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ABSTRACT

The goal of this study was to explore the connection between authentic leadership, spirituality, and human development theory to determine if spirituality contributes to the emergence or formation of an authentic leadership identity. An interdisciplinary research approach was conducted by reviewing literature on authentic leadership, spirituality, and human development. A sequential explanatory mixed method design was used to collect and analyze the personal beliefs and life experiences of individuals who were nominated as authentic leaders. Sixty-one participants completed a questionnaire and a subset of eleven participants completed semi-structured interviews.

Quantitative findings identified that nearly 94% of participants considered themselves to be spiritual ($n = 57$). Most participants (90%) believe that spirituality influences their beliefs about leadership and their behaviors as leaders ($n = 55$). Similarly, most participants (90%) affirmed that their spirituality influences their authenticity and self-awareness as a leader ($n = 55$).

Qualitative findings from semi-structured interviews identified that spirituality, or spiritual influences, experienced during the formative years, influenced participants’ values and beliefs, defined their principles and ethics, and provided a framework for how to live and behave. For most participants, these values and beliefs were informed by religious parents and/or a religious upbringing. When a participant did not reference a religious parent or religious upbringing, a sense of God, or higher power, or a strong sense of service was acknowledged instead. Findings also credit spirituality, or the belief in a higher power or God with having encouraged a participants’ journey or purpose. Participants acknowledged that spirituality has helped and continues to help define who they are, who they want to be, and how they want to live and work.
Based on these findings, this study offers evidence that values and beliefs link spirituality to the emergence of an authentic leadership identity. While an individual’s identity continues to be shaped and influenced across a person’s lifespan, core values which influenced their emergence as an authentic leader were established during the early formative years, informed by parental and spiritual (religious) influences. As such, spirituality may be a mediating variable which influences the emergence of authentic leadership identity, as well as, encourages a sense of purpose, life-direction, and/or self-actualization.
Chapter One: Introduction

“The best way to describe the current status of Leadership Studies is that it is an emerging discipline” (Riggio, R., 2016, p. 10).

Leadership is a complex and universal human phenomenon (Bass, 2008; Bennis, 2007; Day & Zaccaro, 2014; Khurana & Nohria, 2010; Northouse, 2016; Riggio, 2013). Since its inception as a field of study, nearly a century ago, leadership has grown to be one of the most examined areas of organizational development (Bass, 2008; Brungardt, 1996; Grint, 2000; Khurana & Nohria, 2010; Northouse, 2016). Over the years, multiple academic disciplines within the social sciences, applied sciences, and humanities have conducted extensive research and published numerous studies with the intent of advancing leadership theory and practice (Riggio, 2013; Bass, 2008; Northouse, 2016; Paraschiv, 2013). The latest edition of The Handbook of Leadership (Bass, 2008), published shortly after the passing of its author, Bernard M. Bass, is considered amongst the most comprehensive books on leadership (Hewstone, Stroebe, & Jonas, 2015; Popper, 2012; Vecchio, 2007). Dr. Bass, a distinguished Professor Emeritus, director of the Center for Leadership Studies and founder of academic journal The Leadership Quarterly, compiled over 35 years of research findings and theories on leadership and referenced nearly 8,000 academic sources across the book’s 1,536 pages (Bass, 2008). This number has more than tripled since the first edition was released in 1974, which used approximately 2,500 references across 576 pages (Stogdill, 1974).

Despite the extensive contributions across various academic fields, leadership literature has yet to produce a fixed or universally agreed upon definition, model or theory of leadership (Bass, 2008; Borwick, 1995; Khurana & Nohria, 2010; Day & Zaccaro, 2014; Klenke, 1990; Leithwood, Jantzi & Steinbach, 2000a; Northouse, 2016; Rost, 1991; Sorenson, 2000; Yukl, 2006). Definitions of leadership are almost as widespread as there are people interested in
researching the topic (Antonakis, Cianciolo, & Sternberg, 2004; Bass, 2008; Conger & Riggio, 2007; Northouse, 2016; Stogdill, 1974). In his influential, award-winning book *Leadership*, American historian, political scientist and distinguished authority on leadership studies, James McGregor Burns, lamented that, “leadership is one of the most observed and least understood phenomena on earth” (1978, p. 2). A fellow scholar and pioneer in leadership studies, Warren Bennis, added, “it is almost cliché of the leadership literature that a single definition of leadership is lacking” (Bennis, 2007, pg. 2).

The desire to understand leadership is salient and ubiquitous (Khurana & Nohria, 2010; Perruci & McManus, 2013; Northouse, 2016; 2018). The topic of leadership continues to be widely discussed and debated among scholars, educators, consultants and practitioners (Bass, 2008; Drucker, 1998; Khurana, & Nohria, 2010; Northouse, 2012; Rost 1991); making leadership one of the most central and fastest-growing subjects in academia and in corporate America (Global Human Capital Trends 2017, n.d.); Perruci & McManus, 2013; Harvey & Riggio, 2011). According to a report released in May 2016 by the U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), business was the top field of study amongst undergraduate and graduate students (McFarland, Hussar, de Brey, Snyder, Wang, Wilkinson-Flicker, Gebrekristos, Zhang, Rathbun, Barmer, Bullock Mann, & Hinz, 2017). Moreover, research collected across 277 academic programs by the Association of Study of Higher Education (ASHE) and in partnership with the Council for Higher Education Programs (CAHEP), found that administration, management, or leadership was the primary focus and expertise underlying 99 percent of the nearly 194 academic programs in higher education available in the U.S. and 75 percent of the 83 programs available globally (Rumbley, Altback, Stanfield, Shimmi, de Gayardon, & Chan, 2014).
In 2015, American companies spent nearly 31 billion dollars on programs to develop and prepare leaders (Singaraju, Carroll, & Park, 2016). The 2016 Global Human Capital Trend report prepared by Deloitte LLP, found that 89 percent of the over 7,000 executives from across 130 countries surveyed, rated the need to strengthen and improve organizational leadership as the second most critical priority behind organizational design. A joint study between MIT’s Sloan Management Review and Deloitte LLP found that 70 percent of more than 1,000 business leaders believed that they do not have the right leaders to adapt to the changing digital and diverse landscape of the new millennium (Kane, Palmer, Nguyen, Kiron, & Buckley, 2016); a secondary study found nearly 40 percent of the survey respondents believed that their current leadership programs provide only ‘some’ value; while 24 percent reported they provide ‘little to no’ value (Global Human Capital Trends 2016, n.d.).

As the pervasiveness of leadership within corporate America and academia grows so, too, does the body of literature on the topic (Bass & Bass, 2008; Khurana & Nohria, 2010; Perrucci & McManus, 2013; Northouse, 2016, 2018). As of September 17, 2017, Amazon, one of the largest online retailers and 8th largest employer in the U.S., listed over 100,000 books with the word ‘leadership’ in the title and over 200,000 on the topic of leadership itself. A query conducted September 22, 2017 using Google, the largest internet search engine in the world, found that the term ‘leadership’ and ‘leadership theory’ produced nearly 839 million and 3.1 million results respectively (Google, 2017). When the search was conducted using Google Scholar, a specialized academic search engine, the term ‘leadership’ and ‘leadership theory’ produced nearly 3.8 million and 2.9 million results respectively; these numbers have more than doubled since 2009 returning only 1.4 million and 1.5 million results respectively (Google Scholar, 2017).
Technological and digital advancements in the 21st century have significantly contributed to the rapid growth, dissemination, and accessibility of literature on leadership (Global Human Capital Trends, 2016; Grint, 2000). The expansion of the internet together with an increase in algorithmic functioning and specialization of search engines has enlarged the capacity and search experiences for scholars and practitioners alike (Global Human Capital Trends 2016, n.d.; Strickland, 2008). The creation of open source platforms such as Wikipedia, in 2001, and open educational resources (OER), in 2002, continue to encourage and amplify the availability of leadership literature globally (Global Human Capital Trends 2016, n.d.; Grint, 2000; Laakso, Welling, Bukvova, Nyman, Björk, & Hedlund, 2011). A recent study approximated that the number of online academic journals registered through the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ) has more than doubled from 4,800 active journals in 2009 to over 10,000 as of September 2017 (Laakso et al., 2011). Furthermore, the articles published in these journals have increased from approximately 190,000 articles in 2009 to 2.5 million as of September 2017 (Laakso et al., 2011).

While there is an ever-growing body of information available on leadership, the study of leadership in the U.S. has come under significant scrutiny for two reasons: first, for maintaining outdated and incomplete constructs of leadership which have not kept pace with the needs of the 21st century workforce (Bennis, 2007; Global Human Capital Trends 2016, n. d.; Lowe & Gardner, 2001; Rost & Barker, 2000; Sorenson, 2000; Yukl, 2008; Yukl & Mahsud, 2010); and, secondly, for not addressing and resolving the waning public confidence and trust in leadership across key U.S. institutions as a result of continued corporate scandals and leadership failings (Global Human Capital Trends 2016, n.d.; George, 2010; Northouse, 2016). Before his death in November 2005, Peter Drucker, an Austrian-born American management consultant, educator,
and author, whose publications contributed to the theoretical and practical foundations of modern business, reaffirmed that most of the traditional beliefs and expectations about business, technology, management and leadership are outdated and insufficient for the changing world of the 21st century (Cohen, 2009). These sentiments have been highlighted and supported by other leadership scholars and practitioners since the turn of the century (Luthans & Avolio, 2003; George, 2003; George, 2010; Khurana, & Nohria; Klenke, 2004; Northouse, 2016; Rost, 1991; Bennis, 2007).

The workforce of the 21st century is complex, dynamic, diverse, and multifaceted (Global Human Capital Trends 2016, n.d.; George, 2010; Khurana, & Nohria, 2010; Northouse, 2016; Winston & Patterson, 2006). Leaders today are facing the most complicated and complex workforce in history (LHH, 2007). According to ongoing research conducted by RAND on the American workforce in the 21st century, three important trends continue to influence the workplace: (a) demographic changes (growing diversity, increased generational differences, and aging workforce); (b) continuing technological advancements (increasing collaboration and the demand for higher skilled workers); and (c) increased globalization and global integration (Karoly & Kumar, 2016). Bill George, professor of management at Harvard Business School and the author of several best-selling books on leadership, confessed in his review of 21st century leadership that “traditional leaders thought they could solve this problem with rulebooks, training programs and compliance systems and were shocked when people deviated” (George, 2010, para. 2).

The growing complexity and highly competitive landscape of the 21st century continues to challenge the business ethics, morality and social responsibility of leaders (Tsalkis & Seaton, 2007; Weil, 2007; Northouse, 2016). As such, leaders are facing an increase in ethical and moral dilemmas which require the ability to conduct themselves with authenticity, integrity and
accountability (Brimmer, 2007). Northouse’s textbook, *Leadership: Theory and Practice*, across several editions since first released in 1997, provides multiple accounts of corporate scandals and leadership failings (2001, 2003; 2010; 2012; 2016). According to Northouse (2012), at the turn of the 21st century, financial reporting scandals such as Enron in 2001 and Worldcom in 2002, which involved senior most executives and CEOs, highlighted the failings of leadership in corporate America and eroded away at the public confidence. Following the scandals, Congress passed the Sarbanes-Oxley (SOX) Act of 2002, also known as the Public Company Accounting Reform and Investor Protection Act and Corporate and Auditing Accountability, Responsibility and Transparency Act which established new business requirements and reporting regulations for all U.S. public and private corporations (Bumiller, 2002).

Despite increased government regulations, corporate scandals, and unethical decision making continue to plague the present-day American workplace (Avolio & Gardner, 2005; Brimmer, 2007; Luthans & Avolio, 2003; Northouse, 2016; Seligman, 2002). Consider Wells Fargo’s fraudulent cross-selling account scandal affecting upwards of 3.5 million accounts, which first surfaced in 2016 and continues to widen as further investigation and regulatory actions take place (Koren, 2017). Prior to this corporate debacle, Wells Fargo had earned a strong reputation with a long history of sound management in the banking industry (Tayan, 2016). In 2015, Wells Fargo ranked 7th on Barron’s list of ‘Most Respected Companies’ (Racanelli, 2015) and in 2013 its Chairman and CEO, John Stumpf, was honored as ‘Banker of the Year’; a designation regarded as the industry standard for banking excellence (Aspan, 2013). On October 2016, Stumpf was forced to resign as outrage and criticism grew over his leadership failings and the unethical business practices within his company (Peltz, 2017). To date, Wells Fargo has fired four senior managers and over 5,300 lower-level employees related to this
scandal (Peltz, 2017). The company has also agreed to pay $185-million dollars in fines and penalties to regulators and admits to facing additional investigations and lawsuits in the coming months (Koren, 2017).

Wells Fargo is one of many examples of the failings amongst key institutions in the United States. A recent global study conducted by Edelman (2017) revealed that trust and leadership is in crisis around the world; noting that the general population in 20 of the 28 countries surveyed, including the United States, do not trust their key institutions of government, business, mass media, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs). The annual survey, which started tracking the general population’s trust in 2012, showed a significant increase in distrust across all countries, citing that one in two countries have lost faith in their overall systems altogether (Edelman, 2017). Moreover, the survey revealed that over two-thirds of the general population lacked confidence in their current leaders, from government officials to CEOs and board of directors (Edelman, 2017). The credibility of corporate CEOs declined across all 28 countries, dropping 12 points and reaching an all-time low of 37 percent (Edelman, 2017). For the U.S.A., trustworthiness of CEOs dropped 5 points from 43 to 38 percent (Elderman, 2017).

As the U.S. nears the first quarter mark of the 21st century, Americans continue to have little trust or confidence in most major institutions, including governmental agencies and private corporations (Edelman, 2017; Newport, 2017; Pew Research Center, 2017a). According to the latest Gallup poll conducted in June 2017, the confidence of the American people remains below historical averages; with only 28 percent of Americans satisfied with the current state of the nation (Newport, 2017). Some of the biggest leadership scandals to happen in the U.S. occurred in 2016: from claims that the Trump campaign colluded with the Russian government in the 2016 presidential election (Graham, 2017) to sexual harassment claims against the chairman and
CEO of Fox News, Roger Ailes (Siemaszko, 2017) to pharmaceutical giant, Mylan’s EpiPen price gouging scandal (Tuttle, 2016) to Samsung’s mass battery recall (Mathews & Heimer, 2016). These scandals only substantiate a growing concern that the American workforce has little trust and confidence in leadership (Gallup, 2017). As such, Northouse (2016) believes that the American people, “…long for bona fide leadership they can trust and for leaders who are honest and good” (p. 253).

In response to the continuing suspicion and growing distrust of major American institutions, there is a renewed interest in the research of authenticity and authentic leadership as a solution to restore confidence and regain trust in contemporary leadership (Avolio & Luthans, 2006; Brown, Trevino, and Harrison, 2005; George, 2003, Lorenzi, 2004). The desire to work for ethical organizations is increasing, especially amongst younger generations of the workforce (Mitroff, 2003; Gallup, 2016). According to a recent Gallup report on the state of the American workplace, Americans are searching for greater meaning and purpose from their careers (Gallup, 2016). This desire for meaning and purpose has fueled a growing revival of spirituality and, specifically, spirituality in the workplace. Jurkiewicz & Giacalone (2004) and Brown (2003) believe that spirituality is a way to recapture trust in response to the failings of the 21st century workplace. Spirituality at work is not just about religion (Laabs, 1995; Cavanagh, 1999) but rather about employees who see themselves as spiritual beings whose work life is filled with purpose and meaning (Fry, 2005; Jurkiewicz & Giacalone, 2004).

**Background of the Study**

Authentic leadership is a growing area of research within leadership studies (Avolio et al., 2004; Cameron, Dutton, & Quinn, 2003; Cooper & Nelson, 2006; Luthans, 2002; Luthans & Avolio, 2003). Conversations around authenticity within the corporate context began in the late
1970’s, however, Warren Bennis (1989), a luminary in leadership studies, was the first noted authority on leadership to explore certain elements of authenticity in his book, *On Becoming a Leader*. Bennis (2003) posits that “becoming a leader is synonymous with becoming yourself” and equates authenticity with leadership (p. 9). Yet, it was not until Bill George, Harvard professor and CEO of Medtronic, published a book called *Authentic Leadership* in 2003 that the initial interest in authentic leadership emerged. Like Bennis (1989), George and Sims (2007) believe that leadership is not something you are born with but requires constant development and growth over time.

Authenticity is at the core of authentic leadership (George, 2003), and is based on the ancient Greek maxim which encourages to thine own self be true (Magill, 2003; Shusterman, 2012). Authenticity can be defined as, “owning one’s personal experiences, be they thoughts, emotions, needs, preferences, or beliefs, processes captured by the injunction to know oneself” (Harter, 2002, p. 382). According to authentic leadership theory (Gardner et al., 2011; Luthans & Avolio, 2003), leaders are described as authentic when their behavior is consistent with their personal values and beliefs. Authentic leaders are also value centered with a moral/ethical component which drives their behavior (Luthans & Avolio, 2003; Shamir & Eilam, 2005).

Shamir and Eilam (2005) advance a conceptualization of authentic leaders which describes self-concept attributes and avoids describing the leader’s style, values or convictions. Shamir and Eilam (2005) define authentic leaders as individuals who have a higher level of self-resolution and self-concordant goals, with self-expressive behaviors and believe that their role as a leader is central to defining themselves.

Although there has been a significant amount of interest in recent years related to authentic leadership, empirical research on authentic leadership is limited (Luthans & Avolio,
One possible reason for this lack of empirical research is the difficulty involved in substantiating and measuring authentic leadership behavior (Cooper, Scandura, & Schriesheim, 2005). Shamir and Eilam (2005) posit that the leader’s life story can provide significant insight into assessing authenticity and understanding the emergence of authentic leaders. Analyzing biographical accounts and personal narratives can provide insight into how a leader’s core values and beliefs were influenced by life experiences or significant events (Shamir & Eilam, 2005; Shamir, Dayan-Horesh, & Adler, 2005). Pearce (2003) advances that everything an individual believes passionately about have formed from life experiences. “Life-stories provide authentic leaders with a self-concept that can be expressed through the leadership role” (Shamir & Eilam, 2005, p. 402).

In addition, there is an emerging interest in bringing spirituality into the workplace (Fry, 2003). Although minimal empirical work has been conducted on spirituality in the workplace, research has suggested that spirituality is a vital aspect of leadership (Sanders, Hopkins, & Geroy, 2003; Thompson, 2000; Wilber, 2000). Researchers view spirituality as a multifaceted human construct which focuses on finding a connection to something meaningful that transcends everyday life (Dehler & Welsh, 2003; Tepper, 2003; Goethals, Sorenson, & Burns, 2004). This perspective has led many researchers to argue that spirituality is at the core of successful leadership because it mediates the search for transcendent purpose, meaning and values (Conger, 1998; Fry, 2003, 2005b; Kanungo & Mendonca, 1996; Mitroff & Denton, 1999; Paloutzian & Ellison, 1982) which are held as central components of authentic leadership (Luthans & Avolio, 2003).

The study of spirituality in the workplace has encouraged the development of a new theory on leadership: Spiritual leadership. Spiritual leadership is considered a developing
paradigm which links spirituality and leadership (Klenke, 2005; Fry, 2005b). Spiritual leadership theory is grounded in the belief that spiritual leaders are driven by a spiritual calling (Fry, 2003) or “sense that one’s life has meaning and makes a difference” (Fry & Whittington, 2005, p. 186). Like the study of leadership, there is no widely accepted definition of spirituality or spiritual leadership (Kinjerski & Skrypnek, 2004; Klenke, 2005). Fry (2003) defines spiritual leadership as, “comprising the values, attitudes, and behaviors that are necessary to motivate one self and others so that they have a sense of spiritual survival through calling and membership” (p. 694–695). According to Sweeney & Fry (2012), spiritual leadership facilitates character development in leaders, specifically the aspects of self-identity, social awareness, and personal core values. Several researchers emphasized that individuals with higher levels of spirituality are more effective leaders (Cacioppe, 2000; Fry, 2003; Fry et al., 2005).

The theory of spiritual leadership (Fry, 2003, 2005a, 2008, 2009) has been tested in a diverse array of organizations across both public and private sectors. The findings from these studies indicate that the spiritual leadership model proposed by Fry (2009) positively enhances organizations and influences employee life satisfaction, organizational commitment and productivity (Fry & Matherly, 2006; Fry & Slocum, 2008; Fry; Fry et al., 2010). In addition, research indicates that personal outcomes associated with spiritual leadership include a greater sense of psychological well-being and life satisfaction (Fry et al., 2010; Fry et al., 2011; Fry, Vitucci, & Cedillo, 2005).

Problem Statement

The theory of authentic leadership has increasingly garnered attention from both academic researchers and business practitioners for nearly two decades. Although there is considerable literature written on the topic of authentic leadership (Diddams & Chang, 2012),
from a research perspective, it is still in its infancy as an emerging theory of leadership (Cianci, Hannah, Roberts, & Tsakumis, 2014; Cooper et al., 2005; Gardner et al., 2011; Hunt, 1999; Klenke, 2005; Luthans & Avolio, 2003). Several gaps and differing perspectives around the definition, constructs, mediating variables, and perceived outcomes have been identified in the literature (Banks, Mccaulley, Gardner, & Guler, 2016; Cianci et al., 2014; Gardner et al., 2011; Ford & Harding, 2011; Popper & Mayseless, 2007). Recent research suggests that there is not enough evidence to identify antecedents and requisite preconditions which could predict the emergence of authentic leadership or allow for recommendations to further the development of authentic leaders (Cianci et al., 2014; Avolio et al., 2011). Many agree, there is a need for a more empirical approach to understanding authentic leadership (Gardner et al., 2011), especially the factors which initially influence the emergence of an authentic leadership identity (Klenke, 2007).

Literature on authentic leadership, while expanding, is limited in its findings and discussions focused on the initial process by which authentic leaders form an authentic leadership identity (Gardner et al., 2011). Currently, there is no overarching or widely shared theory of how one develops into a leader, nonetheless an authentic leader (Avolio, 2007; Avolio & Hannah, 2008; Day, 2000; Riggio, 2008). Day, Harrison, and Halpin (2009) suggest that leader development occurs in an “ongoing, dynamic fashion across the life span” (p. xiii). Avolio & Gardner (2005) and Gardner et al. (2005) suggest that the development of an authentic leadership identity may be time dependent (taking places over time) or may be triggered by specific life events such as crisis situations or essential life experiences (Bennis & Thomas, 2002; Shamir & Eilam, 2005). However, Pallus, Nasby, and Easton (1991) contend that impactful experiences in life are not enough to stimulate the revision or redirection of identity.
Some scholars (Lord & Emrich, 2000) posit that both the antecedents of authentic leadership and spirituality may be influenced by factors of the human mind such as cognition, affect, and conation (Huitt, 1996; Tallon, 1997).

Kegan and Lahey (2010) argue that recent leadership development studies have not concentrated on the underlying ‘operating system’ used for effective leadership development. This has led to recommendations for research to link the process by which leaders develop to human and adult development (e.g. Dinh et al., 2014). Avolio and Gardner (2005) highlight the challenge within current leadership research by pointing to the lack of research on core personal processes which influence the initial and ongoing development of leaders. Day, Harrison, and Halpin (2009), Quick and Nelson (2008), and Avolio (2005; 2007) share the concern that traditional leadership studies fail to provide an integrative understanding of leadership from a whole person perspective. Lord and Hall (2005) also recognize that there is a lack of theory and empirical research available on the topic.

As such, there is an emerging interest in fully understanding the formation of a leadership identity and, more specifically related to this research study, the formation of an authentic leader’s identity (Johnson, Venus, Lanaj, Mao, & Chang, 2012). While some theorist on leadership and identity acknowledge that leadership identities develop over time, Komives, Owen, Longerbeam, Mainella, & Osteen (2005) suggest that there are essential developmental influences such as adult and peer influences, meaningful involvement experiences and reflective learning which contribute to the emergence of a leadership identity across six developmental stages. Moreover, once these factors are internalized, an identity is not static and enduring but continues to evolve as the individual participates in a continual process to discover and uncover their identity (Komives, Owen, Longerbeam, Mainella, & Osteen, 2005; McEwen, 2003).
Research on leadership identity development is limited (Johnson et al., 2012; DeRue & Ashford, 2010), particularly with regards to research focused on the role spirituality may play in the initial emergence or shaping of an authentic leadership identity. Within recent years, theorists have speculated that multiple social and organizational contextual factors contribute to the formation of a leadership identity (Baldomir, 2015; Komives, et al., 2005) and have begun to conceptualize leadership development as a larger and dynamic process influenced by relational and social factors which are independent of any formal role held by the individual or determined by the hierarchy within a social system (Collinson, 2005; Pearce & Conger, 2003; Uhl-Bien, Marion, & McKelvey, 2007). Recognizing spirituality as a social contextual factor provides the grounding for exploring this influence further, especially since research has suggested that spirituality may be an important aspect of leadership (Fry, 2003; Sanders, Hopkins, & Geroy, 2003; Thompson, 2000).

Constructivist development theory (CDT) may shed some light on the development of a leader’s identity across the domains of the human experience (Kegan, 1994). CDT posits that individuals construct their reality by way of constructing meaning-making systems (Kegan & Lahey, 1984). An individual’s meaning-making system shapes their experiences and influences their thinking, feeling and behavior (Cook-Greuter, 1990, 1999; Kegan, 1982, 1994; Loevinger, 1976). Theorists on authentic leadership suggest that developing insight into the construction process of a leadership identity is significant, especially since identity impacts thought processing, affect, motivation, and behavior (Day & Harrison, 2007; Gardner & Avolio, 1998; Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993).
Purpose Statement

The intent of this research was to explore the initial formation and emergence of authentic leadership identity. Research on leadership from a life-story perspective is still scarce, and according to Shamir and Eilam (2005), it is nearly nonexistent related to authentic leadership development. Research which explores authentic leaders’ meaning making system and what experiences have shaped and influenced their development or emergence as an authentic leader may shed some light on the way in which a leader’s identity forms or emerges. Existing research on the development of authentic leadership and spiritual leadership suggests that organizations cannot duplicate or recreate essential life events or experiences as part of a training effort or development program (Shamir & Eilam, 2005; Fry, 2005). Therefore, this study may be able to inform the creation of an integrative approach to authentic leadership development.

