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Abstract

In recent years, leadership research has focused on the concept of “authentic leaders” who act consistently with their values, make balanced decisions, are self-aware, and are transparent in their relationships (Walumbwa, Avolio, Gardner, Wernsing and Peterson, 2008). Authentic leaders have the dual tasks of remaining true to their own values and beliefs (in order to be perceived as authentic) and simultaneously projecting an expressive persona (in order to be perceived as a leader). In this research, personality (extraversion and conscientiousness) and impression management (self-monitoring) constructs are used to capture the aspects of authentic leadership that reflect authenticity (expressiveness and other-directedness) and are shown to predict authentic leadership using ratings of followers. The analysis also includes the different dimensions of the self-monitoring scale, using mini-scales that reflect expressiveness (public-performing) and consistency (other-directedness or self-directedness), and show that they predict authenticity in leaders using self-ratings of leaders. The studies help to explain which leaders meet the challenge of being themselves and projecting their persona. Finally, there is evidence that authentic leadership is a mediator of the relationship between previously studied personality variables (extraversion and conscientiousness) and job satisfaction.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

Researchers have been interested in organizational leadership as a subject of study for many years (Bass, 1990). Because leadership research entails so many components it has been difficult to come to a consensus on one definition. Bass (1990) offers a definition that attempts to integrate leader behavior and effects by stating that leadership is an interaction between two or more members of a group that often involves structuring or restructuring of the situation and the perceptions and expectations of the members. Leaders are agents of change – persons whose acts affect other people more than other people’s acts affect them. Leadership occurs when one group member modifies the motivation or competencies of others in the group. Yukl (2012) defines leadership in organizations as influencing and facilitating individual and collective efforts to accomplish shared objectives.

The study of leaders is important since leaders tend to get the lions’ share of the credit when organizational outcomes are positive and an outsize share of the blame when outcomes are negative. Leaders do matter because they can make a difference in the performance and well-being of an organization. It makes sense, then, to study leaders in order to determine what goes into making an effective leader. The right leader can make such a difference in the outcomes that an organization experiences that many organizations are willing to go the extra mile to attract them: think of the highly-paid college basketball coach, the Silicon-Valley CEO with millions of stock options or the star quarterback who is made the face of his franchise. Thus, it is necessary to understand that leaders influence organizational performance and they do this through their impact on task behaviors and relationship building (Yukl, 2002). Leaders plan and organize work, which is associated with organizational effectiveness (Kim and Yukl, 1995; Yukl, Wall
and Lepsinger, 1990); clarify roles and objectives, which are associated with organizational
effectiveness (Kim and Yukl, 1995; Yukl et al., 1990); support subordinates, which helps to
increase job satisfaction, resulting in a more positive work experience (Brief, Schuler and Van
Sell, 1981); and develop subordinate skills, which makes the manager more effective (Bradford
and Cohen, 1984).

Research shows that leaders can have positive and negative effects on organizational
outcomes. For example, Srivastava, Bartol and Locke (2006) show that empowering leadership
leads to knowledge sharing and improved team performance while abusive supervisors can lead
to increased turnover intentions in followers (Tepper, 2000).

There has been little research that shows how personality constructs can be used to
capture the elements of authentic leadership. This paper explores how the personality dimensions
of expressiveness and consistency can be utilized as measures to predict authentic leadership
through the personality traits of extraversion (expressiveness) and conscientiousness
(consistency) and self-monitoring (subscales include public-performing (expressiveness) and
other-directedness (consistency).

The first chapter of the paper introduces and develops the idea of the “building blocks” of
authentic leadership, expressiveness and consistency, while also providing an overview of
leadership research, an introduction to authentic leadership, a discussion of extraversion and
conscientiousness and an overview of the studies conducted.

Chapters 2, 3 and 4 report on 3 studies that provide empirical support for the building
block argument. Chapter 5 is a study that show the building blocks applied to actual
An Overview of Leadership Research and the Emergence of Authentic Leadership

Over the last several decades, a number of management theories have been put forth to explain leader effectiveness. One of the earliest theories, the Great Man Theory, focused on the innate qualities of the leader. The Great Man Theory posits that certain people are endowed with characteristics that are unique to them (e.g. personality traits, abilities) and which make them especially equipped to lead (Stogdill, 1948) ie. leaders are born and not “made.” As an illustration, one might argue that confidence as a trait is a necessary precursor to effective leadership. However, trait theories do not explain a great deal of variance and, thus, do not have strong predictive power. For example, one can produce many examples of “confident” leaders, many of who have succeeded and many of who have failed. Indeed, Wright (1996) has written that others found no difference between leaders and followers with respect to certain characteristics or even found people who possessed them were more or less likely to become leaders.

Trait theories were followed by behavioral theories, which focus on a leader’s behavioral style and how the leader interacts with others. For example, a leader might focus on the task at hand or the feelings and comfort level of followers in order to influence certain follower actions. Major researchers in this area include Blake and Mouton who developed their Managerial Grid (1964, 1978) which is a catalogue of leadership styles and how those styles operate. The authors produced four main styles: concern for task, concern for person, directive leadership and participative leadership. Another important researcher of trait theory is Stogdill (1963) who originated the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) which measures
leadership style as a function of observations by followers. Behavioral theories proved not to be satisfactory leadership theories because they lacked sufficient explanatory power, partly due to the difficulty in measuring behavior (Yukl, 1989).

Contingency theories assume that effective leadership occurs when a certain mix of leader characteristics and group environment comes together. For example, certain leaders with certain characteristics perform best under certain conditions. Vroom and Yetton (1973) developed a model that helps leaders make better decisions by considering expertise within the group, the leaders’ own expertise and conditions in the environment around the decision. Decision making effectiveness in the model depends on 1) required decision quality and 2) acceptance of final decision by followers. In other words, the model says the leader needs to consider the level of quality of the final decision (and, thus, the quality of the information inputs from team members also known as a team mental model) and the acceptance level of the decision (the extent to which the team has a need to be involved in the decision or their inclination to accept a unilateral decision of the leader). Thus, decision quality is important because leaders will use their expertise in analyzing when and how to use decision inputs to arrive at an optimal decision and decision acceptance by followers is important since followers will likely be responsible for implementing the final decision. Ultimately, contingency theories also have their limitations including the fact that they are narrowly focused on a leaders’ particular work situation or immediate subordinates and are highly complex and difficult to apply (Nohria and Khurana, 2010).

In the 1980s, work on social cognition led leadership researchers to focus on the fact that followers develop mental representations of what leaders should be and how they should act based on how they themselves have been socialized and their own experiences with leaders. In
their work on implicit leadership theories, Lord, Foti and De Vader (1984) suggest that leaders are categorized by followers and argue that leadership perceptions form a number of hierarchically organized cognitive schemas. Leaders are judged based on the degree to which followers believe they fit certain leadership prototypes. Implicit leadership theories are important in understanding how followers interpret the actions of their leaders and their process of sensemaking in organizations (Weick, 1995). Criticisms of implicit leadership theories have included the lack of a widely accepted measure, determining how generalizable leader perceptions are across contexts and groups within organizations and the lack of a strategy that addresses the fact that perceptions of leaders may change over time (Lord et al., 1984).

A very distinct approach to leadership emerged out of the historical analysis of leaders. In a study of political leaders, Burns (1978) posited that the most important and influential leaders were “transformational leaders” who inspired followers to become more focused on their moral values and ethics within the organization. Transformational leadership is a leadership paradigm that is often contrasted with transactional leadership in order to reveal the different ways leaders influence followers (Burns, 1978; Bass, 1985). Transformational leadership is concerned with the ways a leader motivates followers to tap into their deeper, moral selves and to go beyond their own self-interests in order to create organizations that uplift and inspire. Transactional leadership, on the other hand, explains how leaders influence followers to perform tasks, by exchanging effort in order to gain rewards, like bonuses or promotions or in order to avoid punishments or sanctions, like demotions or undesirable job assignments. Bass (1985) argues that transformational leaders inspire followers to go above and beyond expectations by 1) making them more aware of the importance of task outcomes, 2) inducing them to transcend their own self-interest for the sake of the organization or the team and 3) activating their higher-
order needs. On the other hand, transactional leaders also motivate followers to act, however, in this case, the appeal is directly to the self-interest of the follower. Followers comply in order to achieve a goal or to avoid a punishment. Therefore, once the follower obtains the reward or avoids sanction, there is little incentive for the follower to go above and beyond their duty. Transactional leadership does not result in followers “going above and beyond their duty” in the way that transformational leadership inspires them to.

Van Knippenburg and Sitkin (2013) challenge the transformational leadership construct by noting that, among other things, the current conceptualization and operationalization confounds leadership with its effects and that there are problems with how the construct is conceptualized.

One of the most recent approaches to leadership focuses on ethics and values (perhaps in response to notable organizational failings in recent years such as Enron and Worldcom). Work on “authentic leadership” argues that a leader who acts in ways that are consistent with his or her values will create an organizational environment that leads to positive outcomes for leaders, followers, and the organization. The next section reviews the literature on authentic leadership in more detail.

**Authentic Leadership: Definition and Determinants**

Recent corporate malfeasance has created a sense of public (and academic) doubt about leadership in business. Enron, Worldcom and Tyco are just some of the examples where corporate executives broke the law in search of better company performance and their own personal gain. In order to deal with unethical executives, authorities have introduced legislation, including Sarbanes-Oxley, which provides accounting oversight of public companies and
strengthens whistleblower protection. However, another approach proposed by organizational scholars and practitioners, such as Bill George of Medtronic, is the introduction of the concept of authentic leadership. Researchers of authentic leaders argue that authentic leadership matters because it leads to positive outcomes for leaders and followers in organizations and would help correct ethical lapses in corporate leaders.

In one of the recent discussions of authentic leadership, Erickson (1995) made the distinction between sincerity and authenticity. In this account, sincerity is outward-facing and authenticity is inward-facing. So, the authentic leader should look inward, to him or herself and act in ways that are consistent with his or her values, attitudes and beliefs. The key relationship is between the way the authentic leader feels and believes and the way the authentic leader acts. On the other hand, the sincere leader will act in ways that encourages others to believe that the sincere leader is acting in ways that are consistent with his or her values, attitudes and beliefs. That might not necessarily be the case. This distinction can be confusing in empirical work since both constructs rely on the perceptions of others who answer questions about the leader.

The most developed and frequently used definition of authentic leadership comes from Walumbwa et al., (2008). The authors (Walumbwa et al., 2008) argue that authentic leadership promotes positive psychological capacities and a positive ethical climate among followers. This definition proposes that authentic leadership is a self-referential construct that consists of a higher order multi-dimensional set of determinants which consist of balanced processing, internalized morality, relational transparency and self-awareness.

