). According to Levine and Boaks this type of prescriptive models of leadership is problematic for five reasons:

“(1) You have your prescriptions and I have mine, (2) they are not performance based, (3) they ignore critical aspects of performance not consistent with the model, (4) they do not take situational variation into account, (5) they are framed in terms of individual behavior when leadership is a multilevel phenomenon.”

(Levine & Boaks, 2014, p. 227)

Furthermore, there is a fundamental problem of prescriptive models, where there are certain stipulations about what is good, or what is ethical or what is morally desirable, where these stipulations assume that there are intrinsically inherent in leadership, because they fail to account for the “Hitler problem” (Levine & Boaks, 2014, p. 229). Too much of ethical and contemplative leadership theory still focuses on the leader knowing itself (Freeman & Auster, 2011) (Krantz, 1990). The self-centered focus of modern ethical leadership theory only improves the moral standing of the leader, but it does not create a path to actions. How can the ethical self of the leader influence the organization, when only the leader knows the self? The continued focus of the self, self-care and self-improvement as a method of leadership training has not brought about radical change in the world, and when the so-called “natural born leaders” are examined closer, it becomes obvious that there is nothing natural about them (Wilson, 2013).

Theoretical framework

In this section, the theories of Hannah Arendt will be discussed. It will be her concepts of Labor, Work and Action, where there will be a larger emphasis on Work and Action, as the analysis showed that the deputy minister considered the administration to be overwhelmingly related to Work and Action. This thesis asks how leadership is exercised in the Government of Greenland, and using Arendt to understand on what it is exercised. As discussed previously, much of ‘mainstream’ leadership theory is focused on the leaders and the positioning of them. In essence, according to Wilson, many mainstream leadership theories are attempting to define truth about “good leadership” or leadership in general. However, as this thesis is attempting to gain a greater understanding of how leadership is exercised, and does not attempt to create a conclusion, the philosophical approach is appropriate. It is also not entirely new, as Wilson explains:

“In pushing the value of philosophical and historical inquiry to the margins of contemporary leadership knowledge, we have, however, turned our backs on over 5000 years of thinking about leadership.”

(Wilson, 2016, s. 19)

Arendt draws on old and new thinking, so that she is appropriate for the purpose of this thesis, as she does not attempt to make normative definitions, but rather phenomenological inquiries.

Labor, Work and Action

When Hannah Arendt writes about the human condition in her book, she distinguishes between Labor, Work and Action. This distinction between the three will provide a framework for analysis in understanding how the Deputy Minister see their role as leaders. The intention is to understand the role of leadership by understanding the leaders of the Government of Greenland, namely the administrative heads of the government, the deputy ministers. The framework of Arendt will be used to understand the full humans that are the leaders. In a way, this can be called the “The Deputy Minister Condition”, hence the title of the thesis.

The concept of Action

Action is how it is possible to distinguish between different people. It is the distinctness of individuals, the basis of human plurality (Arendt, 1998). It is what separates one human from another, because we are all humans, but each person is not the same as the other. This means that there are some conditions that need to be met in order for humans to act. That is freedom, in the sense the ability to start something new, and plurality, meaning other people to which we can show our distinctness. It is thus not a solitary activity, but requires the presence of others. The others to whom one presents oneself must be equal and distinct from oneself. Action is thus a way to show who one is to others. It is distinct from Work and Labor, in that these are common traits to all, but Action is when one shows ones distinctness. In theory, Work and Labor can be done in solitude, without others. But Action always requires the presence of others. It is through acting that one appears before others. As Arendt puts it:

“Action, as distinguished from fabrication, is never possible in isolation; to be isolated is to be deprived of the capacity to act.”

(Arendt, 1998, p. 188)

Action is what makes people unique, and the ability to act is what makes people feel like they can be themselves. It is part of the full human condition, such as Labor is needed to survive, Work is needed to have consumption, Action is needed to actualize ones individuality. It is important to distinguish individuality from identity, because we can understand the individuality of the action without knowing the actor. A piece of art is individual, and we can identify it as being unique and unlike others, without knowing the name of the artist. In relation to this thesis, it is useful to explain Action within the Government, rather than trying to explain Action in and of itself.

As explained in the Public Administration section, there is the idea of a dichotomy, where there is a complete absence of the individuality of administrators in the political space. However, this idea has been disproven as it has been shown that administrators have influence in policy design and the like, though they often are independent from party politics (Svara J. H., 2001) (Bello & Spano, 2015). Influence in the political space by administrator is the appearance of the individuality of the administrators, meaning it is action. Arendt discusses that the modern bureaucratic apparatus was design to conform society, make it predictable, in an attempt to create peace and safety, but in doing so humans lose their freedom, meaning their ability to Act, because the bureaucracy removed the space of appearance for Speech, which is Action (Arendt, 1998). What has happened is, that the bureaucracy has made all of government into a place for work, where everything is reduced to means and ends. Arendt has this to say about it:

“Here it is self-evident that public admiration and monetary reward are of the same nature and can become substitutes for each other.”

(Arendt, 1998, p. 56)

When public administration begins to measure its success by opinion polling and budgetary responsibility, politics have lost the place it had, namely that it was a place for appearance and to strive for immortality. Arendt is very clear about the dangers of moving into this space, because it is your life that you risk. Not life as in the biological physical life, but Life as in the ability to be a full human that both Works, Labors and Acts. Because it is possible in the space of politics to lose one’s ability to Act, because it requires the presence of others, and one can never foresee the reaction and actions of others. This unpredictability is inherent in Action, because even if humans share the same nature, they are all living a different life. The unpredictability of the consequences of action also shows the nature of Action, namely that the actor can never fully understand the actions until after they are done. The space of appearance was called *polis* by Arendt, and it is a metaphorical place, not the political stage as such, where politicians operate, but rather something that appears whenever people gather together to appear to each other *“in manner of speech and action”* (Arendt, 1998, p. 199). Arendt underlines that it does not appear whenever people gather, but the potentiality of the space is present when people gather, but it is only when they speak and act that there is a space of appearance, a *polis*. In relation to public administration, this would mean that it is the politicians that discuss and debate, but there is a potentiality in the administration as well, because there is always potential whenever people gather. Remember, action is a necessary condition of being a full human, according to Arendt. Therefore, the instrumentalization of action and the

reduction of politics to means to achieve an end has never successfully eliminated Action nor its potentiality. The space of appearance, the *polis*, is not a constant existence, but is continually created through actions. It is also here that power resides, according to Arendt. No one person has power, unless it is in the presence of others. It is also fluid, not centered on the strength of people, and only exists so long as people gather. Returning to government, whenever both politicians and administrators gather to form a new legislation or strategy or combat some societal ailment, they have created the space of appearance and there they exercise power.

Labor

Labor is the activity that is necessary to sustain life, according to Arendt. It is the activity that makes humans no different than animals, and because it is necessary, it is not freedom. It is also never-ending, as the fruits of the activity are immediately consumed. That is the main characteristic of Labor, which is necessary, in the sense it must be done if one wishes to sustain life. So, any activity that is done out of necessity, and not for the activity itself, is Labor. In modern words, we might say that these are menial tasks, because in the modern time, some Labor is Labor of the Head, and not only Labor of the Body, such as farming for food, cleaning to prevent diseases (Arendt, 1998). As Arendt makes quite clear what labor is, and rather than continue to discuss it, I will move on to Work. This thesis is not focused on Labor as such, and will not be a big part of the analysis, but it is important to understand there is a distinction between Work and Labor, as well as Action. What is important, though, is to understand that the Labor is the work of slaves, in the Arendtian sense. Labor is what the ancient Greek considered to be the purview of the slaves, so that the slave masters could attend to Work or even Action. Slavery was a way to attain freedom from the necessities of life for the slave master, and thus pursue higher purposes (Arendt, 1998). It should be noted, that this is not hierarchical order of the three activities, Labor, Work, Action, rather they are the ordered activities of humans.

In organizational terms, this means that the survival of the organization requires labor, and in a government organizations that means payroll, maintenance, paying of the bills and such, but furthermore, the adherence to certain laws and principles of government, these are things that ensure the survival of an Organization such as the Government of Greenland. As mentioned earlier, this type of labor is not the focus of this thesis, so the analysis will be light on this. Some of the deputy ministers did mention that this was part of their responsibilities, but did not view it as a big part of their role.

Work

Work is the activity to fabricate something to an end, to a goal, rather than just for consumption. It is the fabrication of things so that human life is possible, to be elevated beyond the mere animal needs for survival (Arendt, 1998). That which is fabricated by this, the *homo faber*, is autonomous from the *homo faber*. Meaning there is no identity to the thing that is made, which is an important distinction between Work and Action, because according to Arendt, Action is the way that humans show their individuality, and Work is the making of use-things. The way that the *homo faber* understands the world is in terms of its usefulness in achieving an end. The world is made up of things that can be altered, as a way to fabricate something, the things in the world do not have intrinsic value, but only when they are useful in achieving an end. Once, the end is reached, there ceases to be meaning, and the end is sometimes turned into means to another end, and so forth. Therefore, it follows that for the *homo faber* to exist, it needs a purpose, or an end to use Arendt's language. It also follows that the world loses significance, if there is no end, because only use-things have value for the *homo faber*. This also means that the *homo faber* is itself a use-object, mere machine for fabricating means and ends, in order to achieve an end, which itself turns into a mean, unless the fabrication created is used to achieve an end, meaning consuming that which is produced.