This research study explored the connection and/or influence between authentic leadership, spirituality, and human and adult development theory to determine if spirituality contributes to the formation of authentic leadership in individuals. This study assumed a constructivist-developmental approach to human and leadership development and sought to capture an understanding of the life events or experiences which shaped or influenced the emergence and formation of an authentic leader’s identity. Of interest was the influence of spirituality in shaping the development of authentic leaders. The purpose of this study was to explore what role, if any, spirituality played in the initial formation and emergence of an authentic leadership identity. This study intended to understand whether spirituality may shape or influence the emergence and formation of authenticity which may, subsequently, shape or influence the emergence of an authentic leadership identity. This study proposed an interdisciplinary research approach by reviewing literature on authentic leadership, spirituality
and human and adult development. Anchored in the constructive-developmental approach to human experience and human development, this study was envisioned to expand the current literature on authentic leadership, and its link, if any, to spirituality.

A sequential explanatory mixed method design was used to collect and analyze quantitative and then qualitative data in three consecutive phases. In phase one, a quantitative questionnaire was used to collect data related to specific beliefs and behaviors of individuals nominated as authentic leaders, and in phase two, a qualitative method of semi-structured interviews was used to further examine the perceptions of authentic leaders (through semi-structured interviews) concerning what role or influence, if any, spirituality played in the initial formation (development, shaping, emergence) of their authentic leadership identities. In phase three, the data from the questionnaires as well as the semi-structured interviews were analyzed to assess the role spirituality played, if any, in the initial formation (development, shaping, emergence) of their authentic leadership identity.

Participants for this study were identified through a nomination process and were involved in up to three stages of participation: nomination, questionnaire completion and, if applicable, the completion of a semi-structured interview. As part of the initial screening, individuals who were nominated as authentic leaders and agreed to participate in the study were asked to complete a questionnaire which included demographic questions, scaled questions related to their beliefs on spirituality, as well as, the Authentic Leadership Questionnaire (ALQ), an established self-reporting instrument used to measure authentic leadership (Avolio, Gardner, & Walumbwa, 2007). Individuals who scored high or very high on the ALQ instrument and acknowledged agreement to participating in a follow-up interview were invited to participate in the interview. The goal of this study was to conduct between 8-10 semi-structured interviews of
participants who were nominated as authentic leaders and then were confirmed as authentic leaders by way of the ALQ instrument. Data from the questionnaires and interviews were analyzed to understand the role spirituality played in the initial formation (development, shaping, emergence) of their authentic leadership identity.

**Research Questions**

To explore what role, if any, spirituality plays in the initial formation and emergence of an authentic leader, the following research questions were addressed:

1. What role does spirituality play, if any, in the initial formation and emergence of authentic leadership identity?
   a. What do the personal histories and experiences of authentic leaders reveal about the initial formation, emergence and/or continued development of their authentic leadership identity?
   b. What are the perceptions of authentic leaders concerning the role of spirituality in their authentic leadership identity formation?

**Significance of the Study**

Authentic leadership and spiritual leadership are theories in the initial stages of development (Hunt, 1999). Both theories are considered inspirational styles which are rooted in positive psychology (Klenke, 2007). Hence, this study attempted to make a significant contribution in expanding an understanding of the relationship between spirituality and authentic leadership, specifically in the initial formation and emergence of an authentic leadership identity. The emerging theory of spirituality and adult development theory offer interesting contributions to expanding an understanding of the initial formation and emergence of authentic leadership identity (Fry, 2005b; Fry & Whittington, 2005). According to Dent, Higgins, and Wharff, “the
ontology of spirituality in the workplace closely resembles the literature on leadership in that there are many dynamics dimensions or contexts for describing and measuring the phenomenon” (2005, p. 628).

Exploring the connection between authentic leadership and spirituality contributes to a deeper exploration of leadership identity formation. Specifically, understanding the role spirituality may play in the initial formation (shaping, emergence) of authentic leadership identity not only expands the scholarship on authentic leadership and spirituality respectively, but also provides a possible future direction for research on authentic leadership development. Understanding the connection of these two phenomena has the potential to improve the ability of practitioners to promote development and growth in both areas. Additionally, by incorporating a life stories approach to understanding the formation of authentic leadership identity, this study has demonstrated how the constructivist approach to human development can inform future authentic leadership development models and programs.

**Assumptions of the Study**

The following assumptions were made as part of this research study:

1. The identification of authentic leaders relied upon nominations submitted by individuals who perceived the nominee as consistent with the description of authentic leadership. The screening criteria centered on the nominees’ results related to the ALQ instrument and their willingness to participate in semi-structured interviews.

2. The Authentic Leadership Questionnaire (ALQ) is a meaningful way to identify and classify individuals as authentic leaders. Furthermore, that individuals who scored very high or high on the ALQ are representative of authentic leadership and, therefore,
participants pre-screened for interviews were representative of the population of authentic leaders.

3. Individuals who participated in this study truthfully represented themselves when completing the questionnaire and participating in semi-structured interviews, if applicable. This study assumed, participants were self-aware and reflective enough to recall past experiences and describe these experiences as their personal narratives accurately.

4. Leadership is a socially constructed and lived experience which can be learned and understood through narrative interviews.

5. The central tenet of constructive-developmental theory is accurate: humans, in general, develop through increasingly complex stages of meaning-making and ways of being; Human development occurs over a life time and as such, the development of leadership (and authentic leadership) is a life-long undertaking.

Limitations of the Study

The following limitations were identified related to this study:

1. A potential weakness of narrative interviews is that the interview responses are highly subjective.

2. This study focused on the theory of authentic leadership and its definition as a methodological tool to select participants who were nominated in relation to the pre-described definition of authentic leadership. Moreover, this study is limited by the ALQ instrument used to measure levels of authentic leadership.

3. Leadership practices and spiritual orientation of authentic leaders may differ. The population selected for this study represents a group of individuals nominated by others
who perceived them to be authentic leaders (based on the description of authentic leaders provided). While the sample is diverse demographically, survey participants are limited due to the selected social media sites and professional networking site used to announce the Call for Nominations.

4. Given the sample of authentic leaders is limited to the western part of the United States, this study does not claim generalizability to the entire United States population.

5. Another limitation was time. This study was limited by time and is dependent on conditions experienced during that time frame.

**Delimitations of the Study**

1. This study focused on the life experiences and events of authentic leaders only.

2. Only nominated authentic leaders within the western region of the United States were interviewed. Additionally, only those nominated authentic leaders who scored very high or high on the Authentic Leadership Questionnaire (ALQ) were invited to be interviewed and/or interviewed.

3. There is a wide range of sampling approaches available to mixed method researchers. Data for this study were obtained through a quantitative survey method using a questionnaire which included a closed-ended Likert scale, and a qualitative narrative method using semi-structured interviews of approximately 8-10 participants. Interviews were limited to no longer than 60 minutes with pre-defined open-ended questions.

4. Participants were selected through a purposeful sampling approach which allowed the researcher to make a series of strategic choices, aligned with the nature of the study, to identify and select individuals who were authentic leaders and considered especially
knowledgeable about or experienced with the phenomenon of authentic leadership (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011; Patton, 2002).

5. The study did not provide a historical review of leadership literature outside authentic leadership. As such, the researcher did not discuss literature on current authentic leadership development practices or programs.

6. The focus of this research included a review of literature on spirituality; however, this study did not include literature on religion or its historical relevance. This study approached spirituality as a concept which, while related to religion, can exist separate from religion or religious influences.

7. The study approached research from an ontological orientation and was concerned with the nature of existence, being, and reality (Crotty, 2003; Guba, 1990). From an ontological perspective, the researcher was concerned with the nature of reality and how multiple, socially constructed views of reality potentially exist in the world. (Guba, 1990; Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill, 2012)

8. This research follows a constructivist/interpretivist research approach. The constructivist view of research is grounded in the belief that individuals interpret and construct reality and experiences through personal belief systems (Jonassen, 1991) and that the world is in an ongoing process of being made (Elliott, 2005).

**Definition of Key Terms**

*Authenticity.* For the purpose of this research, “authenticity involves both owning one’s personal experiences (thoughts, emotions, needs, and wants) and acting in accordance with those experiences” (Gino, Kouchaki, & Galinsky, 2015, p. 984).
**Authentic Leadership.** Similar to the concept of leadership, literature reveals that a universal or widely accepted definition of authentic leadership does not exist (e.g. Bennis, 2003; Bennis & Thomas, 2002; George, 2003; Luthans & Avolio, 2003; Terry, 1993). Authentic leadership will be defined using the definition proposed by Walumbwa, Avolio, Gardner, Wernsing, and Peterson (2008) which integrates many of the early concepts of the construct, A pattern of leader behavior that draws upon and promotes both positive psychological capacities and a positive ethical climate, to foster greater self-awareness, an internalized moral perspective, balanced processing of information, and relational transparency on the part of leaders working with followers, fostering positive self-development. (p. 94)

**Authentic Leadership Questionnaire (ALQ)** The ALQ is a self-assessment instrument, copyrighted in 2007 (Avolio, Gardner, & Walumbwa, 2007), which measures individual responses related to the four dimensions of authentic leadership (Gardner et al., 2011). There are 16 items which scale for self-awareness (4 items), internalized moral perspective (4 items), balanced processing (3 items), and relational transparency (5 items). The ALQ uses a Likert Scale with five pre-coded responses to allow participant to express the degree to which they agree or disagree with each of the statements. The response options are: 0- Not at all, 1- Once in a while, 2- Sometimes, 3- Fairly often, and 4- Frequently, if not always.

**Developmental Psychology.** Developmental psychology is the scientific study of how and why human beings change over the course of their lifespan from infancy, childhood, and adolescence to adulthood (Hogan, 2000). Developmental psychologists aim to explain how thinking, feeling, and behaviors change throughout life across three dimensions: physical development, cognitive development, and socioemotional development. This study will focus on cognitive development.
Leadership. For this research, it is important to view leadership through multiple lenses which will contribute to an understanding of not only leadership but will frame this research on authentic leadership. Therefore, leadership is relational, influential, shared, strategic, and a complex social phenomenon (Avolio, 2007; Yukl, 2006) and the way individuals become leaders is by learning about leadership through dynamic relationships (Bennis, 1999).

Spirituality. A non-theistic approach to spirituality enables the research to focus on spirituality from a connectedness perspective (Chiu, Emblen, Van Hofwegen, Sawatzky, & Meyerhoff, 2004; Cook, 2004; Dyson, Cobb & Forman, 1997). Hence, spirituality is defined as “a human belief in, movement toward, and relationship with a higher purpose or power, self, and others from which a sense of purpose, consciousness, interconnectedness, and destiny may be derived” (Swift, 2003, p. 5).

Spiritual Leadership. The definition of spiritual leadership will be supported by the research of Fry (2003), whereas, spiritual leadership is defined as,

comprising the values, attitude, and behaviors necessary to intrinsically motive one’s self and others so that they have a sense of spiritual survival through calling and membership. This entails: (1) creating a vision wherein organization members experience a sense of calling in that their life has meaning and makes a difference and (2) establishing a social/organizational culture based on altruistic love whereby leaders and followers have genuine care, concern, and appreciation for both self and others, thereby producing a sense of membership and feel understood and appreciated. (p. 695)

Organization of the Study

This study is organized into five chapters. Chapter 1 introduces the proposed study and includes a discussion of the problem statement, purpose, research framework, significance of the
topic, research questions, definitions of terms, and assumptions and limitations. Chapter 2 provides a review of literature related to authentic leadership, spirituality, and human development. Chapter 3 provides the research methodology, the research design and approach, a description of the population, data gathering procedures, plans for IRB, and the data analysis process. Chapter 4 provides an analysis of the data and the findings from the study. Chapter 5 summarizes the study based on the findings and includes recommendations on next steps, as well as, implications of the study. Chapter 5 also provides suggestions for future research and final thoughts from the researcher.

**Summary of Chapter 1**

The growing complexity and highly competitive landscape of the 21st century continues to challenge the business ethics, moral, and social responsibility of leaders (Tsalikis & Seaton, 2007; Weil, 2007; Northouse, 2016). Corporate scandals and unethical decision making continue to plague the present-day American workplace (Avolio & Gardner, 2005; Brimmer, 2007; Luthans & Avolio, 2003; Northouse, 2016; Seligman, 2002) and Americans continue to have little trust or confidence in most major institutions, including governmental agencies and private corporations (Edelman, 2017; Newport, 2017; Pew Research Center, 2017a).

In response, the study of leadership in the U.S. has come under significant scrutiny for maintaining outdated and incomplete constructs of leadership (Bennis, 2007; Global Human Capital Trends 2016, n.d.; Lowe & Gardner, 2001; Rost & Barker, 2000; Sorenson, 2000; Yukl, 2008; Yukl & Mahsud, 2010), and for not addressing and resolving the waning public confidence in leadership (Global Human Capital Trends 2016, n.d.; George, 2010; Northouse, 2016). Consequently, there is a renewed interest in the research of authenticity and authentic leadership as a solution to restore confidence and regain trust in contemporary leadership (Avolio &
Luthans, 2006; Brown, Trevino, and Harrison, 2005; George, 2003, Lorenzi, 2004), especially as a growing number of Americans desire to work for ethical organizations.

Although there is considerable literature written on the topic of authentic leadership (Diddams & Chang, 2012), it is still in its infancy as an emerging theory of leadership (Cianci et al., 2014; Cooper et al., 2005; Gardner et al., 2011; Hunt, 1999; Klenke, 2005; Luthans & Avolio, 2003). Existing literature on authentic leadership, while expanding, is limited in its findings and discussions focused on the initial process by which authentic leaders form this authentic leadership identity (Gardner et al., 2011). Currently, there is no overarching and widely shared theory of how one develops into a leader (Avolio, 2007; Avolio & Hannah, 2008; Day, 2000; Riggio, 2008). Constructivist development theory may shed some light on the formation of a leader across the domains of human experience (Kegan, 1994).

As covered in Chapter 1, this research study explores the connection between authentic leadership, spirituality, and human development theory to determine if spirituality contributes to the initial formation of authentic leadership in individuals. The specific purpose of this study is to explore what role, if any, spirituality plays in the initial formation and emergence of an authentic leadership identity. The review of literature presented in the next chapter describes current research about authentic leadership, spirituality, and human development. Chapter 3 describes the research design methodology, considerations for human subjects, the data collection process, and interview protocol, as well as the process for analyzing the data. Chapter 4 will present the findings from both the quantitative and qualitative data collected. Chapter 5 will provide a greater synthesis of the data and provide a discussion of the findings, implications, and conclusions of this research study.
Chapter Two: Review of Literature

“The medium for developing into an authentic leader is not the destination, but the journey itself – a journey to find your true self and the purpose of your life’s work” (George & Sims, 2007).

Introduction

In discussions related to leadership in the 21st century, the terms ‘authentic’ and ‘authenticity’ or the phrases ‘to be an authentic person’ or ‘to show up as your authentic self’ are fairly familiar and widely encouraged in the American workplace (Khawaja, 2016; Steiner & Reisinger, 2006). There is no well-defined or universal understanding of what being authentic and displaying authenticity entails (Ibarra, 2015). Most Americans would agree, authenticity as a word is familiar but, as a concept it is not well understood (Ibarra, 2015; Steiner & Reisinger, 2006). Its multiplicity can be attributed to its complex nature and usage as a word over time (Khawaja, 2016). There is a deep historical connection between the understanding, relevance and development of self and the philosophical underpinnings of authenticity (Khawaja, 2016). Authenticity is not only considered a philosophical concept but also a psychological way of being (Khawaja, 2016) with metaphysical, epistemological, and moral components often influenced by religious, political, and social undertones (Varga & Guignon, 2016).

The concept of authenticity can be traced back to ancient Greek philosophers who placed value on controlling one’s own life and seeking self-understanding. As a modern-day concept, authenticity showed up as a reflexive description of leadership within organizational behavior discussions in the 1960s (Gardner, Cogliser, Davis, & Dickens, 2011). It was not until 2003 when Bill George, a Harvard professor and former CEO, wrote about the perils of inauthenticity and need for authenticity within the American workplace that authenticity became a popular leadership concept (George, 2003; Luthans & Avolio, 2003).
Although there has been considerable amount of focus on the topic of authentic leadership in recent years, empirical research on authentic leadership is limited. One possible explanation of this shortage of empirical research is the inherent difficulty involved in defining authenticity, identifying accurate constructs of authentic leadership and, subsequently, measuring authentic leadership behavior (Cooper et al., 2005). This chapter will begin with restating the theoretical framework for this study followed by a review of literature on leadership, authentic leadership, spiritual leadership, spirituality, and human development.

**Theoretical Framework**

Several theories have been used to guide and explore the emergence and formation of authentic leadership identity to see what role, if any, spirituality may play in its development: authentic leadership theory, spirituality, spiritual leadership, and human development. Chief among these theories was the theory of authentic leadership (AL) (Gardner, et al., 2011; George, 2003; Luthans & Avolio, 2003; Walumbwa et al., 2008). According to AL theory (Gardner et al., 2011; Luthans & Avolio, 2003), leaders are described as authentic when their behaviors are in alignment and are consistent with their personal values and beliefs (Avolio & Gardner, 2005). Gardner et al. (2005) advanced that authentic leaders have a strong sense of self awareness and the ability to self-reflect and self-regulate. Moreover, authentic leaders are known to be value centered with a strong moral/ethical component which drives and regulates their behavior (Luthans & Avolio, 2003; Shamir & Eilam, 2005). Authentic leaders remain true to their personal convictions and values even in stressful or challenging situations (Avolio & Gardner, 2005).

Authentic leadership draws greater interest for three reasons: first, authenticity and self-awareness are considered the most important aspects of leadership (Avolio & Luthans, 2006;
Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2001; Ashley & Reiter-Palmon, 2012; Snowden, 2002; secondly, scholars and practitioner suggest that leaders must be authentic to be successful (Bennis, 2003; Brown, 2001; Cashman, 2000; Friedman, 2006; George, 2003, George & Sims, 2007; George, Sims, McLean, & Mayer, 2007); and, thirdly, scholars advance that because authentic leaders are true to themselves and display a strong sense of self awareness and moral courage, they influence positive outcomes in others, such as ethical behaviors, authenticity, and well-being (Avolio, Gardner, Walumbwa, Luthans, & May, 2004; Brown & Mitchell, 2010; Gardner, Avolio, Luthans, May, & Walumbwa, 2005; Ilies, Morgeson, & Nahrgang, 2005).

Leadership scholars acknowledge that spirituality influences transcendent purpose, meaning, and values (Conger, 1998; Fry, 2003, 2005b; Kanungo & Mendonca, 1996; Mitroff & Denton, 1999) which are also central components of authentic leadership (Luthans & Avolio, 2003; Fry, 2005a). Thus, the concept of spirituality informs the study by providing a potential link to authentic leadership by way of the role spirituality plays for its leaders’ identity formation. Research has suggested that spirituality is a critical aspect of the development of leadership identity (Fry, 2003; Sanders, Hopkins, & Geroy, 2003; Thompson, 2000). The ability to authentically express oneself through work is often referred to by scholars and practitioners as having a calling or purpose (George & Sims, 2007). To be truly authentic, a leader must live from a deeper sense of values and meaning (Fry, 2005a).

In response to individuals’ quest for meaning and purpose, a spiritual revival is sweeping across America (Conlin, 1999). Empirical studies on spirituality in the workplace are gaining ground (Ashmos & Duchon, 2000; Giacalone & Jurkiewicz, 2003; Giacalone, Jurkiewicz, & Fry, 2005; Milliman, Czaplewski, & Ferguson, 2003; Mitroff & Denton, 1999). Spirituality at work is not about religion (Laabs, 1995; Cavanagh, 1999) but rather about employees who view
themselves as spiritual and seek a sense of purpose and meaning in their career (Fry, 2005; Jurkiewicz & Giacalone, 2004). A growing consensus amongst researchers view spirituality as a multifaceted construct which focuses on finding a connection to something meaningful which transcends everyday life (Dehler & Welsh, 2003; Tepper, 2003; Goethals et al., 2004).

Current research highlights the need to better understand the formation and development of authentic leadership (Gardner et al., 2011). Some scholars (Lord & Emrich, 2000) posit that both the antecedents of authentic leadership and spirituality may be influenced by factors of the human mind such as cognition, affect, and conation (Huitt, 1996; Tallon, 1997). Day, Harrison, and Halpin (2009) suggest that leader development is an ongoing, dynamic process which occurs across the leader’s life span. Shamir and Eilam (2005) posit that the leader’s life story can provide significant insight into assessing authenticity and understanding the emergence of authentic leaders. Analyzing the personal experiences and narratives of authentic leaders provide rich insight into how core values and beliefs are shaped by life experiences or significant events (Shamir & Eilam, 2005; Shamir, Dayan-Horesh, & Adler, 2005). As such, research on human development was included as a way to inform this study related to the identity, self-actualization, and the development of an authentic leadership identity.

Framing Leadership

‘Leadership is one of the most primary as well as one of the most general forms of association’ (Mumford, 1906, pg. 218).

The study of leadership can be traced back to the early writings of Greek philosopher, Plato, Chinese military strategist and philosopher, Sun Tzu, and Italian politician, historian and philosopher, Niccolo Machiavelli (Northouse, 2012). Yet, from a contemporary perspective, the academic study of leadership in the United States (U.S.) has only emerged as a distinct field of inquiry within the second half of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century (Ciulla & Forsyth, 2011; Northouse, 2012).
Scholars from across numerous disciplines, including the social sciences, humanities, and the professional and applied sciences, have contributed much to the leadership literature (Ciulla & Forsyth, 2011). Collectively, the research is filled with countless definitions, theories, models, styles, competencies, and examples of leaders and leadership all attempting to contribute to an understanding of this complex phenomena called leadership (Doh, 2003; Rost, 1991).

From the first emergent thought on leadership in mid-19th century asserting that leadership is inherent and cannot be taught to the earliest scientific attempts in the 20th century, numerous leadership theories have emerged to form several distinct theory types: Great Man theory, trait theories, contingency theories, situational theories, behavioral-based theories, functional theories, participative theories, management theories, and relationship ( transformational) theories (Bass & Stogdill, 1990; Northouse, 2012).

Despite more than a half century of scientific investigation, the lack of consensus amongst researchers regarding the fundamentals of leadership speaks to its very complex nature (Bass, 2008; Bennis, 2007; Day & Zaccaro, 2014; Khurana & Nohria, 2010; Northouse, 2016; Riggio, 2013). Rather than provide an in-depth account and evolution of leadership theories, the approach for this review of literature is to highlight the complexity and contextual influences on leadership studies in the American workplace across the 20th and 21st century. To best support the research approach of this study, the concept and phenomena of leadership will be examined from a Westernized vantage point, set in the context of the American workplace and framed across two very specific spans of time: the 20th and 21st century. Framing leadership from a first world perspective influenced by the American Industrial Revolution (pre- and post-) allows the literature on leadership to be organized and reviewed in context.
For the United States (U.S.), the late 19\textsuperscript{th} and early 20\textsuperscript{th} century were defined by the American Industrial Revolution (Fisk, 2003). American history saw remarkable innovation, invention and rapid growth in the mechanization of agriculture and textile manufacturing, a revolution in power and energy, significant advancements in communication and transportation, improvements and expansions in the infrastructures of companies, cities and even governmental agencies, as well as, enhancements in healthcare and education (U.S. Department of Labor, 2001). This unique break in history profoundly impacted how Americans lived and worked and how U.S. businesses organized and operated (U.S. Department of Labor, 2001).

The mechanization of production and the automation of manufacturing shifted industries from small in scale with a local reach to large in scale with the ability for mass production (Nanda, 2006). As demand grew, businesses employed a larger workforce than ever before increasing in size from 24 million registered workers at the dawn of the century to nearly 139 million by the end (Fisk, 2003). As businesses focused on increasing production and efficiency (Nanda, 2006), a new level of skilled worker was sought; the skill of supervising and managing the production line and the labor force (Gomez-Mejia, Balkin, & Cardy, 2008). Supervisors and managers became responsible for making their organizations more efficient and more productive (Nanda, 2006).

The American Industrial Revolution profoundly changed the way people thought about labor, working conditions and management (Ghuman & Aswathappa, 2010; Nanda, 2006). According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, the 20th century was an era of significant business expansion and progressive reform in labor laws, wages, fringe benefits and working conditions in the United States (Fisk, 2003). This century also saw the first move toward establishing national laws regulating child labor, working conditions, working hours (including meal and rest periods), compensation (including establishing minimum wage, unemployment,
Social Security and Worker’s Compensation benefits), and anti-discrimination and sexual harassment laws in the workplace (U.S. Department of Labor, 2001). These progressive changes in working conditions, increased labor laws, and diverse workforce of the U.S. during the 20th century also assisted in developing and defining the country’s modern management practices and leadership theories (Gomez-Mejia, Balkin, & Cardy, 2008).

Twentieth century management theory attempted to explore and understand production and manufacturing within industrial life, using real life cases as the bases for improving business (Alajloni, Almashaqba & Al-Qeed, 2010; Gomez-Mejia, Balkin, & Cardy, 2008). The first theories of management were rooted in the need to increase production and efficiency of workers (Ghuman & Aswathappa, 2010). Frederick Taylor, an American mechanical engineer and considered the first management consultant, published his efficiency techniques in 1911. His book, *The Principles of Scientific Management*, is considered the most influential management book of the 20th century (Bedeian & Wren, 2001). Taylor’s book was not necessarily a leadership book, but it is considered one of the first books to establish an approach for a management relationship in the American workplace (Bedeian & Wren, 2001). Taylor believed that the best way to influence efficiency and productivity was through the control and responsibility of management practices to enforce standardization and cooperation amongst employees (Taylor, 1911).

Harvard University became the first American university to offer a graduate degree in Business Administration (MBA) in 1908 (Harvard Business School, 2016). The first textbook on management was published by J. Duncan in 1911 and the first comprehensive theories on management emerged around 1920 (Ghuman & Aswathappa, 2010). Several noteworthy scholars contributed to the empirical understanding of management methods in the early years of the 20th
century (Pietri, 1974): Frederick Taylor’s *The Principle of Scientific Management* (1911); Henry L Gantt’s *Gantt Charts* (1910); Henri Fayol’s 14 principles of management outlined in his book, *General and Industrial Management* (1916); Frank and Lillian Gilbreth’s *Applied Motion Study* (1917); and the classic POSDCORB functions delineated by Gulick and Urwick (1937) which focused on the management elements of planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting and budgeting.

