

Adult Education Quarterly

<http://aeq.sagepub.com>

What Do You Mean By "Authentic"? A Comparative Review of the Literature On Conceptions of Authenticity in Teaching

Carolin Kreber, Monika Klampfleitner, Velda McCune, Sian Bayne and Miesbeth Knottenbelt

Adult Education Quarterly 2007; 58; 22

DOI: 10.1177/0741713607305939

The online version of this article can be found at:
<http://aeq.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/58/1/22>

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

On behalf of:



[American Association for Adult and Continuing Education](#)

Additional services and information for *Adult Education Quarterly* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://aeq.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://aeq.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

Citations <http://aeq.sagepub.com/cgi/content/refs/58/1/22>

WHAT DO YOU MEAN BY “AUTHENTIC”?

A COMPARATIVE REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE ON CONCEPTIONS OF AUTHENTICITY IN TEACHING

CAROLIN KREBER
MONIKA KLAMPFLEITNER
VELDA McCUNE
SIAN BAYNE
MIESBETH KNOTTENBELT

University of Edinburgh

“Authenticity in teaching” has been recognized as an important yet under-researched phenomenon. To gain greater insight into the meaning of authenticity in teaching in adult and higher education settings, the authors delved into some of the philosophical and educational literature on authenticity, giving particular attention, but not confining their review, to the work of Taylor, Heidegger, and Noddings. This study is one of “making sense of authenticity in teaching” in light of the conceptions of authenticity underlying the reviewed texts. Authenticity in teaching emerged as a multidimensional phenomenon, and the findings are presented in the form of multiple features associated with it. Inspired by Taylor’s concept of horizons of significance and Palmer’s notion of the subject-centered classroom, the authors further propose that one dimension of authenticity in teaching relates to educators’ care for the subject matter and thus engaging students in genuine dialogue around ideas that matter.

Keywords: *authenticity; teaching; higher education; negotiation of meaning*

Our team has been involved in a comprehensive research project exploring the various contextual, personal, and disciplinary factors shaping the construction of

CAROLIN KREBER, PhD, is a professor in the Department of Higher and Community Education at the University of Edinburgh, where she is also director of the Centre for Teaching, Learning and Assessment. Her present funded research examines variation in the construction of teacher identities in higher education, the role of authenticity in teaching, and linkages to student capabilities associated with self-authorship.

MONIKA KLAMPFLEITNER is advisor (education) to the vice-chancellor of Chemnitz University of Technology (Germany). Previously, she was research associate in the Department of Higher and Community Education, University of Edinburgh, exploring authenticity within the project “Achieving Successful Graduate Outcomes.”

ADULT EDUCATION QUARTERLY, Vol. 58 No. 1, November 2007 22-43

DOI: 10.1177/0741713607305939

© 2007 American Association for Adult and Continuing Education

teacher identities of educators in research-intensive universities and the links between these teacher identities and the student learning experience in undergraduate courses in law, physics, and English literature. As part of this larger study, we also ventured into under-explored territory by seeking to further uncover the meaning of what we see as a subtheme of teacher identities, namely that of “teacher authenticity” (also see Cranton & Carusetta, 2004a, 2004b). The latter we explored from the perspective of educators, students, and the relevant literature. We decided to report the authenticity part of our larger research project in three separate studies that, ideally, are read in parallel. Although this first article focuses on different “conceptions of authenticity” as found in the relevant educational and philosophical literature, another compares university educators’ and learners’ conceptions of authenticity to those expressed in this literature and a third one explores both the extent to which educators participating in our study showed signs of authenticity and the possible links between authenticity in teaching and student learning.

Our research team is culturally diverse, comprised as it is of individuals of English, Scottish, German, Dutch, and German-Canadian (North American) backgrounds and work experience. Although the philosophical literature on authenticity largely reflects a European tradition, the recent educational literature on “authenticity in teaching” is almost exclusively North American and this *may* bring with it different perceptions across North American and European (and possibly other) cultures as to the utility or value of “authenticity” with regard to better understanding teaching and learning phenomena. Early on in our team meetings, it became transparent that not everyone on the research team shared the same understanding of “authenticity” and perhaps more crucially, there was no consensus regarding the perceived significance of authenticity as an important concept in teaching and learning. “Authenticity in teaching,” we realized, is clearly not an uncontested topic of study (a statement with which the postmodernists among our readers will readily agree)!

With the goal of helping our team reach a deeper and, so we hoped, “common” understanding of the very concept we had set out to explore with educators on our campus, we shared amongst ourselves articles and books on “authenticity.” However, soon after we started reading and discussing the work of different

VELDA McCUNE, PhD, is a lecturer in the Centre for Teaching, Learning and Assessment at the University of Edinburgh. Her research interests focus on students’ and teachers’ perspectives on learning in higher education.

SIAN BAYNE, PhD, is a lecturer in the Department of Higher and Community Education at the University of Edinburgh. She teaches and researches primarily in the area of online learning and the impact of the digital on teaching and learning practice and discourse in higher education.

MIESBETH KNOTTENBELT, PhD, is a development officer in the Centre for Teaching, Learning and Assessment at the University of Edinburgh. Her research interests focus on the experience of postgraduate students in their development as teachers in higher education.

authors, we noticed that the conceptions of authenticity underlying these texts were varied and that there was no single definition of authenticity in the literature. “What shall we tell our participating university teachers in case they cannot relate to the idea of ‘authenticity’ and ask us what we mean by it in this study?” and “Should we offer a definition of ‘authenticity,’ if so which one?” were other sensible questions raised in these early team meetings. Although we eventually agreed that it would be far more interesting to learn from university educators what authenticity meant for them and whether, and if so how, they felt it was significant to their work, we also realized that it would be crucial to ultimately be able to compare their personal conceptions to some formal conceptions found in the existing literature. To fully appreciate the intent of this present article, it is important to be aware of how our thinking on the issue has evolved. Talking about authenticity with educators who already believe that it is important to their work (e.g., Cranton & Carusetta, 2004a, 2004b; Tisdell, 2003), let alone those who have come across some of the related literature, is perhaps a somewhat more straight-forward process than introducing the notion of “authenticity” to educators who may not yet have thought about it at all.

A major purpose of the study then was to advance conceptual understanding of *authenticity in teaching*. This theoretical purpose was rooted in the very practical problem that the concept did not appear to make intuitive sense to everyone on the team, let alone other academics we had interviewed in a pilot study. Some readers may view this purpose rather skeptically, arguing that what is really needed are *practical guidelines* for how to promote authenticity, not theoretical analysis! We provide an initial reaction below.