In organizational terms, this means strategies, sales goals and other business goals. The products, the things that grow the company, but not the things that insure the survival of the company. In governmental organizational terms, these are also strategies, but the goals and aims of the strategies are decided by the politicians. The analysis in this thesis focuses mostly on this type of work, where the deputy minister discusses their work in terms of producing results.

Contemplation

This section is an autoethnographic interjection of the attempt to understand Action and Contemplation. It is included because it was part of the step of understanding the role of Action in the Government of Greenland.

Contemplation – According to Arendt – Autoethnographic interjection

Reading “The Human Condition” by Hannah Arendt, and at the same time considering my thesis, I have been trying to understand the role of contemplation with regards to action. I have been thinking that action follows contemplation, meaning that first one must contemplate before knowing what action to take, however, in reading Arendt, contemplation has a different meaning, and what I

have been thinking about in terms of political action, is judgment, that action follows judgement in the political sphere. This has presented some challenges in framing my thesis and analysis, as the activity I have been making is dialogue with me with myself, namely thinking. So, what is contemplation, and how do I understand the different meanings? It is necessary to consider this, another word for thinking, so that I can analyze using the proper idiography in the framework of Arendt.

When there are multiple choices the leader must make on behalf of those that are led, and the led has different preferences? This is judgment, but is it also contemplation? Is the leader contemplating their choices? In arendtian sense, these are two different things. Contemplation is not in relation to choices, but in relation to search for truth or knowledge, which does not necessarily fuel action. Truth here, is philosophical truth as explained by Arendt (Arendt, 1998). In fact, Arendt wrote it explicitly: *“For thought and contemplation are not the same.”* (Arendt, 1998, p.291). So, is contemplation useless then, in this context, where it is an attempt to understand Leadership in the Government of Greenland? Well, contemplation is the job of the philosopher, in some cases the highest order of existence for the philosopher, according to some ancient Greek philosophers (Arendt, 1998). However, what I have trouble with is the role of contemplation, in the arendtian sense, in the government of Greenland, or in leadership at all. Especially within the context of this thesis, that is grounded in the ontology that within a World there are several realities, and contemplation as brought forth by Arendt, is the search of Truth. Is the truth, then the World, or a subjective reality of the contemplator? It cannot be the second, because the subjective reality is linked to an individual, and this person is mortal. Arendt says that contemplation is connected to the eternal, as oppose to immortality (Arendt, 1998). This distinction between Thought and Contemplation, where Thought and Action are connected in *Vita Activa* as the politician’s way of life and Contemplation is the philosopher’s way of life called *“Vita Contempletiva”*, is difficult to grasp, because Hannah Arendt spends so much time discussing action and speech, and thought, and later Judgment and other ways of thoughts. Arendt continues to connect contemplation to the philosopher’s way of life, and it is because perhaps she does not consider herself a philosopher (Arendt, 1978), she spends considerable amount of time explaining what it is. Thinking and thought are two differing things, and the act of thinking is contemplation, and Thought is when thinking is expressed. Thinking is solitary, and happens within one owns mind, but once it is expressed it appears and becomes a thing of this world (Arendt, 1978). I had a thought when I read Hannah Arendt discussion in *“The life of the mind”* about what thinking is, that it is outside time and place,

outside this world, and only exist in the mind, disconnected from reality. That it reads like her definition of the *eternal* in “The Human Condition”, which is also outside time and reality. Reality as perceived, separate from Truth. So my thought is that contemplation is when the mind connects to the eternal by thinking, and thought is when it returns to reality and appears. Thus, I return to my question: What role does contemplation have in the Government of Greenland? It is the role of the politicians, because it is they that must make a judgement of which actions to take, whether these actions are based in their own thinking or necessitated by outside events. The criterions from which the judgment comes, depends on the thinking of the politicians, the contemplation, as explained by Arendt:

“The principles by which we act and the criteria by which we judge and conduct our lives depend ultimately on the life of the mind.”

(Arendt, 1978, p. 71)

So the role of contemplation in the Government of Greenland, is then a little outside the scope of this paper, as it is activity that the politicians does, and not the deputy minister, however, it is not entirely outside either. To put it simply: The deputy ministers ask the minister: What should we do? Based on my interviews, this question sometimes comes with a set of options that the minister can choose, options prepared by the deputy ministers and other employees (this will be expanded upon in the analysis, based on the interviews). It is because that the deputy ministers cannot make that judgment themselves, that contemplation is to some degree part of the scope of this paper. Even though the deputy ministers cannot make this choice themselves, they make a judgement when they make a decision of which options that the minister will see. Contemplation, as defined as the activity of thinking outside reality and time, is then to some degree also possible by the deputy ministers, the second way that Arendt talks about it. Namely that thinking is the solitary activity of the spectator to find meaning in the past, which is something that is different from the political contemplation, which is thinking in order to act. Arendt, in “The Life of the mind”, connect the different faculties, judging and thinking, to each other. It is therefore not possible to do one in solitude with the other, where thinking always produces the side product of Conscience, which can be argued to be the basis of judgement (Arendt, 1978).

Arendt in Use

The analysis will then focus on understanding the role of Leadership of Government of Greenland through analysis of the interviews and through autoethnographic account, where Arendt’s concepts

of Labor, Work and Action will provide the framework. The analysis will reveal the different aspects of the Deputy Minister Condition, and the autoethnographic section will provide context with lived experiences of the leaderships of the Deputy Ministers. It is especially the concept of Action that will provide a framework of understanding the exercise of leadership in Government of Greenland. Labor and Work are more easily understood in relations to a workplace, where Labor is the activities that are necessary to sustain the workplace, and Work is the production of the things towards an end. In a political organization Labor is thus the actual organization, meaning payroll and other legally binding paper work, such as filling out forms and applications and approving them and such, and where Work is the fabrication of results. But Action is political, and as explained in the public administration literature review section, administrators often have influence over the political, and Action is also part of being a full human, and the assumption here is that the administration are full humans. The concepts will help in providing analysis in understanding how the leaders story their leadership in terms of Labor, Work and Action, as well as help frame the autoethnographic discussions in relations to these concepts as a way to understand what their stories say about working in the Government of Greenland.

Setting the scene – (or data by other words)

This section will set the scene of the analysis. This is where the overview of the Department of Independence will be drawn, as well as the stories of the interviews. As explained earlier, there will be no transcripts of the interviews, instead they will be written into stories that will be the basis of analysis. The analysis itself may contain anonymized quotations, but not in this section.

Department of independence - an overview

The Department of Independence was created in October 2016, when a new coalition was formed in Government. It was part of the agreement that they should create Commission on Greenland's Constitution, and the department was created as well (Grønlands Selvstyre, u.d.). However, the history reaches a little further back, as there were two independent proposal in the parliament in 2011 and 2015 regarding the creation of the Greenlandic constitution commission (Grønlands Selvstyre, 2016). When the Self-Government commission was active from 2004 to 2008, the Government of Greenland created a department of Self-government, whose main assignment was to run an information campaign regarding the report of the commission prior to the referendum (Grønlands Selvstyre, u.d.). Based on the wording in the Budget for 2017, where the Department of Independence is mentioned and put in the budget, I believe that the department was created because the Constitutional Commission was to be created, so it was in the same manner as with the Self-government commission. The major difference between the two commissions was that there was already a decision to hold a referendum on the Self-Governments commission when it was formed (Grønlands-Dansk Selvstyrekommision, 2008), as opposed to the Constitutional Commission that did not have clear path after the report was given (Sermitsiaq.AG, 2017).

The Department of Independence has been moving around different ministries, beginning in Ministry of Independence, Nature, Environment and Agriculture, moving to Ministry of Independence, Foreign Affairs and Agriculture, and upon moving to Ministry of Natural Resources, Labor and Nordic Cooperation it disappeared from the name of the ministry, but remained until being moved to Ministry of Finance and Nordic Cooperation without returning to the name of the ministry. Each change has happened concurrently with the changing coalition, though the department has moved with two different politicians, Suka Frederiksen and Vittus Qujaukitsoq

It is a politically driven organization, where the direction is put forth by the politicians. In a politically driven organization, such as the Government of Greenland, it becomes interesting to find out how this happens.

Tales of leadership

In this section, the interviews with the deputy ministers will be retold, as a narrative about how they see themselves. This will constitute the data for the analysis. As explained in the prior sections, the anonymity of the deputy ministers will need to be protected, which is why there is no transcription of their interviews. Instead, the interview will be retold as stories about leadership, where each interview is one story. Deputy Ministers are identified as DM and a number.

The story of DM1 – The link

This is the story of a link, the story of a deputy minister that links the political and the administrative. This deputy minister's self-understanding was centered on the idea of being the Link between the administration and the politicians, and the people and the government, viewing it as her role to link them all and ensure that the administration makes real the wish and will of the politician and thus the people.