Another noteworthy pioneer in the field of management and leadership studies in the early 1900’s was a woman by the name of Mary Parker Follett (Graham, 2003). Follett, an American social worker and philosopher, is considered a pioneer in the field of organizational behavior and the mother of modern management (McGregor, 1960). Follett defined management as, “the art of getting things done through people” (Follett, Urwick, & Metcalf, 1940). Follett was the first to identify and detail the importance of informal and interpersonal processes that shaped and influenced organizations (McGregor, 1960; Graham, 2003). More specifically, Follett identified the idea of power-sharing based on the use of her concept of ‘power with’ rather than ‘power over’ (Follett et al., 1940; Graham, 2003). Follett’s early work was said to have laid the groundwork for modern leadership theories (Graham, 2003).

There are many more noteworthy practitioners and scholars on leadership since its inception as a discipline in the mid-20th century. From the seminal works of James McGregor Burns, Joseph Rost, Warren Bennis, Margaret Wheatley, and Bill George to the business approaches framed by Stephen Covey, Peter Drucker, and Ken Blanchard, each has contributed to the understanding and advancement of leadership in the twentieth century (Bass & Stodghill, 2000; Avolio, 2008; Denning, 2014). While this is far from an exhaustive list, their theories, philosophies, and fundamentals on leadership have advanced leadership studies in the field of
organizational behavior in the 20th and 21st century. Their respective contributions to leadership studies is provided in Appendix A.

Leadership studies towards the end of the 20th century found scholars and practitioners more focused on exploring and understanding leadership as a social process (Bass, 1998; Conger, 1998; Horner, 1997; Parry, 1998; Rost, 1993; Yukl, 1994). Whitehead (1967) described leadership from a social process perspective indicating it was a complex system of mutual relatedness always in the process of evolving. Whereas Burns (1978) was the first to conceptualize leadership as a social process that involves both leaders and followers interacting and working together to achieve common mutually defined interests. Pfeffer (1977) believed leadership to be a phenomenon which influences both experience and consciousness. For which Baker later added, “Leadership is a dissipative system. . . continually renewing itself within a dynamic context” (Barker, 2001, p. 487).

The metaphor declaring that the world is flat coined by American journalist and three-time Pulitzer Prize winner, Thomas Friedman, is a powerful description of the continuing trends and impact of the American Industrial Revolution and subsequent global reach of the American workplace in the 21st century (2005). In his book, The World is Flat, Friedman analyzes globalization as it relates to commerce, competition, and equal opportunity using the metaphor flattening as a way to describe the changing world as a global playing field (Friedman, 2005). Friedman defines ten forces that have flattened or leveled the global playing field such as Netscape and the Web, which broadened the reach and span of the internet; software technologies, such as HTML, that have allowed workflow on a global platform; open source communities which encouraged uploading and collaborating online; wireless and digital capabilities which have allowed for virtual, mobile, and synchronous transmissions; as well as, several new ways of doing business
such as outsourcing, offshoring, supply-chaining, and insourcing (Friedman, 2005). These ten forces, according to Friedman, converged in 2000 at the very dawn of the 21st century which ushered in a new global economic system and created new pressures on businesses and leaders worldwide (Friedman, 2005).

In his seminal book published in 1991, *Leadership for the Twenty First century*, Joseph C. Rost, a distinguished scholar and noted luminary in leadership studies, in an attempt to define leadership for the 21st century, identified several critiques with the approach and concept of leadership to date (Rost, 1991). While examining an extensive body of literature written on leadership between 1930 and 1979, Rost asserted that, while earlier accounts of the Latin word *duerco* or to lead dated back to the Bible and other Christian works, much of what Americans understand today of the words leader and leadership, is in large part, a result of the democratization of the Western civilization (Rost, 1991). Moreover, Rost believed that much of what has been published and promoted in the United States in the 20th century, had been widely underpinned by preceding economic, political, and social influences stemming from industrialization at the dawn of the century (Rost, 1991).

Rost (1991) posited that leadership scholars, academics, and practitioners, especially in the 1980’s and early 1990’s, were espousing and contributing to a sort of misguided and already ambiguous definition of leader and leadership; a definition birthed out of the American Industrial Revolution where management and leadership were used synonymously. Rost proposed a new definition of leadership for the 21st century as a way to distinguish between the old, antiquated and the new, progressive concept of leadership; he refers to this divergence as a paradigm shift from industrial to post-industrial leadership (Rost, 1991). Like Rost (1991), other scholars toward the end of the 20th century (Bass, 1990; Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Hickman, 1990; Kotter,
1988; Yukl, 1999) supported the view that leadership and management were two very distinct processes and must be understood as such.

According to Table 1 below, an internet query of the term ‘leader’, conducted on March 12, 2017, using Google’s search engine delivered over 1 billion results; a similar search using the term ‘leading’ returned over 1.15 billion results; similarly, the term ‘leadership’ delivered approximately 772 million unique results; the term ‘leadership theory’ returned 359 million results; and, lastly, a search using the term ‘definition of leadership’ delivered nearly 486 million results (Google, 2017). Interestingly, a comparable search using the term ‘management’ resulted in the highest return yielding over 2.66 billion results. When the search was conducted using Google Scholar, a specialized academic search engine, the term ‘leading’, ‘leader’, ‘leadership’ and ‘leadership theory’ produced nearly 6.5 million, 3.4 million, 3.8 million and 2.9 million results respectively; while a search of the term ‘management’ returned 6.4 million results (Google Scholar, 2017).

Table 1

Results of internet query of Leadership terms using Google and Google Scholar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Google Query Terms</th>
<th>Google Results</th>
<th>Google Scholar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>2,660,000,000</td>
<td>6,440,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading</td>
<td>1,150,000,000</td>
<td>6,480,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>1,060,000,000</td>
<td>3,360,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>772,000,000</td>
<td>3,820,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of leadership</td>
<td>486,000,000</td>
<td>2,820,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Theory</td>
<td>359,000,000</td>
<td>2,860,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A similar search conducted on March 12, 2017 of the term ‘leadership’ within the Library of Congress, considered to be the world's largest library containing the most comprehensive record of human creativity and knowledge, resulted in the availability of over 332,874 items; of which 28,298 are catalogued books/printed material dating back over a period of time from the
first printed book in 1559 A.D. written in Latin, entitled *Constitutiones Societatis Iesu*, to present day 2017 A.D. (Library of Congress, 2017). Of those 28,298 books, 9,473 of them are on the specific subject of leadership while 1,939 are on the specific subject of management (Library of Congress, 2017). Moreover, a further refinement of the search on leadership and management, reveals that the top ten categories for leadership range from management (1,362) and executive ability (554) to organizational change (421); while the top ten categories for management range from leadership (1,362) and organizational change (168) to organizational behavior (87) (Library of Congress, 2017). Of special note, amongst the top contributing, notable authors found across both refined searches (leadership and management) are John Maxwell (40), James Kouzes (29), John Eric Adair (28), Kenneth Blanchard (27), Warren Bennis (28), Manfred Kets De Vries (13), John Gardner (13) and Lee Boleman (17), Bernard Bass (10), Peter Northhouse (12), John Kotter (9), James McGregor Burns (8), Robert Greenleaf (8), Terrance Deal (8), Ralph Stogdill (7), Margaret Wheatley (6), Patrick Lencioni (6), Bruce Avolio (5), Bill George (5) and Edgar Schein (5) (Library of Congress, 2017).

According to the dates chronicled by the Library of Congress (2017) as shown in Table 2, only 38 books were published worldwide (to include only one in the US) on leadership at the dawn of the 20th century (1900 A.D. to 1929 A.D.). In fact, the first book published on the subject of leadership in the US, chronicled by the Library of Congress (2017), was written by Walter Burr in 1929 entitled *Community Leadership*. By 1939, the number of books on leadership nearly tripled and by 1969, the publishing of books/printed material on leadership consistently doubled its count over the previous year’s new entries. While the United States’ overall counts of book/printed material between 1900 A.D. and present times are lower when
compared to worldwide counts, the US does maintain the most entries cataloged by the Library of Congress (2017).

Table 2

*Library of Congress publication dates on books/printed material on leadership*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publish Dates</th>
<th>Leadership “worldwide” (9,473)</th>
<th>Leadership “US” (716)</th>
<th>MGMT “worldwide” (1,939)</th>
<th>MGMT “US” (177)</th>
<th>Org Change (542)</th>
<th>Org Effectiveness (395)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1900-1909</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910-1919</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920-1929</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930-1939</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940-1949</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-1959</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-1969</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-1979</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-1989</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-1999</td>
<td>1450</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2009</td>
<td>3054</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2019</td>
<td>2809</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As evidenced by the searches through Google, Google Scholar and the Library of Congress, information and literature on leadership continues to grow year over year. Moreover, while Google’s search engine algorithms were able to comb through over 60 trillion individual pages (pieces of information) and provide results in the hundred million, there continues to be much debate surrounding leadership, from its definition to its measurements of success. "[There are] almost as many definitions of leadership as there are persons who have attempted to define the concept" (Stogdill, 1974, p. 259). McCleskey (2014), citing Bass (2008) argues that the definition of leadership is subjective and is largely influenced by the interest and context of the study endorsed by the researcher. Highlighted in Table 3 is a list of leadership definitions (not
inclusive), compiled from research, in chronological order which can be found in the scholarly literature throughout the 20th and 21st century.

Table 3

*Notable Definitions of Leadership in the 20th and 21st century*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pigors, (1935, p. 116)</td>
<td>Leadership is a process of mutual stimulation which, by the successful interplay of relevant individual differences, controls human energy in the pursuit of a common cause.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stogdill (1950, p. 3)</td>
<td>Leadership may be considered as the process (act) of influencing the activities of an organized group in its efforts toward goal setting and goal achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemphill &amp; Coons (1957, p. 7)</td>
<td>Leadership is the behavior of an individual when he is directing the activities of a group toward a shared goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tannenbaum, Weschler, &amp; Massarik, (1961, p. 24)</td>
<td>Leadership is interpersonal influence, exercised in a situation, and directed, through the communication process, toward the attainment of a specified goal or goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiedler (1967, p. 36)</td>
<td>By leadership behavior we generally mean the particular acts in which a leader engages in the course of directing and coordinating the work of group members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merton (1969, p. 2614)</td>
<td>Leadership is an interpersonal relationship in which others comply between they want to, not because they have to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollander (1978, p.1)</td>
<td>Leadership is a process of influence between a leader and those who are followers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katz &amp; Kahn (1978, p. 528)</td>
<td>Leadership is the influential increment over and above mechanical compliance with the routine directives of the organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennis (1984, pg. x)</td>
<td>Leadership is a function of knowing yourself, having a vision that is well communicated, building trust among colleagues, and taking effective action to realize your own leadership potential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donnelly, Ivancevich, &amp; Gibson (1985, p. 362)</td>
<td>Leadership is an attempt at influencing the activities of followers through the communication process and toward the attainment of some goal or goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hersey &amp; Blanchard (1988, p. 86)</td>
<td>Leadership is the process of influencing the activities of an individual or a group in efforts toward goal achievement in a given situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosking (1988, pg.153)</td>
<td>Leaders are those who consistently make effective contributions to social order, and who are expected and perceived to do so. (Continued)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennis (1989 pg. 139)</td>
<td>The first job of a leader is to define a vision for the organization… Leadership is the capacity to translate vision into reality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DePree (1989, p. 9)</td>
<td>The first responsibility of a leader is to define reality. The last is to say thank you. In between the two, the leader must become a servant and a debtor. That sums up the progress of an artful leader.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bass (1990, p. 19-20).</td>
<td>Leadership is an interaction between two or more members of a group that often involves a structuring or restructuring of the situation and the perceptions and expectations of members… Leadership occurs when one group member modifies the motivation or competencies of others in the group. Any member of the group can exhibit some amount of leadership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohen (1990, p. 9).</td>
<td>Leadership is the art of influencing others to their maximum performance to accomplish any task, objective or project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacobs &amp; Jaques (1990, p. 281)</td>
<td>Leadership is a process of giving purpose (meaningful direction) to collective effort and causing willing effort to be expended to achieve purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardner (1990, p. 1)</td>
<td>Leadership is the process of persuasion or example by which an individual (or leadership team) induces a group to pursue objectives held by the leader or shared by the leader and his or her followers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rost (1991, p. 102)</td>
<td>Leadership is an influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conger (1992, p. 18)</td>
<td>Leaders are individuals who establish direction for a working group of individuals who gain commitment from this group of members to this direction and who then motivate these members to achieve the direction’s outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaques &amp; Clement (1994, p. 4)</td>
<td>Leadership is that process in which one person sets the purpose or direction for one or more other persons and gets them to move along together with him or her and with each other in that direction with competence and full commitment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kouzes &amp; Posner (1995, p. 30)</td>
<td>Leadership is the art of mobilizing others to want to struggle for the shared aspirations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boleman &amp; Deal (2008, p. 345)</td>
<td>Leadership is thus a subtle process of mutual influence fusing thought, feeling, and action. It produces cooperative effort in the service of purposes embraced by both leader and led.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northouse (2010, p. 3)</td>
<td>Leadership is a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For this research, it is important to view the 21st century concept of leadership through multiple lenses. As such, this study will be grounded in the belief that leadership is (a)
relational, influential, shared, strategic, and a complex social phenomenon (Avolio 2007; Yukl, 2006); (b) the way individuals become leaders is by learning about leadership through dynamic relationships (Bennis, 1999; Rost & Baker, 2000; Wheatley, 1990); and (c) the leadership process occurs within a given context (Avolio, 2007, Javidan, Dorfman, Howell, & Hanges, 2010; Judge, Bono, Ilies, & Gerhardt, 2002; Kellerman, 2014).

**Authentic Leadership**

“Becoming a leader is synonymous with becoming yourself” (Bennis, 2003, p. 9).

The earliest use of authenticity dates to the ancient Greek philosophers, who are considered the first scientists interested in the pursuit of wisdom and truth as the highest form of knowledge (Plato, Cooper, & Hutchinson, 1997; Cohn, 2001). The word philosophy comes from the Greek words philo-, meaning love and –sophos, meaning wisdom and generally refers to the pursuit of wisdom, moral discipline and knowledge through logic (Plato, Cooper, & Hutchinson, 1997). For Greek philosophers, the study of the nature of knowledge, reality, existence and the good life (or happiness) were of the highest importance (Klosko, 1987). The most significant contributions were made by Socrates, Plato and Aristotle, who are considered as having laid much of the foundation for Western philosophy (Lloyd, 1970). Each philosopher stressed authenticity as a key ingredient that is achieved by being in control of one’s own life. They all proclaim that the way to being in control of one’s own life is by pursuing the truism ‘know thyself’ (Lloyd, 1970; Magill, 2003; Shusterman, 2012).

The concept of authenticity can be traced back to the ancient Greek maxims carved into the Oracle Delphi around 5th century BC (Laercio, 1925). Written by the Seven Sages (Thales, Pittacos, Bias, Solon, Cleovoulos, Periandros, and Chilon), who lived in Ancient Greece around 6th century BC, the Delphic maxims are a set of 147 aphorism, or moral commandments, that are
said to originate directly from the lips of Apollo, the Greek god of truth (Laercio, 1925; Kyriazoglou, 2012). Perhaps the most famous of these Greek truisms, which is believed to be the most philosophically influential, is ‘know thyself’ (Magill, 2003; Shusterman, 2012). ‘γνῶθι σεαυτόν’ translated as ‘gnothi seauton’ or ‘know thyself’ was carved into the forecourt of the Temple of Apollo at Delphi (Smith, 1870; Forrest, 1958), and was attributed to the sage, Thales of Miletus (c. 624 – c. 546 BC) (Lloyd, 1970). Thales was a well-known, pre-Socratic Greek philosopher, mathematician and astronomer (Kahn, Kirk, & Raven, 1959), and most recognized by his split from the tradition of using mythology to explain the world and the universe and instead engaged in a more scientific approach; what is referred to today as scientific philosophy (Smith, 1870; Magill, 2003).

While many regard Thales as the very first philosopher in the Greek tradition (Smith, 1870), it was another influential Greek thinker, Socrates (470-399 BC), who popularized the inquiry of self and revered the importance of self-knowledge as wisdom (Klosko, 1987). Considered as one of the greatest and most influential philosophers, Socrates is renowned for his contributions to the field of philosophy, especially his theories on ethics, virtues, epistemology, self-knowledge and even happiness (Plato, Cooper, & Hutchinson, 1997). His famous Socratic Method, a process of questioning designed to stimulate critical thinking, expose ignorance and clear the way for self-knowledge, laid the groundwork for the Western system of logic and philosophy (Plato, Cooper, & Hutchinson, 1997; Cohn, 2001).

While nothing Socrates has written is extant, his most notable student, Plato (429-327 BC), became the prominent source of his life and philosophies (May, 2010; Cohn, 2001). Derived from Plato’s writings in the Socratic Dialogues, Socrates lived most of his life constantly examining himself and questioning his own ideas and character (Plato, Cooper, &
Hutchinson, 1997; Cohn, 2001). In Plato’s *Apology*, Socrates, while on trial for corrupting the youth, declares in his own defense, that “the unexamined life is not worth living” and admits that his wisdom existed merely in “knowing that he knew nothing” (1892, 38a).

For Socrates, the most important knowledge was the pursuit of self-knowledge and through that inner-directed quest of self, one finds eudaimonia, a Greek word commonly translated as happiness, or human flourishing (Klosko, 1987; Frede, 2017). Socrates was among the first philosophers to argue that happiness is not reserved for the favored few chosen by the gods but available to everyone who makes the effort (Klosko, 1987). What is more, Socrates associates this effort toward self-knowledge with the most important virtue of all, knowledge or wisdom; suggesting that the pursuit of a virtuous life (self-knowledge) leads to wisdom (happiness) (Frede, 2017).

The key to happiness, he [Socrates] argues, is to turn attention away from the body and towards the soul. By harmonizing our desires, we can learn to pacify the mind and achieve a divine-like state of tranquility. A moral life is to be preferred to an immoral one, primarily because it leads to a happier life. (Setton, n.d.)

Ultimately, Socrates believed that a virtuous person cannot fail but to be happy and likewise, a person who is not virtuous cannot be happy (Setton, n.d.).

Derived from the ancient Greek word authentikos meaning ‘original, principal, genuine’ (OED, 2017), the word ‘authentic’ and its related form ‘authenticity’ are classified an adjective and noun respectively. As an adjective, the Oxford English dictionary defines authentic as of undisputed origin and not a copy; genuine; also noting that, in existential philosophy, authentic is defined as relating or denoting an emotionally appropriate, significant, purposive, and responsible mode of human life (OED, 2017). Similarly, as one of the four definitions provided,
the Merriam Webster dictionary (2017) defines authentic as true to one's own personality, spirit, or character. As a noun, authenticity (first recorded in 1650) is defined as the quality of being authentic; truthfulness of origins, attributions, commitments, sincerity, and intentions; genuineness (dictionary.com).

For the purpose of this research, definitions of authentic and authenticity rooted in the fields of philosophy and psychology are of primary concern. From a philosophical perspective, authenticity is the primary virtue of human individuals and is considered the degree to which one is true to one's own personality, spirit, or character, despite external pressures (Flynn, 2006; Macquarrie, 1972). While the doctrines differ across philosophers, a fundamental position is that the conscious self is seen as in constant emergence and flux with the external world and everyday life occurrences (Flynn, 2006). From a psychology perspective, authenticity is seen as the most essential aspect of well-being (Horney, 2014; May, 1999; Rogers, 1961; Winnicott, 2008) and can be defined as, “owning one’s personal experiences, be they thoughts, emotions, needs, preferences, or beliefs, processes captured by the injunction to know oneself” (Harter, 2002, p. 382). Authenticity involves both acknowledging one’s personal experiences, feelings and preferences and behaving in agreement with those experiences (Gino et al., 2015).

Authenticity is at the heart of authentic leadership (George, 2003). Although the concept of authenticity can trace its roots back to ancient Greek philosophers, the origins of authentic leadership as an academic subject date back to the 1970s. Warren Bennis (1978) was the first noted authority on leadership to explore and publish certain elements of authenticity in his book, On Becoming a Leader. Bennis (2003) posits that “becoming a leader is synonymous with becoming yourself” and equates authenticity with leadership (p. 9). However, it was not until
2003, when Bill George, a Harvard professor and CEO of Medtronic, published a book called *Authentic Leadership* that the public interest in authentic leadership emerged.

According to Northouse (2012), at the turn of the century, financial reporting scandals such as Enron in 2001 and WorldCom in 2002, which involved senior most executives and CEOs, highlighted the failings of leadership in corporate America and eroded away at the public confidence. Despite increased government regulations, corporate scandals, leadership failings, and unethical decision making continue to plague the 21st century American workplace (Avolio 
& Gardner, 2005; Brimmer, 2007; Luthans & Avolio, 2003; Northouse, 2016; Seligman, 2002). Some of the biggest leadership scandals to happen in the U.S. occurred in 2016: from claims that the Trump campaign colluded with the Russian government in the 2016 presidential election (Graham, 2017) to sexual harassment claims against the chairman and CEO of Fox News, Roger Ailes (Siemaszko, 2017) to pharmaceutical giant, Mylan’s EpiPen price gouging scandal (Tuttle, 2016) to Samsung’s mass battery recall (Mathews & Heimer, 2016). These scandals only substantiate a growing concern that the American workforce has little trust and confidence in leadership (Gallup, 2017). Americans continue to have little trust or confidence in most major institutions, including governmental agencies and private corporations (Edelman, 2017; Newport, 2017; Pew Research Center, 2017a). Northouse (2016) believes that the American people, “…long for bona fide leadership they can trust and for leaders who are honest and good” (p. 253).

Authenticity, or more accurately the lack of authenticity, lies at the heart of the 21st century leadership crisis in the U.S. In response, a renewed emphasis was placed on values-based leadership models, specifically research focused on the importance of possessing inner ethical/moral qualities and values, as a call to action to restore confidence, integrity and ethical
behavior in leadership (Avolio, 2003; Avolio & Gardner, 2005; Brown, Trevino, and Harrison, 2005; George, 2003; Lorenzi, 2004; Luthans & Avolio, 2003; May, Chan, Hodges, & Avolio, 2003). Authentic leadership draws greater interest for three reasons: first, authenticity and self-awareness are considered the most important aspects of leadership (Avolio & Luthans, 2006; Goleman, Boyatzis & McKee, 2001; Ashley & Reiter-Palmon, 2012; Snowden, 2002); secondly, scholars and practitioner suggest that leaders must be authentic to be successful (Bennis, 2003; Brown, 2001; Cashman, 2000; Friedman, 2006; George, 2003, George & Sims, 2007; George, Sims, McLean, & Mayer, 2007); and, thirdly, scholars advance that because authentic leaders are true to themselves and display a strong sense of self awareness and moral courage, they influence positive outcomes in others, such as ethical behaviors, authenticity, and well-being (Avolio, Gardner, Walumbwa, Luthans, & May, 2004; Brown & Mitchell, 2010; Gardner, Avolio, Luthans, May, & Walumbwa, 2005; Ilies, Morgeson, & Nahrgang, 2005).

Authentic leadership scholars advance that authentic leadership, while still considered in the infancy phase of construct development, is distinct from other positive, values-based forms of leadership such as charismatic leadership, transformational leadership, servant leadership or ethical leadership (Avolio et al., 2005; Seligman, 2002; Walumbwa et al., 2008). While there are similarities amongst the theories, the modeling of authentic behaviors by authentic leaders and the spillover effect they have on followers is one of the defining aspects of authentic leadership when compared to other values-based forms of leadership (Avolio & Gardner, 2005; Gardner et al., 2005; Walumbwa et al., 2008). To further expand on this difference, charismatic leadership and transformational leadership as similar value-based forms of leadership. Charismatic leaders are considered very skilled communicators who appeal to the emotions of their followers and can inspire and motivate them from a personal vision or passion towards a common goal (Riggio,
Yet, charismatic leadership does not always involve building trust or trusting leadership (Sandberg & Moreman, 2011) like authentic leadership does. Similarly, transformational leaders focus on inspiring outcomes of leadership effectiveness and follower performance (Bass, 1985) whereas, authentic leaders focus on inspiring both leaders and followers to be authentic and stay true to their values, beliefs, emotions and relationships which influence outcomes of leadership effectiveness and follower performance (Gardner et al., 2005).

According to authentic leadership scholars (Avolio & Gardner, 2005; Avolio, Gardner, Walumbwa, Luthans, & May, 2004; Gardner et al., 2011; Luthans & Avolio, 2003; Ilies et al., 2005, Shamir & Eilam, 2005), leaders are described as authentic when their behaviors are consistent with their personal values and beliefs. Gardner et al. (2005) advanced that authentic leaders had a strong sense of self awareness and the ability to self-reflect and self-regulate. Moreover, authentic leaders are known to be value centered with a strong moral/ethical component which drives and regulates their behavior (Luthans & Avolio, 2003; Shamir & Eilam, 2005). Authentic leaders remain true to their personal convictions and values even in stressful or challenging situations (Avolio & Gardner, 2005). Shamir and Eilam (2005) believe that the theory of authentic leadership is more about understanding self-concept attributes or beliefs about oneself than describing the leader’s style, values or convictions.

Beyond self-concept and beliefs, authentic leadership practitioner, Bill George (2003), promotes the model that authentic leaders have a deep sense of purpose and self-discipline which inspires them to lead with their hearts and build genuine connections and relationships with others. George (2004) argued that the key to creating lasting corporate value in America was to replace current leaders with authentic leaders who have the five essential dimensions of authentic leadership: purpose, values, heart, relationships, and self-discipline. Harter, Schmidt,
and Hayes (2002) conclude that the extent to which a person is ‘authentic’ or acts with ‘authenticity’ exists on a spectrum and can be developed through self-discovery.