Recent North American literature in adult and higher education has attached value to authenticity and highlighted the significance of authenticity in teaching. “Authenticity” is seen, for example, to make individuals more whole, more integrated, more fully human, more aware, more content with their personal and professional lives, their actions more clearly linked to purpose, “empowered,” better able to engage in community with others, and so forth. Given that our world has been characterized, on one hand, by “supercomplexity” (Barnett, 2000) and, on the other hand, by what bell hooks (2003) perceives as “the hegemony of imperialist White-supremacist capitalist patriarchal thinking,” one may argue that it is vital for universities and colleges to engage students with an education that allows them to acquire a sense of “being” from which to question and oppose oppression and discrimination in our society as well as make other meaningful contributions with regards to civic responsibility, increasingly complex work contexts and their

AUTHORS’ NOTE: The authors extend special thanks to Shelley Sikora, Grant MacEwan College, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada, for her helpful comments on earlier drafts of this article. We also would like to thank the three anonymous reviewers and the editors of *Adult Education Quarterly* for their valuable comments. The study was funded through a grant from the Higher Education Academy Research and Evaluation Scheme, York, United Kingdom.

personal lives. A central assumption running through some of the literature is that if authenticity were adopted as a worthwhile goal with respect to learners (as, for example, Baxter Magolda's [1999] writing on student self-authorship or Freire's [1971] work on "conscientization" would suggest), it would be critical that educators be authentic themselves. Interestingly, authenticity, as Palmer (1998) argues, also plays a role in the teaching of regular course content. So on one level, "authenticity" is understood as being somehow associated with a sense of empowerment, self-actualization, and individuation, and as such, linked to larger questions of human existence and agency in the world. On a second level, authenticity, on the part of teachers, is seen to also promote student learning in traditional subjects such as English literature, law, or physics (or, if you will, women studies, adult education, or the arts). Clearly then, authenticity appears to have been recognized as a significant construct with respect to learning *and* development and teachers *and* students. However, as long as authenticity remains only vaguely understood and ill defined, which we suggest is the case at present, it is, in a strict sense, not feasible to articulate a persuasive rationale for why we should be concerned with the phenomenon in the first place. Moreover, it is awkward to talk about it with those who have not yet encountered this idea in either the literature they read or in discussions with colleagues; it is impossible to really critically reflect on its meaning let alone fully understands its implications; and, perhaps most importantly, it is difficult to create environments that might encourage greater authenticity among teachers (and learners).

With the purpose of advancing conceptual understanding of authenticity in teaching, we carried out a comparative review of some of the philosophical and educational literature on "authenticity." We read widely moving from the educational literature directly concerned with "teacher authenticity" (e.g., Chickering, Dalton, & Stamm, 2006; Cranton, 2001, 2006; Dirkx, 2006; Grimmet & Neufeld, 1994; Palmer, 1998; Rogers, 1983; Tisdell, 2003), to literature discussing the process of human development toward self-authorship through dialogue, relations, and critical self-reflection (e.g., Baxter Magolda, 2001; Freire, 1971; Kegan, 1994), to the wider philosophical literature including scholars such as Rousseau, Kierkegaard, Nietzsche, Buber, Sartre, and eventually, the work of Heidegger, Adorno, and Taylor. This latter literature initially proved more frustrating than productive given the multiple interpretations and nuances inherent in the conceptions of authenticity found there in and by the fact that, apart from a cursory introduction to some of these ideas during under- or postgraduate studies, none of us had a firm grounding in existentialist philosophy let alone the unique phenomenology (or *fundamental ontology*) of Martin Heidegger. After an adventurous expedition into the jungle of works such as "*Being and Time*," we became acutely aware that we needed to keep in mind the concrete purpose of our study and explore the philosophical texts we were reading for their relevance for understanding authenticity in relation to *adult and higher education*, and to undergraduate teaching and learning in particular. Eventually,

we decided to offer an overview of the wider literature on authenticity as a contribution to the field of adult and higher education, but at the same time concentrate on a few key points in the works of Charles Taylor (1991), Martin Heidegger (as discussed in Zimmerman, 1986), and educational philosopher Nel Noddings (2003) as these proved particularly relevant in helping us to define what “authenticity in teaching” might mean.

Given our own Whiteness, plus the fact that the literature on authenticity we ended up reviewing is almost exclusively White, we recognize the predominantly White Eurocentric nature of the discussion that follows. We add, however, that this is also a reflection of the literature on authenticity in general. Because we were primarily interested in identifying and comparing underlying conceptions of the term “authenticity” as used by different authors, and only secondarily in finding out whether popular texts in adult and higher education may indirectly address certain dimensions of authenticity (which, undoubtedly, many of them do), we deliberately focused on literature that uses the term “authenticity” *explicitly* (or had been widely recognized as being about “authenticity,” for example Carl Rogers’s now classic work on “congruence,” or Palmer’s writing on “integrity”). It is for this reason that we did not include a thorough review of the evolving literature on spirituality in education, unless the author or authors related spirituality directly to “authenticity.”

AUTHENTICITY IN THE LITERATURE

For purposes of organization, we’ve divided the discussion of the literature on authenticity into nine primary areas related to defining authenticity, its relationship to identity, and to teaching. These are discussed below.

Identity, Authenticity, Authentic Identity, or Spirituality?

When reviewing the literature on “authenticity,” it immediately becomes apparent that the terms authenticity and identity are employed in different ways by different scholars. Some tend to use them interchangeably, whereas others explicitly distinguish the two. Cranton (2001), for example, suggests that finding one’s identity means to become more authentic, whereas Tisdell (1998, 2003) would argue that it is possible to have assumed an identity that is *inauthentic* or at least not one’s own (as in *unauthentic*), and the challenge is to move toward a more *authentic identity*. This latter view would be shared by Erich Fromm (1969), who maintained that our attitudes, feelings, and desires are usually learned from others and we define ourselves (or construct our identities) according to the recognition we then gain from these others. Though concerned with the same phenomenon, Palmer (1998), in his book *The Courage to Teach*, never uses the word *authenticity* but instead speaks of identity (or selfhood) and *integrity*. By the latter he means “that I discern what is integral to my selfhood, what fits and what

does not It means becoming more real by acknowledging the whole of who I am” (p. 13). Palmer (1998), Tisdell (2003), and Chickering et al. (2006), explicitly link authenticity to another ill-defined term, that is, “spirituality.” Tisdell (2003), for example, suggests that moving toward a more authentic identity or self is part of what constitutes spiritual development. These latter scholars criticize the heavy emphasis on rational empiricism in higher education and call for colleges and universities to engage not only the rational mind but also the “hearts and spirits” of educators and students (similar views have been expressed by Dillard, 2006; hooks, 2003). The authors referenced in this section would likely not disagree with each other on the essential features of authenticity but, still, the language they employ in describing the concept is variegated.

Existing Definitions of Authenticity in Relation to Teaching

Cranton and Carusetta (2004b) described authenticity in university teaching as an under-researched field. Their empirical work on the emergence of authenticity grounded in the Jungian notion of individuation (Jung, 1973) showed a general pattern of beginning university educators being primarily in the early stages of developing authenticity and experienced educators in later stages. They conclude that authentic university educators show consistency between values and actions (also see Chickering et al., 2006), relate to others in ways that encourage their authenticity, and engage in critical reflection on teaching practice. This understanding matches and extends earlier perspectives offered by Jarvis (1992) and Brookfield (1990). The authors define authenticity in teaching as a process of “being conscious of self, other, relationships, and context through critical reflection” (Cranton & Carusetta, 2004a, p. 288). Their definition is compatible with much of the literature we reviewed but at the same time perhaps does not bring to the fore certain qualities that some philosophers deem important in describing authenticity.