I arrived at DM1's office at the agreed upon time, but she was not in the office yet. It had taken a few tries to find a time where I could conduct the interview. All the deputy ministers are busy, I quickly realized. Finally, DM1 arrived and we went into her office, but before I sat down, she explained she was waiting for a call she had to take, and I would have to leave the office. As she asked me to sit down and begin the interview, the phone rang, and I was gestured to leave. I tell you this, to illustrate the difficulties in securing the interviews, even though each and every one of the deputy ministers who agreed to participate, agreed so with gusto. When I was back inside her office, I explain the background of my thesis, what I am investigating, which theories I was using, and then I asked for permission to record. This approach became the same with each consequent interview. I then asked what I asked all the deputy minister that I interviewed: How do you see your role as leader of the ministry in general?

The very first definition of her role DM1 gives is that of the Link, in fact, it was so very much the first thing, that is the first note I wrote from the interview. The role of the link between the political and the administration is the connective tissue of DM1's story. The administration, in the view of DM1, holds the expertise of the purview of the ministry, as it cannot be expected that the people has the professional expertise. The administration serves the people through their representative, the minister. The deputy minister is the administrative head of a hierarchical organization, to which the deputy minister gives tasks and assignment based on discussions with the minister. It is the duty of the deputy minister to be informed of the minister's

wishes, and when the wishes of the minister are unclear, it is also the duty of the deputy minister to clarify. DM1 explains that sometimes it is necessary to rely on one's understanding of the political landscape in order to interpret what the minister wants. It is her duty to know the challenges and opportunities within the ministry's purview through understanding the full political process, including knowing what the law says and what is the will of parliament. Therefore, the deputy minister must follow the news, the ongoing political development and have knowledge of the coalition agreement and other documents where the political agenda. Her view of the duties include the role as interpreter, as advisor, and to reflect the minister. It is important to have a good chemistry with the minister, because the deputy minister is reliant on the minister to do the job. It is necessary to be able to have a frank discussion with the minister, who is a reflection of the people's wishes. The act of interpreting the minister's wishes into concrete tasks and assignments for the administration involves the inclusion of the departments within the ministry that are responsible for whatever part of the purview that requires completion of tasks and assignments. DM1 discusses the reliance on the departments to have the specific case expertise, and thus her role is also to conduct a dialogue with the departments. She sees the role as a link between the political and administrative as a core function of the position, where the hierarchical organization of the ministry ensures that link, where the administrative answer to her and she answers to the minister. This hierarchy was broken, however, with the Department of Independence, where the head of the department had direct access to the minister, as oppose to going through DM1. She believes that it might have been because of the minister's hands-on approach. What was left unsaid during the interview, was when DM1 emphasized that the other departments in the ministry maintained the hierarchy, these were areas where she had expertise and therefore could better interpret the minister's wishes into assignments and tasks for the administration. DM1 explains that this break with the hierarchy for the head of the Department of Independence is because the department of independence was different, even though she had said that her role as the link between the political and administrative. It was during this line of questioning in the interview, it became apparent that the DM1 was unsure of how to answer, and quickly changed the discussion to general terms. In essence, this is the exception that proves the rule, that the DM1 links the political with the administrative, and in order for her to do that, she needs to know the will of the people and the political and understand the expertise of the department in question. As the political will was unclear regarding independence, so too was her ability to translate that into action, and thus relied on the expertise in the specific department to conduct a dialogue with the minister.

The story of DM2 – the technician

This is a story of a technician, a deputy minister who understands herself as an administrator in a rationally built hierarchical organization. This deputy minister's self-understanding is that of the administrator that makes real the political agenda through technical and professional skills that are in the administration.

Once again, I arrived at DM2's office on the agreed upon time, however, she was not in the office, so I sat outside and waited. She arrived about 20 minutes later, and quickly got down to business. It was clear from the get go, that this deputy minister was very technical, and also did not feel the need to have her phone with her. This was later in the day, than the other interviews, so I got the sense that this was the last item in her schedule for the day. I again explained what my thesis was about before I started recording. DM2 wanted to know how it went with the other interviews, but at this point I only had one other interview and explained that the subject of the role as a link between the political and administration had been a big part of our discussion. She nodded, and I turned on the recorder and asked the question, this is the story of the technician.

Right from the beginning, she re-iterated what I had said prior to the recording, as I was only recording after I had gotten the permission. She reiterated to put what I had said on the record, as well as to begin answering the question. She went through the motion of agreeing with the other interviewee, and saying that her role is also as the link between the political and the administration. Then she started her own story, which began with technical qualifiers of how she sees her role, she discussed the Weberian structure of the bureaucracy, and work rationally on well-defined tasks given by the politicians. In an organization like this, it is her role to divide and hand out the assignments and tasks, as well as make the necessary decisions. The methods that she uses are based on leadership theory, where she discussed value-based leadership. The values she tries to project are legality, professionalism, responsibility and orderliness. She spoke of appreciative leadership and situational leadership. What was left unsaid, was that she had studied leadership in courses, prior to achieving the position she has now. The situational leadership is a particular course that is offered in the Government of Greenland's internal course list (Government of Greenland-HR-PAU, 2017). She explains that the situational leadership manifests itself when she hands out assignments, in terms of the degree of specificity she gives the command. For some, it is a matter of asking for a result, for others they require more specific instructions as to how the final result should be. The responsibility of creating results is the responsibility of the administration and the individual administrator. She distinguishes between menial work, such as filling out forms and

stamping them before sending them up the bureaucracy, and the work she wants her administrators to do. It should be a fun place to work, where there is a sense of making a difference. The employees should use their heads to work, and that is why they are hired. She says that there are clear political indication that are the basis of the ministry, though she adds that often the indication lack specificity. As an example, when the parliament decides that a strategy should be made to combat child obesity (this is an example made by the author, as the interviewee used an example from the ministry). The parliamentary decision will often not include specifics of which goals or measurements that must be implemented, instead it is the deputy minister that will give the assignment to the person in the ministry who has the expertise within that area and ask that person to come with a draft for a strategy. Often, this involves hearing and discussing the issues with other ministries that may have an influence. The example of child obesity would include the health ministry, social ministry, finance ministry and perhaps the educational ministry depending on the efforts against child obesity. She makes explicit that there are possibilities for the administration to produce results without a constant discussion with the minister, or even involving the minister when it is a parliamentary decision. In these cases, there would be laws, procedures and rules about how to proceed. When asked about the procedure when the political indication is unclear, she says that she follows the political debate, the parliamentary negotiations and has a dialogue with the minister. Often times, even when the course of action is unclear, it is possible to create options for the minister, and then the minister may make a choice between the options or command a new option. Her point being, that it is possible for the administration to act even when there is political uncertainty. She continued that this is another way the ministry can create results, when the administrators have ideas they can propose it to her and depending of the nature of the proposal either approve or present it as an option for the minister. I then asked her about her experience with the Department of Independence, which does not exactly have a law, rules or procedures, which for example the ministry of environment and the ministry of health has. This is where the technician spoke clearly, because she rejected that there was no law, rules or procedures, because it is an administrative unit of the government, like any other and thus was subjected to the same laws. There is the law of public management, the budget and other such laws that govern the behavior of the administration. Furthermore, the political debate has made clear the intention of the politicians, and if the specific minister has not given specific command, the administration can still further the goal of the politicians through the expertise they hold. The political uncertainty, she also dismissed, and instead called it a broad definition. Which is why that she, as the deputy minister, need people

in the ministry that are able to fill in the gaps in the broad definition through their professionalism, knowledge and creativity. This is possible, because as opposed to an agency or administrative processing of applications or some sort of classical bureaucratic case work, the ministry receives their mandate from the politicians. More often than not, this mandate is broadly defined. It is then up to the administration to create a more narrowly defined mandate through reliance on what they already know as well as their expertise.

The story of DM3 – the protector

This is the story of the protector, the deputy minister that protects the administrators from political fallout, and the minister from bad administration. This deputy minister's self-understanding is that of the administrator that must give good council to the minister to ensure that the conduct of the minister is lawful and by the books, and also to protect the administration from politicization.

I arrived at the agreed upon time at the DM3s offices, and she was ready for me. Though, this should not indicate that she was less busy than the others, because it took several e-mails, a phone call and a missed appointment to secure this interview. Once again, it is evident just how busy the deputy ministers are. I sat down, and she offered me coffee, which I accepted. I explained my thesis and my area of research, and she was very open and eager to answer questions, because she felt that communication was key and everything she says, she will stand by. She did not ask about the other interviews I had conducted, until after the interview was over. When she did, I sensed that she wanted to know how well she had done compared to the others. I explained that the other deputy ministers had also talked about their dual role between the administration and the political. She had not used the word 'linked' to describe herself, but when I said the others had, she agreed and understood right away what the word meant. Even though she had not used the word to describe herself, she agreed that it was part of her role. So, what did she say when I asked how do she sees her role as leader of the ministry in general? This is the story of the protector.