A review of the literature on authentic leadership revealed that there is no universal or widely accepted definition of authentic leadership (Chan, 2004). Instead, there are numerous definitions of authentic leadership advanced by researchers, from different viewpoints (See Table 4) (Bennis, 2003, Bennis & Thomas, 2002; George, 2003; Luthans & Avolio, 2003; Shamir & Eliam, 2005). George (2003) and George and Sims (2007) described authentic leadership as a style that is consistent with a leader’s personality and core values, and is displayed honestly, ethically, and practically through their actions (2003, 2007). Shamir and Eilam (2005) define authentic leaders from an interpersonal perspective as individuals who have a higher level of self-resolution and self-concordant goals, with self-expressive behaviors and believe that their role as a leader is central to defining themselves. For the purpose of this research study, authentic leadership will be defined using the definition proposed by Walumbwa et al. (2008) which integrates many of the early concepts of the construct:

A pattern of leader behavior that draws upon and promotes both positive psychological capacities and a positive ethical climate, to foster greater self-awareness, an internalized moral perspective, balanced processing of information, and relational transparency on the part of leaders working with followers, fostering positive self-development. (p. 94)
### Definitions of Authentic Leaders and Authentic Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rome &amp; Rome (1967, p.185)</td>
<td>“A hierarchical organization, in short, like an individual person, is ‘authentic’ to the extent that, throughout its leadership, it accepts finitude, uncertainty, and contingency; realizes its capacity for responsibility and choice; acknowledges guilt and errors; fulfills its creative managerial potential for flexible planning, growth, and charter or policy formation; and responsibly participates in the wider community.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson &amp; Hoy (1983, p. 67-68)</td>
<td>“Leadership authenticity is therefore defined as the extent to which subordinates perceive their leader to demonstrate the acceptance of organizational and personal responsibility for actions, outcomes, and mistakes; to be non-manipulating of subordinates; and to exhibit salience of self over role. Leadership inauthenticity is defined as the extent to which subordinates perceive their leader to be ‘passing the buck’ and blaming others and circumstances for errors and outcomes; to be manipulative of subordinates; and to be demonstrating a salience of role over self.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George (2003, p.12)</td>
<td>“Authentic leaders use their natural abilities, but they also recognize their shortcomings, and work hard to overcome them. They lead with purpose, meaning, and values. They build enduring relationships with people. Others follow them because they know where they stand. They are consistent and self-disciplined. When their principles are tested, they refuse to compromise. Authentic leaders are dedicated to developing themselves because they know that becoming a leader takes a lifetime of personal growth.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luthans &amp; Avolio (2003, p.243)</td>
<td>“[W]e define authentic leadership in organizations as a process that draws from both positive psychological capacities and a highly developed organizational context, which results in both greater self-awareness and self-regulated positive behaviors on the part of leaders and associates, fostering positive self-development. The authentic leader is confident, hopeful, optimistic, resilient, transparent, moral/ethical future-oriented, and gives priority to developing associates into leaders themselves. The authentic leader does not try to coerce or even rationally persuade associates, but rather the leader’s authentic values, beliefs, and behaviors serve to model the development of associates.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilies, Morgeson, &amp; Nahrgang (2005, p. 374)</td>
<td>“Authentic leaders are deeply aware of their values and beliefs, they are self-confident, genuine, reliable and trustworthy, and they focus on building followers’ strengths, broadening their thinking and creating a positive and engaging organizational context.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eilam &amp; Shamir (2005, p. 339)</td>
<td>“[O]ur definition of authentic leaders implies that authentic leaders can be distinguished from less authentic or inauthentic leaders by four self-related characteristics: 1) the degree of person role merger i.e., the salience of the leadership role in their self-concept, 2) the level of self-concept clarity and the extent to which this clarity centers around strongly held values and convictions, 3) the extent to which their goals are self-concordant, and 4) the degree to which their behavior is consistent with their self-concept.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George &amp; Sims (2007, p. xxxi)</td>
<td>“Authentic leaders are genuine people who are true to themselves and to what they believe in. They engender trust and develop genuine connections with others. Because people trust them, they are able to motivate others to high levels of performance. Rather than letting the expectations of other people guide them, they are prepared to be their own person and go their own way. As they develop as authentic leaders, they are more concerned about serving others than they are about their own success or recognition.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walumbwa, Avolio, Gardner, Wernsing, &amp; Peterson (2008, p. 94)</td>
<td>“[W]e define authentic leadership as a pattern of leader behavior that draws upon and promotes both positive psychological capacities and a positive ethical climate, to foster greater self-awareness, an internalized moral perspective, balanced processing of information, and relational transparency on the part of leaders working with followers, fostering positive self-development.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitehead (2009, p. 850)</td>
<td>“In this article, a definition of an authentic leader is adopted as one who: (1) is self-aware, humble, always seeking improvement, aware of those being led and looks out for the welfare of others; (2) fosters high degrees of trust by building an ethical and moral framework; and (3) is committed to organizational success within the construct of social values.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


At a fundamental level, authentic leadership is the alignment of a leader’s identity and his or her patterned behavior (Gardner et al., 2005; Shamir & Eliam, 2005). From a practitioner perspective, George and Sims (2007) suggest that there are five key dimensions to authentic leadership: purpose, values, heart, relationships, connectedness, and self-discipline. Shamir and Eilam (2005) identified four characteristics of authentic leaders as: (a) authentic leaders are true to themselves; (b) authentic leaders are intrinsically motivated; (c) authentic leaders lead from
their own moral perspective; and (d) authentic leaders behave consistent with their personal convictions, values, and beliefs. The four dimensions that are most commonly used in conceptualizing and measuring authentic leadership are self-awareness, relational transparency, balanced processing, and an internalized moral perspective (Avolio & Gardner, 2005; Gardner et al., 2005; Neider & Schriesheim, 2011; Walumbwa et al., 2008). A description of each dimension is listed in Table 5 below.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authentic Leadership Component</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Awareness</td>
<td>To what degree is the leader aware of his or her strengths, limitations, how others see him or her and how the leader impacts others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td>To what degree does the leader reinforce a level of openness with others that provides them with an opportunity to be forthcoming with their ideas, challenges and opinions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced Processing</td>
<td>To what degree does the leader solicit enough opinions and viewpoints prior to making important decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical/Moral Perspective</td>
<td>To what degree does the leader set a high standard for moral and ethical conduct.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Although the four dimensions of are considered distinct aspects of authentic leadership, they are interrelated and influence the manifestations of an individual’s authentic leadership behavior (Avolio & Gardner, 2005; Ilies, Morgeson, & Nahrgang, 2005; Walumbwa et al., 2008). The most important dimension of authentic leadership is self-awareness (Avolio & Gardner, 2005). Self-awareness, noted in the literature on authentic leadership as the ability to equally identify their own weaknesses and strengths (Gardner et al., 2005), is instrumental to a
leader’s ability to understand their own motivations, emotions, values, and behaviors (Avolio & Gardner, 2005; Michie & Gooty, 2005). This heightened self-awareness contributes to the leader’s ability to self-regulate. Avolio and Gardner (2005) found that high levels of self-regulation enables authentic leaders to internally embrace their morals and values, evaluate their own actions in alignment with those morals and values, and make necessary adjustments in response. Self-awareness encourages self-regulation which, in returns, allows the leader to build upon their self-awareness in a balanced way (Gardner et al., 2005).

When authentic leaders are more objective, reflective, evaluative, and accepting of themselves a heightened internalized moral perspective can be achieved (Gardner et al., 2005). An internalized moral perspective refers to higher levels of moral development and moral courage which guide internal moral and ethical standards and values (Hannah, Avolio, & Walumbwa, 2011). Researchers (Kidder & Bracy, 2001; Miller, 2002; Peterson & Seligman, 2004) have defined moral courage as a character strength or inner psychological strength to draw from when faced with challenging ethical or moral choices. Hannah and Avolio (2010) suggest that moral courage and, moreover, an internalized moral perspective, are not static traits or features, but rather a malleable aspect of an individual’s psychological processes.

Authentic leaders who are self-awareness, rely on an internalized moral perspective, and have a balanced processing are more consistent in their words and actions which result in authentic behavior (Avolio & Gardner, 2005; Gardner et al., 2005). Kernis (2005) suggests that authentic behavior provides a positive modeling for followers who perceive leaders as consistent in their words and actions. Avolio and Gardner (2005) believe this openness and genuineness leads to and encourages transparency which engenders followership. Illies et al. (2005) found that authentic leaders who display more transparency positively impact the values, satisfaction
and well-being of their followers. Hannah, Lester, and Vogelgesang (2005) believe that when authentic leaders consistently demonstrate authentic behaviors, display a moral perspective and courage by ‘standing up’ and ‘acting in line with’ their values, followers and other members are more likely to emulate these behaviors. From a social learning perspective, scholars advance that authentic leaders model a set of behaviors to members which, in turn, facilitate the development of social scripts for moral courage (Hannah, Sweeney, & Lester, 2010; Sekerka, Bagozzi, & Charnigo, 2009) and ethical behaviors (Reynolds, 2006) which guide members’ actions and decisions in future situations (Avolio & Gardner, 2005).

Recent research has highlighted the need to better understand the formation and development of authentic leadership (Gardner et al., 2011). George (2007) suggests that it takes time and conscious effort to develop authentic leadership. Research on authentic leadership has suggested that the development of authentic leadership may be time dependent (taking places over time) (Avolio & Gardner, 2005; Gardner et al., 2005) or may be triggered by specific life events such as crisis situations or essential experiences (Shamir & Eilam, 2005). Avolio and Luthans (2006) propose that by learning from significant life or leadership moments and situations and being self-aware and reflective, leaders can build out authenticity as a leader. Yet, Pallus, Nasby, and Easton (1991) contend that impactful experiences in life are not enough to stimulate the revision or redirection of identity.

Shamir and Eilam (2005) posit that the leader’s life story can provide significant insight into assessing authenticity and understanding the emergence of authentic leaders. The interpretation of these personal experiences and events inform their self-identity and moral development as leaders (Shamir & Eilam). Fellow scholars support the sharing of a leader’s life story as an effective approach to develop authentic leaders and followers (George, Sims, McLean
Analyzing biographical accounts and personal narratives can provide insight into how life experiences or significant events have shaped a leader’s core values and beliefs (Shamir & Eilam, 2005; Shamir, Dayan-Horesh, & Adler, 2005). Pearce (2003) advances that everything an individual believes passionately about have formed from life experiences. “Life-stories provide authentic leaders with a self-concept that can be expressed through the leadership role” (Shamir & Eilam, 2005, p. 402). Avolio and Luthans (2006) advocate for the examination of defining moments in a person’s life to verify if authentic leadership development is a personal and true-to-self process; further supporting their findings that leaders tend to speak about their life story when it comes to leadership development versus the trainings or programs they attended (Avolio & Luthans, 2006).

Research on authentic leadership has provided encouraging linkages and positive correlations to several important workplace factors and outcomes (Avolio, Gardner, Walumbwa, Luthans & May, 2004; Jensen & Luthans, 2006; Giallonardo, Wong, & Iwasiw, 2010; Peus, Wesche, Streicher, Braun & Fey, 2012; Walumbwa et al., 2008; Wong & Cummings, 2009). These linkages of authentic leadership are not only seen on the individual leader level but also on the group level amongst followers and team members as well. Several studies have focused on the impact of authentic leadership on followers have shown a link to an increased job performance (Walumbwa et al., 2008; Wong & Cummings, 2009), higher levels of job satisfaction and engagement (Avolio, Gardner, Walumbwa, Luthans, & May, 2004; Jensen & Luthans, 2006; Giallonardo, Wong, & Iwasiw, 2010; Peus, Wesche, Streicher, Braun & Fey, 2012; Walumbwa et al., 2008; Wong & Cummings, 2009), higher levels of organizational commitment (Avolio et al., 2004; Jensen & Luthans, 2006; Walumbwa et al., 2008), as well as
higher levels of transparency and moral courage (Hannah et al., 2010; Sekerta et al., 2009) and ethical behavior (Reynolds, 2006) amongst members.

According to Ilies et al. (2005) and Wong and Cummings (2009), followers report lower levels of burnout and higher levels of positive affective states when lead by authentic leaders. Recent research (Rego, Sousa, Marques, & eCunha, 2014; Walumbwa et al., 2008; Walumbwa, Wang, Wang, Schaubroeck, & Avolio, 2010) found that organizational citizenship behaviors (i.e., going above and beyond to help fellow coworkers), creativity and empowerment were heightened amongst followers who rated their supervisors as being a more authentic leader. George and Sims (2007) suggest that is takes time and conscious effort to develop authentic leadership. Research on authentic leadership has suggested that the development of authentic leadership may be time dependent (taking places over time) (Avolio & Gardner, 2005; Gardner et al., 2005) or may be triggered by specific life events such as crisis situations or essential experiences (Shamir & Eilam, 2005). Avolio and Luthans (2006) propose that by learning from significant life or leadership moments and situations and being self-aware and reflective, leaders can build out authenticity as a leader. Yet, Pallus, Nasby, and Easton (1991) contend that impactful experiences in life are not enough to stimulate the revision or redirection of identity.

Spirituality

“Just as industrialization gave rise to social liberalism, the New Economy is causing a deep-seated curiosity about the nature of knowledge and life, providing a fertile environment for this new swirl of non-materialistic ideas” (Conlin, 1999, p. 156).

The English word spirit comes from the Latin word *spiritus*, which means breath, energy, courage, vigor and soul (Simpson, 1960). The historical roots of spirituality developed within early Christianity to reference a religious way of being (Wong, 2009). The meaning of spirituality has changed and developed over time to represent a more of a quest for sacred
meaning, experience or evolving inner dimension (Houtman & Aupers, 2007; Sheldrake, 2007; Snyder & Lopez, 2007; Waaijman, 2002). Modern notions of spirituality have become increasingly disconnected from traditional religious affiliations (Houtman & Aupers, 2007; Wong, 2009).

Presently, there are no widely accepted definitions of spirituality (Kinjerski & Skrypnek, 2004; Koenig, 2012). In general, spirituality connotes the self’s existential search for meaning and belonging (Roof, 1993). Research often cites that spirituality is about individuals who are true to themselves and act with integrity (Smith and Rayment, 2007). Koenig (2012) asserts that spirituality is intimately connected to the supernatural and mystical but extends beyond organized religion in that it includes both a search for the transcendent and for purpose. Smith and Rayment (2007) suggest that spirituality can provide a sense of meaning or inspire feelings of connectedness and inner wholeness.

Researchers often reinforce a search for meaning when defining spirituality (Anderson, Krajewski, Goffin, & Jackson, 2008; Tisdell, 2003; Woods & Woods, 2008). For the purpose of this study, a non-theistic approach to spirituality enables the research to focus on spirituality from a connectedness perspective (Chiu, Emblen, Van Hofwegen, Sawatzky, & Meyerhoff, 2004; Cook, 2004; Dyson et. al, 1997). Hence, spirituality is defined as, “a human belief in, movement toward, and relationship with a higher purpose or power, self, and others from which a sense of purpose, consciousness, interconnectedness, and destiny may be derived” (Swift, 2003, p. 5).

On April 8, 1966, the cover of Time Magazine, simply read “Is God Dead?” (Time Magazine, 1966). This cover enraged readers and has come to be called the most controversial cover of all time (Rothman, n.d.). The question represented the counterculture sentiment of
Americans amid the Vietnam war and the nation’s fight for civil rights (Hevesi, 2008; Rothman, n.d.). The accompanying article asserted that there was a crisis of faith occurring in America and many people were questioning the role of God in an increasingly secularized and controversial world (Rothman, n.d.). Fifty years later, and the question, “Is God dead?” has not changed but the perspective and landscape of America has.

The distinction between spirituality and religion became more apparent during the late 20th century with the rise of secularism or separation between church and state (Kosmin & Keysar, 2007). Since the mid-1960s, there has been a decline in absolute certainty in God (Johnson, 2016; Pew, 2014). A 1965 poll conducted by Lou Harris, found that 97% of Americans believed in God (Johnson, 2016). In 2014, the Pew Religious Landscape Study reported that 63% of Americans believed in God with absolute certainty whereas 20% believed fairly certainly; down from 71% and 17% respectively in 2007 (Pew, 2014). Frank Newport, Gallup’s editor-in-chief and author of God Is Alive and Well: The Future of Religion in America, attributes the decline in the belief in God not so much to a lack of belief but more so to the shift in cultural changes occurring in America in the late 20th and early 21st century (Newport, 2012). Newport (2012) believed that Americans prior to the 1970s felt they could not hold deviant viewpoints where religion was concerned.

According to a recent poll conducted by Pew Research Center in April 2017, 25% of U.S. adults view themselves as spiritual but not religious (SBNR); up by eight percent since 2012 (Pew, 2017b). Interestingly, this poll also revealed that those who identified as SBNR are more educated than the U.S. public as a whole (Pew, 2017b). SBNR are individuals who describe themselves as spiritual but not religious either because their religious faith is not very important in their life or they do not identify with a religion at all (Barna Group, 2017). Linda Mercadante,
a Professor of Theology and author of *Beliefs Without Borders: Inside the Minds of the Spiritual but not Religious* (SBNR) (2014), there are five distinct categories of SBNR (see Table 6).

Table 6

*Descriptions of the five types of Spiritual But Not Religious*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Spiritual But Not Religious (SBNR) Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dissenters</td>
<td>Individuals who, for the most part, make a conscious effort to veer away from institutional religion. This group is comprised of protesting dissenters, drifted dissenters, and conscientious objector dissenters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casuals</td>
<td>Individuals who see religious and/or spiritual practices as primarily functional (therapeutic). Spirituality is not an organizing principle in their lives. Rather they believe it should be used on an as-needed basis for bettering their health, relieving stress, and for emotional support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explorers</td>
<td>Individuals who seem to have a spiritual wanderlust. They are in constant search for novel spiritual practices to be a byproduct of their ‘unsatisfied curiosity’, their desire for journey and change, as well as feelings of disappointment. Explorers are best understood as ‘spiritual tourists’ who take comfort in the destination-less journey of their spirituality and have no intentions of committing to a spiritual home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seekers</td>
<td>Individuals who are looking for a spiritual home but contemplate recovering earlier religious identities. Seekers embrace the SBNR label and are eager to find a completely new religious identity or alternative spiritual group that they can commit to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrants</td>
<td>Individuals who have found themselves in a novel spiritual realm and are trying to adjust themselves to this newfound identity and its community. Immigrants are seen as ‘trying on’ a radically new spiritual environment but have yet to feel completely settled there.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


According to Fry (2016), altruistic love is the common bridge between spirituality and religion; however, the two are very distinct. Pargament (1997) defines religion as “the search for significance in ways related to the sacred” (pg. 32). Mahoney and Pargament (2004) posit that at the core of sacred is some transcendent, boundless entity or ultimate power, such as God. Fry (2016) contends that religion is concerned with faith supported formal practices, a system of beliefs, and ritualized prayers while spirituality is concerned with the well-being and
connectedness of the human spirit, transcendent meaning, and service to others. From this perspective, religion is not necessary for spirituality, but spirituality is necessary for religion (Fry, 2016). Spirituality can exist inclusively or exclusively of religion. A non-theistic approach to spirituality enables the research to focus on spirituality from a connectedness perspective (Chiu, Emblen, Van Hofwegen, Sawatzky, & Meyerhoff, 2004; Cook, 2004; Dyson, Cobb & Forman, 1997).

There are two broad models discussed in the literature that point to an increase sense of spirituality or spiritual growth occurring predominantly in adulthood: (a) spiritual growth as a product of the maturation process and journey towards self-actualization (Jung, 1943; 1964; Sinnott, 1994, Wink, 1999); and (b) spiritual growth as a product of the cognitive development process which takes place due to the constraints and adversity in adulthood (Atchley, 1997; Burke, 1999; McFadden, 1996). Proponents of spiritual growth occurring as a product of the maturation process, assert that middle aged and older adults, after having experienced the ambiguity and relativity of one’s life, tend to focus their adulthood on expanding one’s sense of self beyond their day-to-day realities (Alexander, C., Davies, J. Dixon, C., Dillbeck, M., Drucker, S., Oetzel, R., Muehlmn, J., & Orme-Johnson, D., 1990). Jung’s (1943; 1964) focus on spiritual development, suggests that around midlife as an individual begins to contemplate one’s mortality which signals an introspective exploration of the spiritual aspects of self and consciousness. Like Jung, Wink (1999) agrees that this inward turn in adulthood expands one’s sense of self moving toward self-actualization which replaces the outer directed orientation of young adulthood.

Proponents of the model that spiritual growth is related to the cognitive development process in adulthood, conceptualize the link between spirituality and development more in terms
of a response to constraints and adverse life experiences (Atchley, 1997; Burke, 1999). According to Stokes (1991), it is the periods of transition and crisis that occur in life which more significantly encourage “the process of making sense of life’s meaning and purpose” (p. 176). McFadden (1996) suggests that spirituality may be especially meaningful in older adulthood as a result of broader social forces. Sinnott (1994) questions the role of intelligence when considering the relationship between cognitive development and spiritual development, especially since Gardner (1993) does not include spirituality in his theory of multiple intelligences. Emmons (1999, 2000b) has argued that “spiritual intelligence can be viewed as a form of intelligence because it predicts functioning and adaptation and offers capabilities that enable people to solve problems and attain goals” (p. 3). Further, Emmons suggested that there were four components of spiritual intelligence which focus on the ability to solve problems and enter a heightened state of consciousness as well as the ability to be present in everyday experiences and transcend the psychical and material world. Like Emmons, Vaughan (2002) suggests that spiritual intelligence implies a deeper level of consciousness and emerges as the consciousness evolves a deeper transpersonal awareness of life, body, mind, soul, and spirit.

Spirituality in the workplace is not about religion (Laabs, 1995; Cavanagh, 1999) but rather about employees who see themselves as spiritual and seeking a sense of purpose and meaning through their work (Fry, 2005; Jurkiewicz & Giacalone, 2004). In an era of corporate scandals, failing leadership, and widespread distrust of American institutions, the desire to work for ethical organizations is growing (Mitroff, 2003). According to a recent Gallup report on the state of the American workplace, Americans are searching for a greater meaning and purpose from their work lives (Newport, 2017). The desire for greater meaning and purpose has fueled a growing revival of spirituality and, specifically, spirituality in the workplace (Fry, 2003).
Jurkiewicz and Giacalone (2004) and Brown (2003) believe that spirituality is a way to recapture trust in response to the failings of the modern workplace.

In response to individuals’ quest for meaning and purpose, a spiritual revival is sweeping across America (Conlin, 1999). Empirical studies on spirituality in the workplace are gaining ground (Ashmos & Duchon, 2000; Giacalone & Jurkiewicz, 2003; Giacalone, Jurkiewicz, & Fry, 2005; Milliman, Czaplewska, & Ferguson, 2003; Mitroff & Denton, 1999). Spirituality at work is not about religion (Laabs, 1995; Cavanagh, 1999) but rather about employees who view themselves as spiritual and seek a sense of purpose and meaning in their career (Fry, 2005; Jurkiewicz & Giacalone, 2004). A growing consensus amongst researchers is to view spirituality as a multifaceted construct which focuses on finding a connection to something meaningful which transcends everyday life (Dehler & Welsh, 2003; Tepper, 2003; Goethals et al., 2004).

While spirituality, in the past, has been seen as a more private matter with little or no place in the workplace, organizations are experiencing a growing number of employees who are choosing to bring their spirituality to work (Fry, 2016; SHRM, 2014).

Organizations are becoming the stage for the practice of spirituality (Hendricks & Ludeman, 1997). Corporate scandals, downsizing, excessive cost cuts, and multiple accounts of toxic leadership contribute to a search for a greater meaning in the workplace (Cash & Gray, 2000). According to Thompson (2000), negative and discouraging work experiences cause employees to seek greater integration of work-life balance. Failure to provide work life balance or meaningful work opportunities are cited as root causes of organizational dysfunctions, employee turnover, and ineffectiveness (Duchon & Plowman, 2005; Hartsfield, 2003). Mitroff and Denton (1999) found in their survey of American workers, that individuals want to bring their whole selves to work which includes their soul and spirit.
Research on spirituality in the workplace indicates that meaningful work contributes to the spiritual well-being and life satisfaction of employees (Fry et al., 2010; Fry et al., 2011). Fry (2009) found that spirituality enhances the quality of life and the degree to which individuals are satisfied with their life (Fry, 2009). Other research (Hartsfield, 2003; Neck & Milliman, 1994) has suggested that spirituality positively correlates with workplace attitudes such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment. In a study conducted by Garcia-Zamor (2003), findings show that spirituality in the workplace positively correlated with the dimensions of meaning making, meditation and sense of mission. Duchon and Plowman (2005) reported that the spiritual climate of an organization impacts the overall performance of the workplace.

The positive outcomes associated with supporting spirituality in the workplace benefit both employees and the overall organization (Fry, 2016). Companies known for their support of spirituality in the workplaces have been found to outperform their competitors related to productivity and continuous improvement (Fairholm, 1998; Thompson, 2000). Krishnakumar and Neck (2002) found increased creativity, honesty, and trust within an organization when individuals are able to express spirituality in the workplace. Evian Springs (McLaughlin, 2009), Amway (Pratt, 2000), Tom’s Maine (Tischler, 2012), Ford (Burack, 1999), Southwest Airlines (Rigoglioso, 1999) and the Container Store (McLaughlin, 2009) are all organizations that have successfully applied spirituality in their workplace.

Spiritual leadership theory is a developing paradigm which links spirituality and leadership (Klenke, 2005; Fry, 2005b). This theory is considered a values-based form of leadership based on an intrinsic motivation model that incorporates vision, hope/faith, and altruistic love which encourages spiritual survival through meaning/calling and membership
Spiritual leadership is focused on an inner life which serves as a quest toward a transcendent purpose to love and serve others (Fry, 2016).

According to Fry and Cohen (2009), the essential aspects of spiritual leadership include leader and follower well-being, calling and membership, and vision and value congruence. Scholars Fairholm (1996) and Nelson-Becker and Canda (2008), believe that spiritual leaders inspire followers inwardly toward meaning and purpose which fosters higher levels of organizational commitment and effectiveness. Further, Fry and Cohen state that the theory of spiritual leadership is based on intrinsic motivation and the relationship between hope, faith, and altruism (2009). For the purpose of this research, the definition of spiritual leadership was supported by the research of Fry (2003), whereas, spiritual leadership is defined as,

comprising the values, attitude, and behaviors necessary to intrinsically motive one’s self and others so that they have a sense of spiritual survival through calling and membership. This entails: (1) creating a vision wherein organization members experience a sense of calling in that their life has meaning and makes a difference and (2) establishing a social/organizational culture based on altruistic love whereby leaders and followers have genuine care, concern, and appreciation for both self and others, thereby producing a sense of membership and feel understood and appreciated. (p. 694-695)

Spiritual leadership theory is grounded in the belief that spiritual leaders are driven by a spiritual calling or higher purpose (Fry, 2003) and/or the belief that one’s life has meaning and makes a difference in this world (Fry & Whittington, 2005). Literature on spirituality often refers to an individual’s journey or path as a calling (Mitroff, 2003). Elliott (1992) defines a calling as work that individuals would do even if they did not have to work because of the
fulfillment and happiness it brings. Others have described a calling as work that contributes to a better world (Lips-Wiersma, 2002b; Lashley, Neal, Slunt, Berman, & Hultgren, 1994).