Tisdell (2003) views authenticity as “having a sense that one is operating from a sense of self that is defined by oneself as opposed to being defined by other people’s expectations” (p. 32). Similarly, Cranton (2001) sees authenticity as the “expression of one’s genuine Self in the community and society” (p. iiix), and an authentic teacher as someone who merges self and teacher, brings him or herself into the teaching or into the relationships with students. Although Carl Rogers (1983) in his discussion of teacher characteristics that promote student learning employed the terms “trustworthiness,” “genuineness,” “realness” and “congruence,” rather than authenticity, his concern with “being truly myself with them [students]” (p. 25) seems to be particularly reflected in Cranton’s statement. Chickering et al. (2006) espouse largely the same definition. They suggest that to foster authenticity in higher education, it is important for teachers to be authentic themselves, this in turn involves being as candid as possible about their beliefs, values, and prejudices. However, Chickering and his colleagues explicitly

acknowledge that authenticity can carry a negative value. This view is supported by British philosopher Bernard Williams (2004) who, commenting on Rousseau's link between sincerity, authenticity, and virtue, asks, "If there is such a thing as a real self of an individual, what reason is there to think that it must coincide with an underlying character of honour, considerateness and compassion?" (p. 182). Likewise, literary critic Lionel Trilling (1972/2006) argued that sincerity and authenticity were not the same, suggesting that sincerity would refer to the virtue of the "free declaration of belief," whereas authenticity would refer to being honest with oneself and as such link sincerity with a quest of confronting the truth. Evoking memories of people who were "authentically evil," Chickering et al. make clear that the form of authenticity they have in mind with regard to teachers and students is one that is kind, caring, and responsible. A similar point is made by Baggini (2005) who distinguishes between authenticity as aspiring to live life truthfully and authenticity as living a moral life; the latter notion, as will be seen later, was taken up most explicitly by Canadian philosopher Charles Taylor.

Moving Toward Greater Authenticity Through Transformative Learning

Within recent North American literature, the notion of "authenticity in teaching" has been discussed, as was seen, from the perspective of "spirituality" (e.g., Chickering et al., 2006; Dillard, 2006; hooks, 2003; Tisdell, 2003) but also the perspective of "transformative learning theory." As for the latter, two vantage points can be distinguished. On one hand, authenticity in teaching has been linked to transformative learning theory grounded in Carl Jung's notion of individuation (e.g., Boyd & Myers, 1988); on the other hand, it has been linked to an interpretation of transformative learning theory that, although not denying the first perspective, tends to emphasize cognitive and rational processes related to critical reflection on assumption, values, and beliefs (e.g., Mezirow, 1981, 1991, 2000). In his 1991 book, Mezirow argued that Boyd's perspective would complement his own views "by placing an important emphasis on the significance of presentational awareness and the centrality of the self in transformative learning" (p. 167). However, Mezirow's articulation of transformation learning theory was heavily influenced by critical social theory's concern with a critique of ideology and the development of a critical consciousness, notions we will explore later in discussing Adorno's critique of Heidegger's view on authenticity.

In both interpretations, however, moving toward greater authenticity in teaching is seen, in essence, as a process of individuation. Cranton (2001, 2006) and Cranton and Carusetta (2004a, 2004b) describe individuation, the process of becoming more conscious and gaining in self-awareness and self-knowledge, as one that comes about primarily through critical reflection. In contrast, Dirkx's (2006) interpretation of becoming more authentic in teaching, building directly on Robert Boyd's work, is grounded in the deeper emotional or extra-rational dimensions of learning. According to this view, the process of becoming more

conscious is facilitated through the imaginative (rather than rational) dimensions of the self (see also Dirkx, 2000). Dirkx's view of authenticity is also linked to "spirituality."

We suggest that the notion of individuation provides a meaningful lens from which to understand what "authenticity in teaching" might mean and the two orientations with respect to transformative learning serve to illuminate what the process of moving toward greater authenticity in teaching may look like. However, we wonder whether there might be additional aspects of authenticity that perhaps are not brought to the fore by these perspectives alone.

Authentic Teachers Encourage Authenticity Through Care

Palmer (1998) observed that authentic teachers (in his language, those who have found their *integrity*), have a capacity to bring about vital connections between teacher and subject (teachers caring deeply about their subject), teacher and student (teachers caring about students), and student and subject (students having been enthused about the subject). This link between authenticity and support of learning that Palmer addresses is perhaps most clearly reflected in the work of Rogers (1983) but also that of Jarvis (1992) and Cranton and Carusetta (2004b). According to Rogers, learning is facilitated in an atmosphere of mutual trust, where the teacher is acting in congruent ways, believes in students, and, in interacting with students, also becomes a learner. Jarvis argued that "authentic action is to be found when individuals freely act in such a way that they try to foster the growth and development of each other's being" (p. 113). Jewish philosopher Martin Buber (1958) emphasized the importance of genuine dialogue and relationships in the nurturing of growth, development, or authenticity. The "I-Thou" relationship is characterized by the genuine intent to affirm and foster each other's being by bringing oneself into this relationship. Freire (1971) perhaps expressed the same idea when he observed that "The teacher's thinking is authenticated only by the authenticity of the students' thinking. The teacher cannot think for her students, nor can she impose her thought on them" (pp. 63-64). Our research team debated these insights for a long time, with some agreeing strongly and others disagreeing with the notion that authentic university teachers have an interest in promoting authenticity in students. Eventually, we settled on a view that authentic teachers, at the very least, are interested in supporting students' learning of the subject matter, and that some try to foster students' development and authenticity in a broader sense (when the subject area is adult education, theology, or English literature, the latter goal *may* be more readily espoused than when it is physics, for example).

Authenticity is also one of the main themes Heidegger explored in "*Being and Time*." Zimmerman (1986), discussing Heidegger, explains that "to care for something *inauthentically* would mean to manipulate it for selfish purposes. To

care for something authentically means to let it manifest itself in its own way” (p. 44). Following 19th century German philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche’s distinction between *compassion* and *pity* in how we relate to others, Heidegger distinguishes between “leaping in” and “leaping ahead” (Zimmerman, 1986, pp. 94-95). When we *leap in* for someone, we take over responsibility for the person and thereby diminish the other’s authenticity. In contrast, when we *leap ahead* of the other we let her take responsibility herself (or in Heidegger’s language, we let her “take over her own possibilities”) and act in ways that instill confidence. By *leaping ahead* we authentically care and foster the other person’s authenticity. Similar ideas were expressed by Nel Noddings (2003) in her now classic book *Caring* (first published in 1983). Certain acts (which on the surface may look like acts of caring) do not qualify as true acts of caring if they diminish the independence or development of the other. Citing Milton Mayeroff, Noddings writes, “To care for another person, in the most significant sense, is to help him [*sic*] grow and actualize himself” (p. 9).