She starts by separating the political and the administrative and says that she has a part in both places, and thus stands in the middle. In general, she says that it is her role to stand in the middle and connect the political and the administrative. This standing in the middle, is emphasized throughout the interview, by explaining that it is her head that will go if the minister's head goes, so she must stand in the middle to ensure that everything that is given to the minister goes through her, and she can be assured that it is legal, follows the rule and is according to the procedure, but she also explains that it is sometimes necessary to offer political advise. Not advice in the sense

explaining what the minister ought to do, or to promote any political standpoint, but advice in terms of providing analysis of the political consequences of any action or helping the politicians understand the political landscape. This is often necessary with freshman politicians with little experiences in being a minister. I asked if she had any experience when the minister was unclear about what they wanted, and if she would sometime have a difficulty in interpreting the minister. She explained that often that is not how the work is done, because there would be a certain problem or something that requires a decision, rather than the minister giving a task. She will then have a professional and technical solution, sometimes several options, and then the minister will choose. But her point was that there are rarely situations where she does not know the task at hand, because she can always present options for the minister to take. She explains, that she therefore must have a keen awareness of the political landscape as well as follow the developing news closely.

Standing in the middle also means, DM3 explains, that she must ensure that no employee is given directive or put in a position where they would need to say no to the minister or accept an assignment that the DM3 would have given to another more qualified person. It happens sometimes that the minister will personally know an employee in the administration and will conduct themselves without regard to their new position as the political head of their acquaintance's workplace. There is also a risk of the minister given an assignment to an employee without the deputy minister ever being made aware of the assignment, and if something goes wrong, it is not the employee that is at risk, but the deputy minister. That is why she has instructed her employees to just say yes to whatever the minister gives, then afterwards go to their supervisor or herself and explain what has happened and what has been asked of them. However, she also acknowledges that this standing in the middle also puts her in a position to be able to influence the direction of the policy, and she says that is a balancing act to walk the line as a deputy minister to assist the politician in defining the goals and giving the goals. It is the politician's job to give a political direction. In fact, she made this very clear herself as I was about to round out the interview. She wanted to add, that in particularly with freshmen politicians, it is possible for the deputy minister to control which information that is available for the minister, whether regarding on-going cases or possible risks. The minister's, whether freshman politician or new to the ministry, first week is very important in this regard, as it sets the standard for how and when the minister receives the information, and for the deputy minister to see how much information they can comprehend. She has experience with a minister that liked to walk the halls, talk with the employees and generally be very friendly to people working there, and this was a little challenging, because she felt she needed

to attend every meeting the minister was in with administrators, but it was also impractical that she should always follow the minister around. Which is why she has said very clearly to this minister that all communication relating to work must go through her, and she has said so to the employees as well. The friendly banter is acceptable, only in so far that it does not involve any work/assignment or tasks. Which is why she has the general rule that any task given to an employee, the employees will just say yes and make notes, then tell it to their immediate supervisor, as told above. I then asked her about her experience with the Department of Independence, which does not have a case law or anything on which to do the work. She reverted back to her other points, saying that the department should make a strategy for actions based on what they know of the political, and then present that strategy to the minister, so as to create a concrete map for the department, because once the strategy is approved, there would be no more reasons for the employees to talk with the minister. She admitted that she found the purview of the Department of Independence challenging, as she had not followed the news closely. Fortunately, she was seated with a minister with very clear ideas of what needs to be done. In situations where DM3 has little knowledge, she relies on the departmental employees. Meaning, she had them sit with her and the minister to discuss any ongoing cases or challenges that requires action, but they are not allowed to sit alone with the minister, for her and their sake. This is another prove of the protective instinct of DM3, to stand in the middle and shield both the administrative and the political from any danger there might exists, even when she doesn't know where that danger might come from.

The story of DM4 – The dialogos

This is the story of the dialogos, the deputy minister that conducts dialogues with the political and the administrative. This deputy ministers understands herself as the one who talks with the employees in the course of administration, as a way to ensure that the person with the most knowledge of a subject as well as other angles of a subject are covered. This deputy minister's self-understanding is that it is her responsibility that all relevant parties are heard, and that there is a broad dialogue about the issues.

This deputy minister was abroad, so we had agreed to do a telephone interview, and at the agreed upon time I made the call. She picked up and immediately told me that I only have 20 minutes because she was sitting in a meeting. It had taken a few e-mails to find a time where it was possible for both of us to have a conference call. I started to explain the background of my thesis, when she interrupted me to say that she thought I was finished with all that. Meaning, she thought I had finished my studies already. I then explain that it was due to delays in my studies, and I was

supposed to be finished last year. She was joking a little, but also trying to tell me to hurry up and be done with it. I then continued the background of my thesis, and explained that she will be anonymized, and went straight to the first question, because I had so little time. She didn't seem to mind, because she didn't ask me about the other interviews. I should note that the relationship I have with this deputy minister is friendlier than the others, so that the interview is interjected with many inside and personal jokes. For me, it was also the hardest interview to turn into a story, because it took me several false starts to start writing it. She started talking about her role in terms of responsibility, but in the course of the interview, it became clear that it was not that simple. Even though she may not see her role as the one who dialogues, the way she talked about what she does clearly shows that she is much keener on inclusion than the being aware of her holding the sole responsibility. So, here follows the story of the dialogos.

Like the other interviewees, she understands the separation of the political and administrative, when she explains that she has responsibilities both in the political and the administrative. The political is towards the minister, and help the minister in making decisions, setting the goals and the path forward. The administrative includes management, but she talks in length about how much she relies on the employees in creating solutions and solve tasks and assignments. Her reliance is based on the self-insight that she cannot know it all, and therefore needs to place her trust in her employees' expertise and knowledge. She explains that it was her responsibility to ensure that the political ambitions, goals and decisions are carried out and that the administration and the political are in tune with each other. Meaning, that there is a need to connect the administrative to the political, and that she is thus the one with the responsibility that this happens. Sometimes the political ambitions are very clear, but the political does not necessarily have an understanding of the administrative challenges in carrying out the ambitions. There can be limited resources, in terms of pure financial, but also in human and knowledge resources. She gave an example of a very ambitious goal within the purview of the ministry, but she only had two employees for the area and the budget was not in sync with the ambition. This proved a challenge, because she would need to do several things. First, she needs to have a dialogue with the two employees and discuss what is feasible, and in her role as the administrative head, she could draw from the other employees in the ministry, not just from the two. This shows a necessary creativity in the approach to public administration, in that a ministry is split up into departments with each their own purview, but she understands that the individual administrator may have some knowledge or ideas that could create a synergy across departments. She therefore included the rest of the ministry

when there were challenging cases. The second thing she needed to do was go into a dialogue with the minister so that she politically can argue for more funding within the cabinet and in the parliament. The administration can help build arguments, and she can, as the deputy minister, assist with political arguments as well. Because, as with the other interviewees, she understands that part of her job is to advise the politician on political matters, not in a sense of pushing for certain policies, but to provide political analysis. This is a necessary part of the job and is connected to the third thing she must do. She often needs to have a dialogue with other deputy ministers to solve problems and to hear from others in the same position as hers, as well as give administrative arguments for increased budgeting.

When I asked about how she saw her role as leader in terms of Department of Independence, she explained how challenging it was that there were cases where the political was so unclear, that it was not possible to proceed. She said, that even though she made use of administrative tools, such as creating options for the politician to choose from, the political level disagreed so much that none of the options the administration created were chosen. She talked about the dialogues she had with the department, with senior administrators that have had a hand in shaping the memorandums, reports and policies regarding self-government and independence. Furthermore, she had dialogues with me, the head of department and others in the ministry, trying to find a way to untangle the challenges. In general, this was her way of finding a way through a challenging road, where she engages in dialogue with as many as possible. This was based on trust in the employees. It also manifested itself, when she said that sometimes, when a briefing or a case has been cleared with her, she did not need to be in the room to brief the minister. This means that the head of department and/or the employee will brief the minister alone. This is another example of the dialogos, and how much she trusts in the process of dialogue. To her, the best way to ensure the proper progress of political agenda is through dialogue, even when the political agenda is unclear.

The stories of deputy ministers – A tale of leadership (conclusion)

So it became, the end of the stories, the tale of leadership told through four leaders. These are true stories, but each on its own do not tell the whole tale. I have listened to the interviews, over and over again, trying to engage with them, understand the essence of each deputy minister. Not to conclusively tell the specific deputy minister's whole truth, but to discover fore-structures of the role of leadership in the Government of Greenland. Even though, the deputy minister's self-

understanding is expressed individually in a certain way, it is not always the role that they inhabit that they describe. In the process of writing these stories, I have listened to the interviews over and over again, noticing more and more of which words they use, where they put the emphasis as they see their role, listening to what they say and what they leave out. Then using a moniker for each deputy minister as a way to create an anchor, a plot device, a way to write a character, I have fleshed out the different deputy ministers, to show they are all different individuals, but it is not their individuality that is of interests in this thesis, it is their commonalities, their similarities, the experiences that they share, not with each other, but with the role they inhabit.

In fact, as shown throughout the four stories, they all see their role as a sort of in-between the political and the administrative. This is common to all, though the implication varies from DM to DM. To some, it is a zone of danger, to others it is a room for interpretation, but these are merely the things the DMs individually focus on. Each aspect is part of the role of leadership, though the experience of each is different. Now that we have the stories of deputy minister, a full tale of leadership, what will follow is deeper analysis of the role of leadership, through thinking about their stories through theoretical frameworks about leadership and public administration.

Theoretical analysis

These next sections will analyze the role of leadership, through theoretical framework, as well as autoethnographic stories about the lived experience of the exercised leadership. It begins with analysis of the role of deputy minister in the framework of Public Administration theory, then followed by analysis in terms of Labor, Work and Action, and it is in these part that the autoethnographic interjection will appear. Finally, there will be a discussion of the findings, before finishing with a conclusion.