Lopez (1989) proposed that the discovery of one’s calling necessitates a deeper sense of self-knowledge, especially related to one’s interests, goals, and values. Kush and Kim (2004) posited that a strong sense of identity, which includes a strong sense of self-awareness and a strong sense of purpose, results in the discovery of one’s calling. Scholars (Elliott, 1992; Emmons, 1999; Fowler, 1985; Thompson, 2000) have suggested that the search for meaning and purpose in life involves every aspect of one’s life, including one’s career. Mitroff (2003) suggests that work is a vital part of spirituality and the quest for meaning.

Elliott suggested that the impetus of a calling is subjectively experienced, whether viewed as divinely inspired or psychologically created (1992). Like Elliott, several scholars (Lips-Wiersma, 2002a, 2002b; Rehm, 1990; Wrzesniewski, 2003) within the late 20th century and early 21st century, viewed the existence of calling from a secular perspective. Barnett (1985) posits that a career can encourage and lead to a person’s enlightenment which includes mastery of skill, spiritual growth and self-knowledge. Rehm (1990) concluded that a person’s calling may come from any source that encourages a person to follow a direction which allows for them to manifest their talents in an authentic, true-to-self way.

Research has suggested that spirituality is a critical aspect of the development of leadership identity (Fry, 2003; Sanders, Hopkins, & Geroy, 2003; Thompson, 2000). The ability to authentically express oneself through work is often referred to by scholars and practitioners as having a calling or purpose (George & Sims, 2007). To be truly authentic, a leader must live from a deeper sense of values and meaning (Fry, 2005a). Leadership scholars acknowledge that spiritual leadership influences transcendent purpose, meaning and values (Conger, 1998; Fry,
which are central components of authentic leadership (Luthans & Avolio, 2003; Fry, 2005a). Authentic leaders acknowledge their inner conscience and are guided by their inner values and desire to serve others (Avolio & Gardner, 2005).

The intention of spiritual leadership is to promote a vision and ensure value alignment and support a sense of membership between the leader, follower, and organization (Fry, 2003). Fry (2005b) suggests that the theory of spiritual leadership offers an alternative framework for developing authentic leadership theory and practice. Fry (2003) reports that living one’s life in alignment with one’s values ensures authenticity and ethical well-being, which further supports authentic leadership and spiritual leadership. Kurth (2003) discusses the importance of spiritual practices which are necessary for developing spiritual leadership. These spiritual practices include knowing one’s self, respecting and honoring the beliefs of others, being trustworthy, and maintaining a spiritual practice which could include mindfulness, prayer, meditation, yoga, journal writing, and reading inspirational literature (Kurth, 2003).

**Human Development**

Literature on authentic leadership, while expanding, is limited in its findings and discussions focused on the initial process by which authentic leaders form or develop an authentic leadership identity (Gardner et al., 2011). Some scholars (Lord & Emrich, 2000) posit that both the antecedents of authentic leadership and spirituality may be influenced by factors of the human mind such as cognition, affect, and conation (Huitt, 1996; Tallon, 1997). Currently, there are no overarching or widely shared theories of how one develops into a leader, nonetheless an authentic leader (Avolio, 2007; Avolio & Hannah, 2008; Day, 2000; Riggio, 2008). Avolio & Gardner (2005) and Gardner et al. (2005) suggest that the development of an authentic leadership
identity may be time dependent (taking places over time) or may be triggered by specific life
events such as crisis situations or essential life experiences (Bennis & Thomas, 2002; Shamir &
Eilam, 2005).

Researchers postulate that the development of a leader happens in an ongoing, dynamic
process which occurs across the leader’s life span (Day, et al., 2009). However, Pallus, Nasby,
and Easton (1991) contend that impactful experiences in life are not enough to stimulate the
revision or redirection of identity. Kegan and Lahey (2009) argue that recent leadership
development studies have not concentrated on the underlying cognitive operating system used
for effective leadership development. As such, recommendations were made for research to link
the process by which leaders develop to human development, or specifically, adult development
(e.g. Dinh et al., 2014).

Researchers have speculated that multiple social and organizational contextual factors
contribute to the formation of a leadership identity (Baldomir, 2015; Komives et al., 2005).
Avolio and Gardner (2005) highlight the challenge within current leadership research by pointing
to the lack of research on core personal processes which influence the initial and ongoing
development of leaders. Avolio (2005; 2007), Day, Harrison, and Halpin (2009), and Quick and
Nelson (2008) share the concern that traditional leadership studies fail to provide an integrative
understanding of leadership from a whole person perspective. Lord and Hall (2005) and
Mitchell and James (2001) recognize that there is a lack of theoretical and empirical research
available on when (time) and how (specifications) the development of leadership takes place.

Relevant to this research are the contributions made by 20th century humanistic
and Erik Erikson (1959; 1974; 1975; 1982) as well as developmental psychologists, Robert
Kegan (1982; 1994; 2010) and Paul Baltes (1987; 2006). While humanistic psychologists, Carl Rogers (1959; 1963) and Abraham Maslow (1943; 1968; 1971), concentrated their research on the developmental process of fully functioning individuals and the quest for self-actualization, Carl Jung focused on the nature of the three parts of the human psyche (ego, personal unconscious, and the collective unconscious) and causes of behavior related to identity and personality (1953; 1983). Like Jung, Erikson believed that development of an individual took place as a continuous learning process (1959; 1974; 1975). Moreover, Erikson (1959; 1974; 1982) was concerned with the stages of personality development, emphasizing the social relationships that are important at each stage. This research of Jung, Maslow, and Erikson identified that meaningful work was essential to facilitating personal growth of a person’s inner self or psyche (Treadgold, 1996).

Influenced by the works of Jung, Maslow, and Erikson, American developmental psychologists, Robert Kegan (1982; 1994; 2000) and German developmental psychologist, Paul Baltes (1987; 2006) focused their attention on understanding the developmental process and construction of human consciousness towards self-actualization. Kegan presents his theory of adult development as a sequence of five orders of consciousness: incorporative, impulsive, imperial, interpersonal, and institutional (1982; 1994). Paul Baltes (1987) promotes the life-span orientation of human development which involved the belief that development is not completed in adulthood but spans the entire length of a person’s life. The remaining section of this chapter will focus on the contributions of these researchers across two perspectives of human development: the humanistic perspective and the constructivist development perspective.

The humanistic approach to development, or humanistic psychology, which emerged in the mid-20th century in response to the limitations of Sigmund Freud’s psychoanalytic theory and
B. Skimmer’s behaviorism, emphasizes the study of the whole person (Moss, 2015). Unlike the behaviorist perspective which describes and explains learning and behavior in terms of person’s response to their environment (Benjafield, 2010; McLeod, 2017), the humanistic perspective theorizes that an individual’s learning and behavior is connected to their perception of the world, personal experiences and understandings, conscious feelings and self-perceptions (Benjafield, 2010; Greening, 2006). While the conceptual origins of the humanistic approach have roots in phenomenological and existentialist thoughts of early 19th and 20th century philosophers: Kierkegaard, Nietzsche, Heidegger, Merleau-Ponty and Sartre, the foundation of humanistic psychology as a discipline is credited to the works of Abraham Maslow and Carl Rogers (Moss, 2015).

Abraham Maslow, an American psychologist and revered as the founding father of humanistic psychology (Hoffman, 1988). Maslow wrote extensively on the subject of human potential and self-actualization beginning in the early 1940’s (1943; 1954; 1968; 1970; 1971, 1987). In 2002, a survey conducted by Review of General Psychology, ranked Maslow as the tenth most cited psychologist of the 20th century. Maslow is best known for creating Maslow’s hierarchy of needs (1943), a theory of human needs which proposes that humans are motivated by a series of hierarchical needs (visually represented by a pyramid), ranging from lower level needs or deficiency needs (physiological needs, safety needs, belongingness and love needs, and esteem needs) to higher level needs, or growth needs (self-actualization).

The term self-actualization was originally used by German neurologist and psychiatrist, Kurt Goldstein, in his book *The Organism: A Holistic Approach to Biology Derived from Pathological Data in Man* (1943), which presented self-actualization as “the tendency to actualize, as much as possible, [the organism’s] individual capacities” (1934/1959, p. 82).
Goldstein (1959) believed that self-actualization was the driving life force behind all organisms. Influenced by Goldstein, Maslow placed self-actualization at the top of his hierarchy of human needs, identifying it as the pinnacle of human motivation. However, Maslow conceptualized self-actualization as a growth need which provided the motivation to achieve or realize one’s capabilities or potential and self-fulfillment, versus a driving force that determined one’s life. Maslow held that self-actualization was a desire, “to become everything one is capable of becoming” (Maslow, 1987, p. 64).

Maslow continued to refine and expand out his theory over several decades (1943; 1962; 1970; 1987). In 1970, Maslow included cognitive and aesthetic needs to the list of human needs and proposed that the order of needs is more flexible than he originally stated; noting, for example, the need for self-esteem may be more important than the need for belonging and love for some (1970; 1971). During this time, Maslow also reexamine his original vision of self-actualization, criticizing his original concept for not acknowledging a need for realizing oneself beyond oneself, for example, in altruism or spirituality (1971). He referred to this need as self-transcendence, “…the very highest and most inclusive or holistic levels of human consciousness, behaving and relating, as ends that than means, to oneself, to significant others, to human beings in general, to other species, to nature, and to the cosmos” (Maslow, 1971, p. 269).

For Maslow (1971) the fundamental motivation underlying an individual’s calling can be described within his hierarchy of needs as an intrinsic motivation toward self-actualization. Maslow’s described a person’s calling or purpose in terms of growth needs as the realization or fulfillment of one’s talents and potentialities. Maslow (1971) posits that self-actualizing individuals also have strong ethical principles.
Carol Rogers was an early 20th century American psychologist considered to be one of the founding fathers of the humanistic approach and psychotherapy research. Rogers received the Award for Distinguished Scientific Contributions by the American Psychological Association (APA) in 1956 and the Award for Distinguished Professional Contributions to Psychology by APA in 1972. Rogers is considered a pioneer in psychological research, clinical psychology and the sixth most notable psychologist of the 20th century (Haggbloom, Warnick, Warnick, Jones, Yarbrough, Russell, Borecky, McGahhey, & Powell, 2003).

Rogers’ most noteworthy contribution is his humanistic, person-centered approach to understanding personality and human relationships (Prochaska & Norcross, 2007; Arnold, 2014). Rogers held that every individual has the capacity and desire for personal growth and transformation, or self-actualization (Rogers, 1951; 1953; 1959). Much of his work centered on the fully functioning (self-actualizing) person. Rogers (1962) identified five characteristics of the fully functioning person: (a) they are open to both positive and negative experiences; (b) they focus on existential living; (c) they trust their feelings, instincts and decision-making; (d) they are creative and open to change and risk; and (e) they lead a fulfilled life.

Like Maslow, Roger’s believed self-actualization to be the key tenet of human psychology but, added that growth could only be achieved within an environment that provided genuineness, acceptance, and empathy (1959). Rogers wrote extensively about the process of the fully functioning person and the tendency toward actualization in his nineteen basic propositions (1951; 1953). His fourth proposition states that, “The organism has one basic tendency and striving—to actualize, maintain, and enhance the experiencing organism” (Rogers, 1951, p. 489). Rogers further reinforces, in his fifteenth proposition, that for an individual to function optimally, there must be congruence and little to no dissonance between one’s self-concept and
one’s behaviors and experiences (1951). For Rogers, this process of achieving congruency required self-relation and self-reevaluation and ultimately, an affirmative relationship to one’s life allowing for further integration and self-actualization (1951; 1961). Rogers later concludes, “the curious paradox is that when I accept myself just as I am, then I can change” (1961, p. 31).

According to Rogers (1959), fully functioning, self-actualizing, people desire to feel, experience, and behave in accordance with the perceptions and beliefs they hold about themselves (self-concept). This desire to achieve alignment or congruence between their self-concept and ideal-self encourages a sense of self-worth (1959). The more consistent or congruent a person’s self-concept is with his or her ideal-self, the higher his or her sense of self-worth (1959). Rogers believed feelings of self-worth developed in early childhood and are first influenced by the relationships/interactions with one’s parents and are later influenced by interactions with significant others (1951;1959). Ultimately, what one believes about one’s self (self-worth) influences one’s psychological health and a sense of congruency which can impact the likelihood of realizing self-actualization (Rogers, 1959). Rogers held the belief that self-actualization is achieved only when a person’s ideal self is congruent with his or her actual behavior or self-concept (1951) but that this process of becoming required the courage to stretch and grow to reach one’s potentialities (1961).

According to Erik Erikson, a German-born American developmental psychologist and psychoanalyst, everyone has an inherent motivation to find meaning in their lives and their identity serves as the foundation of their life pursuits (1968). Erikson concluded that healthy developing individuals pass through a series of eight interrelated stages within their life cycle from infancy to adulthood (1959; 1982). A summary chart of the eight stages of Erikson’s Psychosocial Theory of Development is included in the appendix (see Appendix B).
Each stage of development involves a psychosocial crisis of two ‘contrary dispositions’ or opposing emotional forces which significantly disturb a person’s development and personality (Erikson, 1982). For example, within stage seven, adults who are in their 40’s and 50’s desire to find meaning in their work and/or making a difference and struggle between this desire and feeling stuck in life and unaccomplished (generativity versus stagnation). According to Erikson (1959), people experience these stages in a fixed sequence, but the timing and results vary according to the individual and circumstances.

Erickson asserts that successfully passing through each crisis involves achieving a healthy balance between the two opposing dispositions thus contributing to balanced outcomes or basic psychological virtues (1959; 1982). His research suggests that each individual must learn how to hold both extremes of each life stage, neither accepting or rejecting the limits, but understanding the value each represents in the development of their life in order for the optimal psychological virtue to emerge. As such, each virtue corresponds to one of the eight stages and are listed in order of stages here: Hope (basic trust vs. basic mistrust); Will (autonomy vs. shame); Purpose (initiative vs. guilt); competence (industry vs. inferiority); Fidelity (identity vs. role confusion); Love (intimacy vs. isolation); Care (generativity vs. stagnation); Wisdom (ego integrity vs. despair). Erikson describes the basic psychological virtues as personal strengths which underpin personal growth (1959).

In his research, Erikson (1964) emphasized that development can vary from one person to another based on sociocultural influences that exist at each stage of development. Erikson (1964) maintained that a person’s identity develops in a predetermined order which builds upon the previous stage and the skills, values and beliefs that were developed within that stage. Successful passage through a crisis stage is dependent on finding the right balance between each
extreme and can significantly impact emotional or psychological tendencies (1959). Erikson acknowledges that his theory is more description and does not provide what kinds of experiences or crisis a person must experience in order to successfully resolve various conflicts and move from one stage to another (1964).

Similar to Erikson, Carl Jung, a Swiss psychiatrist and psychoanalyst, believes that an individual’s psyche is made up of several interacting systems (Stevens, 1991) which influence a person’s process of individuation, or realization of self through a life-long process (Jung, 1957). The three main systems of the psyche are the ego, the personal unconscious, and the collective unconscious. According to Jung (1947; 1954; 1957), the ego, or conscious mind, represents the thoughts, memories, and emotions that a person is aware of which, in turn, largely influences their sense of identity; the personal unconscious represents information that is present in an individual’s mind but is not readily available to the consciousness (i.e., either forgotten or repressed); and the collective unconscious represents innate characteristics that are inherited and, thus, instinctual.

According to Jung, the collective unconscious, acts as a separate sub-system or archetypes of the human psyche which influences subconscious behaviors (1947). Jung posits that there are universal predispositions or innate characteristics as a result of evolution that imprint on the human mind (1939; 1947). These innate characteristics are inherited from one’s ancestors and become structures of the unconscious mind, or archetypes (1939). Theses archetypes, identified as symbols, images, memories, and thoughts, are believed to have similar universal meaning across cultures and show up in literature, art, religion, and dreams (Corbett, 2012). Jung’s work focused on four main archetypes: persona (the outward face one presents to the world), anima/animus (the unconscious balance of opposites, either masculine or feminine
that exists within each person), shadow (the animal side of one’s personality), and self (unification of consciousness and unconsciousness in a person as part of the process of individuation) (1947).

Jung believed that the main task in life is to discover and fulfill one’s deep, innate potential (Dunne, Bernier, & Houston, 2012). According to Jung (1962), individuation or the process of transformation whereby the personal and collective unconsciousness are brought into consciousness create the final stage of a human’s journey towards integration of the psyche or wholeness (Rowan, 1990). Jung (1933;1971) emphasized the importance of understanding the ego and the unconscious, both the personal unconscious and the collective unconscious, and the role each plays in the individuation process. Moreover, the personal and collective unconscious influence the progress an individual makes in discovering their true self because they must first be brought into consciousness, ego-consciousness (1957). Jung (1957) pointed out that a person’s knowledge of the ego is often confused with knowledge of the self:

Anyone who has any ego consciousness at all takes it for granted that he knows himself. But the ego knows only its own contents, not the unconscious and its contents. People measure their self-knowledge by what the average person in their social environment knows of himself, but not by the real psychic facts which are for the most part hidden from them. In this respect the psyche behaves like the body, of whose physiological and anatomical structure the average person knows very little too. (“The Undiscovered Self,” CW 10, para. 491)

Jung believed this process of individuation to have a holistic healing effect, both mentally, psychically and spiritually (1962). In fact, based on his study of Christianity, Buddhism,
Hinduism, Taoism, and other traditions, Jung (1952) believed that this journey of transformation to meet the self was at the heart of all religions and their beliefs on spiritual awakenings.

Constructive development theories on human development (Cook-Greuter, 1990; 1999; Kegan, 1982; 1994; Loevinger, 1976) assert that an individual’s meaning-making system shapes their experiences and influences their thinking, feeling, and behavior. Constructivist development theory asserts that individuals construct their reality across many domains of human experience (Kegan, 1994; Kegan & Lahey, 1984). Of special interest is Robert Kegan’s, a Professor of Adult Learning and Professional Development at the Harvard University of Graduate School of Education, contribution to the field of human development.

Kegan (1994) was strongly influenced by Jean Piaget, a pioneer in developmental psychology and who is best known for his theory about the nature and development of human intelligence known as the theory of cognitive development. Kegan built upon the work of Piaget and other development psychologists by expanding the principles of mental organization beyond cognition to “affective, interpersonal and intrapersonal realms” (1994, p. 29). One of the most central contributions Kegan (1994) made to the field of adult development was his research substantiating that development continues after adolescence. Like Erikson (1968), Kegan (1994) affirms that identity development occurs in response to a crisis of differentiating one’s self which he characterized as transitions between each stage. For Kegan (1994), true transformative learning occurs when individuals change, “not just the way he behaves, not just the way he feels, but the way he knows—not just what he knows but the way he knows” (p. 17).

Kegan’s constructive development theory identifies that there are a variety of ‘capacities of mind’ or ‘ways of knowing’ which continue to develop and expand in complexity beyond adolescence (1994). Central to this theory is its view of the human capacity for human beings to
construct meaning and shape their own reality (Kegan, 1982; 1994). This process of growth and development is marked by continual shifts or transitions which influence an ongoing construction and reconstruction of the person’s consciousness in relation to their environment which consists of cognitive, intrapersonal and interpersonal aspects (Kegan, 1982).

Kegan’s theory of adult development (1982) is grounded in the belief that all individuals naturally progress through as many as five distinct stages over a lifetime and that there exist distinct orders of consciousness (1994) and forms of mind (2000). Underlying Kegan’s theory is the belief that each of the five transitions or orders of consciousness develops out a capacity to transform or change the way one knows and understand the world. Transitioning from one stage to another requires what Kegan refers to as a subject-object shift (1982). This transition moves individuals from being the subject of reality (what they see, feel, and know) toward viewing reality as the object for which one has the ability to critically reflect on, detach from, and control. Kegan asserts that nearly 65 percent of the populations will never make it past stage three (1994).

Some developmental psychologists, most notably Paul Baltes (1987; 2006), have suggested that understanding human development is not necessarily how individuals progress through predetermined life stages but more so how humans adapt to life circumstances. Baltes (1987) argues that life experiences and socio-cultural conditions shape the development of an individual. Baltes, Staudinger, and Lindenberger (1999) theorizes that human development occurs in a multidirectional and multidimensional nature across the life span and having an adaptive capacity to respond to adversity and to make positive changes is critical.

Several researchers have linked adult development theory to leadership as a way to discuss potential implications of leadership development (Avolio 1999, 2005; Avolio &
Leadership development is thought to be a human development process that involves and encourages the development of an individual’s perceived self-concept or identity as a leader (Komives, Owen, Longerbeam, Mainella, & Osteen, 2005; Komives, Owen, Longerbeam, Maniella, & Osteen, 2006; Lord & Hall, 2005). Avolio and Gibbons (1988) suggest that leadership development is the result and accumulation of various life experiences. Burns (1978), Bennis and Nanus (1985), and Bass (1985) believe that leaders who are highly self-aware and reflective as well as choose to view all life’s experiences as learning experiences to develop from are the most authentic and successful.

In 2006, Komives, et al. (2005, 2006) suggested a model of leadership identity development which outlined six stages of identity development: awareness, exploration/engagement, leader identified, leadership differentiated, generativity, and integration/synthesis. Komives, et al. (2005) posits that at each stage there are developmental components that influenced their awareness of self and development of leadership self-efficacy such as role models, meaningful involvement, and reflective learning. Moreover, the first two stages of development largely were dependent on others, particularly adults and peers (Komives et al., 2006), whereas stage three through six focused on relational interdependencies which shaped the attitudes of leadership and affirmed their leadership identity (Komives, et al., 2009).

In 2007, George suggested in his book, True North, that the leaders’ journey spanned a life time differentiated by three phases, each lasting about 30 years long. George referred to this journey as moving from individually focused to collectively focused (2007). Phase I is what George refers to as Preparing for Leadership and occurs the first 30 years of life. This is the phase represented as a leader’s opportunity to rub up against the world to figure things out, gather skills, experiences, and relationships before actual leadership roles begin (George, 2007;
George & McLean, 2007). The primary concern in this phase is an individual’s focus on themselves and their performance or achievements (George & McLean, 2007). Phase II which spans from about 30 to 60 years old is referred to as the *Leading* phase. This phase is marked by successive roles in management or leadership positions which provide opportunities to accumulate leadership experience (George & McLean, 2007). This phase is not a straight upward trajectory, but rather includes ups and downs as challenges and lessons present themselves (George & Sims, 2007). According to George and McLean (2007),

> The transformation from ‘I’ to ‘We’ results from the positive experience of having a wise mentor or a unique opportunity at a young age. But as much as we all want positive experiences like these, transformations for most leaders result from going through a crucible. (p. 28)

George and Sims (2007) and George and McLean (2007) describes crucibles as experience learned from moments which test the limits and stretch leaders. These crucibles can result from difficult work situations such as receiving critical feedback or losing a job or painful personal experiences such as divorce, illness or the death of a loved one (2007). He also advances that this phase culminates in the fifties when leaders typically reach their peak leadership (2007). Finally, Phase III, from 60’s onward, is marked as *Giving Back*. This phase is marked by leaders who feel less competitive, open to other’s points of view, and desire to develop other leaders (George, 2007). George and McLean posit that a leader’s transformation can take many forms but, that their crucible experiences cause them to, “recognize the meaning of their experience and make a commitment to goals larger than themselves” (2007, p.32).
Summary of Chapter 2

The foundational concepts of authentic leadership theory have significant impact on leadership approaches in the 21st century (George, 2003; Luthans & Avolio, 2003). Current research highlights the need to better understand the formation and development of authentic leadership (Gardner et al., 2011). Leadership scholars acknowledge that spiritual leadership influences transcendent purpose, meaning, and values (Conger, 1998; Fry, 2003, 2005b; Kanungo & Mendonca, 1996; Mitroff & Denton, 1999) which are central components of authentic leadership (Luthans & Avolio, 2003; Fry, 2005a). Day, Harrison, and Halpin (2009) suggest that leader development is an ongoing, dynamic process which occurs across the leader’s life span. Shamir and Eilam (2005) posit that the leader’s life story can provide significant insight into assessing authenticity and understanding the emergence of authentic leaders. Moreover, humanistic psychologists believe the focusing on the life stories or narratives is the ideal way to understand what an individual has experienced and how this influences who they are becoming (Derobertis & Bland, 2017).

As stated, the purpose of this study was to explore what role, if any, spirituality plays in the initial formation and emergence of an authentic leadership identity. Three related topics-authentic leadership, spirituality, and human development- provided the basis for understanding the initial emergence and formation of authentic leadership identity. This chapter restated the theoretical framework underlying this study as well as provided a review of literature on leadership, authentic leadership, spirituality, and human development. Chapter 3 describes the research design methodology, considerations for human subjects, the data collection process, and interview protocol, as well as the process for analyzing the data.
Chapter Three: Research Methods

“Experience is meaningful and human behavior is generated from and informed by this meaningfulness” (Polkinghorne, 1988, p. 1).

As discussed in Chapter 1, the purpose of this study was to explore what role, if any, spirituality played in the initial formation and emergence of an authentic leadership identity. This study sought to understand whether spirituality could shape or influence the emergence and formation of authenticity which may, subsequently, shape or influence the emergence of authentic leadership identity. According to narrative psychologist, Donald Polkinghorne (1988), “narrative meaning is a cognitive process that organizes human experiences into temporally meaningful episodes” (p. 1). To understand human behavior, an exploration of the meaning making systems that form human experience was undertaken by using a sequential explanatory mixed method design which included questionnaires and semi-structured interviews (Polkinghorne, 1988; Seidman, 2013). The research purpose, questions, and methodology were aligned to promote the research of individuals within a context-driven meaning making system (Seidman, 2013).

To explore what role, if any, spirituality played in the initial formation and emergence of an authentic leader, the following research question(s) were addressed:

1. What role does spirituality play, if any, in the initial formation and emergence of authentic leadership identity?
   a. What do the personal histories and triggering events of authentic leaders who reveal about the initial formation, emergence and/or continued development of their authentic leadership identity?
   b. What are the perceptions of authentic leaders concerning the role of spirituality in their authentic leadership identity formation?
Chapter 3 describes the research design methodology of sequential explanatory mixed methods, using questionnaires and semi-structured interviews, and why it was selected as the best fit for this research. The population and sampling methodology are reviewed, as well as the research strategy. Considerations for human subjects are addressed, including thoughts on this researcher’s biases. The data collection process and interview protocol are provided. Finally, the process for analyzing the data and identifying findings from the research are presented along with important ethical considerations. This chapter discusses the research methodologies that were employed to accomplish the study’s purpose, and to answer the research questions.