Balanced processing refers to leaders who show that they objectively analyze all relevant data before coming to a decision and solicit views that challenge their deeply held positions (Walumbwa, Avolio, Gardner, Wernsing and Peterson, 2008; Gardner, Avolio, Luthans, May
and Walumbwa, 2005). This subdimension consists of the individual being comfortable with ideas even if those ideas are at odds with his or her presently held opinions. Indeed, Kernis (2003) writes, balanced processing involves not denying, distorting, exaggerating, or ignoring private knowledge, internal experiences, and externally based evaluative information. Instead, it involves objectivity and acceptance of one's positive and negative aspects, attributes, and qualities (Kernis, 2003). Balanced processing was originally called unbiased processing but was renamed in order to take into account that all people carry biases into each interaction they have (Gardner, Avolio, Luthans et al., 2005).

Internalized morality refers to an internalized and integrated form of self-regulation guided by a set of values (Ryan and Deci, 2003). This type of self-regulation is determined by individual moral guidelines and values rather than from group, organizational or societal pressures, and it results in decision–making and behavior that is consistent with these internalized values (Avolio and Gardner, 2005). Internalized morality is an integral part of authentic leadership because it helps give the authentic leader the moral strength and moral compass to make decisions that are not popular or may not be well-received by others. Kernis (2003) writes more about internalized morality when he asserts that individuals come to know and accept themselves, including their strengths and weaknesses, they display high levels of stable and strong self-esteem. Kernis (2003) continues by writing that such individuals are also relatively free of the defensiveness displayed by less mature people and consequently are more comfortable forming transparent, open, and close relationships with others. Furthermore, they display behavior that reflects consistency between their values, beliefs, and actions, behavior that others would interpret as authentic (Kernis, 2003).
Relational transparency refers to presenting ones’ authentic self (as opposed to a fake or distorted self) to others (Walumbwa et al., 2008). Such behavior promotes trust through disclosures that involve openly sharing information and expressions of one’s true thoughts and feelings while trying to minimize displays of inappropriate emotions (Kernis, 2003). It must be noted that context matters. The authentic leader should choose appropriate places and times to share of themselves. In order to be relationally transparent, that is, openly sharing yourself with others, including strengths and weaknesses, one would need to have a stable and mature self-esteem, similar to the one outlined under internalized morality.

Finally, self-awareness refers to demonstrating an understanding of how one derives and makes meaning of the world and how that meaning making process impacts the way one views himself or herself over time (Walumbwa et al., 2008). It also refers to showing an understanding of one’s strengths and weaknesses and the multi-faceted nature of the self, which includes gaining insight into the self through exposure to others, and being cognizant of one’s impact on others (Kernis, 2003). A leader who is self-aware is concerned with how they appear to others since they understand that the leader influences the environment in which everyone exists. The actions and utterances of the leader matter. Gardner et al. (2005) argue that the authentic leader constantly asks “Who am I?”

Researchers have posited outcomes for authentic leadership at the individual (leader, follower), group (follower) and organizational levels of analysis. For example, when considering leader outcomes, authentic leadership should be positively related to ethical leadership (a leadership theory that asserts that the leader is a “moral manager” concerned with imparting positive ethical values to followers and will use rewards and punishments to ensure follow-through) (Brown, Trevino & Harrison, 2007; Brown & Trevino, 2006) (Walumbwa et al., 2008);
to the leader’s psychological well-being (Toor and Ofari, 2009); and to transformational leadership as perceived by followers (Walumbwa et al., 2008). Authentic leadership is found to be negatively related to the leaders’ contingent self-esteem (self-esteem dependent on meeting expectations or certain goals) (Toor and Ofari, 2009). When considering follower outcomes, authentic leadership is positively related to job satisfaction (Jensen and Luthans, 2006); job performance (Walumbwa et al., 2008); empowerment (Walumbwa, Wang, Wang, Schaubroeck and Avolio, 2010); esprit de corps (Henderson and Hoy, 1983); identification with the supervisor (Walumbwa et al., 2010); organizational citizenship behaviors (Walumbwa et al, 2008; Walumbwa et al., 2010); organizational commitment (Walumbwa et al., 2008; Jensen and Luthans, 2006); satisfaction with supervisor (Walumbwa et al., 2008); work engagement (Walumbwa et al., 2010); and work happiness (Jensen and Luthans, 2006). Authentic leadership is negatively related to burnout for followers (Wong and Cummings, 2009). When considering organizational outcomes, authentic leadership is positively related to firm financial performance (Clapp-Smith, Vogelgesang and Avey, 2009) and openness of organizational climate (Hoy and Henderson, 1983).

Authentic leadership, at its heart, is about the leader staying true to him or herself. Harter (2002) refers to the leader as “owning” his or her attitudes, beliefs and values and “acting” on those same attitudes, beliefs and values. Walumbwa et al. (2008) believe that authentic leadership has an inherent moral component. An authentic leader is a positive force in the organization. The authors argue that a leader, who has reached a high level of authenticity, has a type of self-development, reflected by self-awareness and self-acceptance, which is incompatible with a low or negative level of moral development (Kegan, 1982). The argument concludes by observing that those with a low level of moral development will be unlikely to possess the
capacity for self-reflection and introspection required for a true understanding of the self (or others) (Kegan, 1982). Not all researchers agree with this view. Shamir and Eilam (2005) would advocate that an authentic leader can be ethically neutral and that their definition of an authentic leader does not say anything about the authentic leaders’ values, attitudes or beliefs.

**Building Blocks of Authentic Leadership**

Previous research has not examined the Big 5 factors (Costa & McCrae, 1992) as antecedents of authentic leadership. In my dissertation, I conceive of authentic leadership as a process of follower social perception. What do followers see? And, how do they see it? I argue that being perceived as an authentic leader depends on two building blocks in the leader: consistency and expressiveness. A leader needs to act in ways that are consistent with his or her attitudes, beliefs and values and he or she needs to be seen in order for observers and followers to be able to know the leader and the fact that the leader is, in fact, behaving in ways consistent with his or her beliefs, attitudes and values.

Consistency taps an important aspect of leadership, which is trust. Bedian and Day (2004) engaged in a series of letters in which they tried to determine which type of leader would be most accepted: the leader who was flexible and changed his or her behavior depending on the situation, reflecting an ability to meet the needs of followers in different situations (Day) or the leader who behaved consistently across situations, reflecting an orientation that met expectations through behavioral consistency (Bedian). Consistency was the leader orientation that was more valued by followers and the mechanism was trust. Followers value a leader who shows a stable self across time and situations.
Expressiveness is a leader trait that refers to the visibility of a leader. A leader must be seen in order for others to know who the leader is, what his or her attitudes, values and beliefs are and whether or not the leader adheres to those attitudes, values and beliefs when he or she acts.

Although early research on leadership traits was not regarded as very successful, I revisit this perspective with a different lens. I argue that stable individual differences can reliably predict leadership perceptions if they are conceived of as the building blocks of social perception.

**Personality Research: Big Five and Self-Monitoring**

For many years, personality researchers have tried to identify stable individual differences that explain important differences in behavior and life outcomes. For example, what explains the career success of some and the lack of career success of others? Or, how can we better understand health or marital outcomes? A clear consensus has emerged around the Five-Factor Model (Digman 1990; Goldberg 1990) of personality as a parsimonious and complete view of individual differences. The Five-Factor Model (FFM) consists of 5 main personality traits (Costa and McCrae 1992): 1) openness to experience, which includes intellectual curiosity and preference for variety; 2) conscientiousness, which includes dutifulness and self-discipline; 3) extraversion, which includes gregariousness and assertiveness; 4) agreeableness, which includes altruism and trust; and 5) neuroticism, which includes self-consciousness and vulnerability.

Researchers have used the Five-Factor Model to study various interpersonal phenomena. Neuroticism of the husband, neuroticism of the wife and the impulse control of the husband were found to be key predictors outcomes of marital outcomes (Kelly and Conley, 1987), Goodwin
and Friedman, (2006) show that conscientiousness is associated with reduced mental and physical effects for a variety of disorders, while neuroticism is associated with increased effects, and that extraversion was related to salary level, promotions and career satisfaction (Siebert and Kraimer, 2001).

Judge and his colleagues (Judge, Bono, Ilies & Gerhardt, 2002) have examined whether the FFM can predict (and potentially explain) successful leadership behavior. Their meta-analysis of 222 correlations from 73 samples has revealed small but consistent relationships between leader FFM trait and follower perceptions of effective leadership, which refers to a leaders’ performance in influencing his or her team in achieving its goals (Stogdill, 1950): neuroticism = -.22, openness = .24, conscientiousness = .16, extraversion=.24 and agreeableness = .21. I propose that two dimensions of FFM serve as building blocks for authentic leadership. Extraversion is related to expressiveness (being seen); conscientiousness is related to consistency (what is seen).

Costa and McCrae (1992) find that extraverts are active, talkative, energetic and optimistic. Additionally, extraverts seek attention (Ashton, Lee & Paunonen, 2002) and excitement (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1975). Research shows that extraversion consists of two components, affiliation (having and valuing warm personal relationships) and agency (being socially dominant, assertive, and influential) (Depue & Collins, 1999). I propose that extraversion can serve as one building block of authentic leadership: It is a measure of expressiveness.

People who are conscientious, on the other hand, tend to have a strong sense of direction and work hard to achieve goals and are deliberate, self-disciplined, cautious and tend to be neat and well organized (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Conscientiousness appears to be made up of two
components, achievement and dependability (Mount & Barrick, 1995). I propose that conscientiousness can serve as a second building block of authentic leadership: It is a measure of consistency.

By exploring the links between extraversion, conscientiousness, and authentic leadership, my dissertation can provide a deeper insight to the existing leadership literature. Judge’s research has largely considered the five personality dimensions as having separate contributions to leadership effectiveness. However, he and his colleagues conducted a meta-analysis (Judge et al., 2002) and found that extraversion was one of three traits (neuroticism and openness were the other two traits) which had success in predicting leadership effectiveness across studies. The other two variables, conscientiousness and agreeableness, while not as successful at generalizing across studies did have non-zero, mean correlations with leadership effectiveness. In their paper on leadership emergence and leadership effectiveness (Judge, Piccolo and Kosalka, 2009) theorize that the "dark” side and “bright” side of personality traits will be influential in predicting perceived leadership effectiveness and objective leadership effectiveness. Finally, Colbert, Judge, Choi and Wang (2012) show that the FFM is a useful predictor of leadership effectiveness when self and observer ratings are used.