In addition, Noddings draws an important distinction between rule-bound caring and caring grounded in empathy, regard, and affection for the other. Rule-bound caring in university teaching may extend to concrete behaviors such as giving feedback as frequently and comprehensively as we have to (but no more) or ensuring that we keep regular office hours during which we make ourselves available to students (but keep our availability restricted to that). Caring based on empathy, genuine regard, or affection transcends, and at times may even directly oppose, such rules or regulations. This latter form of caring is compatible with authentic caring.

Authenticity, Self-Authorship, and Constructive Developmental Pedagogy

Palmer’s (1998) description of the deep capacity authentic teachers possess for building vital connections between students and their subject can conceptually be linked to the notion of a constructive developmental pedagogy as discussed by Baxter Magolda (1999, 2001). Based on her extensive research with undergraduate students, she identified three core pedagogical principles that would help promote student “self-authorship” (Kegan, 1994). The three pedagogical principles she identified are (a) learners are validated as “knowers,” (b) learning is situated within their experience, and (c) learning itself is conceptualized as mutually constructing knowledge.

Baxter Magolda argues that to meet the challenges of our times, students need to develop *self-authorship*, an intellectual, moral, and personal complexity that undergirds their readiness for coping with the multiple personal, vocational, and civic challenges they encounter after college. We perceive a conceptual link between Baxter Magolda’s work and authenticity in teaching for two reasons. First, according to Palmer, authentic teachers succeed in promoting meaningful

engagement of students with the subject matter (in a sense that the students develop an interest and appreciation for it). One may infer that this success hinges on teachers being interested in and respectful of students' present conceptual understanding (Principle 1), being able to relate the subject to the students' experience (Principle 2), and, last, being inclined to engage in community with students in their construction of knowledge (Principle 3). Second, Baxter Magolda (1998) described self-authorship as "a way of making meaning of one's experiences from inside oneself" (p. 152); thus conceived, student self-authorship can essentially be interpreted as a form of student authenticity. One is then reminded of Jarvis (1992) who argued that authentic teachers would promote authenticity (or here "self-authorship") in others. Based on these considerations, we suggest that authenticity in teaching may be associated with a tendency to approach teaching in ways consistent or at least compatible with the practice of constructive developmental pedagogy.

Authenticity as Taking Responsibility for One's Possibilities

In *Being and Time*, Heidegger (1927/1962) distinguishes between *everydayness*, *authenticity* and *inauthenticity*. Everydayness implies doing and accepting what everyone else does. One's actions and beliefs are directed not by one's self but by "*das man*" (by what *one* does). Zimmerman (1986) explains that in describing "*das man*" Heidegger was influenced by Nietzsche's (1883) notion of the "herd," although "*das man*" referred to a way of being, whereas Nietzsche's "herd," of course, referred to the masses themselves. In essence, however, Nietzsche and Heidegger agreed that authentic existence involves confronting the truth, opening oneself up to one's own limited possibilities, not being defined by social norms, and not clinging to comfortable routines.

Heidegger argues that this usual tendency to conceal things at the level of "*das man*," which basically means to superficially regard things, cannot be easily escaped, as it is intrinsic to us as human beings. This everydayness (or "*unauthenticity*"), however, is very different from *inauthenticity*, where people become dominated by the need to conceal their own "finite openness." Heidegger emphasizes that to authentically live, humans need to come to terms with the inevitable fact of their own mortality. By doing so, they cease to live unexamined lives. Perhaps Cynthia Dillard (2006) had something similar in mind when she recently wrote in her book *On Spiritual Strivings*,

As teachers and researchers, ought we not be researching, teaching and writing "as if we were dying"? Such a standard of rigor would require that we be ever vigilant in examining and tending to our body, mind, and spirit everyday—and that we be absolutely cognizant of our short time on this planet Such practice would clearly help us to transform the ways we act, talk, and interact with others. And it is a way for us to live in a conscious manner. (p. 73)

Heidegger also believed that to authentically live means to choose those possibilities (not *everything* can be chosen) that are *uniquely one's own*, to become, or be, what one already is, and to accept responsibility for one's own existence (for further details, see Zimmerman, 1986, p. 30). Likewise, Danish philosopher and theologian Søren Kierkegaard had argued many decades earlier that becoming authentic was a matter of free acts of will or resoluteness (Galomb, 1991). Although there are differences between Heidegger's and Jean-Paul Sartre's Existentialism, links can be observed between Heidegger's notion of authenticity and the French philosopher's notion of the freedom (and responsibility) of the individual to make authentic choices (Onof, 2006). In Sartre's view, life *is* choice in a sense that one cannot avoid making choices and the whole life of an individual is expressed as "an original project that unfolds throughout time" (Onof, 2006, p. 14).

Heidegger's language is often obscure and his work very abstract as his notion of authenticity is not a moral one (as is, for example, Charles Taylor's, see below) but primarily an ontological one. Heidegger explores the huge and century-old question of what it means *to be*. Zimmerman (1986) suggests that only if one reads in between the lines of *Being and Time* is there any sense expressed in the book that individuals should be authentic. He writes,

It is true that *Being and Time* never says that the reader should choose to be authentic. To have said this would have meant the end of existential describing and the beginning of *existentiell prescribing*. Surely, it is a careless reader who fails to notice the exhortative dimension in this book. (p. 34)

Hence, *existentiell* tasks, according to Heidegger, are the particular concrete personal choices we make (i.e., the facts of how we interact with the world) that upon analysis reveal the basic structures (existentials) of being (such as the human potential towards authenticity, or everydayness, or inauthenticity), but do not, by themselves, constitute the essence of human being. For Heidegger, morality is an *existentiell* matter, whereas authenticity is an *existential* matter. One can authentically exist without being moral, and act morally without authentically existing. An "existential" is a category that is unique to the existence of human beings (e.g., to exist authentically). Choosing particular acts, decisions, or modes of behavior is not an existential but an *existentiell* task.

Authenticity and Heidegger's Notion of Care

Another significant aspect of Heidegger's concept of authenticity is the notion of *care*. Care, in Heidegger's work, means "*to be concerned*" about worldly affairs and one's own existence. Just as Heidegger's concept of authenticity is not a moral one, his notion of "care," at least at the first level of interpretation, has little to do with care in a moral sense (in contrast to Nel Noddings's concept of caring, for example). "Care" is the very essence of being human. Zimmerman

(1986) explains that when we exist *inauthentically*, we have essentially forgotten to *care*. We distract ourselves with all kinds of things to deny our finitude and we do not “take proper care,” neither of worldly things nor of our own and others’ existence. If, on the other hand, we exist in *everydayness*, a less severe form of being not authentic (or *unauthentic*), our being (way of living) is caught up in everyday affairs but is no longer fully escaping from the truth about itself. Finally, when we *authentically* exist, we take care about our own life and about other beings as appropriately as possible. Zimmerman, summarizing Heidegger, writes, “The more open or authentic I am, the more able I am to care for myself and Others. The stronger my care becomes, the more open I am to myself and Others” (p. 65). By being open for things, we care for them. And being open (to one’s own possibilities) is an aspect of authentic existence.