Dichotomy of public administration and politics in Government of Greenland

This sections begins with a short recap of the dichotomy concept. The dichotomy concept of the separation of the administration and public is more as a principle of how administrator ought to be have, namely not be involved in political affairs, and the other side is that politicians ought not to be involved in the administrative affairs. Svava criticize the dichotomy, as it does not describe how politicians and administrators typically interact. Political neutrality and the political-administrator dichotomy are independent, meaning that political-administrator dichotomy does not ensure political neutrality. The political-administrative dichotomy has a long history and is sometimes understood as the complete separation as the principle described above, other times it is understood that the administration are involved in the policy design, but not in partisan politics, causing a confusion as to what the dichotomy actually means.

The deputy minister, when first asked about how they saw the role as leaders of the department, talked about how they are the connection between the administration and the politics. That it is their job to make the will of the politician into reality by relaying the will of the politician to the administrators. At a glance, they see their roles as mere machines that realizes the political. Interestingly, all deputy minister's described their role the same way, where they are the contact person for the minister, and that they are the ones who will interpret the politicians will into action. However, upon further discussion, the dichotomy appears to be an ideal principle, as Svava explained, and the reality of the deputy ministers is much more nuanced. Even though the deputy minister spoke of their role as merely servants to the minister, they also discussed different ways they have influence. One was very aware of how much influence the Deputy Minister has, especially when it a freshman minister. As established earlier, the deputy minister do not expect the ministers to be experts in the ministries purview, so for freshman ministers it means that the deputy minister spends time getting them up to speed, making sure that the minister understand their

responsibilities and brief them on ongoing cases and efforts. It is possible here, according to the DM3, to promote some cases or agendas the deputy ministers feels strongly about, or to neglect areas where the deputy minister is not comfortable. This, DM3 points out, is if the deputy ministers is not doing their jobs. DM3 has made it important that the minister is as well informed as possible, partly because if there is a political fallout, it will be the minister's head as well as the deputy ministers that goes. This means, that sometimes the deputy ministers also act as political advisors, meaning that they council the minister on how the parliament or the media may or may not spin the story, or how it may affect the political career of the politician. This is completely outside the dichotomy of the "administration as machines". Each of the deputy ministers that was interviewed had the same point, even if they were not as explicit as the DM3. DM1 discusses that it is not necessary for the politician to be experts in their purview, because they are elected from the general public, and they cannot be expected to have the specialized knowledge that the administration has. DM1 was implying that it is the responsibility of the administration to be informed and advise the politicians, to be loyal to the minister in terms of providing information. DM2 discusses that the most common situation is that the minister or the parliament gives an assignment that is unclear or not directly actionable, and then it is the administration that defines the assignment more clearly, attempting to give what the minister or parliament wants. The administration must rely on their professional knowledge, which the minister do not have, and it is implied here that the minister merely wishes a product of some sort, and expects the administration to have the knowledge to produce that. DM4 discusses how sometimes the politicians, when both the minister, others in the cabinet and the parliament have a difficulty in making a decision on a specific case, the administration can offer up solutions and in a way make the politicians options fewer, and thus force the politicians to make a decision. So even though each deputy minister started out by discussing their role as a leaders of the ministry in dichotomist terms, throughout the interview, they gave examples of how there is fluidity in their roles, where they are not just machines that makes real the will of the politicians. On the contrary, they discussed what sort of influence they have, and how it is necessary to have that kind of influence, because it is a professional influence and not a political one, meaning that they have the knowledge of the purview of the minister, and they are the ones who know how to solve or give analysis on a given assignment, in ways the minister can't be expected to have.

Labor, Work and Action in Government of Greenland

The previous section was necessary for the purpose of the thesis, meaning that it is part of the process of understanding how the deputy ministers see their role, but the following section is more the focus of the inquiry. This thesis was motivated by the desire to understand how things are the way they are, and this next few pages will illuminate that. It begins with an autoethnographic section, and then goes back and forth between that and Labor vs. Work analysis, before moving into an analysis of Action, which will also have autoethnographic interjections. Then at the end, there will be a discussion of the discoveries before finishing off with the conclusion.

Autoethnographic fore-structure discovery

I have felt a little disillusioned about working in government, because I am such a believer of democracy. When I first began working, it was difficult to figure out what I was supposed to be doing, and how to do it. I thought that I would be doing much more analysis and writing analyses so that the minister would read them and offer up some assignments. I quickly learned that the particular things that I have studied in university, both in Denmark and the U.S., as well as during my activism, were completely unknown to the politicians. How could I write an analysis in such a way that the minister understood what I was talking about? I was disillusioned, because there was such a knowledge gap between the highly educated administration and the politicians. During this research, I came across a footnote in Hannah Arendt's "The Human Condition":

"What the household knows the master knows"

(Arendt, 1998, p.40, footnote)

Itself a quote that Arendt makes of Seneca's remark. She explains that Seneca was remarking on the usefulness of educated slaves to an ignorant master. I was struck by how that resonated with me, and it was in the beginning of this study. I felt like a slave that was more educated and knowledgeable than politicians, but it was useless because what the master knows, the slave knows. I remember almost exactly when that happened, this disillusionment. We were three public servants trying to explain a concept in the working paper of the Greenlandic constitutional commission, and I succinctly explain that concept, and thought it enough. But one of the senior advisors continued to explain to the minister, providing more examples and kept repeating his point using different words. This particular senior advisor at that time had 10+ years of experience in the public administration. I couldn't understand why he kept talking, while thinking to myself that we've made the point pretty clear. However, I realized he was doing it, because he knew that the succinct explanation I gave was

not enough for the politician. I do not know how much or how little others understand, nor am I aware how much of my everyday speech is littered with academic terms and precise descriptions of what things are, which I have acquired over a long education. But the senior advisor was aware, and he knew that he had to continue explaining in length until it was beyond a doubt whether the politician understood the concept. This took 10 more minutes of explanation. At that point, I understood just how esoteric my knowledge actually was, and I was disillusioned, because this was one single concept, and my analysis is full of concepts, and would I have to explain all of them 10 minutes at the time? So, that was my mentality going into this thesis, and I felt really hopeless of a future where my studying and reading was wasted, that all the years of schooling has resulted in frustration. And this feeling continued until very recently, when it changed because of my interviews with the deputy ministers, but also significantly due to an assignment from the minister that I was given through my department head.

I was asked to right an op-ed (opinion editorial) as a response to news about declining population, and the following public debate about why people were moving away from Greenland. I was given broad ideas, relatively unspecific on which messages there were to be presented. It was going to be the minister's op-ed, and it should rebuke the pessimistic debate. From the get go, I felt it was a pretty broad assignment, but with a very concrete end, and since I hadn't directly talked with the minister to more clearly understand which messages he wished to highlight, I looked to his recent political actions. He had struck a broad budget agreement for 2019, where five of the seven parties in parliament had signed on, and it contained some language that I could use in messaging the op-ed. Furthermore, in recent meetings I had attended, there had been a discussion that fewer people were job seekers, meaning unemployment rates were at their lowest. So, the way I learned which messages to focus on, was through the official announcements and statistics as well as political declarations and agreements. I was relying on what I knew and what was publicly and confidentially available. When I finished the first draft, I gave it to my department head, which commented on it and shared it with the other department heads in the ministry, who added with their own information, before giving it to the deputy minister for approval and then finally given to the minister to be read and approved, or commented and amended. By involving the whole ministry, and incorporating the political statements and agreements, I wrote a draft, where the key messages were not changed, but were amended by the rest of the ministry, and the minister approved it without further comments or amendments, except to say that he was quite satisfied. What I discovered here, is that even though the instructions I was given were not entirely clear, there was a

way of discerning what the minister wanted, even if I didn't talk to him. It is possible to ascertain the political by interpreting information other than what the politician has given for the specific assignment. I am using "interpret" literally here, because the message that was shaped in the op-ed, the skeleton of the message is the urging of telling better stories, acknowledging all the work being done by most people in Greenland to contribute to society, this particular message was designed by me, based on an imprecise assignment: Write an op-ed rebuking the pessimistic debate, and especially give a provocative response to the complaints that the Government is not doing enough to welcome the citizens who returned from Denmark after their studies. It was a message shaped based on my experience as the president of the Greenlandic student organization in Denmark, as well as my experience as a Greenlandic student in Denmark that returned to Greenland. I advised against the provocative message to my department head, and instead crafted a more positive message, that challenged and celebrated those who do return and go to work every day. Now, I changed the messaging from provocation to inspiration, and I did that by myself, but the change was accepted. The reason I did it, is because provocation of Greenlandic students, especially the organization of Greenlandic students in Denmark, does not look well, as the organization and the students receive a lot of media attention. They would most likely respond, and they would be less than complimentary to the minister. This happened a few years ago, and that particular minister had to publicly apologize¹. There is an understanding of the influence of administration in policy design and enactment, which I discussed in the Public Administration literature review section, and this is one of the ways that the influences manifests itself, where an assignment with a lot of room of interpretation is completed with the discretion of the individual administrator, namely me, and once the assignment is completed it is presented to the minister for approval. Then the minister can agree or disagree or offer comments. It made me think about other ways I have influence, because I could have written the op-ed differently or I could have focused on other messages. What remains, though, even if I had, even if my personal views and politics had permeated the op-ed, it doesn't mean that I have the ability to make public my personal preferences and override the politicians, because everything is subjected to approval by the minister. Ultimately, whatever I do, needs the minister's sign off before it can be actualized. This is where I have made another discovery of influence, I wrote that op-ed, what if I had decided not to write certain points? Not withhold, but rather it is my discretion as to what information I highlight and include in building an argument.