I argue that two of the dimensions, extraversion and conscientiousness, should be thought of as building blocks of authentic leadership, and that authentic leadership mediates the relationship between personality and important organizational outcomes. Thus, I argue for an integrative model of leadership effectiveness that combines two diverse theoretical perspectives—FFM and authentic leadership—into a single framework.
Self-Monitoring

Self-monitoring is the extent to which individuals monitor, adjust and control their behavior so as to manage how it is perceived by others (Snyder, 1974). High self-monitors are motivated to impress others and, as a result, pay close attention to social cues in their environment and adjust their behavior in order to appear appropriate given the situation. Low self-monitors, on the other hand, are motivated to act in ways that are consistent with their interests and personality. Their behavior tends to be consistent across situations. Self-monitoring can be measured as a continuous individual difference variable. Self-monitoring has been used to study leader emergence in teams (Day, Shleicher, Unckless, & Hiller, 2002; Zaccaro, Foti & Kenny, 1991; Cronshaw & Ellis, 1991; Anderson & Tolson, 1989, 1991); managerial outcomes in organizations (Baron, 1989; Kilduff, 1992; Kilduff & Day, 1994); socialization (Eder, 1987; Graziano & Ward, 1992; Graziano & Waschull, 1995); and friendship and romantic relationships (Simpson, 1987; Simpson, Gangestad & Biek, 1993; Snyder, Gangestad & Simpson, 1983; Snyder & Simpson, 1984).

In regard to self-monitoring and leadership, Day et al., (2002) conducted a meta-analysis using field samples and show that high self-monitoring is associated with leader emergence with an effect size of .15. The authors argue that their results suggest that the self-monitoring personality, in which the individual pays attention to situational cues, adjusts his or her behavior in order to match the situation and pays close attention to upper level managers, is at least partly responsible for advancement within organizations into leadership positions. Furthermore, Zaccaro et al. (1991) find a significant correlation of .22 between leader emergence and self-monitoring. The authors refer to previous work (Stogdill, 1948) in hypothesizing that behavioral flexibility, in which the leader exhibits sensitivity to the social situation, is associated with leader
emergence. Cronshaw and Ellis (1989) also show that high self-monitors will emerge as leaders in groups across situations when social cues are evident that high self-monitors can read and react to. Self-monitoring can also determine follower behavior. Followers who were high self-monitors tend to pay more attention to the behaviors of the leader and to more closely follow the leader since they interpret leader behavior as situationally appropriate (Cronshaw & Ellis, 1989). In a longitudinal study, Tate (2008) found no relationship between self-monitoring and leadership. Finally, Sosik and Dinger (2007) revealed that contingent reward leadership was more positively related to instrumental vision themes for low self-monitors than for high self-monitors, reflecting contingency reward leadership’s description as transparent and reliable, paralleling the behavior of low self-monitors. Conversely, charismatic leadership was more positively related to inspirational themes for high self-monitors than for low self-monitors, reflecting the fact that high self-monitors are more expressive communicators and, therefore, appear to be more charismatic to followers (Sosik & Dinger, 2007).

Aside from leadership, managerial outcomes have been influenced by self-monitoring. Baron (1989) illustrates that high self-monitors are more likely to resolve conflict using collaboration and compromise than are low self-monitors, reflecting the greater social sensitivity of high self-monitors. Another result comes from Kilduff (1992) who claims that high self-monitors, relative to low self-monitors, choose organizations based on the opportunity to act out roles and imitate the behavior of other people. Kilduff (1994) also contends that high self-monitors were more likely than low self-monitors to change employers, move locations, earn cross-company promotions and, for those who stayed with the same company, to earn internal promotions. Finally, Day and Schleicker (2006) assert that high self-monitors are better than their low self-monitor counterparts at “getting along and getting ahead.” High self-monitors are
less committed to the organization, more likely to have role conflict and role ambiguity, have less job satisfaction, better rated job performance and more likely to be perceived as a leader.

Research shows that high self-monitors perform at a high level (Day & Schleicher, 2006) in organizations partly as a result of occupying structural holes in organization networks (Mehra, Kilduff & Brass, 2001). High self-monitors tend to occupy central, strategic positions in networks which enables them to access resources and information leading to high performance. Taking central positions in organization networks allows high self-monitors to have access to new information and additional resources which allows them to enhance their performance. Low self-monitors, on the other hand, are more likely to socialize and organize with those that share their values and interests. As a result, trust develops because people interact with those that are always the same person under all conditions leading them to have a better understanding of the motivations of the people in their immediate circle.

Although Mehra, Kilduff and Brass (2001) show that high self-monitors tend to occupy central positions in social networks, research has a mixed record when it comes to showing the relationship between high self-monitors and their likelihood to take organizational leadership roles. Day et al. (2002) conducted a meta-analysis that revealed a .15 association between high self-monitoring and leadership emergence. On the other hand, Tate (2008) did not find a relationship between self-monitoring and leadership emergence. I argue that the weak relationship between self-monitoring and leadership is due to the fact that the self-monitoring construct, by design, requires that the building blocks of authentic leadership, consistency and expressiveness, are combined in an antagonistic way. Specifically, self-monitoring is built on two subscales, public-performing and other-directedness. Public-performing, which is a high self-monitoring trait, is a good measure of expressiveness. Other-directedness, which is also a
high self-monitoring trait, is negatively related to consistency. Thus the two subscales load
together as a measure of self-monitoring but work in opposite directions for creating perceptions
of being an authentic leader. And, when the construct is composed by adding together both of the
subscales, an authentic leader who was high in expressiveness and low in other-directedness
would actually fall in the middle of the self-monitoring scale. Although the self-monitoring
construct clearly identifies high or low self-monitors at the extremes of the scale, it does not
clearly identify authentic leaders because they are to be found in the middle of the composite.

To develop this line of reasoning further, the two self-monitoring subscales actually
create a $2 \times 2$ space of public-performing by other-directedness. Two quadrants fall on a diagonal
that define high and low self-monitors. The two quadrants on the other diagonal produce a
middle level score on self-monitoring but are markedly different in their implication for
authentic leadership. One quadrant consists of the building blocks of authentic leadership: A high
score on public-performing (high on expressiveness) and a low score on other-directedness (high
on consistency). The other quadrant is the antithesis of authentic leadership: A low score on
public-performing (low on expressiveness) and a high score on other-directedness (low on
consistency). I predict that using the subscales of self-monitoring as building blocks will reveal
a stronger, clearer relationship between elements of self-monitoring and perceptions of authentic
leadership.

Research using similar constructs has also argued that useful predictors will not always
have a linear relationship to leadership. For example, Ames and Flynn (2007) showed that
assertiveness has an inverted $u$ relationship to leadership: leaders with low and high levels of
assertiveness are rated as less effective than are leaders who fall in the middle of the
assertiveness scale. The authors describe the endpoints of assertiveness into 1) low assertiveness,
which refers to showing unwarranted deference, 2) high assertiveness, which may refer to belligerently pursuing goals and moderate assertiveness, which refers to defending against imposition and actively making legitimate claims.

The personality constructs used to explore authentic leadership are not unitary constructs. For those constructs with two dimensions that do not move in exactly the same direction, especially if they move in opposite directions, researchers have to be aware of the contribution of each dimension to the measurement score of the overall construct since the subscales might not add up to an expected result. For example, extraversion consists of the two dimensions, sociability and dominance. Often, these subscales do not move in exactly the same direction. This means that when employed to predict an outcome, the subscales of the construct may be muting the overall effect of the higher order construct, extraversion. Sociability reflects affiliation (Depue & Collins, 1999) while dominance reflects agency and assertiveness (Depue & Collins, 1999). For any personality construct that is used to predict authentic leadership, it can be instructive to examine the effects that the subscales have on authentic leaderships’ building blocks. Often, if the subscales do not work in the same direction or reflect only one of the building blocks of authentic leadership, expressiveness or consistency, then the overall effect of that construct may be muted.

**Overview of Studies**

**Measurables rated by the perceiver (the follower)**

High ratings on extraversion and high ratings on conscientiousness are predicted to have a positive relationship with perceptions of authentic leadership. This paper argues that followers perceive authentic leadership largely as behavior that is consistent with values, attitudes and beliefs. High conscientiousness reflects that consistency as the individual persistently adheres to
his or her values. Extraversion serves as an amplifier, a way to broadcast what those values actually are. Extraversion is important because it allows followers the chance to know the leaders’ values, attitudes and beliefs. In combination, high extraversion and high conscientiousness should result in the perception of high authentic leadership.

**H1a. Leaders who are rated (by followers) high on extraversion and high on conscientiousness (significant interaction) will be rated high on authentic leadership.**

**H1b. Leaders who are rated (by followers) high on extraversion and high on conscientiousness (significant main effects of each) will be rated high on authentic leadership.**

**Measurables rated by the self (the leader)**

High ratings on extraversion and high ratings on conscientiousness are predicted to have a positive relationship with self-ratings of authentic leadership. Self-ratings are often used in personality research, reflecting the fact that an individual has more knowledge about his or her own thoughts, emotions, cognitions and characteristics than others. So, a leader who rates him or herself high on conscientiousness recognizes a consistency in the espousal of values, attitudes and beliefs and the enacting of those same values, attitudes and beliefs. Extraversion by the leader causes the leader to be committed to his or her values, attitudes and beliefs as he or she publicly makes known to the self and to others what those values, attitudes and beliefs are. To the extent that self-ratings are not influenced by self-serving biases (e.g. social desirability bias) then self-ratings are accurate and suitable for use.

**H2a. Individuals who rate themselves high on extraversion and high on conscientiousness (significant interaction) will rate themselves high on authentic leadership.**
H2b. Individuals who rate themselves high on extraversion and high on conscientiousness (significant main effects) will rate themselves high on authentic leadership.

The same logic is used to propose that self-ratings of self-monitoring will predict self-perceived authentic leadership when the subscales of self-monitoring are used to predict expressiveness (public-performing) and consistency (low other-directedness).

H2c. Individuals who measure high on the public performing (self-monitoring subscale) and low on the other-directedness (self-monitoring subscale) (significant interaction) will be rated high on authentic leadership.

H2d. Individuals who measure high on the public performing (self-monitoring subscale) and low on the other-directedness (self-monitoring subscale) (significant main effects) will be rated high on authentic leadership.

Authentic leadership as a mediator of the relationship between personality variables and organizational outcomes and an analysis of the subscales of extraversion

Authentic leadership is predicted to mediate the relationship between the independent variables extraversion and conscientiousness (personality characteristics) and organizational outcomes. Research shows that extraversion predicts organizational outcomes. For example, Judge, Bono, Ilies and Gerhardt (2002) show that extraversion leads to job satisfaction. Research also shows that authentic leadership leads to job satisfaction (Jensen & Luthans, 2006). This paper argues that authentic leadership can actually be the mechanism that explains the relationship between the personality variables of a leader and organizational outcomes. In other words, what may really explain the relationship between extraversion, conscientiousness and organizational outcomes is the fact that the leader is authentic and this authentic leadership is
captured by the dimensions of the individual personality. Additionally, authentic leadership may have direct effects and indirect effects (through the personality characteristics) on organizational outcomes.

