AUTHENTIC LEADERSHIP

Margaret Meacham, MBA, PhD

April 2007

Authentic Leadership Overview

Authentic leadership components include leader, follower, culture, and outcomes. Leaders influence followers who create, maintain, and sustain culture, which ultimately affects the performance outcomes of the organization. A brief overview of the leader's role and significant concepts affecting authenticity are discussed. The dimensions of followership follow, culminating with a discussion of authentic cultures and veritable and sustainable outcomes.

Authentic Leaders ~ Briefly

Avolio, Gardner, Walumbwa, Luthans, and May (2004a) considered authentic leadership as the root construct for all positive leaderships, including transformational and ethical leadership. Luthans and Avolio (2003) noted that a convergence of positive psychology, transformational leadership, and ethical leadership was needed to allow institutions to thrive, gain competitive advantage, and survive; this convergence was known as authentic leadership. Cooper, Scandura, and Schriesheim (2005) suggested the disciplines of leadership, ethics, and positive organizational scholarship informed the authentic leadership construct.

Hannah, Lester, and Vogelgesang (2005) defined authentic leadership as "a process that: (1) emanates from a leader; (2) is driven by the abilities and motives inherent in a highly developed moral self-concept; and (3) is fueled by leader virtue and an altruistic desire to exercise agentic control over the leadership domain" (p. 51). Gardner, Avolio, and Walumbwa (2005b) emphasized that authentic leadership focused attention on "the processes whereby leaders and followers experience growth by becoming more authentic" (p. 346).

Cooper et al. (2005) asserted that authentic leadership could not be acquired as a competency skill through a traditional leadership training program. Authentic leadership was learned over a lifetime. Training could not replicate "trigger events" that influenced personal development. Scholars could not agree on whether ethical decision-making could be taught through training programs. Age seemed to be particularly relevant for the development of authenticity. Experiences that honed authenticity took time, often a lifetime, to experience. Individuals needed time to experience various trigger events and then to reflect upon them, which would influence moral development. Such development took years.

May, Chan, Hodges, and Avolio (2003) explained that authentic leadership development had three required moral components: moral capacity, moral courage, and moral resiliency. All three of these developed over time, influenced moral actions, and modeled the way for followers and other leaders. An authentic institutional culture that was ethical and supportive allowed authentic leadership development to flourish.

Chan, Hannah, and Gardner (2005) asserted, "authentic leadership is a lifelong developmental phenomenon that involves acquiring greater self-awareness along with an unwavering commitment to and regulation of the self" (p. 35). Avolio and Gardner (2005) noted a focus of authentic leadership was personal development for the sake of development prior to seeking or attaining leadership roles. This was one of the distinguishing features of authentic leadership. Once leadership roles had been attained, further professional and personal development would continue as the leader sought to evolve authentically. Most leadership development discussed relative to other forms of leadership were focused on leadership development solely after one had attained a

position of leadership with an emphasis on professional development rather than personal development.

Moral Development.

Luthans and Avolio (2003) posited an inherent ethical or moral component to authentic leadership. May et al. (2003) asserted authentic leaders used an ethical and transparent decision-making process that inherently required a moral component. In order to have a positive moral perspective, one must have a positive moral capacity to address ethical issues, take moral actions, and develop authenticity. Burns (1978) insisted upon a moral component for transformational leadership, as did Bass (1990) in his later work as he expanded upon his own work (1985) and Burns' (1978) model for transformational leadership.

Avolio and Gardner (2005) noted that authentic leaders influenced followers through "the processes of identification, positive modeling, emotional contagion, supporting self-determination, and positive social exchanges …," which were considered to be the "leadership component" of authentic leadership (p. 328). Gardner et al. (2005b) indicated that:

> First and foremost, an authentic leader must achieve authenticity
> … through self-awareness, self-acceptance, and authentic actions
> and relationships. However, authentic leadership extends beyond
> the authenticity of the leader as a person to encompass authentic
> relations with followers and associates. These relationships are
> characterized by: a) transparency, openness, and trust, b) guidance
> toward worthy objectives, and c) an emphasis on follower
> development (p. 347).

Avolio et al. (2004a) posited that authentic leaders influenced follower attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors while enhancing the effects of hope, optimism, trust, and positive emotions. The positive emotions and trust developed between leaders and followers

strengthened the leadership process by building integrity. Emotions were viewed as important within the leader-follower relationship, unlike many other leadership paradigms. Authentic leaders influenced follower attitudes of commitment, job satisfaction, empowerment, and task engagement. The interrelationship between meaningfulness in the workplace and task engagement was strong, which effected productivity, profits, customer satisfaction, employee turnover, and job-related accidents. Gardner et al. (2005b) noted that leaders could profoundly influence followers' views regarding appropriate values. When leaders focused on self-enhancement values, followers activated their working self-concept on the individual (independent) level. When leaders focused on self-transcendence values, followers activated their working self-concept on the collective (relational) level. Lord and Brown (2001) added that when leaders focus on self-enhancement and self-transcendence values simultaneously, followers failed to activate the working self-concept due to the incompatibility of such a message. When asked to focus on personal gain, followers would. When asked to focus on self-sacrifice for the organization, followers would. But when the self-enhancing leader asked the followers for self-sacrifice, followers usually did nothing in response rather than sorting out the inconsistencies and incongruencies.

Varella, Javidan, and Waldman (2005) maintained authentic leaders strove to develop social capital with followers, which ultimately benefited the social group rather than the individual. Luthans, Avolio, Walumbwa, and Li (2005) asserted authentic leaders also would strive to develop psychological capital (individual benefit) with followers, which produced higher levels of optimism, resilience, efficacy, and hope within the followers.

Avolio and Gardner (2005) explained that leaders influenced followers through personal and social identification, positive modeling, emotional contagion, and positive social exchanges. Avolio et al. (2004a, 2004b), Gardner et al. (2005b), and Ilies, Morgeson, and Nahrgang (2005) discussed how leader values, modeling, and relational transparency influenced followers' personal identification (self) and social identification (self within the context of society). Followers identified with the leader.

Positive Modeling.

Avolio et al. (2004a), Gardner et al. (2005b), Ilies et al. (2005), Luthans and Avolio (2003), May et al. (2003), Shamir and Eilam (2005), and Shamir, House, and Arthur (1993) cited the primary mechanism authentic leaders used to influence followers was positive modeling. Positive modeling was a component of self-awareness, self-regulation, positive psychological states, and positive moral perspectives. Leaders who positively modeled must be self-aware and regulate their behaviors. Through this awareness, positive psychological states and positive moral perspectives developed for leaders and followers. Avolio et al. (2004a) and Michie and Gooty (2005) discussed the influence of emotional contagion and positive social exchanges on followers. Authentic leaders who appropriately showed their emotions and kept a positive emotional perspective tended to be contagious with their influence on followers' emotional states, which created positive psychological states for leaders and followers. Leaders who transparently and positively interacted with followers created the opportunity for mutually beneficial positive social exchanges. These exchanges built trust and integrity within the leader-follower relationship.

Gardner et al. (2005b) maintained that as authentic leaders actively and continuously modeled self-awareness, balanced processing, transparency, and authentic behavior, they did this through congruency of thoughts, words, and deeds. Therefore, this positive modeling exhibited to followers an authentic way of thinking, speaking, and behaving that would enhance authentic follower development. Authentic leaders positive modeling served as a key input to authentic follower development. The authentic growth of leaders and followers created group norms that would shift the organizational culture toward a more ethical and authentic culture.

Sheldon and Elliot (1999) and Sheldon and Houser-Marko (2001) documented that authentic leaders positively modeled authentic behaviors while direct verbal communications enhanced understanding of how to achieve authenticity and self-concordant identities. Clifton and Harter (2003) and Liden, Wayne, and Sparrowe (2000) argued that by helping followers to discover their talents, develop their strengths, and empower them to accomplish more, leaders modeled the capacity to excel.

Gardner et al. (2005b) noted that when followers were exposed to authentic leader's positive modeling, these experiences, coupled with self-development, a positive work environment, and meaningful work, created high levels of trust between leaders and followers that led to high levels of professional engagement, which ultimately would lead to well-being for leaders and followers. Such positive personal and professional growth experienced directly impacted sustainable and veritable organizational outcomes. Erickson (1995a), Harter (2002), Harter, Schmidt, and Hayes (2002), Harter, Schmidt, and Keyes (2003), and Ilies et al. (2005) documented that authentic relationships between

leaders and followers sought the following outcomes: trust, engagement, and workplace well-being.