**Research Design**

This research study was conducted as a sequential explanatory mixed method to explore the phenomena of authentic leadership identity formation and the influence spirituality had on the initial emergence or formation of authentic leadership identity. Due to the nascent nature of authentic leadership research, an exploratory approach has been encouraged by several researchers (Bryman, 1995; Conger, 1998; Gardner et al., 2011) calling for extensive use of qualitative methods with narrative designs. As a sequential explanatory mixed methods research study, the goal was to first investigate how authentic leaders assessed their beliefs and behaviors related to spirituality and authentic leadership via a questionnaire. Thereafter, participants recounted how their life experiences and beliefs on spirituality may have influenced their authentic leadership identities via semi-structured interviews.

According to Gardner et al. (2011), the theory of authentic leadership appears to be in Reichers and Schneider’s (1990) first stage of development as a theoretical construct where researchers are attempting to legitimize the concept, its definition, establish its reliability and contribution amongst existing leadership literature. As outlined by Reichers and Schneider
(1990), construct development follows a predictable sequence across three stages of scientific development: introduction and elaboration, evaluation and augmentation, and consolidation and accommodation. Within the introduction and elaboration stage, research is used to legitimize and justify the concept. At this early stage, attempts are being made to inform and integrate findings and open new areas of inquiry of authentic leadership research. As such, a sequential explanatory mixed methods approach allowed for the exploration of existing authentic leadership literature from a new theoretical perspective to understand the potential influence of spirituality (Brown, 2006; Singh, 2007).

Sources of Data

For this study, data were obtained through semi-structured interviews with 11 participants. Existing literature provides limited clarification regarding the minimum number of interviews that should be undertaken as part of a study (Baker & Edwards, 2012). Warren (2002) suggest that the minimum number of interviews be between 20 and 30 for an interview-based qualitative study to be published. Whereas Bertaux (1981) holds that fifteen is the smallest acceptable number for all qualitative research methods. Mason (2010) reported the range of number of interviews found in the abstracts of doctoral students using qualitative research methods in Great Britain and Ireland was between one and 95. Given the a priori method of data analysis (discussed further below), the number of qualitative interviews identified for this study was targeted between 8-10 participants.

Design Procedures

This research study employed a sequential mixed method design using a three-step design procedure for data collection: (a) recruitment by nomination, (b) questionnaire completion, and (c) a semi-structured interview. Participants for this study were recruited though a nomination
process and screened using a Questionnaire which included demographic questions, scaled rating questions and a pre-existing, self-rating instrument called the Authentic Leadership Questionnaire (ALQ) (Avolio, Gardner, & Walumbwa, 2007). Participants who scored within the high or very high range on the ALQ were considered for a semi-structured interview. Figure 1 provides a visual image of the process flow for the three-step design procedure.

**Figure 1.** Three-step design procedure.

The following outlines the procedures for recruitment, screening, and data collection strategies:

Participants for this study were recruited through a nomination process. The *Open Call for Nominations* (see Appendix C) was posted to social media sites Facebook and Instagram, as well as the professional networking site, LinkedIn. This researcher’s personal Facebook and
Instagram accounts and professional LinkedIn profiles were used to post the *Open Call for Nominations*. The *Open Call for Nominations* included a brief explanation of the study, a description of the nomination criteria, and the process for submitting nominations. The *Open Call for Nominations* invited individuals to nominate someone whom they perceived as an authentic leader, based on the definition provided within the announcement, to potentially participate in a doctoral research study.

The time-period for accepting nominations for authentic leaders ran for three weeks. During this time, nominations of authentic leaders were submitted by employed adults in the private and public sector of the western United States who were either currently working with or reporting to the nominee or who had worked with or reported to the nominee at some point in the past. Individuals nominating a potential participant were asked to provide the nominee’s contact information (name and email address) to the researcher through email. All individuals who submitted a nomination for an authentic leader received a response email (see Appendix D) from the researcher expressing appreciation for their time and nominations.

As nominations for authentic leaders were received, an *Invitation to Participate* (see Appendix E) was sent individually to each nominee via email. Within the *Invitation to Participate*, a brief explanation of the study, an overview of the process, and a hyperlink to the electronic statement of informed consent and *Questionnaire* was included. The *Invitation to Participate* acknowledged the recipient’s nomination as an authentic leader and invited his or her participation in a doctoral research study aimed at understanding the lived experiences or events which encouraged the formation of their authentic leadership identity. Nominees were assured that participation in the study was voluntary, and the researcher adhered to strict guidelines,
specifically contained within the electronic informed consent, regulated by Pepperdine’s Institutional Review Board (IRB).

As part of the researcher’s commitment to IRB guidelines, a unique study code was issued for the participant and provided within the *Invitation to Participate*. Participants who elected to participate were required to reference this code in order to access the online *Questionnaire*. The use of study codes was intended to protect the privacy of research participants. Study codes provide an added layer of anonymity, in the event that the data were lost, stolen, etc. Additionally, study codes prevented anyone who may not be authorized to view the data from determining a participant’s identity. The master spreadsheet linking participant’s name and unique study was password protected and securely maintained separate from participant’s data. The master tracking spreadsheet (see Appendix F) was created, utilizing Microsoft Excel, to capture and track the nominations through the three-step process.

Nominees who responded to the invitation email declining to participate in the study were sent a *Thank You* reply (see Appendix G) thanking them for their consideration and asking if they would like to nominate another perceived authentic leader. If no response was received from the nominee, only two *Participation Reminders* (see Appendix H) were sent out at approximately one-week and two-week intervals following the original distribution date on the *Invitation to Participate*. Once the maximum number of interviews were achieved, no further follow up was taken to encourage participation.

Once nominees read through the information contained in the *Invitation to Participate* and agreed to participate, they were directed to click on the hyperlink contained in the email. This hyperlink took them to the *Questionnaire* (see Appendix I) landing page through Qualtrics, a third-party online survey platform. Qualtrics allows for customized surveys to be administered
through their website. This feature provided the ability to track progress and pull reporting, along with security and confidentiality features to prevent fraud and abuse of surveys (Qualtrics, 2017).

Qualtrics maintains the highest commitment to security and confidentiality and is subject to the investigatory and enforcement powers of the Federal Trade Commission (FTC). Qualtrics uses Transport Layer Security (TLS) encryption for all transmitted data and protects surveys with passwords and HTTP referrer checking (Qualtrics, 2017). Qualtrics is independently audited using the industry SSAE-16 methods and is presently undergoing certification under the FedRAMP program for security compliance (Qualtrics, 2017). A printed copy of Qualtrics statement of security is included in the Appendix (see Appendix J).

Before gaining access to the Questionnaire, participants were reminded that the informed consent information was contained in the Invitation to Participate along with their unique study code. Participants were asked to click on the “I Agree” button and enter their unique study code to acknowledge that they had read through the informed consent information and agreed to participate in the research study. According to Pepperdine University IRB Guidance for Obtaining Informed Consent guidelines, the researcher could obtain informed consent without signature. A participants’ acknowledgement of the informed consent was granted when they selected the “I agree” button. This acknowledgment provided participants access to the questionnaire.

The Questionnaire (see Appendix I) contained 10 closed-ended (demographic) questions and 22 scaled rating (Likert-type) questions across four sections. Section one included demographic questions such as age, gender, years in the workforce, etc. Section two contained six core questions which related to the participant’s beliefs and how they see themselves.
Section three contained questions directly from the Authentic Leadership Questionnaire (ALQ) related to a participant’s leadership style (Avolio, Gardner, & Walumbwa, 2007). Section four contained one yes/no screening question asking the participants, if applicable, were they willing to participate in a follow-up interview. Participants were provided with directions prior to completing each section. Before submission, participants were advised that individuals who met specific research criteria and acknowledged that they were willing to participate in an interview would be invited to schedule a follow-up interview, if applicable.

Completion of the full *Questionnaire* took approximately 15-20 minutes. The average completion time documented by the creators of the ALQ instrument was 10-15 minutes (Mindgarden, 2016). The ALQ instrument was presented in adherence to copyright guidelines provided by the creators. Permission to utilize the ALQ (Version 1.0 Self) instrument for research purposes through remote online usage was granted by MindGarden. A copy of permission to use the ALQ (Version 1.0 Self) instrument, in alignment with copyright expectations, is included in appendix (see Appendix K).

The purpose of the ALQ was to measure individual responses related to the four dimensions of authentic leadership (Gardner et al., 2011). There were 16 items which scale for self-awareness (4 items), internalized moral perspective (4 items), balanced processing (3 items), and relational transparency (5 items). The ALQ instructions required participants to answer each question as they perceived themselves relative to the leadership style dimension within that section. The ALQ uses a Likert Scale with five pre-coded responses to allow participants to express the degree to which they agree or disagree with each of the statements. The response options were: 0- Not at all, 1- Once in a while, 2- Sometimes, 3- Fairly often, and 4- Frequently, if not always.
The ALQ is a relatively new instrument, copyrighted in 2007 (Avolio, Gardner, & Walumbwa, 2007) and operationalized and validated by Walumbwa, et al. (2008). The ALQ was derived from Kernis and Goldman’s (2006) multi-component conception of authenticity which was documented as the most frequently used instrument to measure authentic leadership during a review of literature from 1980 to 2010 by Gardner et al. (2011). The ALQ instrument has been used and tested as a measure of authentic leadership in countries such as USA, China, Kenya (Walumbwa et al., 2008), Portugal (Rego, Vitoria, Magalhaes, Riberiro, & eCunha, 2012), Belgium (Leroy, Polanski, & Simons, 2012), Canada (Laschinger, Wong, & Grau, 2012), New Zealand (Caza, Bagozzi, & Caza, 2012), and Germany (Peus et al., 2012). In addition, the ALQ instrument has been used by researchers in many difference business sectors across several studies since 2010 (Clapp-Smith et al., 2009; Hassan & Ahmed, 2011; Hmieleski, Cole, & Baron, 2012; Luthans, Avolio, Avey et al., 2007; Luthans, Avolio, & Youssef, 2007; Peterson et al., 2012; Walumbwa et al., 2008; Walumbwa, Luthans, Avey, & Okey, 2011; Wong & Grau, 2012; Wooley, Caza & Levy, 2011).

Once the Questionnaire was submitted by the participant, the ALQ section was scored within the Qualtrics system according to the scoring guidelines established by the ALQ creators (Avolio, Gardner, & Walumbwa, 2007). A total authentic leadership score was calculated by adding up the numerical value of each response across the 16 statements for a total score of up to 64 points, indicating the higher the score, the higher the level of self-ascribed authentic leadership by the participant (Avolio, Gardner, & Walumbwa, 2007). For verification purposes, the researcher manually scored each submission to ensure accuracy of the online scoring. The following ranges were used to indicate the level of authentic leadership a participant embodies based on the total score: very high (49-64), high (33-48), low (17-32), and very low (0-16).
Scores in the upper ranges (33-64) indicate stronger authentic leadership, whereas scores in the lower ranges (0-32) indicate weaker authentic leadership.

Given this study intended to explore the influence of spirituality, if any, on the emergence of authentic leadership identity, it was important to identify those participants who had been nominated as authentic leaders, and who were also affirmed as authentic leaders, as evidenced by their ALQ scores. Therefore, participants who scored within the high (33-48) or very high (49-64) range on the ALQ scale and indicated ‘yes’ in section four of the Questionnaire (agreeing to participate in a follow-up interview) were considered for the semi-structured interviews. For those participants who scored within the low and very low range or who scored within the high or very high range but, indicated ‘no’ in section four of the Questionnaire when asked if they would be willing to participate in a follow-up interview, were sent a Thank You- Not Selected for further participation email (see Appendix M).

When the maximum number of 10 interviews was reached, a Thank You – Response Rate Reached email (See Appendix N) was sent to remaining individuals who had yet responded to the Interview Invitation for their time and/or willingness to participate. The email advised that the total number of research participants for the semi-structured interview phase had been reached; however, their questionnaire data would still be valuable to the overall research study.

All participants who completed the Questionnaire (which includes the ALQ instrument) were sent an email which contained their overall ALQ score within two weeks of completing the assessment. The results were included within either the Thank You – Not Selected (see Appendix M), Thank You – Response Rate Reached (see Appendix N) or the Interview Invitation (see Appendix O) email. Included within each of the emails was a reference and hyperlink to the MindGarden website for additional ALQ resources and frequently asked questions (FAQs).
Participants who scored high (33-48) or very high (49-64) on ALQ portion of the Questionnaire and acknowledged their willingness to participate in a follow-up interview were invited to take part in a 60-minute, semi-structured interview. The Interview Invitation email (see Appendix O) advised that their results fell within the high or very high range and their participation in an interview was essential to this research study. The definition of an authentic leader was provided with their results along with a request for their availability to schedule a 60-minute interview to occur within the following two weeks. As part of the researcher’s responsibility to maintain a strong ethical commitment, participants who met all criteria for participation in the interview were advised that they could request to review a copy of the interview questions prior to the scheduled interview taking place.

The researcher embraced a flexible approach to the interview process by offering the participant a choice in the interview method. Participants were offered three options by which the interview could take place: (a) an in-person (face-to-face) interview, (b) a telephone interview, or (c) a Skype interview. According to Rappaport and Stewart (1997) offering participants a choice engenders and equalizes the relationship between the researcher and participant. Each interview option offered its own advantages and disadvantages. Sturges and Hanrahan (2004) acknowledge that telephone interviews are rarely viewed as a substitute for face-to-face interviews. However, Holt (2010) suggests that telephone interviews do provide a practical and appropriate alternative to face-to-face interviews, especially if distance or traveling restrictions are of concern. Holt (2010) posits that while telephone interviews do not allow the researcher to see the subtle nuances of body language and eye contact, it does allow the researcher to focus more on the answers not the environment in which the answers were produced.
Recent researchers within the social sciences (Evans, Ferrando, Findler, Stowell, Smart, & Haglin, 2008; Flick, 2009) have suggested that the use of the technology to support face-to-face interviews, such as with web-based options such as Skype, can produce the nearly same synchronous, real-time interaction experienced with in-person interviews. Further, Skype offers the option to record both visual and audio interaction (Skype, 2017). Skype provides the researcher and participant a user-friendly and low-cost alternative to addressing concerns of interview location, personal safety, comfort and distance/travel (Evans et al., 2008). However, if the participant is not willing to create a Skype account, this option may not be preferred.

Once the interview was scheduled, a Reminder Email (see Appendix P) was sent to each participant at least 3-days prior to the interview. Included within the email was a restatement of the time, date, contact process, and method of the interview. A restatement of the purpose of the interview, as well as suggestions on how to prepare for the interview were included. To assist the participant, four reflective questions were included in the Reminder email to encourage the participant to begin thinking of their emergence as an authentic leader. Participants were encouraged to reflect on the following four questions prior to the scheduled interview:

1. How would you describe yourself as an authentic leader?
2. Was there a specific turning point you can recall which signified your emergence as an authentic leader?
3. What were some of the specific events or experiences which encouraged your emergence as an authentic leader?
4. Spirituality is defined as defined as, “a human belief in, movement toward, and relationship with a higher purpose or power, self, and others from which a sense of purpose, consciousness, interconnectedness, and destiny may be derived” (Swift,
2003, p. 5). How may spirituality have influenced your emergence as an authentic leader?

In advance of the interview, the Interview Questionnaire (see Appendix Q) was prepared for each participant using the participant’s unique study code to maintain anonymity. The interview was classified as a semi-structured interview. Semi-structured interviews involve a few pre-determined areas of interest with possible prompts to help guide the conversation (Rubin & Rubin, 2005). The same pre-determined questions were asked of each participant during the interview process. The Interview Questionnaire was used to guide the researcher in an orderly manner through the interview questions. The researcher used the Interview Questionnaire form to capture notes and salient interview details not necessarily captured in audio recordings. The researcher further expanded upon these notes shortly after each interview was complete to preserve accuracy of researcher’s memory. The field notes included reactions of the researcher during and after the interviews and served as later reminders as to when, for example, a particular thought, question, or assumption of interest first surfaced. The field notes represented reflexivity and reflective practices to uncover potential perceived biases. Table 7 provides the connection between the research questions and the corresponding interview questions.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Corresponding Interview Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| RQ1: What role does spirituality play, if any, in the initial formation and emergence of authentic leadership identity? | **Interview Question 1:** What does authentic leadership mean to you?  
**Interview Question 2:** How would you describe yourself as an authentic leader?  
**Interview Question 3:** Describe your values as an authentic leader?  
**Interview Question 4:** Are these values consistent with the values you hold in your everyday life? If not, please explain. |

(Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Corresponding Interview Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| RQ2: What do the personal histories and triggering events of authentic leaders reveal about the initial formation, emergence and/or continued development of their authentic leadership identity? | *Interview Question 5:* Thinking back, how has your identity as an authentic leader formed or emerged?  
*Interview Question 6:* Were there specific experiences, people, or events which contributed or encouraged you to become an authentic leader? Please share.  
*Interview Question 7:* At what age would you say you clearly identified yourself as an authentic leader?  
*Interview Question 8:* Do you feel you have become a more effective authentic leader over time? If so, how? |
| RQ3: What are the perceptions of authentic leaders concerning the role of spirituality in their authentic leadership identity formation? | *Interview Question 9:* Spirituality is defined as “a human belief in, movement toward, and relationship with a higher purpose or power, self, and others from which a sense of purpose, consciousness, interconnectedness, and destiny may be derived” (Swift, 2003, pg. 5). Would you describe yourself as a spiritual leader?  
*Interview Question 10:* Thinking back, how has spirituality influenced your identity?  
*Interview Question 11:* How may spirituality have influenced or contributed to the emergence of your authentic leadership identity?  
*Interview Question 12:* Please share a few experiences or events you feel capture the way spirituality has influenced or contributed to the emergence of your authentic leadership identity. |

In preparation for the interview, the researcher set up appropriate recording equipment, depending on the method (in-person, Skype, or telephone) selected by participant. At the start of the interview, the researcher read from the *Interview Questionnaire* reiterating the purpose of the study, acknowledging the informed consent, and confirming that the interview will be audio-recorded. A digital recorder was used for in-person and telephonic interviews to allow for easier transcription. For telephone interviews, the phone was placed on speaker to allow for audio recording. For Skype interviews, the Skype software allows for audio recording; however, a digital recorder was used for back-up. The audio records were transcribed within one month of the recording and a copy of the transcription was emailed to the participant as a way of member
checking the accuracy of the transcription (member checking will be discussed later in the next section). All digital files will be destroyed within two years of the close of the project.

If for any reason the participant felt uncomfortable, or asked to stop the interview, or the interview was interrupted, the recording was stopped immediately and started again as appropriate, if applicable. Special care was taken with the participants, and, if applicable, the researcher asked for clarification from the participant on how and when to proceed. If the participant wished to discontinue further participation, clarification was sought to ensure the needs and wants of the participant were heard and respected. If a participant decided to withdraw and did not want any of his/her data used, the questionnaire, any notes and audio transcription were immediately and properly destroyed. A Thank You email (see Appendix R) was sent following each interview thanking the individual for participation and reaffirming that all former data collected will be properly and immediately destroyed.

**Human Subjects Considerations**

When dealing with human participants, there are a series of ethical considerations which must be made to ensure that the researcher considers the needs and concerns of the people being studied. Adherence to human subject’s considerations will be maintained pursuant to all ethical, and professional standards established by Pepperdine University and in compliance with the Institutional Review Board (IRB). Pepperdine University and its doctoral students are guided by the three core ethical principles set forth in the Belmont Report: (a) Respect for persons to ensure the autonomy and respect of research participants, (b) Beneficence requires a researcher to minimize risks, including psychological and social, associated with research, and (b) Justice which requires the researcher to ensure fair allocation of risks and benefits which could arise from the research (1979). This researcher has participated in and successfully completed three
core modules of human subject’s training courses through the Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI): (a) Information Privacy Security (IPS); (b) Conflicts of Interest; and (c) GSEP Education Division- Social-Behavioral- Educational (SBE) (see Appendix S).

Additionally, this researcher obtained written approval from the Pepperdine IRB (see Appendix T) prior to initiating any research.

The researchers IRB application was in the form of EXEMPT review due to the limited risk on the part of those participating in the study. Questions contained within the questionnaire and interview were normal, straight forward questions and were considered minimally invasive given they did not ask the participant to disclose information beyond normal day-to-day workplace scenarios/practices and/or beliefs about themselves. The researcher identified a potential minimal risk that might occur if after completing the questionnaire (which includes the ALQ instrument), the participants believed themselves to represent a higher level of authentic leadership than what was determined by the instrument scoring. The researcher provided a disclosure to the participant regarding this possibility as part of the instructions. As an attempt to address this risk, as well as support participants, the researcher provided a link to the website of ALQ creators (MindGarden) to make available additional resources and materials on authentic leadership, the ALQ instrument, and ALQ Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ).

As part of this researcher’s commitment to the protection of human subjects, a strict informed consent procedure was followed. Each participant received informed consent information within the Invitation to Participate and was required to provide acknowledgement of the informed consent information electronically before beginning the Questionnaire, as well as, prior to participating in the interview. As part of the informed consent, participants were provided with an overview of the study, what is expected from their participation, and the
amount of time required. Anticipated risks and benefits were discussed in the informed consent information as well as how confidentiality will be assured. The name and contact information of the researcher’s faculty supervisor was provided should the participant, at any time, have questions or concerns regarding the research. Participants were offered an opportunity to review sample questions contained Interview Questionnaire prior to agreeing to participate. All information was provided in a way the participant could clearly understand. To protect the participants’ rights and to avoid causing harm, the researcher reaffirmed that completing the Questionnaire and, if applicable, the interview, were strictly voluntary and that the participant could withdraw at any time.

All electronic communications were sent using the researcher’s Pepperdine email which was secured and encrypted by the University’s Information Technology department. The Questionnaire was completed through Qualtrics. As discussed in an earlier section, Qualtrics maintains the highest commitment to security and confidentiality and is subject to the investigatory and enforcement powers of the Federal Trade Commission (FTC).

Study codes were used to protect the confidentiality of research participants. A unique study code was provided to each participant in the Invitation to Participate email. Participants used their assigned study code in place of their name when completing the Questionnaire to protect participants' responses/data. Results of the Questionnaire, which included the ALQ instrument, were only identifiable to the researcher in order to identify participants with high or very high levels of authentic leadership for the semi-structured interviews. The master spreadsheet linking the participant’s name and unique study was password protected and securely maintained separate from any of the participant’s data. Study codes provided an added layer of anonymity, if a data document is lost, stolen, leaked or hacked online, etc. Additionally,
the study codes prevented anyone who may not have been authorized to view the data from determining the participant's identity.

In addition to study codes, strict confidentiality practices were established by the researcher to ensure privacy of all participants. The researcher secured all digital data and computerized records/reports by password protection. The researcher secured all data documents (interview notes and transcripts) in locked locations. The researcher limited access to all identifiable information and removed identifiers (e.g., names, email addresses, etc.) from questionnaire and interview responses when reporting aggregate data or discussing interview findings/responses. The researcher will properly dispose, destroy and/or delete all study data/documents after two years following the close of the project. The researcher disclosed the limited anonymity and strict confidentiality practices to participants as part of the informed consent.

As part of the commitment to the consideration of human subjects, a small-scale preliminary pilot of the study was conducted in preparation for the main study. According to Baker (1994), the fundamental purpose of a pilot study early on is to enhance the probability of the study’s larger scale success. A pilot study provided the opportunity to develop consistent practices to enhance data integrity, study procedures, and the protection of human subjects (Teijlingen, Rennie, Hundley, & Graham, 2001). The researcher believed this to be important to evaluate the feasibility of the interview process, possible improvement of the interview questions and to identify any potential time constraints of study procedures.

According to Cohen et al. (2007), interviews are considered intrusive to a participant’s private life, not only because interviews require a time commitment but also because they include sensitive, personal questions. A pilot study allowed the researcher to practice the
interview questions to improve upon the internal validity of the questions and/or process (Baker, 1994; Teijlingen et al., 2001). The researcher obtained feedback to identify potentially ambiguous and/or difficult questions, and/or to assess whether each question produces an adequate range of responses. This allowed the researcher time to re-word any questions prior to launching the main study.

The pilot study assisted the researcher in ensuring the flow of the questions and interview skills needed were appropriate. Interviews may feel conversational at some point to the interviewee; therefore, the researcher must maintain clear boundaries between what is being shared by the participant during the interview and what responses or information is being shared by the researcher with the participant in return. The interviewer must listen empathetically, establish trust, demonstrate a neutral attitude, encourage and treat the participant like the expert and properly facilitate the interview from beginning to end. The interviewer must be prepared to adjust the interview style, as appropriate.

In summary, sound confidentiality practices were established by the researcher to ensure strict privacy and anonymity of participants. There was a minimal risk that an invasion to the participant’s privacy will result from research activities. Therefore, ethical issues were considered and appropriately addressed at all stages of the recruitment and interview process to reaffirm confidentiality, anonymity and security of data. The researcher secured all digital data and computerized records/reports by ensuring password protection. The researcher secured all data documents (interview notes and transcripts) in locked locations. The researcher limited access to all identifiable information. The researcher removed identifiers (e.g., names, email addresses, etc.) from the questionnaire and interview responses when reporting aggregate data or discussing interview findings/responses. The researcher disclosed the limited anonymity and
strict confidentiality practices to participants as part of the informed consent prior to completing the Questionnaire and the semi-structured interview.

Data Analysis

Two methods of analysis were used for this mixed method research design. The method of analysis chosen for the quantitative data obtained from the Questionnaire was descriptive statistics. The method of analysis chosen for the qualitative data obtained from the semi-structured interviews was thematic analysis using a priori approach for content analysis (coding).

Descriptive statistics was used to calculate, describe, and summarize research data obtained from the questionnaires in a logical and meaningful way (Van Elst, 2015). Frequency distributions were conducted to summarize the data and provide a general understanding of the data set and percentage analysis was used to validate the results from the entire study (Creswell, 2008; Cohen et al., 2007). The quantitative data were tabulated and numerically coded and represented in tables and graphs. The goal of using descriptive statistics to analyze the quantitative data was to answer basic questions about the research data set, namely: Who, What, Why, Where, How, How Much? (Vetter, 2017).