¹ <https://sermitsiaq.ag/studerende-raser-nivi-olsen>
<https://sermitsiaq.ag/nivi-olsen-undskylder-studielaans-udtalelser>

Now, on this particular assignment, I did do my best to include all the information that supported the overall message, but in theory, I could have “forgotten” to check the numbers on the statistics I used, or not included any statistics at all. This is not only true for me, but for everyone who commented and amended the op-ed in the drafting process. Before it got to the minister’s table, there could be information withheld or added. I didn’t always realize this. In the beginning of my employment, I would ask for more precise instructions, but as time has passed and I learned what the job entails, I have stopped asking for more precise instructions. This was not the first op-ed that I help author, but it was by far the most influence I’ve had on its messaging. So, in the course of writing the Op-Ed, I have found two distinct fore-structures, namely that it is possible to find the meaning of the politicians through other means than discussions with the minister, and that administrators can influence the enactment of political will through filtering of information. What I realized in this process, as well as reflection of my role in this ethnographic paper, is that I am not a slave to a master. Yes, I might know more that the minister on some certain aspects, but that is the design of a public administration. As one of the deputy ministers put it:

“Vi kan ikke forvente at en minister er ekspert på [sagsområde], det er jo folkets repræsentant, og i teorien kan de komme fra gaden.”

Interview with DM1 (The Link) (edited to ensure anonymity)

She was implying that it is the role of the public administration to be the experts and help the ministers. All hope was not lost after all.

Labor vs. work

In the arendtian sense of the work, the deputy minister does her work, meaning she makes the speech of the politician into work. It is the raw material that becomes a result. Opinions and thoughts of the politicians are translated into a sort of “objective reality”, where the only opinion that the deputy minister has is that of the objective opinion. Public administration is a place of “work” in the arendtian sense, in that the process of doing the work is a means to an end, an end that is political, but nonetheless the work is a means to an end.

“To have a definite beginning and a definite, predictable end is the mark of fabrication, ...”

(Arendt, 1998, p. 143)

However, not all assignments in public administration are works, rather labor. Labor is repetitive and doing the same thing to make something for consumption. DM2 (The Technician) actually differentiates between these types of assignments in Government, when she says

“Ethvert arbejde består i at man får meget nøje instruktioner om her er [opgave], udfyld den, og når du har udfyldt den, aflevere til mig, så sætter jeg stempel på og sender den videre til nogle andre. Det er ikke noget der kræver en større flok akademikere, som dem jeg har ansat.”

Interview with DM2 (The Technician) (edited for clarity and anonymity)

She used an example of a type job that exists in the system, which is not the kind of organization where she is the leader. She continued to explain that the type of organization she wants and promotes is a place where the academics she has hired are able to use their heads.

Autoethnographic intertention, not a slave

So, I ended the last part about having hope, and it is here that the hope manifests itself, meaning the hope that I shall not be a slave, nor that I am in fact one. Labor can in theory be done by slaves, and often have. However, work requires mastery, and I am in fact a Master of International Business, and this is a Master's thesis in organization and strategy. In autoethnographic methods, it is possible to use memory, and I have thought back on my nearly two years of work in the Department of Independence, trying to think of examples where I was not merely a laborers, but in fact a worker, *homo faber*, as Arendt calls it (Arendt, 1998). When Vittus Qujaukitsoq became minister, one of the things that he wanted to change was the working paper (kommissorium) of the Greenlandic Constitutional Commission, and I was assigned that task. I wrote a draft based on my knowledge of how institutions are built and analyzed, which I have acquired through my education. I was not told to do this and that in a certain way. It was, in the beginning, up to me. The draft that I wrote, I modelled after the working paper of Self-Government and Home-rule commissions, which had a working paper, and separate document with prerequisites. These were prerequisites for the commission on how they should conduct their work, essentially the framework for how to organize and which areas to focus on. The working paper contained the what, the prerequisites contained the how. Part of the problem with the prior working paper, was there was no agreement on a political level, on how to go about solving the task of writing a draft for a constitution. So I took this model, and wrote the working paper draft, and then drafted a prerequisites document as well. These were then distributed between different department heads and the deputy minister, adding, commenting and re-writing. But the basic structure, of the working paper and the prerequisites document, that

was mine, and in fact, much of the document is also based on my original writing. That was not the labor of a slave, but the work of a *homo faber*.

Labor vs. work continued

The deputy ministers explained how they would translate the political to administrative work, so that they could work it.

“Starte med en eller anden form for dialog med en Naalakkersuisoq²”

Interview with DM2 (The Technician)

DM2 explains that in this dialogue, they would discuss a problem or something that has arisen, and the need to do something about it. Then the deputy minister will find the employees that will be able to come up with a solution, and this solution will then be proposed to the minister. The minister always ultimately makes the decision. But in between the utterance of the need to do something, and until there something to do, the administration is responsible to produce that something.

“Høj grad os selv der er ansvarlig for at sørge for at producere det der skal produceres”

Interview with DM2 (The Technician)

The *homo faber* is known as one that sees everything as means to an end, and the end that is understood here as the will of the politicians. There is some creativity allowed in the process, but it is none the less the employee as a producer of results. The work has no value unless it brings the administration closer to the end, not the end of the world, but the end as in the goal. It is therefore an important part of the Deputy Ministers job to find these ends and goals and purposes, to define them in such a way the *homo fabers* of the administration can produce the desired results. This idea of interpreting, or translating, the wishes of the politicians into assignments and tasks was explained as part of their role by the DMs. The methods they used also were the same, meaning that they would consult with the rest of the ministry, with the employees, in dialogue with the politician and so forth. It is clear now, that *homo faber* is very much the role of the DMs, and it is demonstrated when they were asked about their role as leaders of the Department of Independence. As explained earlier, the Department of Independence does not have a case law as such, and the wish of the politicians has not entirely been clear. The different deputy ministers tackled that challenge

² Naalakkersuisoq is the Greenlandic word for “minister”, also the official name, so in Danish, they are also called “Naalakkersuisoq”.

differently, but they all understood the problem. The politicians did not have a clear purpose of what the role of the Department of Independence should be, they did not have any political decisions that they could translate into concrete goals for the *homo faber* in the administration.

Action in the Government of Greenland

There is a space of potentiality for action between the relationship of the DM and the Minister, when the thoughts of the minister are articulated to the DM such that the DM may act on them. There is a sort of dependency between the two to create a space that allows for the creation of actionable task for the organization. It is merely a potentiality of existence, and it is not given that it will exist, because it relies on the ability of both the DM and to speak their thoughts. At the cross section between the Deputy Minister (DM) and the Minister, there is an opportunity for a vacuum, if the minister does not Act. The DM can ask for further instruction, or compel the minister to act, but it is also a power difference, and a matter of priorities. This vacuum will result in an unfocused assignment, unclear assignment, unclear mission, that causes entropy or apathy, as the employees no longer have enough to do, nor a direction to go, meaning there is no end. When there is no end for which to create the means to reach that end, then the world stops making sense. It is in this section that leadership happens, in the ability of the DM to translate the thoughts of the minister into actionable work. Failing this, then there are no actionable work for the employees. Or perhaps, rather it becomes labor, where it is not planned nor with direction, but in reaction to ongoing events, where it is necessary to each time consult with leadership, through department head, deputy minister and minister, to ensure that the ministry survives. In periods of non-activity upon which to react, the employees are in a waiting position. It is in this space that Action can occur, it is here that those with the authority create the space on which those without authority can Act, act such that they are free, act so that they be able to collaborate, negotiate, and compromise to their conviction, so that they are able to think, to understand, to know their own conviction, so that they have the tools to achieve the ability to understand and think. It is important here to distinguish the "their own" and "their conviction" from the employees personal conviction, and make clear that it is the organization that is the Self in this manner. DM3 (The Protector) expressed it thusly:

“Hvis man er heldig, eller man har en minister som er god til at komme med det her visioner, ideer og klarhed omkring hvad de gerne vil, så vil der komme en dialog fra ministeren til mig.

Modsat kan man have en minister der ikke rigtig ved noget, og som skal læres op og informeres og der vil komme meget faglig input fra mig, måske også politisk rådgivning, og der vil det komme fra

mig til ministeren, eller departementet via mig.”

Interview with DM3 (The Protector)

It is interesting that DM3 (The Protector) uses the word “lucky” to describe that a minister with clear goals, because that highlights that the space between the minister and themselves is sometimes challenging, when she discusses how it is with a minister without a clear understanding of their role.