Although on a first level of interpretation Heidegger’s notion of care does not carry moral connotations at all, it does so on a second level, namely once linked to his earlier statement about “leaping in” and “leaping ahead.” We can conclude that we appropriately “take care”, for ourselves and others, when we *leap ahead* and promote our own and others’ authenticity.

What could Heidegger’s complex notions of authenticity and care mean for authenticity of university teachers? At the risk of oversimplifying things but with the intent to make Heidegger’s ideas more practical or concrete for exploring authenticity in teaching, we offer the following considerations. Let us start with the fact that not only our lives but also our working lives as educators, here our academic careers, are finite. There is an end to it after 30 or 40 years and for many of us this prompts the question of what we really want this “career” to be about. What is it that I want to achieve? Which possibilities are uniquely my own? What is my career, my work life (which, for many of us, is inextricably linked to our personal life) *really about*? What do I want to become? Heidegger’s notion of *everydayness* is perhaps typical for most teachers at research-intensive universities. *Everydayness* is an “undifferentiated” (average) way of being a teacher. It would mean, by and large, to orient one’s actions on what everyone else in the department seems to be doing.

Choosing *authenticity over everydayness* would mean to be fully open to one’s own (limited) possibilities as a teacher within one’s university career. It would imply examining one’s career in light of one’s teaching role and examining teaching itself. It would mean to take care of teaching, and of others, the way described earlier. But it would also mean to really care about one’s subject. As Palmer (1998) said, “No matter how technical my subject may be, the things I teach are things I care about—and what I care about helps define my selfhood” (p. 17).

Finally, *inauthenticity*, as it implies deliberate concealment, may involve being a teacher even though one abhors the role (e.g., see Palmer’s [1998] story of a university teacher who hated being a professor but stayed on eventually sacrificing happiness and health) or teaching in a subject area that is not fulfilling and that is not a good fit with one’s personality (also see Cranton, 2001, pp. 90-91). Because

inauthenticity also means “manipulating things for selfish reasons,” inauthenticity in teaching could refer to pursuing rewards for teaching (for example institutional or national “teaching awards”) to further one’s career rather than to help students learn, grow, and develop. Another example would be someone who publishes extensively on teaching matters and earns recognition for that, but does not really care about his or her own teaching and students very much.

Authenticity as a Critique of Ideology

The most forceful critique of Heidegger’s existentialism was offered by Theodor Adorno, a member of the Frankfurt School of critical social theory. In the “Jargon of Authenticity,” Adorno (1964/2003) argues in essence that a notion of authenticity that is directed only inwardly and thereby ignores the objective social context and how our selves are historically shaped, prevents rather than promotes real freedom as it would mystify the actual processes of domination. Critical theory’s concern with reconstructing the generation of historical consciousness is directed at Heidegger’s view that individuals could recognize their own possibilities, and hence reach “authenticity,” by looking simply inwardly. Authenticity thus conceived would remain a *jargon* only, as it abdicates the important dialectical relationship of object and subject and historical subjectivity or consciousness collapses into mere self-experience, or an absolute idealism. As such, individuals are prevented from recognizing their true possibilities. Instead, Adorno claims that human subjectivity is historically shaped, yet not determined, and it is only through reflective critique (the reconstruction of the evolution of historical forms of consciousness) that individuals could recognize their real emancipatory possibilities.

When applied to university educators, perhaps Adorno’s perspective comes to life in the faculty member, or group of faculty members, who, through critical reflection on how departmental and disciplinary norms and practices have shaped their own pedagogical practices, attitudes, and thoughts toward teaching, comes to identify, as a result of reflective critique, alternatives to present norms and practices that might eventually lead to changes in the departmental teaching culture. Reflective critique could also lead to a transformation in collective or normative notions of what the institution or department ought to value with regards to teaching and learning.

Authenticity as a Moral Ideal

Cranton (2001) argued that

the authentic teacher cares about teaching, believes in its value, wants to work well with students, and has a professional respect for students in general. Not liking a student is bound to happen; the authentic teacher wants to know why and what to do. In other words, professionalism and ethical, moral behaviour take over. (p. 81)

Although many definitions of authenticity emphasize the notion of individual decision making and emancipation from (often inner) constraints, Cranton's statement on authenticity in teachers adds the new dimension of morality and professionalism. Authentic teachers do not just act on the basis of their own decisions or self-definition but they (also) do so according to a certain code of practice. But how is this code arrived at? An answer can perhaps be found in Canadian philosopher Charles Taylor's discussion of authenticity.

Taylor (1991) writes,

Briefly we can say that authenticity (A) involves (i) creation and construction as well as discovery, (ii) originality, and frequently (iii) opposition to the rules of society and even potentially to what we recognize as morality. But it is also true . . . that it (B) requires (i) openness to horizons of significance (for otherwise the creation loses the background that can save it from insignificance) and (ii) self-definition in dialogue. (p. 66)

What gives my choice as a teacher any significance is not that I choose, or that I create an "original" identity that is truly my own, but the fact that there is a larger horizon of significance within which my choice was made. For Taylor, history, the demands of nature, the needs of our fellow human beings, the duties of citizenship, or the call of God are all issues that can define the horizon of significance against which we need to define ourselves to construct authentic identities. The horizon of significance has to be something substantial, something that deeply matters, not just for myself, but for society as a whole. Taylor (1991) writes that only if we exist in a world in which any one of these issues "*matters* (emphasis in original) crucially, can I define an identity for myself that is not trivial" (p. 41). Chickering et al. (2006) acknowledge this to some extent when they argue that authenticity interacts with interdependence and with "our capacity to identify with something larger than our own self-interest" (p. 9).

Acting authentically as a teacher then cannot mean that I may just choose to not care about my courses and about my students and state this very candidly and genuinely (as we saw earlier, Chickering et al. refer to such negative examples of "authenticity" as "authentically evil"). Taylor would consider this as a deviant form of authenticity, one where self-determining freedom prevails. The issue here is not that many of us would, or could, not agree with such a choice; the issue is that the choice of how I decided to define myself was not made within any horizons of significance (and, because of that, loses its significance). It is not made by considering the crucial question of what it is, at this time, in this societal, political, cultural context, in this present policy environment, that *deeply matters* to us with regards to the education of undergraduates. It is these questions, we think, that would need to be negotiated first to arrive at horizons of significance, and then to define an authentic identity as teachers. Clearly, what exactly gets negotiated may vary from one discipline to another because the subject matter is very different. At the same time, there may be certain goals and purposes that

transcend disciplinary boundaries (Kreber, in press). But importantly, authenticity in teaching, or the construction of an authentic identity, would need to include negotiating the tension between *creative originality* and *self-definition in dialogue* (as the former would otherwise drift into nothing more but self-determining freedom) around *horizons of significance*. It is this understanding that makes authenticity a moral ideal. And it is these horizons of significance, one may argue, that may not get sufficient attention in educational discussions on how to structure the undergraduate curriculum or in professional development courses for academic teachers. Perhaps, as Heidegger observes, we prefer to live in *everydayness*, where we pretty much do and accept what everyone else does. Such complacency is clearly different from authenticity as a moral ideal. Authentic teachers do not passively buy into certain dominant discourses as this would mean to either ignore horizons of significance altogether or to accept them without critical reflection. Surely, horizons of significance (if they indeed have any significance) do not constantly and rapidly change, but they need to be identified, critically reflected on, negotiated, and valued.