**H3. Authentic leadership will mediate the relationship between personality characteristics (independent variables) and outcome variables.**

The following three chapters of this paper present studies designed to test the proposed hypotheses. The next chapter shows a study that attempts to addresses weaknesses of the first three studies. The final chapters suggest future directions and a general discussion. To begin with, Chapter Two is a study showing how other-rated personality variables predict other-rated authentic leadership. Chapter Three, on the other hand, provides two studies which reveal how self-rated authentic leadership is predicted by self-rated personality variables. The purpose of the first two chapters is to provide evidence supporting the existence of the building blocks of leadership, expressiveness and consistency and show how the personality variables that represent these two constructs predict authentic leadership. The dyadic study in Chapter Five is a multi-stage study designed to capture ratings from multiple sources, the leader and the follower/colleague (direct report, supervisor, peer and other rater). This study will address the weaknesses of the prior studies by addressing the common method bias that is introduced by using only one rater per study. The objective of Chapter Four is to present evidence that authentic leadership is a mediator of the relationship between the personality variables and organizational outcomes.

Finally, Chapter Six concludes by discussing future directions for the building blocks of authentic leadership and authentic leadership itself and possible limitations of authentic leadership research.
Chapter 2: Follower Perceptions of Leader Authenticity (Study 1)

This study used cross-sectional survey data with the primary objective of obtaining follower ratings of authentic leadership. It is important to show that observers of the leader are able to identify authentic leadership through the building blocks of authentic leadership: expressiveness (extraversion) and consistency (conscientiousness). This is the first step in showing how the building blocks of authentic leadership can be used to illustrate who a leader is and how we know who that leader is. In this study, participants were full-time employees.

Method

Design, sample and data collection. Study 1 asked working subjects to nominate a manager they had worked with and rate that manager using multiple personality and leadership scales. Correlations between perceived personality and perceived authentic leadership across different managers were. It was expected that managers with particular combinations of scores on personality scales will score as high or low on the authentic leadership scale. For example, those rating high on expressiveness (extraversion in the Big 5 scale) and high on consistency (conscientiousness in the Big 5 scale) would be rated highest on authentic leadership. It is believed this will have empirical value as an additional, independent measure of authentic leadership.

This study was an online study using Amazon Mechanical Turk software. Respondents were told that the study would take 20 minutes to complete and that they could exit the study at any time for any reason. Respondents were told that they would only get paid the $.75 reward for the completion of the study. This study asked the participants to rate a target of his/her choosing.
on personality (extraversion and conscientiousness) and authentic leadership. The subject saw the instructions:

“Please think of a leader that you have worked with in the recent past. The situation might have been a formal relationship (work) or a more informal relationship (sports team, church relationship, school relationship etc.). Please take a minute to think of your different interactions with your team leader. Interactions might have been positive or negative. Please try to develop a complete recollection of your leader. Please answer the following questions.”

At the beginning of the survey, participants viewed a screen with the informed consent. Participants were told that researchers from Duke University were interested in how people are perceived based on their social situations. Then, participants were told that the survey concerned leadership behavior and that they would be asked to think of a leader and to the extent that they agree with the assessments of that leaders’ behavior. Next, participants were given examples of questions they would see on the survey including “My leader clearly states what he or she believes” or “My leader asks for ideas that challenge his or her core beliefs.” These are the authentic leadership questions. Next, participants were told they would see questions like “My leader is the life of the party” or “My leader is always prepared.” These are the personality (extraversion and conscientiousness) questions. Then participants were given examples of the self-monitoring questions they would see including “I would make a very good actor” or “I can argue for a position that is not my own.” The informed consent screen ends with a note that participants will answer demographic questions and questions about income.

Participants were asked to think of a leader that they have worked with in the recent past.

Participants then answered questions about the leaders’ background including:

Who is the leader you are thinking of? Please write down the initials of the leader you are thinking of _____.

What kind of team did this leader lead (for example, work team, sports team, school, church etc.)?
work___ sports____ school____ church____ other____

How long did you spend with this leader on this team?
Less than one year____ 1 year____ 2 years____ 3 years____ more than 3 years____

What is the gender of this leader? Male____ Female____

Next, participants answered questions about the leader’s personality. Scales used were
the Big 5 factors (Costa & McCrae, 1978, 1992, 1995). Participants then answered questions
from the authentic leadership inventory (Neider & Schreisheim, 2011). Finally, participants
answered demographic questions including questions about gender, age, education and whether
the respondent works outside of the home.

The sample consists of 128 respondents, 71 of whom are men and 57 of whom are
women. Respondents worked in organizations ranging from 1 to 250 people and most
respondents interacted with 6 to 10 people each day.

Measures

**Personality.** Respondents answered items from the Big 5 Factors (Costa & McCrae,
1978, 1992, 1995). This paper is particularly concerned with the extraversion and
conscientiousness scales. Extraversion is defined by Merriam-Webster’s (2004) dictionary as the
act, state or habit of being predominantly concerned with obtaining gratification from what is
outside of the self. Examples of extraversion items include “My leader makes friends easily” and
“My leader feels comfortable around people.” Conscientiousness is defined by Merriam-
Webster’s (2004) dictionary as the trait of being thorough, careful or vigilant. Examples of
conscientiousness items include “My leader is always prepared” and “My leader pays attention
to details.”
Each of these scales consists of 10 items. Each item was measured on a 7-point scale with 1 representing “strongly disagree” and 7 representing “strongly agree” that the leader exhibits that particular characteristic. The 10 items for each scale were added together and divided by 10 in order to come up with a composite score. The resulting scores were mean-centered before they were used in the analysis.

The 10 items measuring extraversion had a reliability of $\alpha = .862$ (Cronbach’s alpha). The 10 items measuring conscientiousness had a reliability of $\alpha = .905$ (Cronbach’s alpha).

**Authentic Leadership.** The ALI (Neider and Schreisheim, 2011) was used in order to measure authentic leadership. The ALI has 4 determinants: balanced processing (e.g. “My leader asks for ideas that challenge his/her core beliefs”), internalized morality (My leader uses his/her core beliefs to make a decision”), relational transparency (My leader openly shares information with others”) and self-awareness (“My leader shows that he/she understands his/her strengths/weaknesses”). The items in the ALI tend to be behavioral, making it easier for followers to observe and evaluate.

Each of the 4 determinants consists of 4 items. Each item was measured on a 7-point scale with 1 representing “strongly disagree” and 7 representing “strongly agree” that the leader exhibits that particular characteristic. The 4 items for each scale were added together and divided by 16 in order to come up with a composite score.

The 16 items measuring authentic leadership had a reliability of $\alpha = .941$ (Cronbach’s alpha).
Results and Discussion

Study 1 was designed to test the claim that the independent variables, expressiveness (extraversion) and consistency (conscientiousness), combine to predict the dependent variable, authentic leadership. The predictors for all studies were mean centered. The data were analyzed using linear regression. The data were evaluated and tested at 1 standard deviation above and 1 standard deviation below the mean. Means, minimums, maximums and standard deviations of the data can be seen in table 1. The relationships among the variables can be observed in figure 1.

Multiple linear regression analysis was used to develop a model for predicting authentic leadership via other-rated (follower of the leader) extraversion and conscientiousness. Basic regression coefficients are shown in Table 2. The extraversion and conscientiousness predictors had significant ($p < .05$) partial effects in the full model and the interaction was marginally significant ($p<.10$). The two predictor model was able to account for 45% of the variance in authentic leadership, $F(3, 124) = 33.799$, $p < .000$, $R^2 = .450$, adjusted $R^2 = .437$.

Results support hypothesis 1. The main effect of extraversion was significant (.185, $p<.023$) which suggests that, all else equal, the more followers are able to observe the leader in action, the more they perceive him or her as authentic. The main effect of conscientiousness was highly significant (.600, $p<.000$) showing that a leader who exhibits a determination to follow his or her values, attitudes and beliefs will be perceived as authentic. These results show that the leader who acts consistently and is observed doing so will be seen as authentic. The overall results were significant, $F(3, 127) = 33.79$, $p<.000$, suggesting that there was a significant effect of perceptions of extraversion and conscientiousness on perceptions of authentic leadership at the $p<.05$ level. The interaction was marginally significant (.113, $p<.051$) and suggests that
extraversion and conscientiousness work together to predict authentic leadership. The coefficient was positive suggesting that the 2 variables help amplify the effect of the other in predicting authentic leadership.

**Table 1 – Study 1 & Study 2: Means, Ranges, Standard Deviations and Correlations.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALI</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.347**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientious</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.644**</td>
<td>0.343**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-ALI</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Monitor</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM Extra</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>.785**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM Consistent</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.270**</td>
<td>0.603**</td>
<td>0.366**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<.01, *p<.05**
### Table 2 – Study 1 & Study 2: Regression Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Study 1</th>
<th>Study 2 (Big 5)</th>
<th>Study 2 (SM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>5.181</td>
<td>5.149</td>
<td>5.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>.185*</td>
<td>.158**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>.600**</td>
<td>.306**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra x Cons</td>
<td>.113+</td>
<td>.073*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Directedness (SM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.199*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public-Performing (SM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.078+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Direct x PP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.037</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+p<.10, *p<.05, **p<.05
Figure 1 – Study 1: Authentic Leadership as a Function of Extraversion and Conscientiousness as Perceived by Others (Rated by Followers)
Chapter 3: Leader Self-Rating of Authentic Leadership (Study 2)

This study used cross-sectional survey data with the primary objective of obtaining leader (self) ratings of authentic leadership. Study 2 used personality measures collected from the leader about him or herself as well as self-rated authentic leadership. Thus, both Study 1 and Study 2 used a single source of raters to provide personality perceptions and authentic leadership ratings, but varied the source—follower (in Study 1) or leader (in Study 2). Together, the two studies reveal how the building blocks of authentic leadership can be used by followers and leaders in order to reveal authentic leadership. In this study, participants were full-time employees.

Method

Design, sample and data collection. Study 2 asked working subjects to rate their own characteristics using multiple personality and leadership scales. Correlations between perceived personality and perceived authentic leadership across different managers were evaluated. It was expected that managers high on expressiveness (extraversion in the Big 5 scale) and high on consistency (conscientiousness in the Big 5 scale) would rate themselves highest on authentic leadership.

This study was an online study using Amazon Mechanical Turk software. Respondents were told that the study would take 20 minutes to complete and that they could exit the study at any time for any reason. Respondents were told that they would only get paid the $.75 reward for the completion of the study. This study asked the participants to rate themselves on personality (extraversion and conscientiousness) and authentic leadership. The subject saw the instructions:

“For each question below, please indicate your extent of agreement or disagreement by circling the appropriate number.”
At the beginning of the survey, participants viewed a screen with the statement of informed consent. Participants were told that researchers from Duke University were interested in how people are perceived based on their social situations. Then, participants were told that the survey concerned leadership behavior. Next, participants were given examples of questions they would see on the survey including “I clearly states what I believe” or “I ask for ideas that challenge my core beliefs.” These are the authentic leadership questions. Next, participants were told they would see questions like “I am the life of the party” or “I am always prepared.” These are the personality (extraversion and conscientiousness) questions. Then participants were given examples of the self-monitoring questions they would see including “I would make a very good actor” or “I can argue for a position that is not my own.” The informed consent screen ends with a note that participants will answer demographic questions and questions about income.