Authentic Relational Transparency.

Hughes (2005) noted authentic leaders strove for relational transparency with followers by being open with information, promoting sharing of ideas, self-disclosing appropriately, and being more trustworthy while expecting more trustworthiness. Avolio et al. (2004b) described four expressions of appropriate self-disclosure between authentic leaders and followers: goals/motives, identity, values, and emotions (GIVE). Hughes (2005) asserted authentic leaders who appropriately self-disclosed with followers were establishing relational transparency. Followers motivation increased when they know why they were doing what they were doing (goals/motives), trusted who they were dealing with (identity), understood and shared in the values underlying the decision-making (values), and felt secure in sharing and trusting in the expressed emotions of themselves and those with whom they worked.

Dasborough and Ashkanasy (2005) determined that follower perceptions of leader authenticity were grounded in the leader's moral behavior and intentions. Did followers perceive the authentic leader to be open, trustworthy, and transparent? The most critical determinant for followers of leader authenticity was their perception of the leader's intentions. Weierter (1997) noted followers track behaviors and expressions to determine if they should follow this particular leader. Dasborough and Ashkanasy (2002) posited the followers' perceptions of the leader's authenticity resulted in leader attributions regarding intentions, emotional reactions to influence attempts, labeling as transformational, and changes in trust levels. The importance of these perceptions lay

with what followers attributed to leaders because these attributions influenced follower attitudes and behaviors.

Avolio and Gardner (2005) analyzed that through an authentic relationship with their leader, followers internalized the positively modeled value and belief system of the leader into their own value and belief system. As a result, followers evolved their self-conception of their actual and possible selves. When leaders were transparent, followers gained respect for them, which influenced followers then to use transparency as they developed their own heightened authenticity.

Authentic Followers

Gardner et al. (2005b) specified that the model for authentic followership was based on the model for authentic leadership (figure 4). However, the goal for followership was to develop followers (self-awareness and self-regulation) to a level that would positively affect outcomes. The goal was not to develop more leaders; the goal was to develop more effective (authentic) followers. Gardner et al. (2005b) stated that follower development in many ways mirrored leader development because the purpose of positive modeling by authentic leaders was the authentic development of the follower. Follower development was a central tenet of authentic leadership. As followers responded to leaders' positive modeling, they integrated their heightened self-awareness and self-regulatory processes into their identity (self).

Hoyle, Kernis, Leary, and Baldwin (1999) believed that followers individually developed their unique conception of self based on their early childhood, family and friend experiences, their educational attainments and work experiences, as well as the role models in their lives. Dean, Brandes, and Dhwardkar (1998) observed that new and

inexperienced followers were more receptive to positive modeling than experienced, jaded followers who had become cynical due to ineffective or opportunistic past leaders, office politics, or shattered expectations. Gardner et al. (2005b) added that with time, patience, and perseverance authentic leaders could overcome such follower resistance, which might serve as a trigger event for the follower's own individual development.

Gardner et al. (2005b) asserted that three desirable outcomes were sought from the followership: trust, engagement, and well-being. Dirks and Ferrin (2002) and Jones and George (1998) confirmed that heightened levels of trust allowed followers to accept the leadership of the leader. Harter et al. (2003) posited that when followers involved themselves in their work, follower satisfaction increased. Such increases in satisfaction in turn increased enthusiasm for work. This process of engagement could directly affect organizational outcomes. Kahneman (1999) and Ryan and Deci (2000) claimed followers who felt stressed at work lacked a sense of well-being. Through authentic followership development, a sense of well-being developed which allowed the follower to affect organizational outcomes positively. Gardner et al. (2005b) followed up by stressing that authentic followership development was an integral part of and a product of authentic leadership. Followership included the components of follower self-awareness, follower self-regulation, follower self-development, and leader-follower authentic relationships that would lead to follower engagement and eudaimonia.

Follower Self-Awareness.

Avolio and Gardner (2005) indicated that authentic followers became self-aware and self-accepting. Such acceptance enhanced self-regulation as exhibited by their behaviors, which supported the goal attainment of the organization. Followers pursued

these goals because they had come to believe in them and because they were congruent with the leader's goals.

Gardner et al. (2005b) stated that follower self-awareness required self-knowledge of their identity, emotions, values, motives, and goals. Through positive modeling, authentic leaders encouraged self-discovery among followers, which led to self-awareness and self-knowledge. Those followers who aligned themselves with the leader's values and beliefs would be more inclined toward authentic follower development. Followers whose beliefs and values were incongruent with the leader's beliefs and values might like the leader while not necessarily following the leader. Followers whose beliefs and values were congruent with the leader's beliefs and values were more willing to follow the leader's lead. The closer the alignment between follower and leader beliefs and values, the more the follower would identify with and welcome the opportunity to follow that leader.

Gardner et al. (2005b) noted that followers low in self-clarity lacked insight into their identities, core values, emotions, motives, or goals. Based on their lack of self-clarity, they often were attracted to leaders who had higher self-clarity. Gardner and Avolio (1998) asserted followers often came to identify with these leaders' end values and beliefs even though Ryan and Deci (2003) observed the followers were relying on an external source of regulation. Weierter (1997) stressed that authentic leaders encouraged followers to develop their own value system so unscrupulous leaders could not manipulate them. Howell and Shamir (2005) and Weierter (1997) added that authentic leaders encouraged followers to identify less with them as a person and identify more with their value system. Deci and Ryan (1995) and Kernis (2003) noted that as followers

internalized these values, their self-clarity and autonomy would be enhanced, which would lead to higher levels of authenticity.

Gardner et al. (2005b) observed that authentic leaders' persona often threatened followers who were low in self-clarity. Because they did not have a clear sense of their self, values, or beliefs, low self-clarity follower's inner confusion encouraged them to reject authentic leaders and their influence or to be completely dependent on the leader for direction. They did not have a clear sense of who they were nor were they confident enough to engage in an authentic relationship. Authentic leaders who were patient, who persisted, and who continued to model authentic behaviors might enhance feelings of trust and a desire for self-discovery on the part of such followers.

Follower Self-Regulation.

Kernis (2003) and Deci and Ryan (1995, 2000) observed that follower self-regulation mirrored leader self-regulation. Self-regulation, coupled with self-awareness, balanced processing, authentic behaviors, and relational transparency, resulted in internalized values and goals that led to follower development. Gardner et al. (2005b) determined that those followers who developed stable, positive, and authentic expressions would clearly be more effective followers, professionally and personally.

Follower Self-Development.

Hannah et al. (2005) predicted morally developed authentic leaders would foster follower development through: "(1) follower emulation of the leader's conduct; (2) stronger bonds of trust between the leader and follower; (3) a higher degree of transparency across the organization; (4) stronger social identification and buy-in by followers; and (5) greater leader latitude to make difficult and potentially unpopular

decisions" (p. 70). Luthans and Avolio (2003) and Lord, Brown, and Freiberg (1999) claimed that authentic leaders with a future orientation on transcendent values would focus followers on their possible selves, rather than their current selves, affording followers the opportunity to promote self-verification motives that would cause them to seek out accurate feedback to facilitate personal growth and development.

Leader-Follower Authentic Relationships.

Avolio and Gardner (2005) stated that when leader-follower relationships were authentic, this authentic relationship promoted open and honest communications due to deeply held shared values, thereby promoting the pursuit and attainment of shared goals. Gardner et al. (2005b) noted that authentic relationships described the relationships between leaders, followers, and others. The mutually reciprocal relationships allowed for follower and leader self-development, as well as an understanding of the interrelatedness of their professional association. Gardner and Avolio (1998) added that the cohesion of this relationship was not based on perceptions of leader or follower actions, but on judgments of attribution made by followers or leaders regarding the others' intentions, effectiveness, and authenticity.