Grimmet and Neufeld (1994) applied Taylor's definition of authenticity specifically to teachers, concluding that "to be professional" teachers need to "possess an authentic identity" (p. 208) in a Taylorian sense. Connecting Taylor's ideal of authenticity with Sergiovanni's (1992) moral leadership theory, they distinguish three motivations of teachers—the traditional, the alternative, and the authentic. The traditional motivation is to do what *is rewarded*. The alternative motivation is to do what *is rewarding*. The moral motivation is to do what *is good*. Following Taylor, they suggest that "authentic motivation is . . . caught up in a struggle to do what is necessary and of value, not just for the organization nor just for oneself, *but ultimately in the important interests of learners* [italics added]" (p. 5). Perhaps bell hooks (2003) and Cynthia Dillard (2006) describe their "horizon of significance" as educators when they identify the ultimate purpose of their academic educational work as "the practice of freedom" and "service to humanity." As well, Nel Noddings's (2003) insight that "to care for another person, in the most significant sense, is to help him grow and actualize himself" (Milton Mayeroff, as cited in Noddings, 2003, p. 9) may be another way of phrasing the horizon of significance within which to make decisions concerning the education of others. At times, as Rogers and Noddings suggest, teachers may need to act in opposition to existing rules or conventions to act in the best interest of students (the difference between rule-bound and authentic caring referred to earlier).

Some may argue this is all very well but what about helping students learn through engagement with the subject matter? Most educators, particularly in university settings, place a high value on the subject matter they are engaged in and as such it *matters* crucially to them. By extension, one may argue that these educators partially define themselves through their subject matter, and by sharing it with students they then bring parts of themselves into their teaching. Applying Taylor's idea of "horizons of significance," it would appear that authentic teachers

are not only committed to presenting the subject in ways that reveals the depth of their understanding, insight and enthusiasm about it but perhaps also convey how the subject itself *matters* in the real world (let alone in their lives). We therefore propose that genuine dialogue, as emphasized by many scholars describing the nature of authenticity and authentic relationships (for example Buber, Freire, Noddings, hooks, or Dillard), at the level of higher education, is dialogue that centers on *ideas* that matter, and the latter are associated largely with the subject being taught.

However, this issue of “care for the subject matter,” and partial self-definition through the subject or discipline, is to some extent convoluted by the fact that for many university teachers the subject matter they teach, particularly at undergraduate level, can be quite removed from their academic (and personal) interests. The crucial question then becomes whether in such circumstances there can still be “authenticity”? We suggest that authenticity in teaching involves conveying to students how even this subject matter—that which is more removed from the teacher’s personal research interests—*matters!* This does not mean that educators put on a mask and pretend they believe it matters (which would be inauthentic—see Cranton’s [2001] important discussion about teaching in a subject area that is not a good fit with one’s personality, where the most authentic response is actually to quit teaching, at least in that subject area). Instead, it does mean that “authenticity in teaching” involves caring enough about the learning experience of students so that educators willingly make efforts to discover the subject’s substance and relevance and then help students see how it *matters*. Thus conceived, “authenticity in teaching” would include an informed sense of why particular content areas matter, an understanding of why students may not yet see why they matter, and sensibilities around and skill in helping students understand why they matter. We propose that when hooks (2003) speaks about good teachers “serving the needs of students” (p. 83) this statement also applies to teachers helping students to seriously engage with subject matter they themselves may not, at least initially, be hugely interested in. Perhaps Elton (2000) said it most succinctly,

While teaching that becomes merely a technical service to consumers may be a form of prostitution, teaching that is always accompanied by our own enquiry, reflection and passion for a subject matter in which we are wholly engaged is in danger of putting self-love above duty, our duty to our students. (p. 260)

The horizon of significance of “acting in the best interest of learners” then has several implications: First, authentic teachers engage with the larger questions of purpose with regards to education and ask, for example, how can we best serve the needs of students or humanity (e.g., Dillard, 2006; hooks, 2003), or how can we help students grow and develop (e.g., Noddings, 2003). Second, authentic teachers convey how the subject matter *matters* in the real world, and possibly in their own lives, and also connect learners in authentic conversations or dialogue around significant or unresolved issues in relation to the subject matter. Third,

authentic teachers are guided more by caring for the education of students than by their own self-interest and hence are able to do what is described under the second point even though the subject concerned may not be congruent with their personal or academic research interests.

Conceptual links then emerge between Taylor's notion of authenticity and Palmer's (1998) idea of the subject-centered classroom, the latter being one in which the teacher is able to generate community, or *genuine dialogue*, between him or herself and the subject ("caring for the subject"), him or herself and the students ("caring for students"), and the students with the subject ("students caring about the subject"). The teacher then provides the vital bridge that allows the students to fully engage with the subject matter thereby furthering both their learning and development. As we saw earlier, this bridge between the educator's and the students' ways of meaning-making is also at the heart of what Baxter Magolda (1999) refers to as a constructive-developmental pedagogy where students are, first, validated for what they have to contribute; second, the subject material is linked to their experiences; and, third, learning itself is conceived of as a process of mutually constructing knowledge as educator and student engage in dialogue. Authenticity in teaching then involves educators creating the conditions that allow students to fully engage with and learn to appreciate this subject matter (which *crucially matters*), thereby furthering their learning and development. It is in this sense that authenticity in teaching can be linked to constructive developmental pedagogy even though this link may at first sight seem somewhat oblique.