Next, each participant answered questions about his or her own personality. Scales used were the Big 5 factors (Costa & McCrae, 1978, 1992, 1995) and the self-monitoring scale (Gangestad & Snyder, 1985; Snyder & Gangestad, 1986). Participants then answered questions from the authentic leadership inventory which were adapted to be a self-rating (Neider & Schreisheim, 2011). Finally, participants answered demographic questions including questions about gender, age, education and whether the respondent works outside of the home.

The sample consisted of 107 respondents, 60 of whom are men and 47 of whom are women. Respondents worked in organizations ranging from 1 to 250 people and most respondents interacted with 6 to 10 people each day.
Measures

**Personality.** As in Study 1, respondents answered items from the Big 5 Factors (Costa & McCrae, 1978, 1992, 1995) on extraversion and conscientiousness. In this study, they answered the questions about themselves.

Each of these scales consists of 10 items. Each item was measured on a 7-point scale with 1 representing “strongly disagree” and 7 representing “strongly agree” that the leader exhibits that particular characteristic. The 10 items for each scale were added together and divided by 10 in order to come up with a composite score. The resulting scores were mean-centered before they were used in the analysis.

The 10 items measuring extraversion had a reliability of $\alpha = .918$ (Cronbach’s alpha). The 10 items measuring conscientiousness had a reliability of $\alpha = .927$ (Cronbach’s alpha).

**Self-Monitoring.** Self-monitoring was measured using the 1986 version of the self-monitoring scale (Gangestad & Snyder, 1985; Snyder & Gangestad, 1986). Self-monitoring has 2 components, public performing and other-directedness. The scale consists of 18 items and each item was measured on a 7-point scale with 1 representing “strongly disagree” and 7 representing “strongly agree” that the respondent exhibited the particular behavior. The 18 items were added together and divided by 18 to arrive at a composite self-monitoring score.

The 18 items measuring self-monitoring had a reliability of $\alpha = .820$ (Cronbach’s alpha).

**Authentic Leadership.** The ALI (Neider & Schreisheim, 2011) was used in order to measure authentic leadership. The ALI has 4 subscales with 4 items each. Examples of adapted items on each subscale include: balanced processing (e.g. “I ask for ideas that challenge my core beliefs”), internalized morality (I leader use my core beliefs to make a decision”), relational
transparency ("I openly share information with others") and self-awareness ("I show that I understand my strengths/weaknesses"). The items in the ALI tend to be behavioral, making it easier for followers to observe and evaluate.

Each item was measured on a 7-point scale with 1 representing "strongly disagree" and 7 representing "strongly agree" that the leader (the self) exhibits that particular characteristic. The 4 items for each scale were added together and divided by 16 in order to come up with a composite score.

The 16 items measuring authentic leadership had a reliability of $\alpha = .866$ (Cronbach’s alpha).

**Results and Discussion**

Study 2 used the Big 5 factors and subscales of self-monitoring as independent variables to test whether they predict self-rated perceptions of authentic leadership. Means, minimums, maximums and standard deviations of the data can be seen in table 1. The relationships among the variables can be observed in figure 2.

Multiple linear regression analysis was used to predict authentic leadership from self-rated extraversion and conscientiousness. Basic descriptive statistics and correlation coefficients are shown in Table 1. The extraversion and conscientiousness predictors had significant ($p < .05$) partial effects in the full model and the interaction was significant ($p < .05$). The two predictor model was able to account for 40% of the variance in authentic leadership, $F(3, 115) = 26.681, p < .000, R^2 = .410, \text{adjusted } R^2 = .395$.

Results support hypothesis 2 (the Big 5 will predict authentic leadership). The interaction was significant ($.073, p < .037$) and suggests that, as hypothesized, extraversion and
conscientiousness work together to predict authentic leadership. The coefficient is positive suggesting that the 2 variables move in the same direction as they predict authentic leadership. The main effect of extraversion is significant (.158, p<.001) which suggests that, all else equal, the more we are able to observe the leader in action, the more we are to perceive him or her as authentic. The main effect of conscientiousness is highly significant (.306, p<.000) showing that a leader who exhibits a determination to follow his or her values, attitudes and beliefs will be perceived as authentic. As with study 1, these results show that the leader who believes he or she acts consistently and is visible also believes that he or she acts as an authentic leader.

Figure 2 – Study 2 (Big 5): Authentic Leadership as a Function of Extraversion and Conscientiousness as Perceived by the Self (Self-Rated)
Study 2 also included self-rated self-monitoring to test whether expressiveness (self-monitoring subscale of public performing) and consistency (self-monitoring subscale of consistency) would predict self-rated authentic leadership. Means, minimums, maximums and standard deviations of the data can be seen in table 1. The relationships among the variables can be observed in figure 3.

Multiple linear regression analysis was used to predict authentic leadership from a measure of expressiveness (public performing) and consistency (self-directedness). Basic descriptive statistics and regression coefficients are shown in Table 2. The public performing predictor had a marginally significant partial effect in the model \(p<.10\) and the self-directed predictor had a significant \(p < .05\) partial effect in the full model. The interaction was not significant. The two predictor model was able to account for 10% of the variance in authentic leadership, \(F(3, 115) = 4.408, p < .006, R^2 = .103, \) adjusted \(R^2 = .080\).

Results provide partial support for hypothesis 2 (SM). The interaction was not significant \((-0.037, p<.347\) therefore there is not anything definitive to be said about the interaction and its’ relationship to the dependent variable, authentic leadership. The main effect of public performing is marginally significant \((0.078, p<.086)\) which suggests that, all else equal, the more leaders believe they are visible, the more they perceive themselves to be an authentic leader. The main effect of self-directedness is highly significant \((0.199, p<.003)\) showing that a leader who exhibits a determination to follow his or her values, attitudes and beliefs believes he or she will be perceived as acting authentically. These results add to the previous studies and support the idea that the leader who acts consistently and is observed doing so will be seen as authentic.
Figure 3 – Study 2 (SM): Authentic Leadership as a Function of Self-Monitoring (Public-Performing) and Self-Monitoring (Self-Directedness) as Perceived by the Self (Self-Rated)
Chapter 4: Authentic Leadership as a Mediator of Personality and Outcomes (Study 3)

This study used cross-sectional survey data with the primary objective of testing whether authentic leadership mediates the relationship between personality and organizational outcomes. It has been shown in the previous two chapters that authentic leadership is positively related to expressiveness (extraversion and public performing) and consistency (conscientiousness and self-directedness) whether these measures are self-rated or other-rated.

Judge et al. (2002) have shown that leader extraversion predicts follower job satisfaction. Jensen and Luthans (2006) find that authentic leadership leads to job satisfaction. The question that I test in this chapter is whether authentic leadership is the mechanism that explains the relationship between the leader’s personality variables and employee’s organizational outcomes.

Additionally, Study 3 tests whether the extraversion construct is more predictive of authentic leadership when it is broken into subscales. Specifically, extraversion consists of 2 subscales, sociability and dominance, which may work in opposite directions. I predict that sociability is the important variable that serves as the expressiveness building block for authentic leadership (Hypothesis 4). Dominance, on the other hand, is potentially harmful to effective leadership, and specifically to elements of authentic leadership that include gathering the opinions of others.

Method

Design, sample and data collection. Study 3 asked working subjects about their supervisors and how they rated their leaders’ characteristics using multiple personality scales, as the independent variables, and leadership scales and their own levels of job satisfaction as the dependent variables. Correlations between perceived personality and perceived authentic
leadership across different managers were tested. It was expected that authentic leadership would be revealed as the mechanism that helped to explain the relationship between leader personality and job satisfaction.

This study was an online study using Amazon Mechanical Turk respondents. Respondents were told that the study would take 20 minutes to complete and that they could exit the study at any time for any reason. Respondents were told that they would only get paid the $.75 reward for the completion of the study. This study asked the participants to rate a leader on personality (extraversion and conscientiousness) and authentic leadership. The subject saw the instructions:

“Please think of a leader that you have worked with in the recent past. The situation should be a formal relationship (work). Please take a minute to think of your different interactions with your team leader. Interactions might have been positive or negative. Please try to develop a complete recollection of your leader. Now that you have thought of a work supervisor you have worked with, please write that person's initials in the box. The following questions will refer to your supervisor (referred to by his or her initials).”

At the beginning of the survey, participants viewed a screen with the statement of informed consent. Participants were told that researchers from Duke University were interested in how people are perceived based on their social situations. Then, participants were told that the survey concerned leadership behavior. Next, participants were told they would be asked to think of a work supervisor and given examples of questions about that supervisor, such as “He/she (my supervisor) is always prepared” or “He/she (my supervisor) does things the right way.”. Next, participants were told they would see questions like “My supervisor clearly states what he/she means” or “My supervisor admits mistakes when they occur.” The informed consent screen ended with a note that participants will answer demographic questions and questions about income.
Next, participants answered questions about his or her supervisor including “what is the gender of your supervisor?”, “what is the age of your supervisor?”, “what is the nature of your relationship with your supervisor?”, and “for how long has your supervisor been your supervisor (with this team)?”

Next, participants answered personality questions (extraversion and conscientiousness) about the leader. Scales used were the Big 5 factors (Costa and McCrae, 1978, 1992, 1995). Participants then answered questions from the authentic leadership inventory (Neider & Schreisheim, 2011) about the leader. Then, participants answered questions about their own feelings and attitudes regarding perceived ethics of their supervisor, perceived levels of manipulation of their supervisor and their own levels of job satisfaction. Finally, participants answered demographic questions including questions about gender, age, education and whether the respondent works outside of the home.

The sample consisted of 179 respondents, 114 of whom are men and 65 of whom are women. Respondents worked outside of the home in organizations.

Measures

**Personality.** Respondents answered items from the Big 5 Factors (Costa and McCrae, 1978, 1992, 1995) about the leader.

Each of these scales consisted of 10 items. Each item was measured on a 7-point scale with 1 representing “strongly disagree” and 7 representing “strongly agree” that the leader exhibits that particular characteristic. The 10 items for each scale were added together and divided by 10 in order to come up with a composite score. The resulting scores were mean-centered before they were used in the analysis.
The 10 items measuring extraversion had a reliability of $\alpha = .898$ (Cronbach’s alpha). The 10 items measuring conscientiousness had a reliability of $\alpha = .941$ (Cronbach’s alpha).