Rousseau (1995) discussed the psychological contract between leaders and followers based on consistent, transparent interactions that resulted in positive outcomes. Followers learned over time what decisions to make, even in the leader's absence, based on the psychological contract of common understanding and responsibilities of the mutual parties. Meeting both parties' expectations strengthened mutual trust that fostered an authentic relationship, which ultimately enhanced outcomes and performance. Avolio (1999) posited that followers developed trust over time (relational trust) in the leader's

intentions, which gave leaders the benefit of the doubt. Dirks and Ferrin (2002) asserted followers at this level of trust tended to have higher levels of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, professional behaviors, and job performance, which contributed to sustainable and veritable outcomes.

Robins and Boldero (2003) maintained that when leaders and followers saw themselves as being similar due to shared values and goals, consistently acting transparently enhanced authentic relationships. When followers had high congruence between their true and possible selves with the leader's true and possible selves, high levels of trust, intimacy, cooperation, and goal alignment were achieved. The accuracy of the presented and perceived selves from followers and leaders was important to ensure high levels of trust and intimacy. Incongruency resulted in superficial, hierarchical, or dominant roles and relationships, which adversely influenced the organizational culture.

Follower Engagement.

Harter et al. (2002) defined employee engagement as "the individual's involvement and satisfaction with as well as enthusiasm for work" (p. 269). May, Gilson, and Harter (2004) discussed role performances where followers viewed engagement of their physical, cognitive, and emotional selves toward organizational goals and outcomes. Followers who perceived their engagement at work as meaningful were more inclined to escalate their engagement. May (2004) further found that perceptions of meaningfulness were influenced by co-worker relationships, work assignments, and the fit between worker and work. Harter et al. (2002) showed employee engagement and positive organizational outcomes were strongly associated with positive customer satisfaction, productivity, profit, and employee turnover.

Follower Well-Being.

Ilies et al. (2005) outlined how authentic leaders influenced followers'
eudaimonic well-being. The five factors that influenced eudaimonia were personal and
organizational identification, emotional contagion, modeling positive behaviors,
supporting self-determination (autonomy), and promoting positive social exchanges.
Followers often personally identified with authentic leaders when the leaders had
personal integrity, displayed an elevated self-awareness, supported truthful relationships,
and had developed unconditional trust with followers. Authentic leaders positively
expressed their emotions as they developed a culture accepting of emotional expression.
The leader's positive emotions influenced followers' experiences as they created a state
of emotional contagion. Authentic leaders expressed positive authentic behaviors and
modeled such behaviors for superiors, colleagues, and followers. Authentic leaders
provided opportunities for followers' skill development by fostering follower autonomy
(self-determination). Finally, authentic leaders created opportunities for social exchanges
with followers as leaders modeled authentic behaviors and expressed their values, beliefs,
and purposes.

Ryan and Deci (2001) described the construct of eudaimonic well-being as
involving self-congruence, vital functioning, life satisfaction, and psychological health.
Waterman (1993) linked eudaimonia with authenticity by positing this linkage occurred
when individual's actions were congruent with their true self. Harter et al. (2003)
maintained that workplace well-being occurred as a direct result of authentic
relationships enhanced by positive modeling, encouragement, and nurturing. Luthans
and Avolio (2003) used Harter et al.'s (2002) meta-analysis to assert workplace well-

being resulted in a competitive advantage, which produced sustainable and veritable

follower outcomes. Avolio and Gardner (2005) asserted that the relationships between

leaders and followers were also affected.

Authentic Culture

Avolio (2003) documented that leadership scholars believed organizational

cultures were turbulent, uncertain, and challenging. Authentic leaders altered the

organizational culture with their authentic behaviors and positive modeling. An authentic

culture must be developed to sustain and foster further authentic development of leaders

and followers. Gardner et al. (2005b) and Luthans and Avolio (2003) asserted that a

positive organizational culture must be linked to the authentic leader and authentic

follower in order to facilitate veritable and sustainable outcomes.

Gardner et al. (2005b) and Luthans and Avolio (2003) stressed that authentic

leaders must insist upon, cultivate, promote, and support an inclusive organizational

culture (climate or context) to promote learning and personal growth. They believed that

any social system, including organizations and leadership, generated countless forces and

balances that perpetuated the status quo of that system, as reflected through its culture.

Schein (2004) asserted that the culture created by the dominant group was based on "a

pattern of shared basic assumptions that was learned by a group as it solved its problems

of external adaptation and internal integration, that has worked well enough to be

considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to

perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems" (p. 17). Gardner et al. (2005b)

indicated that authentic leaders and authentic followers could create an authentic

organizational culture. The reciprocal nature of leaders and followers creating an

authentic culture and the authentic culture supporting the authenticity of leaders and followers was noted. The authentic culture was a by-product of an escalation of multiple authentic relationships.

Avolio and Gardner (2005) argued that organizational culture moderated the authentic leadership-performance relationship. A positive authentic culture could directly lead to heightened leader and follower self-awareness. An inclusive, ethical, and strength-based culture could support authenticity and authentic development. Organizations that supported open and equitable access to information, resources, support, and opportunities developed a culture that was conducive to learning and personal development, which would lead to veritable and sustainable outcomes.

May et al. (2003) contended that authentic leaders, through their decisions and actions, shaped the culture and work processes that developed and promoted ethical behaviors and supported responsible work habits of their followers. Ethical cultures were caring cultures that recognized and supported the intrinsic value of all followers. Therefore, the ethical reasoning used by authentic leaders was based on their intrinsic value. Followers viewed the authentic leaders' decisions as just, fair, ethical, and impartial. When followers perceived any divergence from this path, they felt safe in expressing their opinions knowing authentic leaders would heed their concerns. Hence, followers tended to want to emulate authentic leader behaviors.

Avolio (2003) posited that a positive organizational culture could support authenticity, while authenticity could create a positive organizational culture. Gardner et al. (2005b) acknowledged Kanter's (1977) and Kanter, Stein, and Jick's (1992) work showing work environments with open access to information, resources, support, and

opportunity enhanced leaders' and followers' abilities to work productively. Hence, leaders must create and sustain workplace environments that supported learning, growth, and transparency to produce sustainable and veritable outcomes. Rhoades, Eisenberger, and Armeli (2001) showed follower commitment and positive attitudes were enhanced when they were treated in a fair and positive manner, which Gardner et al. (2005b) asserted could result in a competitive advantage. Leadership that was inclusive, caring, engaging, and oriented toward personal development would create and sustain a positive organizational culture.

Authentic Outcomes

Avolio and Gardner (2005) documented that sustainable superior performance and sustainable competitive advantage were used interchangeably in the strategic management literature. Barney (1991) described these terms as indicating the outcome when the organization developed and implemented a strategy that created a value no other firm could or had duplicated. Once competitors were able to duplicate this strategy successfully (obtain the same outcome), the original organization no longer had sustained their competitive advantage. Rouse and Daellenbach (1999) added that competitive advantage was formed over time with above-average performance sustaining it.

Avolio and Gardner (2005) concluded that *veritable* qualified *sustained* performance by requiring its attainment through ethical and authentic processes. Watson (2003) stressed that veritable (genuine) values sustained the performance and growth, while Roberts and Dowling (2002) added that these outcomes occurred over time. Beer (2001) concurred that veritable and sustainable outcomes were a long-term strategy. Therefore, short-term financial gains and immediate performance often were sacrificed in

the interests of the long-term strategy. Avolio and Gardner (2005) asserted that veritable sustained performance included more than financial performance. It included the intangible of building human, social, and psychological capital, as well as tacit knowledge. Rousseau (1995) asserted the psychological contracts consciously and unconsciously established between leaders and followers were vital to veritable and sustainable outcomes.

Summary

Authentic leadership encompassed the leader, follower, and culture dimensions with the added dimension of outcomes. Qualities of the leader and their moral development dramatically influenced their positive modeling with followers, as well as their authentic transparency. Followers' self-awareness, self-regulation, and follower development affected followers' authentic relationships, their engagement levels, and their eudaimonic well-being. Finally, culture and outcomes were assessed within the context of authentic leadership.

Authentic Leaders

An understanding of who authentic leaders are and how they develop authentically is only half of the equation. The other half of the equation includes what choices and actions they take that differentiates them from non-authentic leaders.

Who Are Authentic Leaders?