The method of analysis chosen for the qualitative data obtained for this study was thematic analysis using a priori approach for content analysis (coding). Thematic analysis is one of the most broadly used methods of analyzing data in qualitative research (Boyatzis, 1998; Guest, 2012). According to Braun and Clarke (2006), thematic analysis is used for identifying, analyzing and reporting patterns that emerge within the data. Marshall and Rossman (2016) suggest that data analysis creates order and structure to the data while the researcher attempts to search for relationships amongst the categories. Boyatzis (1998) posits that the flexibility of
thematic analysis allows for the interpretation of various aspects of the research data, including underlying ideologies and latent themes.

Thematic analysis facilitates an investigation of the interview data from two perspectives: first, it allows for coding to be conducted in an inductive way; and second, it allows the researcher to check if the data are consistent with the research questions (Braun & Clark, 2006). A thematic analysis approach ensures a consistent process of determining themes by adhering to a three-step model: describe, compare, and relate (Bazeley, 2009). According to Thomas (2006) the primary purpose of an inductive research approach is to allow for the emergence of findings to come from repeated and significant themes within the data. Therefore, the data collected through interviews with authentic leaders was analyzed based on a three-step procedure suggested in the literature (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Miles & Huberman, 1984): first, prepare the data for analysis by transcribing and reviewing; second, code the data and identify themes; and third, describe the patterns. Braun and Clarke (2006) recommend that the process of thematic analysis take place across six phases: familiarization with data, generating initial codes, searching for themes among codes, reviewing themes, defining and naming themes, and producing the final report.

For the purpose of this study, the researcher adopted the six-phase process recommended by Braun and Clarke (2006). During the first phase of becoming familiar with the data, the audio files from each interview were prepared for analysis by transcribing the data into written transcripts. Interviews were conducted in English and were directly translated in English, verbatim. The advantage of utilizing a digital recorder during the interview process was so that a credible software programs can be used to assist in the transcription process. For transcription purposes, HyperTRANSCRIBE software was used. HyperTRANSCRIBE is a transcription and
dictation software tool that provides keyboard control over the playback of audio files.

HyperTRANSCRIBE allowed the researcher to manually transcribe all interviews to ensure the accuracy of all transcriptions. The audio files were maintained and saved directly to the researcher’s computer and could not be accessed over the internet or by logging into the user’s HyperTRANSCRIBE account through another computer. This feature ensures the security and privacy of the data.

Ensuring the accuracy of the transcription for each interview was a critical step to the dependability of data analysis (Patton, 1990; Polland, 1995). According to Polland (1995) there are two points of concern related to the idea of a ‘verbatim’ transcript. The first is that audio transcripts do not capture the emotional context or nonverbal communications such as long pauses, tone, or body posturing, and, as such, cannot be considered a truly verbatim record of the interview (Oakley, 1981; Polland, 1995). Secondly, transcribing oral interviews into written text cannot be done truly verbatim because of the inherent differences in communication style such as emphasis of a word or phrase, broken sentences, or redirection of thought which causes what Polland (1995) refers to as, “the messiness of casual conversation” (pg. 291). Thus, the very idea of a truly precise or verbatim transcription is impractical due to the intersubjectivity of communication (Given, 2008; Polland, 1995). Instead, researchers must seek to obtain ‘close to verbatim’ transcriptions instead (Polland, 1995).

Establishing the trustworthiness of the transcriptions was imperative to the reliability and rigor of qualitative research (Patton, 1990; Poland, 1995), especially since it is inherently interpretive research (Creswell, 1994). Thus, the researcher utilized three practices during the transcription process. First, the researcher ensured the practice of reflexivity was used by including a personal statement discussing potential biases or preconceived ideas and assumptions
about the research topics. Also, a reflexive journal was used by the researcher during the transcription and coding process to be transparent about the researcher’s experiences, thoughts, and feelings. Creswell (2007) believes that qualitative researchers shape the work that they do as an instrument for collecting and analyzing data and, as such, can be considered a tool of analysis. According to Russell and Kelly (2002), researchers should use their journal to examine “personal assumptions and goals” and make clear “individual belief systems and subjectivities” (p. 2).

Second, the researcher reread the hand written fieldnotes taken during the interview process as a point of reference before beginning the transcription process. Finally, the researcher employed the use of member checking once a transcript was completed which provided the interviewee the opportunity to review and validate the accuracy of the transcript. These practices are discussed in further detail later in this section.

The goal of the first phase of thematic analysis was for the researcher to feel comfortable and familiar with the data (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The researcher took the time to listen to all audio recordings and review all transcripts line by line at least once before the actual coding process began. While studying the data, the researcher took notes and begin to consider ideas for coding that may influence and/or reinforce the a priori coding themes. This practice was considered precoding. According to Saldana (2013), precoding allows the researcher to identify potential words or themes before the formal data analysis takes place. The primary researcher also reviewed all field notes taken during each of the interviews to identify relationships and ideas for coding based on reactions and connections made during interviews.

The transcripts of the audio recordings were imported from HyperTRANSCRIBE into HyperRESEARCH software. HyperRESEARCH was used to assist the researcher in organizing, managing and analyzing the interview data during the coding process.
HyperRESEARCH supported the analysis of data in several ways by providing transparency of information quickly, word frequency results, and search term reports. Additionally, HyperRESEARCH allowed the researcher to use word frequency counts to identify words of interest and consistency of usage. According to Stemler (2001), word frequency counts help to strengthen the validity of inferences the researcher makes about the data. Ishak and Bakar (2012) caution that software tools, such as HyperRESEARCH, do not remove the responsibility of the researcher to make sense of the data in relation to the phenomena being studied.

Within the second phase of generating initial codes, the researcher established a set of initial *a priori* codes. *A priori* is a method of coding which allowed the researcher to utilize the pre-existing theoretical framework to establish categories for coding prior to the analysis of the data (Saldana, 2015). Saldana (2013) also suggested using the research questions to create labels for coding. The theories of authentic leadership, spirituality and spiritual leadership defined specific attributes and behaviors of authentic leaders and spiritual leaders which helped the researcher establish the *a priori* codes. A code book was created and loaded into HyperResearch prior to coding the data.

During phase three, searching for themes, the data were organized into meaningful groups using the pre-determined *a priori* categories. As the coding process took place, the researcher collected and sorted all the phrases or text segments with the same code to compare and identify possible relationships or themes (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Themes are phrases or text segments that describe what the data mean (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Themes make meaningful contributions toward answering the research questions (Guest & MacQueen, 2012). The researcher looked for code frequencies, code relationships, and sequencing within the categories to identify patterns and generate themes (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Guest & MacQueen, 2012). To
prevent the researcher from focusing only on the data that fit the *a priori* themes, the researcher recognized the *a priori* themes as tentative and was open to redefinition or removal throughout the process.

Phase four, *reviewing themes*, required the researcher to refine and assess the emerging themes, as well as, search for data that can either support or refute the proposed theory. Researchers (Saldana, 2013; Braun & Clarke, 2006; Braun & Wilkinson, 2003; Tucket, 2005) recommend constant refinement and reevaluation of grouping and categories to ensure integrity of the coding process. During this phase, some themes may be collapsed or condensed while others may not form clear patterns which can alert the researcher that the thematic map may not accurately reflect the meanings in the data set or potential themes were missed (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Consideration of the validity of the themes and how they connect to the data set is critical at this stage. The researcher’s interpretation of the data set, and systematic analysis connected with the thematic map must align before moving forward (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

*A priori* coding allowed for reflexivity, or for the researcher to reflect on a set of initials codes identified from the research as well as to acknowledge her position within the study (Blair, 2015). Chinn and Brewer (2001) believe that, during the analysis of data, researchers “construct a cognitive model of the data according to the perspective of the person who is reporting the data” (p. 337). While the reflexivity journal was used as a tool to create transparency around the researcher’s position, perspective and assumptions, a secondary researcher or peer reviewer was asked to critically evaluate the codes and coding process to ensure validity. Appropriate changes to the coding and process were made based upon feedback and suggestions from the secondary researcher. The peer review process is discussed further in the next section.
As the researcher moved into phase five, *defining and naming themes*, the researcher prepared a detailed and succinct analysis for each theme. The goal of this phase is to ensure that the researcher could define and explain each theme. The analysis must provide a concise, coherent and valid story of the data, to include providing convincing examples from the data set that go beyond surface meanings (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Foster and Parker (1995) suggest that, “the analysis of the material…is deliberate and self-consciously artful creation by the researcher and must be constructed to persuade the reader of the plausibility of an argument” (p. 204).

After the final themes have been defined and reviewed, the researcher entered phase six, *producing the report*. The goal of this phase was to write a strong thematic analysis of the data which reinforces the validity and quality of the analysis conducted. Guest and MacQueen (2012) recommend that researchers provide a ‘thick description’ of the results which provides subjective explanations and meanings and not just descriptions of the behavior. The report was written to be clear, concise and provide a straightforward account of the story supporting the themes from the data set and research questions. Excerpts from the transcripts were included to capture central issues, enhance readability and reinforce meaningful points in analysis (Corden & Sainsbury, 2006).

**Means to Ensure Study Validity and Reliability**

In research, validity refers to whether the findings of the research study are accurately reflected (true) as well as supported by the evidence (certain) (Patton, 1999); whereas, reliability refers to the degree to which the measurement tools used in the study produce consistent results (Creswell, 2000). Given this is a mixed method research study, the researcher focused on ensuring both the validity and reliability of the quantitative and qualitative data. From a quantitative perspective, reliability is the consistency of a measure (i.e., the questionnaire) while
validity refers to the extent to which the questionnaire measures what it purports to measure (i.e., the ALQ embedded in the questionnaire to measure the level of authentic leadership) (Creswell, 2000; 2009). Qualitative validity ensures the accuracy of the findings while qualitative reliability ensures the consistency of the approach in collecting and analyzing data (Gibbs, 2007). The following discusses the methods the researcher used in the various stages of the research process to ensure validity and reliability.

As a way to validate the accuracy of the information shared by the participant during the interview, the researcher used the practice of member checking. Creswell (2007) encourages member checking as a way to increase the credibility of the research study. Researchers (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Rager, 2005) believe that the practice of member checking provides the participant the opportunity to validate the accuracy and completeness of the responses and experiences that are shared. Therefore, member checking was used at two points during the data collection process: first, during the interview by restating or summarizing the responses given by the participant; and secondly, after the interview by providing a file of the transcriptions of the interviews via email for review. Interviewees were asked to return any comments or feedback on their transcripts within five calendar days. All edits, additions and omissions made to the interview transcript by the interviewee were used as a final copy of the interview.

The validity of the stories shared during the interviews can impact the outcome of the research findings. According to Polit, Beck, and Hungler (2001), the credibility and reliability of the research are established when the findings accurately reflect the reality of the participants. Streubert and Carpenter (1999) add that the trustworthiness of the research is dependent on the study’s ability to fully explore and comprehend the participants’ experiences. To assist participants with recalling their life experiences and personal stories related to their emergence
as an authentic leader, reflective prompts were provided three days prior to the scheduled interview. These questions did not represent the actual interview questions but provided participants an opportunity to reflect on similar themes to jog their memory. The intent of the reflective prompts was to encourage recollection without the pressure to prepare planned responses in advance of the interview. There is no way to avoid participants falsely or deliberately misrepresenting their responses or experiences. Participants may also be unable or unwilling to give the complete story due to memory lapses or personal limitations. Therefore, the researcher recognizes that the reliability and representativeness of data may be compromised to a certain extent in this way.

According to Scheman (2007), data analysis is the way a researcher validates, interprets, and formulates inferences regarding the data. Note taking, digital recording, and the transcription of all interviews were used to safeguard the accuracy and validity of interview data. Additionally, HyperRESEARCH software was used to assist with analyzing the data and providing consistency and transparency of findings. Moreover, to maintain validity and ensure rigor in analyzing the data, the researcher followed the 15-point checklist of criteria established by Bruan and Clarke (2006) for conducting good thematic analysis (see Appendix U).

Gehart et al. (2007) posits that analysis (meaning making) is not a separate activity which is carried out once the data have been collected, but rather occurs throughout the research process. Polit et al. (2001) highlights the importance of the researcher to ensure neutrality or objectivity when interacting or analyzing the data. Holloway and Wheeler (2002) suggest that the researcher utilizes an inquiry audit to trace the coded data back to their original sources. In addition to an inquiry audit, the researcher used the strategy of reflexivity and evaluation (discussed in the earlier section on research philosophy) to expose and assess assumptions and
biases throughout the process. A statement of personal bias (see Appendix V) was prepared prior to the onset of data collection and a separate journal documenting researcher’s efforts of reflexivity and evaluation throughout the process was maintained.

Additionally, to ensure the reliability and dependability of coding, the researcher enlisted the help of a peer reviewer who had experience in qualitative research. This form of reliability is called inter-rater reliability. Huberman (1994) recommends that there be a minimum of at least 80% agreement between the researcher and the secondary reviewer in the consistency of coding to constitute good qualitative reliability.

**Summary of Chapter 3**

As discussed in Chapter 1, the purpose of this research study was to explore what role, if any, spirituality plays in the initial formation and emergence of an authentic leadership identity. To best support the purpose of this study, Chapter 3 outlined the research philosophy, research design, sources of data, data collection strategies, collection procedures and method for data analysis. A brief discussion covering human subject considerations and means to ensure study validity was included.

In summary, this study was conducted as sequential explanatory mixed methods research design. Participants were identified through a nomination process and screened using a questionnaire which included the ALQ instrument. Participants with high or very high levels of authentic leadership took part in a semi-structured interview. Interview questions explore the participant’s perspective of past events and lived experiences related to the what role, if any, spirituality played in the initial formation and emergence of their authentic leadership identity.

The data collected through interviews was analyzed using *a priori* coding and a method of thematic analysis based on a three-step procedure suggested in the literature (Braun & Clark,
2006; Miles & Huberman, 1984): first, the researcher prepared the data for analysis by transcribing; second, the researcher coded the data and identified themes; and third, the researcher described the patterns. To ensure rigor, a 15-point checklist of criteria established by Bruan and Clarke (2006) for conducting good thematic analysis was used. The findings from the data collected and a thorough analysis of data are presented in Chapter 4. Chapter 5 will provide a discussion of the key findings, conclusions, and implications of this study, as well as recommendations for future research.
Chapter Four: Results

“I would consider myself as a spiritual leader because if I really think about it and the guiding principles that I am motivated by do come from a place of spirituality” (Participant 4).

The purpose of this sequential explanatory mixed method study was to explore the phenomena of authentic leadership and the influence spirituality may have on the initial emergence or formation of an authentic leadership identity. This study gathered data from both a quantitative approach by way of questionnaires and a qualitative approach by way of in-depth interviews. Participants for this study were nominated by individuals who believed them to be authentic leaders. A definition of authentic leadership was included in the call for nominations as follows (Walumbwa et al., 2008). Participants who agreed to participate in this study were screened using a questionnaire which included the ALQ instrument to measure the level of their authentic leadership. Those participants who scored high or very high on the ALQ were then invited to be interviewed (see Appendix J for copy of questionnaire). The interview questions were intended to explore the participants’ perspectives of past events and lived experiences related to the what role, if any, spirituality played in the initial formation and emergence of their authentic leadership identity.

The central guiding research question and sub-questions being explored by this research study were as follows:

1. What role does spirituality play, if any, in the initial formation and emergence of authentic leadership identity?
   a. What do the personal histories and triggering events of authentic leaders who reveal about the initial formation, emergence and/or continued development of their authentic leadership identity?
b. What are the perceptions of authentic leaders concerning the role of spirituality in their authentic leadership identity formation?

This chapter presents the findings related to the 61 nominated participants who completed the questionnaire and the 11 participants (as a subset of 61 participants) who completed in-depth interviews. These findings are organized by questionnaire results (section 1-4) and interview results. The last section will provide the study’s key findings.

This study employed a cross-sectional data collection method using purposeful sampling to identify authentic leaders through a criterion of inclusion technique. The open call for nominations was launched in May 2018 and posted to the researcher’s social media sites Facebook and Instagram, as well as the professional networking site, LinkedIn. Six reminders were posted on all sites during the four-week period data collection remained active. Seventy-one nominations were received in total: 20 from Facebook, 18 from Instagram, and 33 from LinkedIn. Of the 71 nominations received, 61 participants completed the questionnaire; a nearly 86% participation rate. From the 61 participants who completed the questionnaire, a subset of 18% or 11 participants completed interviews.

The following discussion of findings will provide insight into the participants’ responses for each section included in the questionnaire: demographics, spiritual beliefs, the ALQ instrument, and willingness to participate in a follow-up interview. A separate discussion of questionnaire findings related to the subset of 11 participants who completed an interview will also be included.

**Questionnaire Results**

Participants were asked 10 demographic questions as part of the questionnaire. Participants were asked to identify their gender, age, race, marital status, education, employment
status, employment industry, job title, years of experience in the workplace, and years of
experience leading others (see Appendix I for a copy of the full questionnaire). This data are
represented in the following pages across two separate tables. Table 8 provides descriptive data
related to the gender, age, race, and marital status of all participants who completed the
questionnaire. Data were also included for the subset of 11 participants who completed a semi-
structured interview.

While in many ways the subset of 11 interview participants closely resembles the
demographics of the larger population of 61 participants who completed the questionnaire, the
law of small numbers cautions researchers against expecting that a smaller sample resemble
exactly the population from which they are drawn (Tversky & Kahneman, 1971). For example,
according to Table 8, the gender identity of the entire population of participants represents a 14%
difference in the number of men versus women who completed the questionnaire. However, this
percentage dropped to a 10% difference in gender when looking at the participants who
completed semi-structured interviews. Similarly, race was represented by a slightly larger
percentage of minorities overall, while the subset of interview participants was represented by a
slightly higher number of Caucasians than minorities (Table 8).

Table 8

*Gender identity, age range, race, marital status, and highest level of education*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>All Participants (N = 61)</th>
<th>Interview Participants (N = 11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender Identity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age Range</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24 years old</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25-34 years old</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 years old</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 years old</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64 years old</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74 years old</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 years or older</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single (Never Married)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married, or in a Domestic Partnership</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than a high school diploma</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS degree or equivalent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college, no degree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate degree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional degree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 provides descriptive data related to the current employment status of all participants, as well as the number of years participants have in the workplace. A breakdown of
the number of years of experience participant have in leading others is also highlighted. Table 9 also provides data for the subset of 11 participants who completed semi-structured interviews. Again, there are slight differences between the larger population who completed the questionnaire and subset of participants who completed semi-structured interviews are acknowledged. For example, according to Table 9, the number of participants who have over 25 years of experience in the workplace represented 31% of population who completed the questionnaire ($n = 19$). However, a slightly higher percentage of participants with over 25 years of experiences were represented in the subset of interview participants (45%, $n = 5$).

Table 9

*Employment status, years in the workplace, and years of experience leading others*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>All Participants ($N = 61$)</th>
<th>Interview Participants ($N = 11$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed, Full Time</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed, Part Time</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Employed</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Military</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemaker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Student</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to work</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years in Workplace</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-3 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7-9 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-15 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-18 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-21 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-25 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 25 years</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>61</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Leading Others</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-3 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-15 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-18 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-21 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-25 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 25 years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>61</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lastly, participants were asked to identify their primary work industry from a list of over 31 industries as well as their current job title. Participants represented 22 of the 31 industries ranging from healthcare (n = 8, 13%), higher education (n = 7, 31%), and government and public administration (n = 6, 10%) to arts, entertainment, and recreation (n = 4, 7%), utilities (n = 4, 7%), and primary education (n = 3, 5%). Interview participants represented 8 of the 31 industries ranging from government and public administration (n = 2, 18%) and broadcasting (n = 2, 18%) to real estate, rental and leasing (n = 1, 9%) and higher education (n = 1). A full list of industries represented by participants is provided in the appendices (see Appendix W).

Participants who completed the questionnaire were asked to specify their current job title. A full list of the job titles is included in the appendices (see Appendix X). According to their title designation, 62% of the participants indicate that they are in some type of leadership role or
management position (e.g. CEO, president, vice president, director, manager, supervisor, dean, fire captain, or pastor) \(n = 38\). Nearly 40\% of the participants specified that their job title was either at the manager \(n = 13, 21\%\), or director level \(n = 10, 16\%\). Sixteen percent identified as President \(n = 5, 8\%\), CEO \(n = 4, 7\%\), or Vice President \(n = 1, 2\%\). For the subset of interview participants, 64\% are in some type of management position (e.g. president, director, manager, or supervisor) \(n = 7\) whereas, 27\% of are at the director level \(n = 3\) and 18\% are at the manager level \(n = 2\).

Table 10 provides a summary of demographic highlights from section one for the 61 participants who completed the questionnaire, as well as, for the subset of 11 participants who completed semi-structured interviews. Slight differences between the larger population and subset of interview participants are noted.

Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>All Participants ((N = 61))</th>
<th>Interview Participants ((N = 11))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>• 62% men ((n = 38)); 38% women ((n = 23))</td>
<td>• 55% men ((n = 6)); 45% women ((n = 5))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Range</td>
<td>• 82% between 35-64 years old ((n = 50))</td>
<td>• 91% between 35-64 years old ((n = 10))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>• Minorities represent 51% ((n = 31)); Caucasians represent 43% ((n = 26))</td>
<td>• Minorities represent 36% ((n = 4)); Caucasians represent 64% ((n = 7))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>• 77% are married or in a domestic partnership ((n = 47))</td>
<td>• 82% are married or in a domestic partnership ((n = 9))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>• 89% hold some type of academic or professional degree ((n = 54))</td>
<td>• 91% hold some type of academic or professional degree ((n = 10))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>• 72% employed full-time ((n = 44)); 15% self-employed ((n = 9))</td>
<td>• 64% employed full-time ((n = 7)); 18% self-employed ((n = 2))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>• 62% of job titles designated in a management or leadership position ((n = 38))</td>
<td>• 64% of job titles designated in a management or leadership position ((n = 7)) (Continued)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
Section two of the questionnaire contained six core questions which relate to participants’ beliefs on spirituality and how they see themselves as authentic leaders. These questions sought to understand the perceptions participants held about themselves as authentic leaders and the extent to which, if any, spirituality influences their beliefs, behaviors, authenticity, and self-awareness. The questionnaire used a Likert scale to collect participant’s beliefs on spirituality across five options: strongly disagree, somewhat disagree, neither agree nor disagree, somewhat agree, and strongly agree. Table 11 provides descriptive data related to these six core items for all participants who completed the questionnaire as well as for the subset of 11 interview participants.

As evidenced in Table 11, none of the participants strongly disagreed with any of the statements related to authentic leadership and the influence of spirituality on beliefs, behavior, levels of authenticity, and self-awareness. Nearly all of the participants responded favorably with 98% affirming the statement, “I believe myself to be an authentic leader.” Additionally, 93% of participants affirmed the statement, “I believe myself to be a spiritual person”; while 90% of the participants showed some level of agreement with the statement, “Spirituality influences my beliefs about leadership.”

As evidenced in Table 11, similar responses were received for the next two statements on the questionnaire. When asked to respond to the statement, “Spirituality influences the way I behave as a leader,” 90% of participants indicated some level of agreement. Likewise, 90% of
participants affirmed that the statement, “My authenticity as a leader is influenced by my spirituality.” Similarly, 90% of participants answered in the affirmative to the statement, “My self-awareness as a leader is influenced by my spirituality.”

It was important to analyze the subset of 11 participants who completed a semi-structured interview. According to Table 11, all interview participants answered affirmatively to the statement, “I believe myself to be an authentic leader.” When asked to respond to the statement, “I believe myself to be a spiritual person,” 82% of interview participants also agreed. When asked to respond to the statement, “Spirituality influences my beliefs about leadership,” 73% of the interview participants showed some level of agreement. Similarly, 82% of interview participants affirmed the statement, “My authenticity as a leader is influenced by my spirituality”, while 73% of participants showed agreement with the statement, “My authenticity as a leader is influenced by my spirituality.” Lastly, 82% of the interview participants answered in affirmatively to the statement, “My self-awareness as a leader is influenced by my spirituality.”

Table 11

**Participants beliefs about authentic leadership and spirituality**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire item</th>
<th>All Participants (N = 61)</th>
<th>Interview Participants (N = 11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I believe myself to be an authentic leader.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree or Disagree</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire item</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. I believe myself to be a spiritual person.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree or Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **3. Spirituality influences my beliefs about leadership.** | | | | |
| Strongly Agree | 34 | 56 | 3 | 27 |
| Somewhat Agree | 21 | 34 | 5 | 46 |
| Neither Agree or Disagree | 5 | 8 | 2 | 18 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 1 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| Strongly Disagree | - | - | - | - |
| **Total** | 61 | 100 | 11 | 100 |

| **4. Spirituality influences the way I behave as a leader.** | | | | |
| Strongly Agree | 35 | 57 | 3 | 27 |
| Somewhat Agree | 20 | 33 | 6 | 55 |
| Neither Agree or Disagree | 5 | 8 | 1 | 9 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 1 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| Strongly Disagree | - | - | - | - |
| **Total** | 61 | 100 | 11 | 100 |

| **5. My authenticity as a leader is influenced by my spirituality.** | | | | |
| Strongly Agree | 34 | 56 | 2 | 18 |
| Somewhat Agree | 21 | 34 | 6 | 55 |
| Neither Agree or Disagree | 5 | 8 | 2 | 18 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 1 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| Strongly Disagree | - | - | - | - |
| **Total** | 61 | 100 | 11 | 100 |

| **6. My self-awareness as a leader is influenced by my spirituality.** | | | | |
| Strongly Agree | 36 | 59 | 4 | 36 |
| Somewhat Agree | 19 | 31 | 5 | 46 |
| Neither Agree or Disagree | 4 | 7 | - | - |
| Somewhat Disagree | 2 | 3 | 2 | 18 |
| Strongly Disagree | - | - | - | - |
| **Total** | 61 | 100 | 11 | 100 |
Table 12 provides a summary of highlights from section two for the 61 participants who completed the questionnaire, as well as, for the subset of 11 participants who completed in-dept interviews. Slight differences between the larger population and subset of interview participants are noted. For example, according to Table 12, 94% of all participants ($n = 57$) provided some level of agreement with item #2 of the questionnaire, whereas 82% of the interview participants responded in kind ($n = 9$). When comparing the responses for the subset of interview participants to the overall population of participants, only a slight difference in agreement appeared ranging between 8-17% depending on the questionnaire item (Table 12). The largest difference of 17% was found with questionnaire item #3 and item #5 identifying that 90% of the overall population of participants ($n = 55$) agreed that spirituality influences their beliefs about leadership, whereas, only 73% of interview participants ($n = 8$) felt the same. The remaining three interview participants either were neutral ($n = 2$) or somewhat disagreed ($n = 1$).