**Authentic Leadership.** As in Study 1, the sixteen-item ALI (Neider & Schreisheim, 2011) was used in order to measure authentic leadership. Each item was measured on a 7-point scale with 1 representing “strongly disagree” and 7 representing “strongly agree” that the leader exhibits that particular characteristic.

The 16 items measuring authentic leadership had a reliability of $\alpha = .951$ (Cronbach’s alpha).

**Satisfaction.** Items used to evaluate participant job satisfaction included “I have felt very satisfied with my job, working with my supervisor”, “Most days I am enthusiastic about my work”, “Each day at work seems like it will never end” (r) and I consider my job to be rather unpleasant (r).

Each item was measured on a 11-point scale with 1 representing “strongly disagree” and 11 representing “strongly agree” that the leader exhibits that particular characteristic. The 4 items were added together and divided by 4 in order to come up with a composite score.
### Table 3 – Study 3: Means, Ranges, Standard Deviations and Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscient</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>.386**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALI</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.405**</td>
<td>.768**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>.344**</td>
<td>.535**</td>
<td>.606**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<.01, *p<.05

### Table 4 – Study 3: Regression Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>AL</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Satisfaction - Mediation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>4.833**</td>
<td>7.431</td>
<td>2.8887*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>.133*</td>
<td>.362*</td>
<td>.2401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>.663**</td>
<td>.914**</td>
<td>.2891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra x Cons</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentic Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.9417**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion x AL – indirect effect</td>
<td>.1319*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness x AL – indirect effect</td>
<td>.6209*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+p<.10, *p<.05, **p<.05
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Study 3 was designed to examine whether authentic leadership is actually a mediator of the relationship between the personality variables (extraversion and conscientiousness) and organizational outcomes like job satisfaction. These data were other-rated with the followers rating the leader on perceptions of personality and authentic leadership. Means, minimums, maximums and standard deviations of the data can be seen in table 3. The relationships among the variables, including regression coefficients, can be observed in figure 4.

Multiple linear regression analysis was used to predict authentic leadership from extraversion and conscientiousness. The extraversion predictor (p<.05) and conscientiousness predictor were significant (p<.000) in the full model. The interaction was not significant. The
two predictor model was able to account for 60% of the variance in authentic leadership, $F(3, 175) = 89.836, p < .000, R^2 = .606$, adjusted $R^2 = .600$. For the model with job satisfaction as the dependent variable, extraversion ($p<.05$) and conscientiousness were significant ($p<.000$). The interaction was not significant. The two predictor model accounted for 30% of the variance in job satisfaction, $F(3, 175) = 26.152, p < .000, R^2 = .310$, adjusted $R^2 = .298$.

Authentic leadership was added as a mediator to the model (Preacher and Hayes, 2004) as a mechanism between the perceived personality variables and follower job satisfaction. Basic descriptive statistics and regression coefficients are shown in Table 4.

Regression analysis was used to investigate the hypothesis that authentic leadership mediates the effect of personality (extraversion and conscientiousness) on job satisfaction. Results indicated that extraversion was a significant predictor of authentic leadership, $b = .1401$, SE $= .0563$, $p < .05$, and that authentic leadership was a significant predictor of job satisfaction, $b = .9417$, SE $= .1973$ $p < .05$. These results support the hypothesis that authentic leadership mediates the relationship between extraversion and job satisfaction. By controlling for authentic leadership as the mediator, extraversion was no longer a significant predictor of job satisfaction, $b = .2401$, SE $= .1500$, ns, results that are consistent with full mediation. About 60% of the variance in job satisfaction was accounted for by the predictors ($R^2 = .60$). The indirect effect of extraversion through authentic leadership was tested using a bootstrap estimation approach with 10,000 samples (Shrout & Bolger, 2002). Results indicated the indirect coefficient of extraversion through authentic leadership was significant, $b = .1319$, SE $= .0707$, 95% CI $= .0227, .3070$. A supervisor who was perceived as increasingly extraverted was associated with approximately .13 points higher job satisfaction scores as mediated by authentic leadership.
Regression analysis was also used to investigate the hypothesis that authentic leadership mediates the effect of personality conscientiousness on job satisfaction. Results indicated that conscientiousness was a significant predictor of authentic leadership, $b = .6593$, $SE = .0471$, $p < .05$, and that authentic leadership was a significant predictor of job satisfaction, $b = .9417$, $SE = .1973$, $p < .05$. These results support the hypothesis that authentic leadership mediates the relationship between conscientiousness and job satisfaction. By controlling for authentic leadership as the mediator, conscientiousness was no longer a significant predictor of job satisfaction, $b = .2891$, $SE = .1793$, ns, results that are consistent with full mediation. About 38% of the variance in satisfaction was accounted for by the predictors ($R^2 = .388$). The indirect effect of conscientiousness through authentic leadership was tested using a bootstrap estimation approach with 10,000 samples (Shrout & Bolger, 2002). Results indicated the indirect coefficient of conscientiousness through authentic leadership was significant, $b = .6209$, $SE = .1634$, 95% CI = .3202, .9680. A supervisor who was perceived as increasingly conscientious was associated with approximately .62 points higher job satisfaction scores as mediated by authentic leadership.
Table 5 – Study 1-3: Summary of Proposed Relationships and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other-Rated AL</th>
<th>Self-Rated AL Study 2</th>
<th>Self-Rated AL Study 2</th>
<th>AL as Mediator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Big 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 1: Other-rated personality predicts AL</td>
<td>Hypothesis 2 (Big 5): Self-rated personality predicts AL</td>
<td>Hypothesis 2 (SM): Self-rated personality (self-monitoring) predicts AL</td>
<td>Hypothesis 3: AL mediates the relationship between personality and job satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial Support: interaction regression coefficient marginally significant and in predicted direction. Main effects significant.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>Partial Support: interaction regression coefficient not significant but in predicted direction. Main effect of self-directedness significant, main effect of public-performing marginally significant.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 5: Dyadic Study - WEMBA Class (Study 4)

Previous studies have relied on single rater assessments of our constructs, and are subject to concerns with common method variance. This study used dyadic survey data to obtain follower ratings of authentic leadership separate from leader self-ratings of extraversion and conscientiousness. This allowed us to test whether self-ratings of the building blocks of authentic leadership -- expressiveness (extraversion) and consistency (conscientiousness) – predicted follower perceptions of authentic leadership. In this study, participants were executive MBA students (targets – WEMBA students) and their direct reports. This study used cross-sectional survey data with the primary objective of obtaining follower ratings of authentic leadership and leader self-ratings of extraversion and conscientiousness.

Method

**Design, sample and data collection.** Study 4 asked WEMBA students (leaders) and others (direct reports, supervisors, peers and others) to complete personality scales (leader) and leadership scales (other raters). WEMBA students completed an online Qualtrics study regarding their personality measures (extraversion and conscientiousness). Other raters of the WEMBA students completed the SDLS leadership questionnaire partially comprised of authentic leadership questions about the WEMBA students. Correlations between perceived personality and perceived authentic leadership across different managers were evaluated. It was expected that those rating high on expressiveness (extraversion in the Big 5 scale) and high on consistency (conscientiousness in the Big 5 scale) would be rated highest on authentic leadership.

The self-rated personality portion of the study was an online study using Qualtrics software. WEMBA students were told that the study would take 5 minutes to complete and that
they could exit the study at any time for any reason. This study asked the participants to rate themselves on personality (extraversion and conscientiousness). The subject saw the following instructions:

“For each of the statements below, indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the statement by clicking on the number in the space beside the question using the scale below.

Please answer these questions based on your thoughts about your own attitudes and your own behavior.”

At the beginning of the survey, participants viewed a screen with the informed consent. Participants were told that researchers from Duke University were interested in how people are perceived based on their personality characteristics and that certain outcomes differ based on these different perceptions by different people. Then, participants were told that they would be asked questions about their own personalities like “I am always prepared” or “I do things the right way.” Participants were then told that each would be eligible to win a $50 gift card upon completion of the survey and there would be 3 winners. Participants were reminded that participation is voluntary and that they can quit the survey at any time. The informed consent screen ended with a note that since participants will answer potentially sensitive questions, information will be de-identified so that participants will not be matched with their answers.

Participants were asked to enter their full names and email addresses.

Next, the WEMBA participants answered questions about their own personality. Scales used were the Big 5 factors (Costa & McCrae, 1978, 1992, 1995) and the self-monitoring scale (Gangestad & Snyder, 1985; Snyder & Gangestad, 1986). Finally, participants were thanked for their participation.
The follower sample consisted of the averaged responses of observers of 49 WEMBA respondents (N = 403).

The follower-rated portion of the study was collected through the Six Domains of Leadership Survey as part of an overall 360 assessment. This portion asked acquaintances of the WEMBA student to rate the student on various questions related to leadership, including authentic leadership.


**Measures**

**Personality.** The WEMBA students answered items from the Big 5 Factors (Costa & McCrae, 1978, 1992, 1995).

Each of these scales consists of 10 items. Each item was measured on a 7-point scale with 1 representing “strongly disagree” and 7 representing “strongly agree” that the leader exhibits that particular characteristic. The 10 items for each scale were added together and divided by 10 in order to come up with a composite score. The resulting scores were mean-centered before they were used in the analysis.
The 10 items measuring extraversion had a reliability of $\alpha = .884$ (Cronbach’s alpha). The 10 items measuring conscientiousness had a reliability of $\alpha = .880$ (Cronbach’s alpha).

**Authentic Leadership.** As in previous studies, the ALI (Neider & Schreisheim, 2011) was used to measure authentic leadership. It was completed by the various followers of the WEMBA student, including direct reports, teammates, and supervisors.

The 16 items measuring authentic leadership had a reliability of $\alpha = .923$ (Cronbach’s alpha).

**Results and Discussion**

Study 4 was designed to test whether leader ratings of expressiveness (self-monitoring subscale of public performing) and consistency (self-monitoring subscale of consistency) would predict follower ratings of authentic leadership in a dyadic research design. The simultaneous collection of field data from the leader and observers was intended to address the common-method variance issue and provide a design with actual leaders and followers which would provide more persuasive results. Means, minimums, maximums and standard deviations of the data can be seen in Table 6.

Multiple linear regression analysis was used to predict authentic leadership from extraversion and conscientiousness. Each WEMBA student had a number of observers: direct reports, supervisors, peers and others. The ratings of these observers was averaged for each WEMBA student in order to come to a subject pool of 49. Basic descriptive statistics and regression coefficients are shown in Table 6 and Table 7. There were no significant main effects. The interaction was not significant. The two predictor model had 49 subjects and was
able to account for 4% of the variance in authentic leadership, $F(3, 45) = .608, p < .613, R^2 = .039$, adjusted $R^2 = -.025$.

Results do not provide support for any hypothesis.

Study 4 did not replicate the findings of the previous 3 studies. Limitations to Study 4 include the fact that the sample size was very small, 49 subjects. The sample size was limited due to the result of working with the students in the WEMBA class who were available. A small sample size limits the amount of power available to find an effect.