Authentic leaders understood that who they had become was as important as the actions they took for themselves, others, and society. Therefore, Chan et al. (2005) emphasized that authentic leaders must be true to themselves and their leadership role. They must be aware of social cues and followers' desires, needs, and expectations rather

than having free rein for expressing their personalities. Therefore, authentic leaders could be true to themselves while adapting well to the demands of leadership. May et al. (2003) asserted that authentic leaders must know what was important to them and what were their core values and beliefs while simultaneously acting in accordance with these values and beliefs.

Hannah et al. (2005) characterized authentic leaders as highly morally attuned, highly altruistic, and highly virtuous with higher levels of moral agency. May et al. (2003) suggested that when leaders knew themselves, were transparent between inner desires, expectation, and values with everyday behaviors in every interaction, they were known as authentic leaders. They exhibited higher moral capacity with their mature analyses of various dilemmas and consequences while staying focused on the greater good rather than self-interests. Ultimately, they executed and upheld the difficult decisions necessary that ensured a positive, optimistic future.

Gardner et al. (2005b) maintained "genuine leaders who lead by example … foster healthy ethical climates characterized by transparency, trust, integrity, and high moral standards. We call such individuals authentic leaders who are not only true to themselves, but lead others by helping them to likewise achieve authenticity" (p. 346). Gardner et al. (2005b) also said, "first and foremost, an authentic leader must achieve authenticity…through self-awareness, self-acceptance, and authentic actions and relationships" (p. 347).

Cashman (1997), a leadership practitioner, defined authentic leadership as "authentic self-expression that creates value" (p. 1). Leadership was not simply a process, but was an intimate expression of the self that came from deep within, reflecting

the self in action. George (2004), another leadership practitioner, believed authenticity

was not about leadership skills or styles, but about being the genuine self. Developing

the persona of a leader through training or seminars was the opposite of striving for

authenticity. Authenticity was about character and a genuine desire to serve others.

Authentic leaders were focused on empowering followers so they could collectively

make a difference. When their principles were tested, they stood up against the pressure.

Authentic leaders recognized that developing authenticity would take a lifetime of

personal growth.

Gardner et al. (2005b) analyzed Goleman's (1995, 1998) and Goleman et al.'s

(2002) research and determined that authentic leaders were emotionally intelligent. In

addition, internalized regulatory processes with self-concordant identities primarily drove

them. They pursued integrated goal sets that personified their internalized value system

and personal standards of conduct. Authentic leaders used intrinsic motivation,

integrated regulation, self-concordant identities, and emotional intelligence as some of

their internalized processes.

What Distinguishes Authentic Leaders?

Moral development, transcendent values, and specific attributions such as passion,

compassion, purpose in life, authenticity, and self-identity have distinguished authentic

leaders from non-authentic leaders. Hannah et al. (2005) acknowledged that authentic

leaders morally developed as they enhanced their moral capacity and authenticity

simultaneously when they experienced trigger events, used self-reflection to analyze and

investigate meaning, used meta-cognition to check the self's reliability, which produced

more virtuous and altruistic moral solutions. Their self-concept strengthened as they

acted upon their moral decisions using moral behaviors, which strengthened the identification and development of the moral self. The moral self exercised its sense of agency, which enhanced moral capacity and authenticity. Gioia and Poole (1984) determined that over time, scripts for these past moral dilemmas provided habituated patterns for future decisions and actions, which allowed authentic leaders to redirect their cognitive abilities toward new and complex issues. Those effective strategies integrated into memory as they became habituated.

Hannah et al. (2005) and Chan et al. (2005) asserted authenticity developed parallel to morality. Moral development and authenticity were mutually reinforcing. Authentic leaders were, at a minimum, postconventionalists based on Kohlberg's stages of moral development. Authenticity, moral capacity, and agency developed in unison. Luthans and Avolio (2003) noted authentic leaders often had higher levels of moral integrity because they were conscious of their value system while (Howell & Avolio, 1992) focusing on the common good rather than the promotion of self-interests. Bass and Steidlmeier (1999) and Luthans and Avolio (2003) specified that authentic leaders engaged in self-transcendent behaviors when they were intrinsically motivated toward universal values, which often took a lifetime of experience to shape and develop.

May et al. (2003) claimed that authentic leaders self-identified as morally worthy individuals and tended to be seen as such by their followers based on perceived moral development and conduct. Therefore, Gardner et al. (2005b) suggested that those who were seen as more trustworthy, honest, credible, respectful of others, fair, and accountable would be viewed by followers as socially attractive and disproportionately

influential. Because of these perceptions, they would be viewed and supported as the leader.

Luthans and Avolio (2003) observed that leaders, and especially authentic leaders, valued individual identity images of trustworthiness, credibility, moral worthiness, integrity, respect for others, fairness, and accountability. As authentic leaders, they were true to themselves while displaying high levels of moral integrity. Hence, Gardner and Avolio (1998) asserted that trustworthiness was a core value that was supported with trustworthy actions that led to enhanced credibility. Gardner et al. (2005b) added that authentic leaders' credibility was based on their knowledge and expertise, as well as their value system, transparency, and consistency between words and deeds.

May et al. (2003) identified six characteristics of moral decision-making for leaders: consequences varied for leaders and followers, the probability of consequences occurring varied, consequences might occur in the present or the future (near or far), distance between leader and follower (near or far) could influence the impact, consequences might affect the few or the many, and the consensus of what the leader should do might vary.

Luthans and Avolio (2003) posited an inherent ethical or moral component to authentic leadership. May et al. (2003) asserted authentic leaders used an ethical and transparent decision-making process that inherently required a moral component. In order to have a positive moral perspective, authentic leaders must have positive moral capacity, efficacy, courage, and resiliency to address ethical issues, take moral actions, and develop authenticity.

May et al. (2003) described three crucial steps toward authentic decision-making: "recognizing moral dilemmas, transparently evaluating the alternatives, and developing intentions to act in a manner consistent with one's evaluations" (p. 255). Then, past experience and relevant knowledge, skills, and abilities could be integrated with the leader's core values and beliefs to reach an ethical authentic decision. Hannah et al. (2005) noted that those using meta-cognition continuously were able to more critically assess and process moral reasoning, which allowed for self-transformation and interpretation of the self while influencing moral agency.

May et al. (2003) stressed that authentic leaders reflected a positive moral perspective and communicated through their words, deeds, and actions high moral standards and values so they might lead by example. Barlow, Jordan, and Hendrix (2003) found moral development increased with maturity and experience.

Hannah et al. (2005) believed authentic leaders had high levels of virtuousness and empathy, which motivated them toward altruism. Then their level of moral engagement was heightened, influencing them toward moral intention. When moral engagement and moral intention were high, authentic leaders would intervene during unethical, immoral, or illegal situations they witnessed even though they might not be directly affected.

Bass and Steidlmeier (1999), Luthans and Avolio (2003), and May et al. (2003) stated that authentic leaders were guided by values oriented toward doing what was right and fair. Gardner et al. (2005b) asserted authentic leaders used transcendent values with the emphasis on "the ends over the means." Burns (1978) noted that transcendent values included liberty, justice, equality, and collective well-being. Erickson (1995a, 1995b)

contented that these values became internalized, which made the value system an integral component of the self. Being authentic meant being true to this internalized value system and the self while resisting external pressures to alter, ignore, or accept conflicting value systems.

Luthans and Avolio (2003) claimed that authentic leaders had higher levels of moral integrity because they were much more conscious of their value system. Howell and Avolio (1992) added that authentic leaders' focused on the common good rather than the promotion of self-interests, which led them toward courageous principled action. Bass and Steidlmeier (1999) and Luthans and Avolio (2003) confirmed that authentic leaders engaged in self-transcending behaviors when they were intrinsically motivated toward universal values.

Bass and Steidlmeier (1999), Luthans and Avolio (2003), and May et al. (2003) stressed that authentic leaders were guided by values oriented toward doing what was right and fair. Michie and Gooty (2005) labeled leaders along four dimensions: high frequency of other-directed emotions, low frequency of other-directed emotions, high priority for self-transcendent values, and low priority for self-transcendent values. Authentic leaders were found to have high frequency of other-directed emotions along with a high priority for self-transcendent values (high consistency between values and behaviors). Those leaders with high other-directed emotions, but low priority for self-transcendent values were categorized as coalitional leaders (moderate consistency between values and behaviors). Those leaders with low other-directed emotions, but high priority on self-transcendent values were categorized as egocentric leaders (low consistency between values and behaviors). Lastly, leaders with low other-directed

emotions and a low priority on self-transcendent values were categorized as sacrificial leaders (moderate consistency between values and behaviors). When emotions and values interacted at their highest levels, there was congruency and transparency between values and actions.