On this comparative review of the literature, we can now make the following observations about authenticity:

Authenticity

Is not the same as self-determining freedom (which is a deviant form of authenticity; e.g., Chickering et al., 2006; Taylor, 1991)

Is not necessarily the same as sincerity (the free declaration of belief) but links sincerity with confronting the truth (e.g., Williams, 2004)

Can be a moral ideal (and, in that interpretation, would negate the possibility of being "authentically evil"; e.g., Chickering et al., 2006; Taylor, 1991; Williams, 2004)

Is the opposite of being *inauthentic* but not of being *unauthentic* (or of *everydayness*; (e.g., Heidegger, 1927/1962)

Has been discussed as a *jargon* or an illusion if reduced to an extreme inwardness and a failure to consider how subjective consciousness has been shaped and the conditions under which possibilities present themselves (e.g., Adorno, 1964/2003)

By some has been discussed in the context of spirituality (e.g., Chickering et al., 2006; Dillard, 2006; Dirkx, 2000, 2006; hooks, 2003; Tisdell, 1998, 2003)

By some has been linked to Jung's notion of individuation (e.g., Cranton & Carusetta, 2004a, 2004b; Dirkx, 2000, 2006)

Is not a final state of being but a process of becoming (e.g., Buber, 1958; Cranton, 2001, 2006; Dillard, 2006; Dirkx, 2000, 2006; Heidegger, 1927/1962; hooks, 2003)

The literature reviewed would also suggest that “authenticity in teaching” could involve these features:

Consistency between values and actions (e.g., Brookfield, 1990; Chickering et al., 2006; Cranton & Carusetta, 2004a, 2004b; Jarvis, 1992; Rogers, 1983)

Presentation of a genuine Self as teacher (being candid, genuine; e.g., Buber, 1958; Cranton, 2001, 2006; Dillard, 2006; Freire, 1971; hooks, 2003; Rogers, 1983)

Care for students (but rule-bound and authentic caring are not the same; e.g., Buber, 1958; Grimmet & Neufeld, 1994; Noddings, 2003; Rogers, 1983)

Care for the subject and interest in engaging students with the subject around ideas that matter (e.g., Palmer, 1998; Taylor, 1991)

Care for what one’s life as a teacher is to be (e.g., Dillard, 2006; Heidegger, 1927/1962)

Self-knowledge and confronting the truth about oneself (e.g., Cranton, 2001, 2006; Heidegger, 1927/1962; Williams, 2004)

Being defined by oneself rather than by others’ expectations (e.g., Cranton, 2001, 2006; Tisdell, 1998, 2003)

Critically reflecting on how certain norms and practices have come about (e.g., Adorno, 1964/2003; Cranton & Carusetta, 2004a, 2004b)

Self-definition in dialogue around horizons of significance (e.g., Taylor, 1991)

Making educational decisions and acting in ways that are in the important interest of students (and ultimately society; e.g., Dillard, 2006; Grimmet & Neufeld, 1994; hooks, 2003; Taylor, 1991)

Promoting the “authenticity” of others (at least their learning and possibly their development in a larger sense; *leaping ahead* rather than *leaping in*; e.g., Buber, 1958; Cranton, 2001, 2006; Dillard, 2006; Freire, 1971; Heidegger, 1927/1962; hooks, 2003; Jarvis, 1992; Noddings, 2003; Palmer, 1998; Rogers, 1983)

Reflecting on purposes (and on one’s own unique possibilities, that is those that *matter most*) in education and teaching (e.g., Heidegger, 1927/1962; Taylor, 1991)

Constructive developmental pedagogy emphasizing the dialogical character of the teaching–learning interaction (e.g., Baxter Magolda, 1998, 1999, 2001)

Note that the people referred to in parentheses made a particular point most strongly; surely this does not necessarily mean that others discussed in this article would not agree with it; but it does mean that they did not make that point as strongly.

The literature we reviewed is informed by different conceptualizations of authenticity, for example a primarily existentialist one, a moral one, a humanist one, a Jungian one or a critical one, and which perspective is espoused in the educational literature that discusses authenticity is not always made explicit. As was shown, however, although these perspectives differ in emphasis, they actually complement each other and thereby contribute to a fuller understanding of the multifaceted or multidimensional notion of authenticity in teaching. Adorno’s critique of Heidegger’s view of authenticity (the former grounded in critical social theory) most explicitly takes into account the influence of the social context within which individuals find themselves. According to Adorno, true “authenticity”

cannot be achieved by looking only inwardly; true “authenticity” is a matter of becoming aware of how structural contextual forces influence self-definition and then acting on this critical consciousness. Context also plays a key role in theories informed by postmodernist assumptions. For this reason we briefly explore how a “postmodern thinker” would react to the idea of authenticity explored here.

The very concept of “authenticity” is suspect to colleagues whose epistemic assumptions are closely aligned with those of postmodernism. Postmodernism encourages awareness of how one has been “constructed” through socialization and one’s “positionality” in relation to the dominant culture (based on the intersection of class, race, sex, sexual orientation, ableness, and so forth). Although such awareness is helpful, postmodernists would say that one could know one’s “self” only through the limits or filters of these forms of socialization. Hence, postmodernists will likely argue that we can never really know anything with certainty and for that reason the very idea of authenticity as knowing one’s true self is seriously flawed. Generally, postmodernism offers a strong critique of the humanist ideal of the unified integrated self. It challenges the idea that people have a core essence or single and stable identity; instead, it encourages us to view identities as “fluid,” “free-floating,” and constantly “shifting.” The issues raised by postmodernist and “critical postmodernist” thinkers over the past three decades help us to see more clearly the tension between conceptualizing the self as an essential core and conceptualizing the self as an ongoing construction. As such, they also help us to appreciate the complexities associated with the notion of “authenticity.” Moreover, taking into account the postmodernist or poststructuralist critique of stable identities propels us to conceptualize the notion of “authenticity” not as something fixed but rather as something that we may choose to work toward. One does not have to buy into the postmodern rejection of “a core self” to appreciate the idea of identities as being both shifting and constructed. We also perceive an important link between the notions of “authenticity” and “agency.” The views expressed by some North American and British colleagues in adult and higher education writing from a feminist poststructuralist perspective (e.g., Tisdell, 1998; Walker, 2001) therefore resonate well with us, and we share the understanding that university educators identities, as teachers, may shift toward greater capacity for agency and, hence, greater authenticity, as they become critically reflective of how contextual factors influence how they see themselves and their students, including the various assumptions they hold, and decisions they make, about the what, how and why of teaching.

What Does it All Mean?

The literature reviewed here revealed authenticity in teaching as an intriguing but also complex and multidimensional phenomenon. Authenticity in teaching involves features such as being genuine, becoming more self-aware, being defined by one’s self rather than by others’ expectations, bringing parts of oneself

into interactions with students, and critically reflecting on self, others, relationships and context, and so forth. But perhaps even more importantly, authenticity, as Charles Taylor argues, has a moral dimension, one that impels us to explore the *horizons of significance* within which we define ourselves as educators and make decisions concerning the education of others. Authenticity is not just something that exclusively rests within myself (as in self-determining freedom); for authenticity to be meaningful it needs to be sought in relation to issues that *matter crucially*. Ultimately, the guiding question for educators, as Neufeld and Grimmet suggest, would be, “Is this in the important interest of learners?” What *is* in the best interest of learners (the horizon of significance) needs to be negotiated and critically reflected on, but as was argued, it is in essence the development of their “authenticity.”

We further propose that genuine dialogue, as emphasized by many scholars describing the nature of authenticity and authentic relationships (for example Buber, Freire, Noddings, hooks, or Dillard), at the level of higher education, is dialogue that centers on *ideas* that matter. Therefore, conceptual links exist between Palmer’s (1998) idea of the subject-centered classroom and authenticity in teaching interpreted through Taylor’s notion of horizons of significance.