Table 6 – Study 4: Means, Ranges, Standard Deviations and Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>.987</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscient</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>.917</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALI</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>.458</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>-.146</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<.01, *p<.05**
### Table 7 – Study 1, Study 2 & Study 4: Regression Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Study 1</th>
<th>Study 2 (Big 5)</th>
<th>Study 2 (SM)</th>
<th>Study 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>5.181**</td>
<td>5.149**</td>
<td>5.162**</td>
<td>4.823**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>.185*</td>
<td>.158**</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>.600**</td>
<td>.306**</td>
<td>-.094</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra x Cons</td>
<td>.113+</td>
<td>.073*</td>
<td>-.050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Directedness (SM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.199*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public-Performing (SM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.078+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Direct x PP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+p<.10, *p<.05, **p<.05
Chapter 6: Future Directions

This paper contributes to authentic leadership research by showing how personality measures can be used to reveal authentic leadership by utilizing them as building blocks of social perception. The building blocks of consistency and expressiveness have been expressed through conscientiousness and extraversion (Big Five) and through self-monitoring (public-performing and other-directedness). Other personality constructs may exhibit this tension between “being yourself” and “being seen.” For example, emotional labor with its focus on deep acting (genuinely feeling emotions that you are portraying to others) is a construct that might fit this paradigm.

Researchers have used traits as predictors in leadership studies for many years, for example the Great Man Theory (Stogdill, 1948). In recent years, however, researchers have become somewhat skeptical about personality as a predictor of leadership because research using personality to predict leadership has been inconsistent and disappointing (Judge et al., 2002). Furthermore, Zaccaro et al., (1991) report that trait explanations of leader emergence are generally regarded with little esteem by leadership researchers. Indeed, Morgeson, Campion, Dipboye, Hollenbeck, Murphy and Schmitt (2007) even assert that personality may not even be a useful or reliable variable for selecting leaders in organizational contexts.

Many of the traditional studies on leadership and personality have proposed a straightforward relationship between personality and leadership e.g. extraversion predicts leader emergence (Judge et al., 2002). And, typically, personality is a self-report, with the leader reporting his or her level of a certain measure of personality (Colbert et al., 2012).
This study, however, takes a different view, that 1) personality and leadership don’t have to have a straightforward, linear relationship. The building blocks of leadership (expressiveness and consistency) are reflected in the personality variables (extraversion and conscientiousness) and the interaction of the two personality variables predict authentic leadership. This study also shows that, 2) by utilizing follower reports with self-reports that leadership can be persuasively predicted. Personality research, using only self-reports, can be faked or biased (Morgeson et al., 2007; Funder, 1991). Moreover, Funder (1991) finds that observer reports can be effective as long as the individual is able to adequately observe the subject. Using both self-reports of the leader and other reports of the followers allows for a more complete and accurate understanding of the leaders’ true characteristics. Heller, Judge, and Watson (2002) argue that using both self and other reports can be effective because you get the best of both approaches: You avoid biases like common method variance, social desirability bias and you get two meaningful perspectives, self and observer. This paper shows that this approach may be especially useful in leadership studies that rely on personality variables: an approach that, when measures are taken, addresses potential research biases and that provides multiple, meaningful perspectives.

As stated before, Heller et al., (2002) reveal that personality research can be improved by more thoughtful research designs. This paper takes a similar approach by using both self-reports and other reports. This paper also advocates another way to improve personality research by more thoughtfully using personality constructs as predictors. By understanding that personality constructs may have subdimensions and that these subdimensions must be thoughtfully handled can make personality research more effective and may provide unexpected insights.

Researchers should be aware of personality constructs that have subscales that are not unitary. Often, the subscales will move in different directions and may produce unexpected
results when aggregated to the higher order construct. For example, this paper shows that an authentic leader is found in the middle of the self-monitoring scale since the public-performing subscale represents a high authentic leadership trait and the other-directedness subscale represents a low authentic leadership trait.

Walumbwa et al. (2008) show through confirmatory factor analyses that authentic leadership is best conceptualized as a higher order, multidimensional construct with subscales balanced processing, internalized morality, relational transparency and self-awareness. Their ALQ measure, using ratings of followers, shows the power of the construct in predicting outcomes for job satisfaction, satisfaction with supervisor, organizational citizenship behaviors and organizational commitment, after controlling for ethical leadership and transformational leadership. Empirical work has followed the recommendation of Walumbwa et al. (2008) and has conceptualized authentic leadership as a higher order construct and utilized it in this way (Walumbwa et al., 2010; Leroy, Palanski & Simons, 2012; Peus, et al., 2012).

One can ask questions, however, about how the subscales impact the overall construct given certain conditions. For example, if the outcome of interest is satisfaction with the supervisor, one might reasonably assume that a leader who scored high on balanced processing, taking the opinions of others into consideration before coming to a conclusion, might score higher on authentic leadership than another leader, all else equal. Or, a leader who scored high on relational transparency or internalized morality, someone who behaves in ways that are consistent with his or her values, might be seen as more trustworthy than a leader who didn’t score as high on these subscales.

Additionally, the subscales might not always move in the same direction, given a certain outcome. For example, if the outcome of interest is trust, a reasonable assumption would be that
a higher score on each of the subscales would positively contribute to feelings of trust in the authentic leader. However, would that assumption hold for a different outcome? If the outcome of interest were identification with the leader, higher scores on internalized morality might not lead to more identification with the leader if the values and attitudes of the leader and follower are not aligned. What about burnout? An authentic leader who scores high on balanced processing, making sure to consider all opinions before making a decision, might appear to be less authentic as his or her constant requests for input takes a toll on followers.

One can also seek to determine which if any of the subscales are primary and/or necessary. For example, definitions of authentic leadership invariably invoke the idea that authentic leadership is concerned with a leader whose actions follow their beliefs, attitudes and values. Thus, it would make sense to test whether a high score on the subscale of internalized morality, or consistency, is necessary for a leader to be perceived as authentic. On the other hand, is it essential that an authentic leader be self-aware? First, self-awareness is difficult to measure for an observer (how would one know whether the actions of a leader reflect the awareness that leader has of him or herself? How would different raters come to agreement). Also, if a leader scored high on the other subscales, would a high score on self-awareness add anything to the perceived authenticity of the leader? These questions can be asked of the other subscales as well.

As just mentioned, there may be measurement issues with the authentic leadership measures, the ALQ and the ALI (Neider & Schreisheim, 2011). Although the items of the ALI, which derives from the ALQ (see Appendix E) appear to be behavioral, a scale that focuses on the more easily observed of the items might lead to better measurement properties, like higher
alphas and more agreement among observers. A re-focusing of the subscales on the most behavioral of the items might lead to better psychometric performance.

**Conclusions**

This paper illustrates how personality, the building blocks of expressiveness and consistency, can be used to influence social processes that result in perceptions of authentic leadership. In this study, followers respond to the interaction of extraversion and conscientiousness and arrive at perceptions of authentic leadership. Other personality constructs, especially those with multiple dimensions, can be utilized in the same way to examine and explain how followers perceive leaders. Personality can and should be used as a predictor in leadership research if used in creative and thoughtful ways.

1. He/she feels comfortable around people.

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   strongly  somewhat  slightly  no  slightly  somewhat  strongly
   disagree  disagree  disagree  opinion  agree  agree  agree

2. He/she makes friends easily

3. He/she is skilled in handling social situations

4. He/she is the life of the party

5. He/she knows how to captivate people

   Extraversion – Reverse Scored

6. He/she doesn’t talk a lot

7. He/she doesn’t like to draw attention to himself/herself

8. He/she would describe his/her experiences as somewhat dull

9. He/she keeps in the background

10. He/she has little to say

1. I feel comfortable around people
   
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   strongly somewhat slightly no slightly somewhat strongly
   disagree disagree disagree opinion agree agree agree

2. I make friends easily

3. I am skilled in handling social situations

4. I am the life of the party

5. I know how to captivate people

**Extraversion –Reverse Scored**

6. I don’t talk a lot

7. I don’t like to draw attention to myself

8. I would describe my experiences as somewhat dull

9. I keep in the background

10. I have little to say

1. He/she is always prepared

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   strongly somewhat slightly no slightly somewhat strongly
disagree disagree disagree opinion agree agree agree

2. He/she pays attention to details

3. He/she gets chores done right away

4. He/she carries out his/her plans

5. He/she makes plans and sticks to them

Conscientiousness – Reverse Scored

6. He/she shirks his/her duties

7. He/she doesn’t see things through

8. He/she does just enough work to get by

9. He/she finds it difficult to get down to work

10. He/she wastes his/her time
Appendix D. Conscientiousness Scale – Self Ratings (Leader Rating Him or Herself) (Costa & McCrae, 1978, 1992, 1995)

1. I am always prepared

   1   2   3   4   5   6   7
   strongly disagree  somewhat disagree  slightly disagree  no opinion  slightly agree  somewhat agree  strongly agree

2. I pay attention to details

3. I get chores done right away

4. I carry out my plans

5. I make plans and stick to them

Conscientiousness – Reverse Scored

6. I shirk my duties

7. I don’t see things through

8. I do just enough work to get by

9. I find it difficult to get down to work

10. I waste my time
Appendix E. Authentic Leadership Scale – Other Ratings (Follower Rating Leader)  
(Neider & Schreisheim, 2011)

1. My leader solicits feedback for improving his/her dealings with others
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly somewhat slightly no slightly somewhat strongly
disagree disagree disagree opinion agree agree agree

2. My leader clearly states what he/she means

3. My leader shows consistency between his/her beliefs and actions

4. My leader asks for ideas that challenge his/her core beliefs

5. My leader describes accurately the way that others view his/her abilities

6. My leader admits mistakes when they occur

7. My leader uses his/her core beliefs to make decisions

8. My leader carefully listens to alternative perspectives before reaching a conclusion

9. My leader shows that he/she understands his/her strengths and weaknesses

10. My leader openly shares information with others

11. My leader resists pressures on him/her to do things contrary to his/her beliefs

12. My leader objectively analyzes relevant data before making a decision

13. My leader is clearly aware of the impact he/she has on others

14. My leader expresses his/her ideas and thoughts clearly to others

15. My leader is guided in his/her actions by internal moral standards

16. My leader encourages others to voice opposing points of view
Appendix F. Authentic Leadership Scale – Self Ratings (Leader Rating Him or Herself)

1. I solicit feedback for improving my dealings with others

1 strongly disagree 2 somewhat disagree 3 slightly disagree 4 no opinion 5 slightly agree 6 somewhat agree 7 strongly agree