Therefore, Bass and Steidlmeier (1999) asserted the moral wisdom of authentic leaders kept personal power and self-aggrandizement in check. Michie and Goody (2005) concluded that while it was recognized that authentic leaders had both self-enhancement and self-transcendent values, they gave priority to their self-transcendent values.

May et al. (2003) documented that ethical values and behaviors were an integral part of authentic leaders' personal and professional lives. They viewed themselves as the moral standard-bearer for their institution with the attendant responsibility for acting morally and in the best interests of others. Such a strong message of words and actions promoted authentic behaviors to followers. May et al. (2003) said, "those who are better able to positively adapt to dealing with adversity or risk arising from taking difficult stances are more likely to sustain authentic moral behaviors over time" (p. 250). They also prophetically stated that leaders proved they were authentic when called upon by fate to take a stand that changed the course of history...for others or the institution.

Gardner and Schermerhorn (2004) noted that core leadership states such as confidence, hope, optimism, and resilience were essential for higher performance. Authentic leaders who possessed these attributes and who passed them on to their followers could influence the veritable and sustainable outcomes of their institution. They built self-confidence (self-efficacy), created hope, raised optimism, and

strengthened resilience while leading with positive performance expectations, which led to feelings of eudaimonia.

Klenke (2005) noted that authentic leaders passionately and compassionately understood followers feelings of distress in the workplace. Compassion and passion were utilized differently. Compassion meant "to feel with others, to enter their point of view and realize that they have the same fears and sorrows as oneself" (p. 166). When individuals connected with another person, they were able to identify with the other, which allowed for the expression of compassion. Passion was "the burning desire to lead, serve the customer, or support a cause or product..." (p. 166). Authentic leaders shared in their followers' pain, fear, and anguish. "Authentic leaders and followers practice compassion and are more passionately involved in their interactions with each other, their organizations, and society than their less authentic counterparts" (p. 166).

Sosik (2000) defined personal meaning, "as that which makes one's life most important, coherent, and worthwhile" (p. 61). He connected personal meaning to the concept of purpose-in-life where individuals possessed future-oriented, self-transcendent goals in life. Tepper (2003) defined spirituality as the motivation to find meaning and purpose in life. Klenke (2005) posited authentic leaders used their overarching meaning and purpose in life as a way of connecting with their deeper self.

Kernis (2003) documented that authenticity was composed of the mutually interdependent components of self-awareness, balanced processing, and behavior. Gardner et al. (2005b) analyzed that authentic leaders who were self-aware of their values, beliefs, and needs and who had a balanced assessment of their self-concept must then analyze the professional (illegal, unethical, immoral) situations before them and then

choose between inauthentic or authentic behaviors as a response to these external pressures. Authenticity must be attained for each of these three levels: self-awareness, balanced processing, and behaviors. Positively modeling authentic behaviors to followers would enhance their authentic follower development, but authentic leaders primarily chose the path of authenticity to ensure congruence between their core values and espoused transcendent values. They were motivated intrinsically, not extrinsically.

Lord et al. (1999) stressed that when individuals perceived themselves as sharing key attributes with other group members, they would self-identify as a member of that group, organization, or society. Hogg (2001) posited that leaders emerged and endured within groups based on their status within the "in-group" rather than the "out-group." Access and membership within the in-group allowed leaders to develop power within the group that led to influence, which ultimately set the leader apart from followers who now identified them as "leaders." Ultimately, leaders defined the characteristics of the group, thereby enduring as the leader of the group. Leaders were disproportionately influential within the group, which was socially attractive to followers who then accepted them as the leader.

Kirkpatrick and Locke (1991) identified six significant leader traits: drive, desire to lead, honesty and integrity, self-confidence, cognitive ability, and knowledge of the leader's industry. They asserted leaders were either born with these traits, learned these traits, or had a combination thereof. Such traits set leaders apart from followers.

Gardner (2003) posited authentic leaders used a self-presentation strategy called exemplification to motivate followers to emulate authentic behaviors. Exemplification allowed authentic leaders to elicit attributions of morally worth and culturally defined

worthiness. Authentic leaders used exemplification to link their authentic self to their authentic behavior in a transparent manner, which influenced veritable and sustainable outcomes.

Avolio et al. (2004a) noted that authentic leaders could be participative, directive, or even authoritarian. Their leadership style was not what differentiated them from other leaders. What differentiated them was their acting upon their deeply held personal values and beliefs, building credibility through integrity, working for the respect and trust of followers, working toward positive authentic relationships, and thinking, talking, and acting authentic all the time, not just in the workplace.

How Do Authentic Leaders Develop?

Personal development, self-awareness, and a strong sense of agency were some of the pathways to authentic development. Gardner et al. (2005b) argued that authentic development occurred over time and in an incremental process. Personal histories and analyses of trigger events could enhance understanding of this developmental process. Personal histories might include early life challenges, educational and professional experiences, as well as family, friends, and role model interactions. Trigger events were those moments in life when noticeable personal growth and development were the by-product of a catalyzing event. This catalyzing event might be a dramatic, life-altering event or it might be a subtle, profound moment that resulted in a sudden, intense personal insight. When leaders focused on their personal experiences and trigger events through self-awareness, these events could be viewed as either positive catalysts toward authentic development or negative catalysts that resulted in a slowing of authentic development.

Avolio (2003, 2005) and Luthans and Avolio (2003) acknowledged that personal development started early in life. How the authentic leader interpreted the various trigger events in life and the other accumulated life experiences enhanced or diminished their self-development. Hoyle, Kernis, Leary, and Baldwin (1999) believed childhood experiences, family influences, cultural influences, role models, and educational experiences developed the individual lenses used to interpret these life events. These stored memories were the self-knowledge (self-schemata) that shaped one's identity. Gardner et al. (2005b) asserted authentic leaders were influenced by one or more positive role models at pivotal times in their life times, resulting in personal growth and self-awareness.

Avolio (2005) and Luthans and Avolio (2003) stressed that how trigger events were managed in life determined whether the event stimulated positive growth and development or whether it arrested positive growth and development. Trigger events could be viewed as positive events or negative events, but the key to development was how these life events were managed. Negative trigger events could be childhood traumas, loss of a loved one, work set backs, financial hardships, or health constraints. Positive trigger events could be a childhood role model who reflected positive thinking or behaviors, a book or movie that triggered introspection, any event that caused a positive paradigm shift, a relationship that supported personal and/or professional growth, or a professional promotion toward a level of responsibility where one could make a difference. Gardner et al. (2005b) added that conscious reflection on these life events and their constructively interpreted meaning developed the self and moved the leader toward further authenticity.

Gardner et al. (2005b) posited that self-awareness was a core element of authentic leadership. Authentic leaders consciously used heightened levels of self-awareness for personal and professional development. Kernis (2003) said awareness involved "having awareness of, and trust in, one's motives, feelings, desires, and self-relevant cognitions" (p. 13). Gardner et al. (2005b) added that self-awareness was a process, not an end in itself, where one came to reflect on those values, beliefs, and talents held that could be used for personal growth, as well as follower development.

Gardner et al. (2005b) noted that leaders who chose to be self-aware consciously used their personal insights to identify and modify their weaknesses, while identifying and enhancing their strengths. Conscious self-reflection allowed for introspection, which enhanced clarity and concordance of identity, core values, emotions, motives, and goals. Such accord and harmony of self developed a sense of well-being.

Gardner et al. (2005b) asserted that authentic leaders accepted, as part of their self-concept, the role of leader and role model. They actively embraced this identity and internalized the meaning behind "leader." However, they were not authentic because they were leaders, but in spite of being leaders. They used their role of leader to promote personal growth and authenticity in others while pursing their mission in life. Hence, their self-concept did include their role as leader. Their self-clarity of their self-concept was strong, which enhanced their authenticity.

Gardner et al. (2005b) stressed that authentic leaders achieved self-concordant identities as they gained self-knowledge and self-awareness. Because of these levels of awareness, their decisions and actions became more congruent, self-determined, and consonant with their internalized system of values and goals.