Auto-ethnographic interjection – Discovery of action

Before continuing, I would like to discuss a little bit about the challenges I feel I have faced in the position as a case officer in the Department of Independence. As explained before, Work is only possible when there is an end. Often there was no clear purpose in the Department of Independence, in terms of something to fabricate. The subject is highly politicized, and as such, being in the administration made it difficult. I am not supposed to be a political actor, but it is was at the same time difficult to find something to do. If I can’t produce analysis, professional opinions, investigate problems or solve problems, the world ceases to have a purpose. Throughout this process of writing a thesis, it has become clear what the problem was, and it is something that I will get into in the analysis. But for the purpose of this interjection, I would like to explain the discoveries I made in the process of reading and contemplating Action. I wish that I had known this earlier in my employment, because what I discovered was that it was possible to create Action, even without politicians. This is a discovery that I have brought with me to my new position in the Department of Foreign Affairs. During the writing of the thesis I have changed jobs, but what is interesting is that I am now working closely with one of the deputy ministers, and this thesis have contributed to my ability to do my job in a very concrete manner, namely that I have understood that it is possible for the administration to Act. The previous section discusses the feeling of entropy because there is no purpose, which is what happens to the *homo faber* when the world ceases to have meaning. What I had not understood about working in the Government of Greenland until I interviewed the deputy ministers, is that it IS possible to Act even as an administrator. Even though Contemplation is the purview of the politicians, it is also important to understand that it is not necessary to be a politician to Act, because there is the other side of Contemplation. The contemplation of the spectator to events and Actions. Which means I can contemplate the political landscape without being a politicians. When acting is connected to natality, of beginnings, as a way to show oneself in the World, not just as a master of Works, but as a Creator of something, then I truly can act. I thought that being a *homo faber* was the role of the administration. What I understand now, is that the deputy minister stand in between the political and administrative, meaning that if I have an idea I

can write it up, and propose it to the deputy minister and they can then give it to the minister for authorization. Public administration are per definition a group of people that have come together for a common goal. According to Arendt, this is also where there is a potentiality of space of appearance. I have to be honest, and say that I may have already been aware of the potentiality, and have actually attempted to Act in terms of the Department of Independence, however, as I said before, independence is such a politicized subject that it was dangerous, in the sense that one's appearance may result in accusations of administrative overreach into the political. Despite this danger, I did present ideas and speeches to the minister as well as to the department head and deputy minister, where the reaction was often non-reaction or lack of understanding of what I was talking about. An example, is when I presented to the minister a paper that I wrote about the Greenlandic word for the Government of Greenland "Naalakkersuisut", which literally means: *Those who give commands*, and my point was that it was an inaccurate translation of the word *Minister*, which etymologically comes from "*servant*" (Kirkegaard, 2017).

Action continued

The lack of Action from the minister is challenging for the ministry, especially for the Deputy Minister, because it is the nature of the public administration to be a place of Action. What the deputy minister's fear of Action, is that it is unpredictable and irreversible. They are also weary of Acting because it is exercise of power, and all the deputy minister in the interviews talked about how the Minister is a representation of the people, who hold the power. They understand the potential for appearance, and they take very good care not to appear, and do what they can to protect themselves as well as the administration from public outrage, which might cost them their job. One DM explained it thusly:

"Det er mit hoved der rydder, hvis ministerens hoved også rydder."

DM3 (The Protector)

However, some of the DMs acknowledged that it is not always political intentions and discussion that initiate the administration. It is possible for the administration to create something new, either a new law, a new procedure or something like that, within the context of the Public Administration. In a way, this is in conversation with the political, conversation not in person to person dialogue, but in response to Actions emanating from Parliament, public debate or the Cabinet. This is what was discussed under Work, as well, where if there is a decision to be a strategy for childhood obesity, there is no clear definition given by the politicians. Despite this, it is not a given that the

proposed strategy is Action, if the administration merely finds a recommendations and such from World Health Organization and other places. If this is the approach, it is the *homo faber* looking at the world for recommendations, reports and others as means to an end, namely the strategy. If on the other hand, the administration decides to set up a brain storming session between different departments and employees, then they have created a *polis* and are engaged in Action, where they are exchanged speech and deeds. This is also where that Contemplation finds its place in the administration, because it is possible for the administration to contemplate, and make judgment. An administration without this aspect would simply be an administration of laborers and workers, doing what they are told. But some DMs encourage Action, as part of the organization. They have put in checks to protect themselves, in that the employees must make up proposals that are subject to approval by the DM, or even the Minister. DM2 (The Technician) explains it thusly:

“De skal have lov at bruge deres hoved, for det er faktisk det jeg har ansat dem til... derfor er det også min opgave at sørge for at de har et miljø omkring sig hvor de rent faktisk har lyst til at bruge deres hoved 8 timer om dagen.”

DM2 (The Technician)

DM3 (The Protector) explained that she follows the news closely and have a keen awareness of the developing political landscape, and will often responds to events by offering up solutions, actions and other things that might be re-actions to events. This is another part of Action, the Re-Action, where one acts based on the action of others, either in concert or in opposition. The proposed solutions would often be subjected to approval by the Minister. DM1 (The Link) also emphasized the need to follow the news with the purpose of understanding the minister, and what may need to be done. DM4 (The Dialogos) also discussed how she engages in dialogue with other administrator, both employees and other deputy ministers, in finding solution for difficult challenges, which in itself is the engagement of action in the space of appearance. DM 4 (The Dialogos) explains:

“Det var nogle politiske ønsker, og der havde vi hverken administrative eller økonomiske resurser... så må man jo prøve at se hvad der er muligt og snakke med andre departementer.”

DM 4 (The Dialogos) (*edited for clarity*)

All the different deputy minister makes use of the space of appearance in finding solutions to some degree, and it is therefore quite clear that Action is indeed possible within the administration, though it might be more technical or professional in terms of the opinions uttered than the Action of the politician, it is Action nonetheless.

Discussion

The inquiry in this thesis was brought about by the author's frustration in working in the Government of Greenland, where there were questions about leadership and its consequences, and that led to the research question of how leadership is exercised in the Government of Greenland. In the leadership review, it was stated that the leadership research has moved from leader centric to more relational, discursive and practice based. Using Arendt's concepts of Labor, Work, and especially Action, this thesis has shown that leadership exercised in the Government of Greenland is very much relational, as DM1 (The Link) and subsequent interviews showed that the role of Deputy Ministers is very much to be the link between the political and administrative. It is inherent in the concept of Action, that there is a need for equality, which is in opposition to most dominant view of the leader in the mainstream leadership discourse (Wilson, 2016). Both DM2 (The Technician) and DM4 (The Dialogos) discuss the need for dialogue with employees, aside from the politicians and other deputy minister, in finding solutions or options. In essence they create a space of appearance, meaning that they acknowledge that they are equal, even though they hold the authority. It is also expressed by DM3 (The Protector) when she discussed how she brings in employees in meetings with the Minister, when the subject matter is outside her area of expertise. In terms of Labor, the leadership view their role as ensuring that what needs to be done is done for the survival of the administration and the political. DM2 (The Technician) used an example of a Work, when parliament passes a law or gives a commandment to the Government, where it is quite clear what needs to be done, she merely ensures that it is put in a process and the order is carried out in procedural manner. It was also DM2 (The Technician) that gave an example of Labor, namely that of doing payroll as well as other traditional bureaucratic work. Both Labor and Work could be considered the ideal situation between the public administration and the politics, where the administration merely functions as an apolitical machine that carries out the will of the people, meaning the political-administrator dichotomy. But as demonstrated by Svava, Jenkins & Gray and Miller & McTavish, the administration does have influence on the political, though it is often a non-party political influence. This finding is supported by the analysis using Arendt's concept of Action, where there is a potentiality of the space of appearance whenever people gather, and demonstrated through the analysis of the stories of the deputy ministers. The autoethnographic interjections also show what Arendt talked about, when she discusses that a person without the ability to act, is not a human, at least not a full one. Because in the interjection in the section of Labor vs. Work, the author discuss the sense of entropy, and the realization that there is no meaning if there is no end.

What is discovered throughout the process of this thesis is the space of appearance, and the realization of the possibilities to Act within the Government of Greenland. However, throughout the interviews, the stories that were told, they acknowledged the possibility of action, but it was not always something that is understood by the employees, at least it takes some time. The Department of Independence have shown how dangerous the space can be, if it is a subject-matter that is highly politicized, where it might not be easy to appear through speech and deeds, without also showing one's party-political allegiance. As Arendt also explained, the space of appearance is not a constant existence, but must be created again and again through Actions. That is the way the leadership is exercised in the Government of Greenland, where it is not a constant existence, but must be exercised in concert with the ministry, other ministries and the minister. By using Arendt to analyze leadership, this thesis have demonstrated that leadership is relational, because when there is an unclear direction, it is not the Deputy Minister's that sets the direction. They go into conversations with other deputy ministers, employees as well as the public at large, namely discussions in parliament, follow the news and other available documents, such as coalition agreements and other political agreements. Here, conversation is understood in the arendtian sense, that it is speeches and appearance in the *polis*. This conversation is not personally conducted by the deputy minister, the minister or the individual employee, but rather as the sum of these three. The deputy minister is the administrative head of the ministry, and the minister is the political head, and each employees is part of the ministry. It is the ministry as whole that conducts the conversation with the public at large, be it the parliament, other ministries and the media. The speeches of the ministry are the results of the individual acts of the minister, deputy ministry and the employees acting in concert for the common meaning.