2. I clearly state what I mean

3. I show consistency between my beliefs and actions

4. I ask for ideas that challenge my core beliefs

5. I describe accurately the way that others view my abilities

6. I admit mistakes when they occur

7. I use my core beliefs to make decisions

8. I carefully listen to alternative perspectives before reaching a conclusion

9. I show that I understand my strengths and weaknesses

10. I openly share information with others

11. I resist pressure on me to do things contrary to my beliefs

12. I objectively analyze relevant data before making a decision

13. I am clearly aware of the impact I have on others

14. I express my ideas and thoughts clearly to others

15. I am guided in my actions by internal moral standards

16. I encourage others to voice opposing points of view
Appendix G. Self-Monitoring Scale – Self Ratings (Gangestad and Snyder, 1985; Snyder and Gangestad)

1. I find it hard to imitate the behavior of other people.

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   strongly   somewhat   slightly   no   slightly   somewhat   strongly
   disagree   disagree   disagree   opinion   agree   agree   agree

2. At parties and social gatherings, I do not attempt to say things that others will like.

3. I can only argue for ideas which I already believe.

4. I can make impromptu speeches on topics about which I have almost no information.

5. I guess I put on a show to impress or entertain others.

6. I would probably make a good actor.

7. In a group of people I am rarely the center of attention.

8. In different situations and with different people, I act like very different persons.

9. I am not particularly good at making other people like me.

10. I’m not always the person I appear to be.

11. I would not change my opinions (or the way I do things) in order to please someone else or win their favor.

12. I have considered being an entertainer.

13. I have never been good at games like charades or improvisational acting.

14. I have trouble changing my behavior to suit different people and different situations.

15. At parties I let others keep the jokes and stories going.

16. I feel a bit awkward in company and do not show up as well as I should.

17. I can look anyone in the face and tell a lie with a straight face (if for a right end).

18. I may deceive people by being friendly when I really dislike them.
Appendix H. Self-Monitoring Mini Scales (Gangestad and Snyder, 1985; Snyder and Gangestad)

Expressiveness (Public-Performing)
4. I can make impromptu speeches on topics about which I have almost no information.
6. I would probably make a good actor.
12. I have considered being an entertainer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expressiveness</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3.188</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consistency (Self-Directedness)
2. At parties and social gatherings, I do not attempt to say things that others will like.
3. I can only argue for ideas which I already believe.
11. I would not change my opinions (or the way I do things) in order to please someone else or win their favor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consistency</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.636</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I. Email To EMBA Students

Hi everyone, my name is Devin and I am a 6th year PhD student in the Management group here at Fuqua. I am working on a possible dissertation project with Professor Larrick where we are examining the leadership characteristics of Fuqua EMBA students. This research would be valuable in understanding how others perceive leaders and how things like trust forms in leadership relationships. Below we describe the types of questions we’d like to ask.

The most important aspect of the research is that it is most fruitful if we can have nearly full participation from each section. Because we want to study leadership, it is most useful to us to have 360 degree sets of respondents (leader and follower or peer) who have existing relationships take the survey. We would also like to look at perceptions within the relationship. So, there will be 2 surveys: survey 1 will be an online survey completed by you, the EMBA student and survey 2 will be an online survey completed by the follower or peer of the EMBA student. So, you will be asked to nominate someone that can report about you and your work. Survey 2 will be completed by that person. It is important to note that each survey is voluntary. And, even if you do decide to participate by responding to the survey, no one besides the researcher (me) will know. Furthermore, we would insist that you please do not ask followers or peers whether they participated by responding and returning the survey. We would not want to create an atmosphere where your co-workers felt obligated to participate in this research. Your co-workers/peers will also be told that the research is voluntary. In any case, your responses to the survey and decision to participate will be completely confidential. We expect each survey to take about 20 minutes to complete.

If you are interested in participating, we would be happy to donate money to a charity of your choice (among St. Judes Medical, Unicef, United Way). We would be happy to donate $10 per person who completes the survey. For EMBA colleagues or peers, we would be happy to offer Amazon gift cards in the amount of $10 for each survey completed. Important! In order to collect the donation or reward, the survey must be completed.

The main questions we’d like to ask are about leadership characteristics and trust in teams. We would like to examine the types of personality traits that cause a leader to be perceived as authentic. We would also like to determine how these characteristics might lead to ratings of trust and work performance. We fully recognize that these are sensitive questions. A key aspect of the research is that all answers will be completely confidential (i.e., known only to me) – no one’s answers would ever be shared with anyone else. When data are analyzed and reported in research papers, they are pooled together in such a way that no person’s answer is every knowable to anyone else. Furthermore, I will do all of the matching of individuals to teams and will de-identify the data by replacing names with corresponding numbers. So, although we ask questions by name, we will remove names from the data. Finally, for those who would be
interested in the results of the study, we can provide a summary of the findings once the study is completed.

Thanks

Devin
Appendix J. Email To Employee/Peer (Phase 2)

Hi Person X, my name is Devin Hargrove and I am a 6th year Phd student in the Management group at Duke University’s Fuqua School of Business. I am working on a dissertation project with Professor Rick Larrick where we are examining the leadership characteristics of Fuqua EMBA students. This research would be valuable in understanding how others perceive leaders and how things like trust forms in leadership relationships. Below we describe the types of questions we’d like to ask.

You are receiving this email because you have been nominated to participate by Supervisor A. Supervisor A thinks that you would be a good person to think about and answer questions regarding Supervisor A’s personality type and work characteristics. While Supervisor A has nominated you, Supervisor A does not require that you participate. In fact, Supervisor A will not know whether or not you have participated. Furthermore, Supervisor A has been told not to contact you about your participation or about the ways in which you answered the questions, should you participate. Just to be clear, participation is voluntary and any answers you provide will be confidential.

Because we want to study leadership, it is most useful to us to have 360 degree sets of respondents (leader and follower or peer) who have existing relationships take the survey. We would also like to look at perceptions within the relationship. So, there will be 2 surveys: survey 1 will be an online survey completed by the EMBA student, the person who nominated you and survey 2 will be an online survey completed by the follower or peer of the EMBA student, which is you. We expect each survey to take about 20 minutes to complete.

If you are interested in participating, we would be happy to offer Amazon gift cards in the amount of $10 for each survey completed. Important! In order to collect the donation or reward, the survey must be completed. You will have 1 month to complete the survey. We may follow up at the 2 week mark, the 3 week mark and a couple of days before the month is up.

The main questions we’d like to ask are about leadership characteristics and trust in teams. We would like to examine the types of personality traits that cause a leader to be perceived as authentic. We would also like to determine how these characteristics might lead to ratings of trust and work performance. We fully recognize that these are sensitive questions. A key aspect of the research is that all answers will be completely confidential (i.e., known only to me) – no one’s answers would ever be shared with anyone else. When data are analyzed and reported in research papers, they are pooled together in such a way that no person’s answer is every knowable to anyone else. Furthermore, I will do all of the matching of individuals to teams and will de-identify the data by replacing names with corresponding numbers. So, although we ask
questions by name, we will remove names from the data. Finally, for those who would be interested in the results of the study, we can provide a summary of the findings once the study is completed.

Would you like to participate? If yes, please click on the link below.

Thanks

Devin
Appendix K: SDLS Instructions

“The survey process begins when you, as a leader seeking evaluations, receive an e-mail giving you a web link that takes you to a personal survey home page (see the “home page” below.) The email explains that the SDLS is a confidential survey: Only you, people with whom you choose to share your results, and your designated coach (if you have one) will see the ratings. The e-mail provides a username (your e-mail address, typically) and a password to enter the website. Once you enter your personal survey home page, there are two things to do: (1) complete the survey on yourself, and (2) list other people you want to ask to rate your leadership actions.

1. To complete the survey on yourself, click on the highlighted text under the heading “Enter Survey” on the line that contains the word “self”, the software will take you directly to the survey. You may answer the survey questions all at one time, or you may complete part now and finish later. (You will also be able to access the survey from the web page where you enter raters, as explained below.) We ask you to rate yourself, so you have a comparison of how you see your leadership to use when you get ratings from others.

(Please note also that there might be other lines in the survey table referring to other people who have requested you to rate their leadership using the SDLS. You would rate them by clicking on the highlighted text under “Enter Survey” in the line with their name listed.)

There is a field on your Survey Home Page that allows you to enter a “preferred name” to be used in e-mails and in the survey itself. This permits you to change the way you are referred to in the survey, so that you can use a nickname (e.g., “Ravi” rather than
“Ravindra”) or a title “Prof. Newton” in questions that mention you by name
(“Ravi/Ravindra/Prof. Sinnarkar, talks about the team as being something of real
importance.”)

2. Asking others to rate you. To complete this step, go to your home page and click on
underlined text that says “Add/Edit Your Raters”. Here you will be able to ask
supervisors, peers, direct reports and others who may have seen your leadership actions
to complete surveys. (When the survey is used situations where people typically do not
have supervisors or direct reports, the form asks only for ratings from peers—or
teammates—and outside raters. This might occur in school classes on leadership, for
example.) From “Add/Edit Your Raters” you will be taken to a new “survey
administration” (again, see below) webpage that will allow you enter raters and to
categorize them according to your relationship to them. As you add each rater, an e-mail
will be sent to him or her asking on your behalf requesting ratings of your leadership.

The e-mails are sent automatically as soon as you enter the rater’s name and
address; you don’t need to click the envelope that appears in the rater list. You can use
that envelope icon later to re-send invitations in case someone loses their login
information or to send out reminders.

These e-mails promise confidentiality to all raters in that only the leader and
his/her coach have access to the ratings. In addition, peer, direct report, and other raters’
ratings are shown only as averages of two or more raters: if only one person in any of
those categories completes the survey, the 1 The survey routinely solicits anonymous
participation in research studies (and we give client organizations a discount for
participation in our research). If leaders choose to participate in our studies, their names
and identifying information are stripped from the data files. Results are not displayed.
Note that this is NOT true in the Supervisor category, where even one response is
displayed.

After you have sent the requests out, you can track progress by the color of the
questionnaire icon in the “Status” column of the raters table. Mousing over the icon will
explain these colors, which are also defined at the bottom of the page. For those who
have not responded, you have the option of resending the initial invitation e-mail, or
sending a shorter reminder e-mail to them.

As noted earlier, the “survey administration” page also has a link that will take
you to your self-survey.

Once the time allotted for the survey has past, an icon will appear on the survey
home page, under “Create Report” in the line of the table that says “self” for
“relationship”. Clicking on this icon will create a “pdf” report of your rating results that
can be viewed on your computer or printed. The graphics allow the leader to compare
ratings by various categories of raters. The tabular reports allow easy comparison across
categories, give information on the variability of responses across raters and questions,
and give more detailed averages for sub-domains and for individual items. Often when
the SDLS is being used in leadership courses, we do not allow the target to see his or
her results until after the class begins. We do this so that we can teach leaders how
to interpret the SDLS before they have spent a lot of time with them.

On the pages that follow we show examples of some of the web pages mentioned above,
and we provide answers to some frequently asked questions about the survey.
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