Ilies et al. (2005) listed three primary personal characteristics defined in the leadership literature that influenced self-realization (eudaimonic well-being). They included positive self-concept (self-awareness), personal integrity (self-awareness), and emotional intelligence (self-regulation). Without these three personal characteristics, no sense of agency would develop. Bandura (2001) defined agency as the capacity to improve quality of life by exercising control over the environment. Authentic leaders had a high sense of agency when they exercised their capacities of intentionality, forethought, self-reactiveness, and self-reflectiveness. Intentionality stressed the conscious intentional exercise of agency. Forethought referred to thinking ahead and analyzing consequences before taking action. Self-reactiveness referred to being self-motivated and self-regulated. Finally, self-reflectiveness concerned the internal process of reflecting upon the perceived competence of the thoughts and actions of the self. Bandura (1991) asserted leaders used their refrain power and proactive power to develop agency. Refrain power was the ability to refrain against acting immorally while proactive power was the proactive ability to behave morally.

Hannah et al. (2005) viewed agency and its dimensions as a central tenet of authentic leaders. Authentic leaders used forethought, self-reaction, and self-reflection as they thought morally and then motivated themselves to behave morally using intentionality, refrain power, and proactive power. Authentic leaders had an inherent need for thinking and behaving morally so developed high levels of self-determinism and agency, which allowed them to resist external pressures to act less authentically and morally.

Hannah et al. (2005) noted authentic leaders possessed higher meta-cognitive abilities. These abilities reinforced a heightened sense of agency over their moral experiences, which led them to incorporate virtuousness into their moral reasoning and decision-making. These attributes supported the ability and motivation of the authentic leader with processing moral dilemmas. Markus and Wurf (1987) added that authentic leaders possessed and utilized altruism and virtue, activated by the self, as part of the self-concept, which strengthened their sense of agency.

What Choices and Actions Do Authentic Leaders Choose?

Moral choices were authentically expressed through intentional moral actions. Then, and only then, could moral courage couple with moral actions that promoted courageous principled actions. Kernis (2003) described behaving authentically as "acting in accord with one's values, preferences, and needs as opposed to acting merely to please others or to attain rewards or avoid punishments through acting 'falsely'…Authenticity is not reflected in a compulsion to be one's true self, but rather in the free and natural expression of core feelings, motives, and inclinations" (p. 14). Deci and Ryan (1995) and Ryan and Deci (2003) stressed that when invited by external pressures to act counter to internalized values, internal conflict arose. Authentic leaders chose to behave in a manner congruent with their internal value system rather than respond to external pressures, which enhanced their integrity and authentic leadership development. Gardner et al. (2005b) added that authentic leaders optimal self-esteem allowed them the security of intrinsic feelings of self-worth that shielded them from external pressures to compromise their beliefs and values.

The value system followed was important to leaders and followers. Lord and Brown (2001) observed that when leaders focused on self-enhancement values, followers focused on self-interests rather than group-interests. Yet, when leaders focused on self-transcendence values, followers focused on group-interests, which led to professional engagement. When leaders focused on self-enhancement and self-transcendence values simultaneously, followers stood back, made decisions not to decide, and basically did nothing. However, their impression of transparency, integrity, trust, and confidence ebbed as adverse pressure occurred within the leader-follower relationship.

Hannah et al. (2005) noted that using multiple lenses or perspectives facilitated complex moral thinking. Complex morally developed individuals did not use a single ethical framework for moral decision-making. Over their lifetime, multiple lenses such as deontological (norms, duties, rules, and laws), teleological (goal-based, consequential, or utilitarian), or areteological (inherent virtuousness of individual or issue) were intertwined and used simultaneously or in tandem. Authentic leaders had a greater propensity to use all or most of these lenses, as necessary, to assess moral dilemmas and achieve the best moral fit for the situation.

Choi and Mai-Dalton (1998, 1999) defined self-sacrificial leadership as the abandonment or postponement of leader interests, privileges, and welfare for the good of others. Klenke (2005) noted many leaders self-sacrifice in times of crisis. Authentic leaders tended to believe so fervently in their purpose in life that they practiced self-sacrifice without compulsion or conflict on a daily basis, not just in times of crisis. Hannah et al. (2005) proposed that authentic leaders' strong integration of values into self

created a strong commitment to the self to the point that authentic leaders saw self-consistent behaviors as a moral imperative.

Bass, Waldman, and Avolio (1987), Choi and Mai-Dalton (1998, 1999), Gardner and Avolio (1998), and Luthans and Avolio (2003) agreed that authentic leaders specifically used positive modeling to influence follower development. They modeled positive values, psychological states, behaviors, and self-development. Followers attended to and were motivated to learn from leaders with high credibility, prestige, and trustworthiness. Followers ignored, and therefore did not learn from, those leaders who did not gain their attention. Leaders who modeled confidence, high moral standards, innovative problem solving, commitment, and self-sacrifice influenced the organizational culture as followers emulated those behaviors modeled.

Luthans and Avolio (2003) contended that authentic relationships were central to authentic follower development; therefore, positive modeling by the authentic leader for the follower was central to authentic relationships. Gardner et al. (2005b) added that positive modeling was mutually beneficial. Leaders modeled authentic behaviors for followers while followers learned authentic behaviors from leaders.

Gardner et al. (2005b) confirmed that authenticity had a relational transparency component. Kernis (2003) defined relational transparency as "relational in nature, in as much as it involves valuing and achieving openness and truthfulness in one's close relationships" (p. 15). Gardner et al. (2005b) contended that appropriate selective-disclosure created bonds of intimacy and trust. Authentic leaders who selectively disclosed their authentic selves to followers could support authentic follower development and enhancement of integrity felt by followers regarding the authentic

leader. Sharing both the positive and negative aspects of the self, as well as helping

others to balance the process of analyzing their positive and negative aspects, created a

transparent relationship between leader and follower. Openness and truthfulness

enhanced closeness. Avolio (2005), Luthans and Avolio (2003), and May et al. (2003)

maintained that openly sharing information (transparency) within relationships was a

critical facet of authentic leadership development. Avolio, Jung, Murry,

Sivasubramaniam, and Garger (2003) observed that transparency allowed followers to

understand the authentic leader was serving the organizational interests even when that

might conflict with the leader's or followers' self-interests. A focus on group interests

over individual interests positively modeled appropriate authentic behaviors. Gardner et

al. (2005b) contended that authentic leaders were comfortable appropriately sharing their

emotions and feelings to followers, while managing the meaning of these emotions and

feelings to maximize positive modeling.

Douglas, Ferris, and Perrewé (2005) confirmed that authentic leaders with

effective political skills used their authenticity to inspire trust and confidence within

followers to motivate, increase productivity, and engender commitment to their cause.

The use of the term "political skills" could have negative connotations, such as appearing

to connote inauthenticity. However, authentic leaders used authentic political skills to

express their passion for transcendent values, prosocial behaviors, and those actions that

integrated their purpose in life with their professional and personal life.

Blau (1964), Gouldner (1960), Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995), Liden, Sparrowe, and

Wayne (1997), and Ilies et al. (2005) agreed that social exchange theory posited that

leaders established a positive social exchange with their followers based on the principles

of reciprocity and value congruence. If the relationship was two-way and there were shared values, a positive social exchange developed between leader and follower. Avolio and Gardner (2005) interpreted that when authentic leaders were unbiased with their self-analysis, personal integrity, and relational orientation, followers developed high levels of trust, respect, and positive affect regarding the relationship. As the authenticity within the leader-follower relationship evolved, greater value congruence developed and leader modeled behaviors were integrated into the follower's way of behaving. Greater authenticity evolved for leaders and followers involved in this authentic relationship.

May et al. (2003) asserted that intention to act was important, but acting ethically, legally, and morally upon this intention was paramount. The difference between authentic leaders and other leaders might simply come down to having the moral courage to say and do the right thing. The most important predictor of authentic leaders' moral actions was their intention to act. Authentic leaders generally knew what was right; it was their intention to act, long-term focus, and subsequent actions that differentiated them from many other leaders.