Heidegger’s notion of taking responsibility for one’s own possibilities strikes us also as particularly important in the working life of a university teacher. It motivates us to ask questions such as “what do I want to achieve in my “university career”? Which possibilities are uniquely my own? What is it *really all about*?” Surely by asking these kinds of questions, one would assume, we do engage in reflection on Self, others, relationships and, importantly, context. As Adorno’s work suggests, it is only by recognizing how our own human subjectivity is historically shaped, yet not determined, that we can reconstruct the evolution of our consciousness and recognize our real emancipatory possibilities. Cranton and Carusetta’s definition of moving toward greater authenticity grounded in the notion of *critical reflection* seems therefore compatible with both a Heideggerian and a Critical view on authenticity.

The literature on authenticity is vast and we do not claim to have done full justice to each of the works cited. The suggestions we offered of what some of these ideas might mean with regards to “authenticity in teaching” are inevitably the result of our subjective interpretations and readers may take a different view. The implications for practice which arise from the various dimensions of authenticity identified in this study strike us as being too multiple to be fully explored here. At a minimum, it would appear essential for adult educators (in all contexts but particularly in university and college settings) to reflect, first, on whether they see any relevance in the notion of “authenticity” as discussed here. Most likely, honestly confronting this issue will not be limited to a purely cognitive process but will engage also their hearts and spirits. “Does this ring true,” “does this feel right,” and “is *this* what education in the end is all about,” are important questions to attend to. Second, it would seem fundamental that educators then critically

reflect on the extent to which they feel they are “authentic”; the features of authenticity that emerged from this comparative review of the literature could be helpful in this process. Third, as we suggested earlier, educators could critically reflect on how contextual factors influence how they see themselves and their students, including the various assumptions they hold, and decisions they make, about the what, how and why of teaching. There are also far-reaching implications for administration and leadership in our colleges and universities regarding the degree to which existing institutional or departmental environments encourage authenticity and, perhaps most crucially, for the field of faculty development (e.g., Carusetta & Cranton, 2005).

References

- Adorno, T. (2003). *The jargon of authenticity*. London: Routledge. (Original work published 1964)
- Baggini, J. (2005). *What's it all about: Philosophy and the meaning of life*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Barnett, R. (2000). *Realizing the university in an age of supercomplexity*. Buckingham, UK: Society for Research into Higher Education, Open University Press.
- Baxter Magolda, M. B. (1998). Developing self-authorship in young adult life. *Journal of College Student Development*, 39, 143-156.
- Baxter Magolda, M. (1999). *Creating contexts for learning and self-authorship. Constructive-developmental pedagogy*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Baxter Magolda, M. (2001). *Making their own way. Narratives for transforming higher education to promote self-development*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Boyd, R. D., & Myers, J. G. (1988). Transformative education. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 4, 261-284.
- Brookfield, S. (1990). *The skilful teacher*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Buber, M. (1958). *I and thou* (2nd ed.; R. G. Smith, Trans.). Edinburgh, UK: T. & T. Clark.
- Carusetta, E., & Cranton, P. (2005). Nurturing authenticity through faculty development. *Journal of Faculty Development*, 20(2), 70-86.
- Chickering, A. W., Dalton, J. C., & Stamm, L. (2006). *Encouraging authenticity and spirituality in higher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cranton, P. A. (2001). *Becoming an authentic teacher in higher education*. Malabar, FL: Krieger.
- Cranton, P. A. (Ed.). (2006). *Authenticity in teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cranton, P. A., & Carusetta, E. (2004a). Developing authenticity as a transformative process. *Journal of Transformative Education*, 2(4), 276-293.
- Cranton, P. A., & Carusetta, E. (2004b). Perspectives on authenticity in teaching. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 55(1), 5-22.
- Dillard, C. (2006). *On spiritual strivings. Transforming an African American woman's academic life*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Dirkx, J. M. (2000). Transformative learning and the journey of individuation. *ERIC Digest 223*. ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career and Vocation Education.
- Dirkx, J. M. (2006). Authenticity and imagination. In P. A. Cranton (Ed.), *Authenticity in teaching* (pp. 27-39). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Elton, L. (2000). Turning academics into teachers: A discourse on love. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 5(2), 257-260.
- Freire, P. (1971). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.

- Fromm, E. (1969). *Escape from freedom*. New York: Avon.
- Galomb, J. (1991). Kierkegaard's ironic ladder to authentic faith. *Philosophy of Religion*, 32, 65-81.
- Grimmet, P., & Neufeld, J. (Eds.). (1994). *Teacher development and the struggle for authenticity: Professional growth and restructuring in the context of change*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Heidegger, M. (1962). *Being and time* (J. Macquarrie & E. Robinson, Trans.). London: SCM. (Original work published 1927)
- hooks, b. (2003). *Teaching community. A pedagogy of hope*. New York: Routledge.
- Jarvis, P. (1992). *The paradoxes of learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Jung, C. G. (1973). On the nature of the psyche (R. F. C. Hull, Trans.). In *The Collected Works of C. G. Jung* (Vol. 8, pp. 159-234). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Kegan, R. (1994). *In over our heads: The mental demands of modern life*. London: Harvard University Press.
- Kreber, C. (in press). *Teaching and Learning within and beyond disciplinary boundaries*. New York: Routledge.
- Mezirow, J. (1981). A Critical Theory of Adult Learning and Education. *Adult Education*, 2, 3-23.
- Mezirow, J. (1991). *Transformative dimensions of adult learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Mezirow, J. (Ed.). (2000). *Learning as transformation: Critical perspectives on a theory in progress*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Nietzsche, F. (1883). *Also sprach zarathustra: Ein buch fuer alle und keinen* [Thus spoke Zarathustra]. Chemnitz, Germany: Verlag von Ernst Schmeitzner.
- Noddings, N. (2003). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education* (2nd ed.). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Onof, C. J. (2006). Jean-Paul Sartre (1905-1980): Existentialism. *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Retrieved November 7, 2006, from <http://www.iep.utm.edu/s/sartre-ex.htm>
- Palmer, P. (1998). *The courage to teach. Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Rogers, C. (1983). *Freedom to learn for the 80s*. Columbus, OH: Merrill.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1992). *Moral leadership: Getting to the heart of school leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Taylor, C. (1991). *The ethics of authenticity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Tisdell, E. (1998). Poststructural feminist pedagogies: The possibilities and limitations of feminist emancipatory adult learning theory and practice. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 48(3), 139-157.
- Tisdell, E. (2003). *Exploring spirituality and culture in adult and higher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Trilling, L. (2006). *Sincerity and authenticity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. (Original work published 1972)
- Walker, M. (Ed.). (2001). *Reconstructing professionalism in university teaching*. Buckingham, UK: Society for Research into Higher Education, Open University Press.
- Williams, B. (2004). *Truth and truthfulness: An essay in genealogy*. In *From sincerity to authenticity* (pp. 172-206). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Zimmerman, M. (1986). *The development of Heidegger's concept of authenticity. Eclipse of the self* (Rev. ed.). Athens: Ohio University Press.