Conclusion

Through Hannah Arendt's concepts of Labor, Work and Action, this thesis has shown that leadership in the Government of Greenland is exercised relationally, where it is not centered on the leader, but where the leader relies on the employees and others to direct the organization. The interviewed deputy ministers storied their leadership very much in relational terms, where all started by relaying how they see themselves as being in-between the political and the administrative. Even though they began their stories by putting themselves in the political-administrator dichotomy, the continued story as well as the analysis showed that they have influence in the political as well. In fact, several of the deputy ministers viewed political counseling as part of their role. Not in terms of given party political advice, but to provide an analysis of the political landscape and how the action of the minister and the ministry might impact the ministers standing in the political landscape.

By using the hermeneutic circle to move back and forth between the interviews, the leadership stories as well as the autoethnographic accounts, this thesis has discovered the fore-structures of working in the Government of Greenland, namely that it is possible to Act, in the arendtian sense. This possibility is created through the way that the administration is organized. Fore-structures are the structures that are not subjective, and this thesis has shown that dialogue, technical knowledge and the political are interlinked, which is necessary to attend to the work. The ability to Act is the ability to begin something new, to start something from nothing, where it is possible to see that it is not a fabrication, where it is possible to identify an author. Identify not in terms of name, but in terms of individuality and not mass production. The Action, the appearance in the polis, the space of appearance that is always possible whenever people gather, is often the concerted action of the whole ministry, and it is therefore possible to identify the ministry, but not the individual actors within the ministry. Leadership is therefore not statically exercised by the deputy minister, in initiating the concerted actions, but often leadership itself is also created in concert with the actors. Leadership is not solitary. The direction of the organization it set, not by the nominative leader, but in concert and conversation with the organization.

Acknowledgments

The process of writing this thesis has been more fun, more interesting and less excruciating because my supervisor, Kenneth Mølbjerg Jørgensen, allowed me to experiment. The experimentation was necessary, because as a person on the autism spectrum, it can be very challenging to wrap my head around writing academically. I love to write, and I love to write stories, which is an entirely different discipline than academic writing. Furthermore, Kenneth has guided my philosophical thinking of leadership, as well as proposing literature, told me to move on when I am stuck, and generally been patient and generous with his time and advice. I feel it important, that I express my gratitude towards Kenneth in writing, because it can be challenging to convey emotions for me. Over the years as a student, many supervisors have crossed my path, and Kenneth is the only one that I have requested to be my supervisor again. For four semesters, he has been my supervisor. Usually I have changed supervisors every semester, because they have never been good at guiding me, but Kenneth has been more than accommodating and taken care to understand the challenges I have. Even before he knew I was on the autism spectrum, he encouraged me to write in whatever way that resulted in me producing pages. So, Kenneth, thank you, I could literally not have written this thesis without you.

I would also like to thank my former head of department, Natuk Lund Olsen, who has allowed me to spend time during my work hours on my thesis and my education in general. Natuk has been immensely generous and supportive of my process. For that I owe her many thanks.

Even though I am deeply grateful that I have been able to study while working, I am looking forward to have nothing to do on the weekends.

I would also like to extend a thanks to many friends on whom I have cancelled many plans, so that I could write this thesis. I am grateful that you have understood and remained my friends.

Finally, I would like to thank all the deputy ministers who allowed themselves to be interviewed. You all know who you are.

Bibliography

- Anderson, L. (2006, August). Analytic Autoethnography. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*(4), pp. 373-395.
- Anderson, L., & Glass-Coffin, B. (2016). Learn By Going. In S. Holman Jones, T. Adams, & C. Ellis, *Handbook of Autoethnography* (pp. 57-83). Routledge.
- Arendt, H. (1978). *The life of the mind*. Harcourt, INC.
- Arendt, H. (1998). *The Human Condition*. London: University of Chicago Press Ltd., London.
- Bello, B., & Spano, A. (2015). Governing the purple zone: How politicians influence public. *European Management Journal*, pp. 354-365.
- Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1991). *The Social Construction of Reality* . Penguin Books.
- Bhaskar, R. (1998). Philosophy and Scientific Realism. In M. Archer, R. Bhaskar, A. Collier, T. Lawson, & A. Norrie, *Critical Realism* (pp. 16-47).
- Bryman, A. (2004). *Social Research Methods*. Oxford University Press.
- Crowther, S., Ironside, P., Spence, D., & Smythe, L. (2017). Crafting Stories in Hermeneutic Phenomenology Research: A Methodological Device. *Qualitative Health Research*, 27(6), pp. 826-835.
- Fontana, A., & McGinnis, T. A. (2015). ETHNOGRAPHY SINCE POSTMODERNISM. In *Studies in Symbolic Interaction* (pp. 215-234). Emerald Group.
- Fontana, A., & Prokos, A. H. (2016). *The Interview : From Formal to Postmodern*, Routledge. New York: Routledge.
- Freeman, R., & Auster, E. (2011, September). Values, Authenticity, and Responsible Leadership. *Journal of Business Ethics*(98), pp. 15-23.
- Government of Greenland- HR-PAU. (2017, March). Situationsbestemt ledelse. Nuuk, Grønland: Nanuaraq - intranet. Retrieved from <https://nanuaraq.naalakkersuisut.gl/da/Kurser/Arkiv-over-kurser/2017/03/Situationsbestemt-ledelse>
- Grandy, G., & Sliwa, M. (2017). Contemplative Leadership: The Possibilities of Ethics of Leadership Theory and Practice. *Journal of Business Ethics*(143), pp. 423-440.
- Groves, K., & LaRocca, M. (2011). Responsible Leadership Outcomes Via Stakeholder CSR Values: Testing a Values-Centered Model of Transformational Leadership. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 1, pp. 37-55.
- Grønlands Selvstyre. (2016). *Redegørelse for nedsættelse af en grønlandsk forfatningskommission*.
- Grønlands Selvstyre. (n.d.). *Naalakkersuisut.gl*. Retrieved 02 24, 2019, from <https://naalakkersuisut.gl/da/Naalakkersuisut/Departementer/Raastoffer-og-Arbejdsmarked/Selvstaendighed>

- Grønlands Selvstyre. (n.d.). *Naalakkersuisut.gl*. Retrieved 02 24, 2019, from <https://naalakkersuisut.gl/da/Naalakkersuisut/Selvstyre>
- Grønlands-Dansk Selvstyrekommission. (2008). Grønlands-Dansk Selvstyrekommissions betænkning om selvstyre i Grønland. Grønlands-Dansk Selvstyrekommission.
- Heil, D. (2010, Spring). Understanding and Leading Organizations - A Hermeneutic phenomenological investigation. *Philosophy Today*(54), pp. 7-17.
- Holt, N. L. (2003, Winter). Representation, Legitimation, and Autoethnography: An Autoethnographic Writing Story. *International Journal of Qualitative Method*(1).
- Jacobsen, D. I. (2006). PUBLIC SECTOR GROWTH: COMPARING. *Public Administration*(1), pp. 185-204.
- Jenkins, B., & Gray, A. (1983). Bureaucratic Politics and Power: Developments in the study of Bureaucracy. *Political Studies*, pp. 177-193.
- King, S. (2000). *On writing*.
- Kirkegaard, H. P. (2017, January 25). *Aqago*. Retrieved from www.aqago.org: <https://www.aqago.org/viden/naalakkersuisut>
- Krantz, J. (1990). Lessons from the Field: An Essay on the Crisis of Leadership in Contemporary Organizations. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*(1), pp. 49-64.
- Laverty, S. M. (2003). Hermeneutic Phenomenology and Phenomenology: A Comparison of Historical and Methodological Considerations. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 3(2), pp. 21-35.
- Levine, P., & Boaks, J. (2014). What does Ethics have to do with Leadership? *Journal of Business Ethics*, pp. 225-242.
- Löwenheim, O. (2010). The "I" in IR: an autoethnographic account. *Review of International Studies*, pp. 1023-1045.
- Miller, K., & McTavish, D. (2012, February). Electoral and Political Changes: the Impact on Political Bureaucratic Relationships in Scottish Government. *Local Government Studies*(1), pp. 113-129.
- Oates, S. B. (1994). *Let the Trumpet Sound: A Life of Martin Luther King, Jr.* . New York: HarperCollins Publishers Inc. .
- Sermitsiaq.AG. (2017, 06 06). *Sermitsiaq.AG*. Retrieved 02 24, 2019, from <https://sermitsiaq.ag/ingen-plan-folkeafstemning-forfatning>
- Skubinn, R., & Herzog, L. (2016). Internalized Moral Identity in Ethical Leadership. *Journal of Business Ethics*, pp. 249-260.
- Svara, J. H. (2001, Mar-Apr). The Myth of the Dichotomy: Complementary Politics and Administration in the Past and Future of Public Administration. *Public Administration Review*(2), pp. 176-183.

Svara, J. H. (2006). Complexity in Political-Administrative Relations and the Limits of the Dichotomy Concept. *Administrative Theory and Praxis*(1), pp. 121-139.

Tolstoy, L. (1908). *A Letter to A Hindu* .

Wilson, S. (2013). Situated Knowledge: A Foucauldian reading of ancient and modern classics of leadership thought. *Leadership*, 1(9), pp. 43-61.

Wilson, S. (2016). *Thinking Differently about Leadership*. Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.