May et al. (2003) stressed that authentic leaders had the fortitude to convert intentions into actions. Their mental and emotional strength to handle adversity, danger, or change was based on their moral courage. Moral courage allowed authentic leaders to focus on long-term outcomes over short-term outcomes, as well as withstand extreme external pressures to diverge from doing the right thing. Moral efficacy was the intrinsic belief that one had the skills, abilities, and motivation to justify a given moral action and effectively handle any external opposition to this action. This intrinsic belief (moral efficacy) enhanced intrinsic moral courage within the authentic leader.

Hannah et al. (2005) said authentic leaders with personal virtuousness and high moral development had a high commitment-to-self. They focused, internally and externally, on virtues and attendant ethical processes. Internal virtues facilitated commitment-to-self and, regardless of the social cost, motivated authentic leaders to express moral behaviors consistent with their beliefs and values. Altruistic behaviors toward others flowed from internal processes that activated external ethical processes expressed as moral leadership. Batson (1998) asserted the focus of altruism was to increase the welfare of another. High levels of empathy created the prosocial emotions of sympathy, tenderness, and compassion, which motivated individuals toward altruism. Peterson and Seligman (2004) listed the six core virtues as courage, wisdom, temperance, humanity, justice, and transcendence. Hannah et al. (2005) believed these six virtues were conspicuous in authentic leaders and drove them to moral actions that positively influenced others.

Hannah et al. (2005) proposed that authentic leaders self-identified as moral leaders because their highly developed self-concept included a complex and evolved moral dimension of which they were aware and utilized with moral perceptions and moral decision-making. Authentic leaders used forethought and intentionality when making ethical decisions, which increased their sense of leadership agency. They took ownership and responsibility for the ethical and moral decisions and actions made by them and their followers.

Summary

Authentic leaders value who they are and those characteristics that define and distinguish them from other individuals and leaders. Their personal and moral

development has taken a lifetime to authentically evolve, which has led them to the point in their lives where they feel compelled to use transcendent behaviors and prosocial behaviors to affect positive change through positive deviance and courageous principled actions.

References

Avolio, B. J. (1999). *Full leadership development: Building the vital forces in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Avolio, B. J. (2003). Examining the full range model of leadership: Looking back to transform forward. In D. Day & S. J. Zaccarro (Eds.), *Leadership development for transforming organizations: Grow leaders for tomorrow* (pp. 71-98). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Avolio, B. J. (2005). *Leadership development in balance: Made/born*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Avolio, B. J., Gardner, J. W., Walumbwa, F. O., Luthans, F., & May, D. R. (2004). Unlocking the mask: A look at the process by which authentic leaders impact follower attitudes and behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly, 15*(6).

Avolio, B. J., & Gardner, W. L. (2005). Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership. *Leadership Quarterly, 16*(3), 315-338.

Avolio, B. J., Jung, D., Murry, B., Sivasubramaniam, N., & Garger, J. (2003). Assessing shared leadership: Development of a team multifactor leadership questionnaire. In C. L. Pearce & J. A. Conger (Eds.), *Shared leadership: Reframing the hows and whys of leadership* (pp. 143-172). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bandura, A. (1991). Social cognitive theory of moral thought and action. In W. M. Kurtines & J. L. Gewirtz (Eds.), *Handbook of moral behavior and development*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bandura, A. (2001). Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology, 52*(1), 1-26.

Barlow, C. B., Jordan, M., & Hendrix, W. H. (2003). Character assessment: An examination of leadership levels. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 17*(4), 563-584.

Barney, J. B. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management, 17*(1), 99-120.

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. M., & Steidlmeier, P. (1999). Ethics, character and authentic transformational leadership behavior. *The Leadership Quarterly, 10*(2), 181-218.

Bass, B. M., & Stogdill, R. M. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications*. New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. M., Waldman, D. A., & Avolio, B. J. (1987). Transformational leadership and the falling dominoes effect. *Group & Organization Studies, 12*(1), 73-87.

Batson, C. D. (1998). Altruism and prosocial behavior. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske & G. Lindsey (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology* (4th ed., Vol. II, pp. 282-316). Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Beer, M. (2001). How to develop an organization capable of sustainable high performance: Embrace the drive for results-capability development paradox. *Organizational Dynamics, 29*(3), 233-247.

Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: Wiley.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.

Cashman, K. (1997). Authentic leadership. *Innovative Leader, 6*(11), 1-3.

Chan, A., Hannah, S. T., & Gardner, J. W. (2005). Veritable authentic leadership: Emergence, functioning, and impacts. In J. W. Gardner, B. J. Avolio & F. Walumbwa (Eds.), *Authentic leadership theory and practice: Origins, effects and development; monographs in leadership and management* (Vol. 3, pp. 3-41). San Diego, CA: Elsevier.

Choi, Y., & Mai-Dalton, R. R. (1998). On the leadership function of self-sacrifice. *The Leadership Quarterly, 9*(4), 475-501.

Choi, Y., & Mai-Dalton, R. R. (1999). The model of followers' responses to self-sacrificial leadership: An empirical test. *The Leadership Quarterly, 10*(3), 397-421.

Clifton, D. O., & Harter, J. K. (2003). Investing in strengths. In K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton & R. E. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive organizational scholarship* (pp. 111-121). San Francisco: Berret-Koehler.

Cooper, C. D., Scandura, T. A., & Schriesheim, C. A. (2005). Looking forward but learning from our past: Potential challenges to developing authentic leadership theory and authentic leaders. *The Leadership Quarterly, 16*(3), 475-493.

Dasborough, M. T., & Ashkanasy, N. M. (2005). Follower emotional reactions to authentic and inauthentic leadership influence. In J. W. Gardner, B. J. Avolio & F. Walumbwa (Eds.), *Authentic leadership theory and practice: Origins, effects and development; monographs in leadership and management* (Vol. 3, pp. 281-300). San Diego, CA: Elsevier.

Dean, J. W., Brandes, P., & Dhwardkar, R. (1998). Organizational cynicism. *Academy of Management Review, 23*(2), 341-352.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1995). Human autonomy: The basis for true self-esteem. In M. H. Kernis (Ed.), *Efficacy, agency, and self-esteem* (pp. 31-49). New York: Plenum Press.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). "What" And "Why" Of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry, 11*(4), 227-268.

Dirks, K. T., & Ferrin, D. L. (2002). Trust in leadership: Meta-analytic findings and implications for research and practice. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(4), 611-628.

Douglas, C., Ferris, G. R., & Perrewé, P. L. (2005). Leader political skill and authentic leadership. In J. W. Gardner, B. J. Avolio & F. Walumbwa (Eds.), *Authentic leadership theory and practice: Origins, effects and development; monographs in leadership and management* (Vol. 3, pp. 139-154). San Diego, CA: Elsevier.

Erickson, R. J. (1995a). The importance of authenticity for self and society. *Symbolic Interaction, 18*(1), 121-144.

Erickson, R. J. (1995b). Our society, our selves: Becoming authentic in an inauthentic world. *Advanced Development, 6*(1), 27-39.

Gardner, W. L. (2003). Perceptions of leader charisma, effectiveness and integrity: Effects of exemplification, delivery and ethical reputation. *Management Communication Quarterly, 16*(4), 502-527.

Gardner, W. L., & Avolio, B. J. (1998). The charismatic relationship: A dramaturgical perspective. *Academy of Management Review, 23*(1), 32-58.

Gardner, W. L., Avolio, B. J., & Walumbwa, F. (2005). Authentic leadership development: Emergent themes and future directions. In W. L. Gardner, B. J.

Avolio & F. Walumbwa (Eds.), *Authentic leadership theory and practice: Origins, effects and development; monographs in leadership and management* (Vol. 3, pp. 387-406). San Diego, CA: Elsevier.

Gardner, W. L., & Schermerhorn, J. R. (2004). Unleashing individual potential: Performance gains through positive organizational behavior and authentic leadership. *Organizational Dynamics, 33*(3), 270-281.

George, B. (2004). Becoming an authentic leader. *Innovative Leader, 13*(1), 1-2.

Gioia, D. A., & Poole, P. P. (1984). Scripts in organizational behavior. *Academy of Management Review, 9*(3), 449-459.

Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.

Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.

Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R. E., & McKee, A. (2002). *Primal leadership: Realizing the power of emotional intelligence*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Gouldner, A. W. (1960). The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. *American Sociological Review, 25*(2), 161-178.

Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *The Leadership Quarterly, 6*(2), 219-247.

Hannah, S. T., Lester, P. B., & Vogelgesang, G. R. (2005). Moral leadership: Explicating the moral component of authentic leadership. In J. W. Gardner, B. J. Avolio & F. Walumbwa (Eds.), *Authentic leadership theory and practice: Origins, effects and*

development; monographs in leadership and management (Vol. 3, pp. 43-81). San Diego, CA: Elsevier.

Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Hayes, T. L. (2002). Business-unit level relationships between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(2), 268-279.

Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Keyes, C. L. M. (2003). Well-being in the workplace and its relationship to business outcomes: A review of the Gallup studies. In C. L. M. Keyes & J. Haidt (Eds.), *Flourishing: Positive psychology and the life well-lived* (pp. 205-224). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Harter, S. (2002). Authenticity. In C. R. Snyder & S. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of positive psychology* (pp. 382-394). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Hogg, M. A. (2001). A social identity theory of leadership. *Personality And Social Psychology Review, 5*(3), 184-200.

Howell, J. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1992). The ethics of charismatic leadership: Submission or liberation? *The Executive, 6*(1), 43-52.

Howell, J. M., & Shamir, B. (2005). The role of followers in the charismatic leadership process: Relationships and their consequences. *Academy of Management Review, 30*(1), 96-112.

Hoyle, R. H., Kernis, M. H., Leary, M. R., & Baldwin, M. W. (1999). *Selfhood: Identity, esteem, regulation*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Hughes, L. W. (2005). Developing transparent relationships through humor in the authentic leader-follower relationship. In J. W. Gardner, B. J. Avolio & F. Walumbwa (Eds.), *Authentic leadership theory and practice: Origins, effects and*

development; monographs in leadership and management (Vol. 3, pp. 83-106). San Diego, CA: Elsevier.

Ilies, R., Morgeson, F. P., & Nahrgang, J. D. (2005). Authentic leadership and eudaemonic well-being: Understanding leader-follower outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly, 16*(3), 373-394.

Jones, G. R., & George, J. M. (1998). The experience and evolution of trust: Implications for cooperation and teamwork. *Academy of Management Review, 23*(3), 531-546.

Kahneman, D. (1999). Objective happiness. In D. Kahneman, E. Diener & N. Schwarz (Eds.), *Well-being: The foundation of hedonic psychology* (pp. 3-25). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Men and women of the corporation*. New York: Basic Books.

Kanter, R. M., Stein, B., & Jick, T. (1992). *The challenge of organizational change: How companies experience it and leaders guide it*. New York: Free Press.

Kernis, M. H. (2003). Toward a conceptualization of optimal self-esteem. *Psychological Inquiry, 14*(1), 1-26.

Kirkpatrick, S. A., & Locke, E. A. (1991). Leadership: Do traits matter? *The Executive, 5*(2), 48-60.

Klenke, K. (2005). The internal theater of the authentic leader: Integrating cognitive, affective, conative and spiritual facets of authentic leadership. In J. W. Gardner, B. J. Avolio & F. Walumbwa (Eds.), *Authentic leadership theory and practice: Origins, effects and development; monographs in leadership and management* (Vol. 3, pp. 155-182). San Diego, CA: Elsevier.

Liden, R. C., Sparrowe, R. T., & Wayne, S. J. (1997). Leader-member exchange theory: The past and potential for the future. *Research in Personnel and Human Resource Management, 15*(1), 47-119.

Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., & Sparrowe, R. T. (2000). An examination of the mediating role of psychological empowerment on the relations between the job, interpersonal relationships, and work outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*(3), 407-416.

Lord, R. G., & Brown, D. J. (2001). Leadership, value, and subordinate self-concepts. *The Leadership Quarterly, 12*(2), 133-152.

Lord, R. G., Brown, D. J., & Freiberg, S. J. (1999). Understanding the dynamics of leadership: The role of follower self-concepts in the leader/follower relationship. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 78*(3), 167-203.

Luthans, F., & Avolio, B. J. (2003). Authentic leadership: A positive developmental approach. In K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton & R. E. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive organizational scholarship* (pp. 241-261). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Luthans, F., Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F., & Li, W. (2005). The psychological capital of Chinese workers: Exploring the relationship with performance. *Management and Organization Review, 1*(2), 249-271.

Markus, H., & Wurf, E. (1987). The dynamic self-concept: A social psychological perspective. *American Review of Psychology, 38*(2), 299-337.

May, D. R. (2004, July). *The flourishing of the human spirit at work: Toward an understanding of the determinants and outcomes of experienced meaningfulness*

at work. Paper presented at the European Conference on Positive Psychology, Verbania Pallanza, Italy.

May, D. R., Chan, A. Y. L., Hodges, T. D., & Avolio, B. J. (2003). Developing the moral component of authentic leadership. *Organizational Dynamics, 32*(3), 247-260.

May, D. R., Gilson, R. L., & Harter, L. (2004). The psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety, and availability and the engagement of the human spirit at work. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 77*(1), 11-37.

Michie, S., & Gooty, J. (2005). Values, emotions, and authenticity: Will the real leader please stand up? *The Leadership Quarterly, 16*(3), 441-457.

Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2004). *Character strengths and virtues: A handbook and classification.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Rhoades, L., Eisenberger, R., & Armeli, S. (2001). Affective commitment to the organization: The contribution of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(5), 825-836.

Roberts, P. W., & Dowling, G. R. (2002). Corporate reputation and sustained superior financial performance. *Strategic Management Journal, 23*(12), 1077-1093.

Robins, G., & Boldero, J. (2003). Relational discrepancy theory: The implications of self-discrepancy theory for dyadic relationships and for the emergence of social structure. *Personality And Social Psychology Review, 7*(1), 56-74.

Rouse, M. J., & Daellenbach, U. S. (1999). Rethinking research methods for the resource-based perspective: Isolating sources of sustainable competitive advantage. *Strategic Management Journal, 20*(5), 487-494.

Rousseau, D. M. (1995). *Psychological contracts in organizations: Understanding written and unwritten agreements*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). On happiness and human potential: A review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. *Annual Review of Psychology, 52*(1), 141-166.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2003). On assimilating identities to the self: A self-determination theory perspective on internalization and integrity within cultures. In M. R. Leary & J. P. Tangney (Eds.), *Handbook of self and identity* (pp. 253-272). New York: Guilford.

Schein, E. H. (2004). *Organizational culture and leadership* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Shamir, B., & Eilam, G. (2005). "What's your story?" A life-stories approach to authentic leadership development. *The Leadership Quarterly, 16*(3), 395-417.

Shamir, B., House, R. J., & Arthur, M. B. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept based theory. *Organizational Science, 4*(5), 577-594.

Sheldon, K. M., & Elliot, A. J. (1999). Goal striving, need satisfaction, and longitudinal well-being: The self-concordance model. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology, 76*(3), 482-497.

Sheldon, K. M., & Houser-Marko, L. (2001). Self-concordance, goal attainment, and the pursuit of happiness: Can there be an upward spiral? *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology, 80*(1), 152-165.

Sosik, J. J. (2000). Possible selves and personal meaning of charismatic and non-charismatic leaders. *Journal of Leadership Studies, 7*, 3-13.

Tepper, B. (2003). Organizational citizenship behavior and the spiritual employee. In R. Giacalone & C. Jurkiewics (Eds.), *Handbook of workplace spirituality and organizational performance* (pp. 181-192). New York: M. E. Sharpe.

Varella, P., Javidan, M., & Waldman, D. A. (2005). The differential effects of socialized and personalized leadership on group social capital. In J. W. Gardner, B. J. Avolio & F. Walumbwa (Eds.), *Authentic leadership theory and practice: Origins, effects and development; monographs in leadership and management* (Vol. 3, pp. 107-137). San Diego, CA: Elsevier.

Waterman, A. S. (1993). Two conceptions of happiness: Contrasts of personal expressiveness (eudaimonia) and hedonic enjoyment. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology, 64*(4), 678-691.

Watson, T. J. (2003). Ethical choice in managerial work: The scope for moral choices in an ethically irrational world. *Human Relations, 56*(2), 167-185.

Weierter, S. J. M. (1997). Who wants to play "Follow the leader?" A theory of charismatic relationships based on routinized charisma and followers characteristics. *The Leadership Quarterly, 8*(2), 171-193.