Table 12

Summary of highlights of participants beliefs about authentic leadership and spirituality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Item</th>
<th>All Participants ($N = 61$)</th>
<th>Interview Participants ($N = 11$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I believe myself to be an authentic leader.</td>
<td>• 87% strongly agree ($n = 53$); 11% somewhat agree ($n = 7$)</td>
<td>• 73% strongly agree ($n = 8$); 27% somewhat agree ($n = 3$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I believe myself to be a spiritual person</td>
<td>• 66% strongly agree ($n = 40$); 28% somewhat agree ($n = 17$)</td>
<td>• 36% strongly agree ($n = 4$); 46% somewhat agree ($n = 5$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Spirituality influences my beliefs about leadership</td>
<td>• 56% strongly agree ($n = 34$); 34% somewhat agree ($n = 21$)</td>
<td>• 27% strongly agree ($n = 3$); 46% somewhat agree ($n = 5$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Spirituality influences the way I behave as a leader</td>
<td>• 57% strongly agree ($n = 35$); 33% somewhat agree ($n = 20$)</td>
<td>• 27% strongly agree ($n = 3$); 55% somewhat agree ($n = 6$)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
Section three contained questions directly from the Authentic Leadership Questionnaire (ALQ) instrument which measures a participant’s level of authentic leadership. There are 16 items which scale for self-awareness (4 items), internalized moral perspective (4 items), balanced processing (3 items), and relational transparency (5 items). The response options are assigned numerical values as follows: 0- Not at all, 1- Once in a while, 2- Sometimes, 3- Fairly often, and 4- Frequently, if not always. A total authentic leadership score was calculated by adding up the numerical value of each response across the 16 statements for a total score of up to 64 points (Avolio, Gardner, & Walumbwa, 2007). The following ranges were used to indicate the level of authentic leadership a participant embodies based on the total ALQ score: very high (49-64), high (33-48), low (17-32), and very low (0-16). Scores in the upper ranges (33-64) indicate stronger authentic leadership, whereas scores in the lower ranges (0-32) indicate weaker authentic leadership.

As stated, 61 participants completed the questionnaire. According to Figure 2, participants scored either within the very high or high range. These results are not very surprising given study participants were nominated as authentic leaders by individuals who
believed them to be authentic leaders already. The ALQ instrument was used to confirm this belief.

Figure 2. Frequency distribution of ALQ scores of all participants (N = 61)

Figure 3 provides insight into the mean, mode, median, and standard deviation of ALQ scores for all participants along with a side by side understanding of the subset of interview participants. This figure highlights that the average ALQ score of all participants and the subset of interview participants was identified to be the same: 54. The relevance of identifying the standard deviation was simply to show that the ALQ scores have a normal distribution with all scores of participants falling within 15 points (or three standard deviations) from the average, higher or lower.
The ALQ instrument contains 16 items which scale for the four dimensions of authentic leadership: self-awareness (4 items), internalized moral perspective (4 items), balanced processing (3 items), and relational transparency (5 items). Participants were to assign a numerical value as follows: 0- Not at all, 1- Once in a while, 2- Sometimes, 3- Fairly often, and 4- Frequently, if not always. Average scores were calculated for each dimension by adding up the numerical values participants assigned to each statement within a dimension and dividing by the total number of statements (Avolio, Gardner, & Walumbwa, 2007).

Figure 4 provides a breakdown of average scores across each ALQ dimension for the 61 participants who completed the questionnaire. Figure 4 also provides a breakdown of average scores between the 50 participants who scored within the very high range \((n = 50)\) and those who scored within the high range \((n = 11)\). According to Figure 4, the dimension with the highest score for all 61 participants, regardless of scoring within the high or very high range on the ALQ, was internalized moral perspective, followed by relational transparency, balanced processing, and self-awareness. Several samples were captured by Walumbwa et al. (2008) and provided as a normative group. The normative group contains a total of 892 participants across three sets.
different studies representing multiple industries and across several countries including the U.S., South Africa, Brazil, and China. The average scores for participants in order of highest to lowest are as follows: internalized moral perspective (2.50), relational transparency (2.40), self-awareness (2.20), and balanced processing (2.20) (Walumbwa et al., 2008). Average scores for this research study are higher than the normative group. This difference can be attributed to the fact that normative data was collected without regard to using a call for nominations of those individuals perceived as authentic leaders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moral/Ethical</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced Processing</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Awareness</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Scores of ALQ by Dimension

![Average Scores of ALQ by Dimension](image)

*Figure 4.* Frequency distribution of average scores of ALQ by dimension (N = 61).

Figure 5 provides an understanding of the average ALQ scores by dimension for all participants as well as the subset of 11 participants. Interview participants’ average score for each dimension in order of highest to lowest is as follows: internalized moral perspective (3.50), self-awareness (3.34), relational transparency (3.31), and balanced processing (3.27).
Figure 5. Frequency distribution of average scores of ALQ by dimension for all participant \( (N = 61) \) and interview participants \( (N = 11) \)

As a summary of the items related to ALQ data in section three, below are summary highlights for the 61 participants who completed the questionnaire as well as for the subset of 11 participants who completed semi-structured interviews. Slight differences between the larger population and subset of interview participants is noted.

Table 13

Summary of highlights of Authentic Leadership Questionnaire (ALQ) data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Item</th>
<th>All Participants ( (N = 61) )</th>
<th>Interview Participants ( (N = 11) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALQ score range</strong></td>
<td>18% scored high ( (n = 11) ); 82% scored very high ( (n = 50) )</td>
<td>18% scored high ( (n = 2) ); 82% scored very high ( (n = 9) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALQ scores</strong></td>
<td>Mean= 54</td>
<td>Mean= 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mode= 58</td>
<td>Mode=54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Median=55</td>
<td>Median=54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distribution of scores</strong></td>
<td>Normal distribution (SD= 5.05)</td>
<td>Normal distribution (SD= 3.90)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Item</th>
<th>All Participants (N = 61)</th>
<th>Interview Participants (N = 11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALQ Dimension ranking</strong></td>
<td>Moral/Ethical (3.63)</td>
<td>Moral/Ethical (3.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>all participants</strong></td>
<td>Transparency (3.35)</td>
<td>Self-Awareness (3.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balanced Processing (3.32)</td>
<td>Transparency (3.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-Awareness (3.31)</td>
<td>Balanced Processing (3.27)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section four contained one yes/no screening question asking the participant, if applicable, were they willing to participate in a follow-up interview. Of the 61 participants who completed the questionnaire, 82% of participants answered in the affirmative with yes (n = 50) indicating that they were willing to participant in a follow-up interview. Only 18% of participants declined (n = 11) the option to participate in a follow-up interview. Of the 82% of participants who agreed to participate in an interview, 22% or 11 participants were scheduled to participate in a semi-structured interview.

**Semi-Structured Interview Results**

A subset of 11 individuals from the 61 participants who completed the questionnaire participated in a semi-structured interview. Given that the intent of this study was to explore the influence of spirituality, if any, on the emergence of authentic leadership identity, it was important to interview participants who had been nominated as authentic leaders and affirmed and self-reported as such by their ALQ score. Participants who scored within the high (33-48) or very high (49-64) range on the ALQ scale and indicated ‘yes’ in section four of the Questionnaire (agreeing to participate in a follow-up interview) were invited to participate in semi-structured interviews.

As previously established, interview participants appropriately represent the overall sample of 61 participants, with slight differences attributable to the smaller number in the subset. Noteworthy for this researcher is to highlight a few characteristics of the interviewees before providing findings from the semi-structured interviews. An overview of interviewees’
characteristics is provided in Table 14. As designated by their title, seven of the participants are in some type of leadership positions. Interview participants are highly educated, with four holding a bachelor’s degree and six holding a master’s degree. All interview participants have at least four years of experience leading others, with eight having over ten years. Additionally, nine participants expressed some level of agreement when asked if they considered themselves to be spiritual leaders (Table 14).

Table 14

Summary of characteristics of interview participants (N = 11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant ID</th>
<th>Title Level</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Years Leading</th>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>ALQ Range</th>
<th>Spiritual?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>13-15</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>VH</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>16-18</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>VH</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>&lt; 25</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>VH</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>Generalist</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>19-21</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>VH</td>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>&lt; 25</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>VH</td>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>13-15</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>VH</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P9</td>
<td>Political Coach</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>&lt; 25</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>VH</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P10</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>&lt; 25</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>VH</td>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P11</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>VH</td>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interview participants were scheduled on a first come, first serve basis in response to the invitation. Eleven interviews were completed in total: three by way of Skype, two in person, and six over the telephone. Each interviewee was asked the same 13 pre-determined questions (see Appendix Q) which allowed participants to share their perceptions and beliefs regarding authentic leadership, themselves as authentic leaders, and spirituality as an influencer of their authentic leadership identity. The 13 interview questions produced a total of 604 coded passages which were further categorized into the following three themes: (a) perceptions of authentic leadership, (b) emergence of authentic leadership, and (c) perceptions of spirituality.

Themes were determined in connection with a review of literature, theoretical orientation, research questions, and a priori codes which were used to analyze and organize the interview data (Strauss & Quinn, 1997; Maxwell, 1996). Participants’ perceptions, values, and experiences are at the center of this researcher study and, thus, become the sources of data and natural focus for identifying themes (Bogdan & Bilken, 1992). Seven subthemes were identified as part of the coding cycle process as the themes were further filtered and analyzed. The researcher also kept reflective notes which aided in the identification of sub-themes. An added layer of validity was established by use of an inter-rater during the coding process. Themes and associated subthemes are presented in Table 15.

Table 15

Summary of themes and subthemes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Subthemes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Authentic Leadership (AL)</td>
<td>• Meaning of authentic leadership (AL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Descriptors of authentic leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Values of authentic leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergence of Authentic Leadership (AL)</td>
<td>• Development as a journey or process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Influences and experiences which encouraged the development of AL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Spirituality</td>
<td>• Influence of spirituality on identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Influence of spirituality on AL identity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interview participants were asked to define authentic leadership and describe how they see themselves as authentic leaders. Through the responses provided by participants and in conjunction with the research questions and a priori codes, three subthemes emerged: (a) meaning of authentic leadership, (b) behaviors of authentic leaders, and (c) values of authentic leaders. Each subtheme will be discussed further in the pages that follow.

The 17 coded passages of what participants attributed to the meaning of authentic leadership centered around authenticity, consistency between words and actions, honesty, vulnerability, consciousness of themselves and others, expressiveness and openness related to feelings, as well as the ability to be themselves no matter what the situation or consequence. Interview participants often provided a meaning of authentic leadership in terms of characteristics, behaviors, and interactions with others. Characteristics such as being authentic and true to oneself, genuine, transparent and compassionate with others, and expressive and open with their feelings and emotions were common. Participants spoke of authentic leaders as having consistency or agreement between what one says and what one does; highlighting the natural ability of authentic leaders to be who they are no matter the situation. Participant 11 spoke of authentic leadership as:

...a willingness to be vulnerable which is probably a great way to describe what it must be like for an authentic leader to really own their weaknesses and at the same time let their strengths shine all while being who they are and who they’ve always been, no matter the situation.

Other participants (shown as P#) offered the following related to the meaning of authentic leadership:

...a person who does not hide his feelings about what’s going on (P2).

It’s saying what I mean, meaning what I say, being honest in my approach to people (P3).
...being true to myself but I am also being true to the employees which I manage (P6).

It’s a very natural leadership...somebody who truly puts the goal and mission of the organization ahead of themselves and isn’t self-centered (P7).

...somebody who cares and thinks about those that are around him (P9).

I would describe them as somebody who understands, respects and appreciates their natural, and I’m going to use the word "God given gifts" (P11).

Participant 4 summed up the meaning of authentic leadership up by stating:

Authentic leadership means that you act in accordance with your thoughts, beliefs and morals when dealing with people and employees within a working environment or even in personal life as a leader. That, as an authentic leader, you can be open and honest and communicate with transparency and compassion for others, while keeping an open mind and looking for a mutually beneficial relationship with colleagues and staff.

Responses related to how participants would describe themselves as authentic leaders were established using the four existing dimensions of authentic leadership as defined by the literature (Walumbwa, et al., 2009). The four dimensions created the initial a priori codes of self-awareness (know thyself), internalized moral perspective (do the right thing), relational transparency (be genuine), and balanced processing (be fair-minded). According to Table 16, these codes produced 102 coded phrases.

During the coding process an additional sub-theme emerged which fell outside of the scope of the initial four AL dimensions. This sub-theme was identified as social skills and produced 93 coded phrases; nearly as many phrases as the AL dimensions combined. Social skills, as defined by Gresham and Elliott (1984) represent socially acceptable, learned competencies and behaviors which facilitate interactions and communications with others and, ultimately, influences how others are treated. These social skills, while possibly inferred by the four AL dimensions, go beyond the qualities of self-awareness, transparency, fair-mindedness, temperance, fortitude, and morality. Examples of these social skills, pulled from the coded
interviews, are provided in Table 16. Table 16 also includes a summary of the coding of sub-themes, code definitions, and coding frequencies.

Table 16

*Summary of coding of sub-themes for descriptors of AL, associated definitions, and coding frequency.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Coding Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Awareness (Know thyself)</strong></td>
<td>True to one’s self, authentic (psychological way of being). Aware of strengths, limitations, and perceived impact on others. Behaviors are in alignment and are consistent with their personal values and beliefs (Avolio &amp; Gardner, 2005).</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relational Transparency (Be genuine)</strong></td>
<td>This involves being honest, open, and straightforward in dealing with others which reinforces a level of openness with others that provides them with an opportunity to be forthcoming with their ideas, challenges and opinions (Gardner &amp; Walumbwa, 2007).</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internalized Moral Perspective (Do the right thing)</strong></td>
<td>An ethical core. Knowing the right thing to do and is driven by a concern for ethics and fairness. Setting a high standard for moral and ethical conduct. The moral courage to use inner principles to do what is good for others, regardless of the threat or risk to self (Kiddler, 2005)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balanced Processing (Be fair-minded)</strong></td>
<td>Solicits opposing viewpoints and considers all options before choosing a course of action. There is no impulsive actions or hidden agendas. Plans are well thought out and openly discussed before making important decisions (Gardner &amp; Walumbwa, 2007)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Skills (How to treat people)</strong></td>
<td>Establishes a sense of loyalty with others. Listens and communicates empathically. Behaves with humility, altruism, advocacy, and compassion. Emotionally expressive, and acts in ways that are respectful, considerate, optimistic, encouraging, and inspirational towards themselves and others. Having a mindset of purpose and vision that extends beyond sense of self.</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interestingly, when participants were asked to describe themselves as an authentic leader, half of the participants admitted that they did not consider themselves to be an authentic leader before being asked to participate in this study. This sentiment was not because participants did not believe themselves to be authentic leaders but, rather, because they had not differentiated
themselves beyond who they are naturally as individuals. Five participants shared similar sentiments to those expressed below:

*I didn't consider myself an authentic leader until [name removed] text me and said, "I have a friend who is doing this study and I think you fit it perfectly." So, I've never really considered myself an authentic leader. I know I'm different (P1).*

*You know what, I really didn't think of myself as an authentic leader until I was asked to participate in this (P3).*

Six participants acknowledged that they either knew they were different, naturally saw themselves as leaders, and/or expressed that they had always been called on to represent or lead a group, whether in the workplace or in school.

*For some reason I always ended up being the leader, making sure things were getting done and doing all that. I think that's when I really grasped the concept of "I am a leader". I just didn't know where that skillset would take me (P1).*

*I knew deep down inside of myself that I had the right qualities for a great foundation as a leader. I knew I was an authentic person, and in my own mind, I knew that was enough (P4).*

*I think I just have that personality that drove me to-- maybe I want to equate it to a natural born leader-- because people always gravitated always to me to help find solutions to whatever the problem was whether it was personal or work related. I was always sought out to be, maybe, the spokesman for the class in situations (P6).*

*As I progressed in my life, I always just fell into leadership roles (P5).*

*...while I've never been one to strive for a title of leadership, I always seem to be that person that other people, you know, designate or look to for direction and leadership...it really was other people who looked at me for guidance and they were people who were being managed by other-- who weren't even my staff members who didn't look to their own leaders but looked to me for guidance and direction (P9).*

Participants described themselves as authentic leaders in terms of characteristics, beliefs, behaviors, and/or interactions and relationships with others. Often, one phrase of an interview would be coded using multiple codes because participants would speak to several AL dimensions and social skills in one response. The following excerpts provide direct examples of participants
who described themselves in terms of characteristics and behaviors related to self-awareness, internalized moral perspective, relational transparency, balanced processing, and social skills.

I would describe myself-- there’s a couple of characteristics that I’ve leveraged. First of all is my just natural attitude and so, I really have done some extra work in being able to maintain a positive attitude and the belief that if we’ve set a vision and I’m clear about the vision and the expectations then my followers will be inspired to follow me and will know that they can trust that I’m going to lead them through whatever it is that we’re trying to do in a way that does not upset them and or if it does then I’m right there to figure out, together how did I move you into an area of upset or unrest and how can we get through it (P5).

Uh, well I have been consistently true-- my actions, I would say, are guided exactly by who I am and my, um, sense of right or wrong and my sort of overarching tendencies to be like a protective person (P7).

You got to be able to communicate who you are otherwise you don’t garner a lot of trust and if somebody is watching you it takes much longer for them to get to the realization that you're somebody they can trust. So, communication becomes important that you walk it and you can talk it and then eventually it becomes about being able to express and organize group and talk about expectations and goals with a sense of purpose, to be an effective leader. So, the authenticity I would say, for me, is being an example and then the leader aspect of me that needed to grow would be the communication of expectation and goals, along with our purpose (P11).

Some participants also spoke to competencies or values such as the need to be authentic, honest, open, and expressive with his/her emotions.

I would describe myself as an authentic leader by the very way in which I conduct myself and behave with others in the workplace. I am very cognizant of building rapport and trust with people I work with, and do that by being myself, by following the convictions that I feel deeply inside, rather than always following guiding principles of the organization or which leadership philosophy they are following (P4).

Other participants described themselves by way of their interactions and relationships with others. One participant shared a sense of having to be inspirational and model the way, as well as be emotionally expressive, authentic, kind and open with others:

You have to inspire the people toward something, and you have to do that together. You have to show them the way to get there and, of course, you need to motivate them to achieve something very important to them but it’s more than leadership because you have to share your emotions when you are achieving some kind of very important objectives.
You have to be very honest, very open. They need to feel that you are there together, you are there for them. They need to feel that what you are feeling is authentic. It's not something you are feeling because you need to motivate them as a professional. You are feeling because you are there, and you care about them (P2).

While another participant expressed a sense of altruism and advocacy when stating the following:

*I can only say that I do my best to put others first in their developmental goals. I'm here to facilitate this for them. I'm not the individual who is responsible for whether they move ahead or not in their work, but I feel like I am their advocate if I am given responsibility for them as a manager* (P3).

One participant described herself as an authentic leader by being in a mutually beneficial relationship with others:

*I operate with the thought in mind that any person that works with me is here for a moment, you know what I mean? It's like-- to me that is almost spiritual. I feel like gifted people in your life, whether its personal or professional. You are gifted people for a moment in time and if I'm going to be working with them I want it to be the best, and most productive relationship for both of us* (P9).

Interview participants were asked to describe their values as authentic leaders. This question resulted in 65 coded phrases describing 21 values expressed by participants. Participants expressed explicit values which made clear the inferences they may have made when speaking to the meaning of authentic leadership. These values also reinforce the perceptions participants hold about themselves as authentic leaders. Several of the values can be considered pre-requisites or complimentary competencies related to the AL dimensions and social skills discussed under the theme: descriptors of authentic leaders. For example, the AL dimension of balanced processing describes the behavior of being fair-minded and soliciting opposing and alternative viewpoints. The ability to listen effectively, act respectfully, and create a sense of supportiveness, loyalty, and openness can be viewed as essential to creating the
conditions necessary to achieve a positive climate and successful outcomes. A participant expressed listening as a value of being fair-minded in his dealing with those he leads:

*For me, listening to the employee or listening to the individuals that I'm either responsible for or that I'm leading. Listening to them and finding out what it is that they want and what it is that they would be most comfortable with. It's important that I always see their side of it because I may not see it the same way they do. So, I think it's understanding what others are looking for and facilitating to the best that I can the pieces that are correct (P3).*

One participant expressed the following relating to how building relationships through compassion, altruism, transparency, and discretion are a part of an internalized moral perspective:

*Integrity to me is all about acting in ways that are ethically and morally consistent and correct. So, those were at the heart—then, I always attempted to be honest and there were— that could be a challenge because the higher you rise in an organization, the more often you're going to be given information that maybe you can't share broadly. So, I often would have trouble with that. Somebody would come and say, "what's going on, I really need to know blah, blah, blah?" I know there were times that I could violate that code of leadership of, you know, keeping things close to the vest. But, I also wanted employees, or partners, or constituents to know, "Hey, I'm invested in you as well and I'm concerned about your wellbeing, so, let me share what I can." So, you know those three things: honesty, integrity and openness were probably key behaviors or values, excuse me, values for me (P10).*

After describing their values, participants were asked if these values are consistent with the values they hold in their everyday lives. All participants answered affirmatively that the values they hold in their professional lives as authentic leaders are also the values they hold in their everyday lives. Participants expressed this congruency of values across their personal and professional lives in a few different ways:

*Yes, absolutely they are. I do not feel like I oscillate or change any of my deep-rooted beliefs or behaviors at work, or at home. Rather I feel fairly consistent in my behaviors both in my everyday life, I'm hardwired like this, and really believe that to be true (P4).*

*Absolutely. Absolutely. In fact, many years ago I took this interesting test to see if I have a [name removed] friend face and a [name removed] family face and a [name removed]*
professional face and so on and so on. The test revealed what I already knew- I'm me all the time; good, bad or indifferent (P5).

One participant, specifically, spoke to not being able to imagine holding values contradictory to her own:

Yea, I think so, yeah, yeah absolutely. Life's too short. I can't imagine being unethical or immoral or you know-- It's just didn't -- I don't think there was a time where I was confronted with having to go, you know, way off course of that kind of moral or ethical compass. I can't imagine doing that so, yes (P10).

Figure 6 provides a summary of the values expressed by participants as well as how those values align with the sub-themes identified under descriptors of authentic leaders.
Figure 6. Values of authentic leaders in relation to the sub-themes of descriptors of authentic leaders.
Interview participants were asked questions related to their development as an authentic leader. Through the responses provided by participants and in conjunction with the research questions and a priori codes, two subthemes emerged: (a) development as a journey or process, and (b) influences and experiences which encouraged the development of authentic leadership. These two subthemes were utilized 128 times when coding participant responses.

Participants were asked at what age they identified themselves as authentic leaders. According to Table 17, the responses provided by participants ranged from as early as 14 years old to 43 years old. In using the ages identified by the nine participants who provided an age, the average age at which participants identified themselves as authentic leaders was approximately 31 years old. Two participants, which included the youngest of interview participants (P11), were not sure at what age they would have considered themselves an authentic leader acknowledging:

_Uh, I wish it were so easy. I, you know, tragically, I'm going to tell you and maybe I've been advocated for and didn’t necessarily deserve it. From day to day, you know, I wouldn't describe myself-- It was much easier-- you asked the first question, "how would you describe an authentic leader", you didn't ask me "why I was an authentic leader". You did ask my what were the principles or values of an authentic leader or how would you describe yourself as one. I gave you the aspects that I think make me an authentic leader and now I'm going to tell you the truth and that's that I'm still trying to figure this out. Honestly, I'm still trying to figure it out. But, I believe it's a daily trial and error to learn more about yourself, to learn more about your strengths and weaknesses, and how that interlocks with everybody around you that you may be leading or that you may be taking the lead from (P11)._

_Umm, I don’t know if I necessarily have, you know. Uh, you know, I try to be an authentic person so I don't-- like, until we start having these conversations, it wasn't necessarily something that I was like, "I'm an authentic leader." yea, I think that I just--it's a way that I've approached things for me personally. It's just trying to be someone who is a certain way as a human being and not necessarily as a leader and, uh, I never really worried about the other stuff, right (P8)._

Participants were then asked if they felt they became a more authentic leader over time and if so, how. Table 17 provides a side-by-side snapshot of each participants’ current age, age
he/she identified themselves as an authentic leader, as well as sentiments towards becoming a more effective authentic leader over time. All participants shared the belief that they became a more effective leader over time. As evidenced in Table 17, participants used terms such as grow, growing, or becoming and metaphors such as journey or process to describe their perceived effectiveness over time. These terms resulted in 34 coded phrases. Three participants also offered analogies to help support their sentiments:

Maybe not my first rodeo on a lot of the stuff. I've seen that movie a few times. I get to, because I've seen that movie, maybe change the ending-- a little bit to a happier ending, maybe not (P6).

In sports people reference it as in "the game is slowing down", you know like, so you get into college football or you get into pro football and when you've been in it for a while, things tend to slow down a little bit for you. So, you can make decisions better and faster. So, I think that is where it seems to be as it's evolved. It's like, I see the game moving a little slower which allows me to make better decisions, you know (P8).

...you know, I compare it to dieting where it's like you need to lose weight and see somebody who has lost all this weight, on the commercial, and they're like fifty pounds small and you're like, "Oh my gosh, I want to be there. I want to lose all that weight and wear that bikini." ...But there's a process to it, you know what I mean (P9).

Table 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant ID</th>
<th>Current Age Range</th>
<th>Age identified self as AL</th>
<th>Do you feel you have become a more effective authentic leader over time? If so, how?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>&quot;Yes, I've managed to basically grow alongside my coworkers and see everything that they go through on a regular basis and take all that and really look at that and consider it. As I've moved up through the ranks it's so much easier to understand and relate to what their struggles are because I've been there...&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>&quot;Yes, a very difficult question. But, I believe that people are still telling me that I have to grow as a leader because I still need to learn.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
Do you feel you have become a more effective authentic leader over time? If so, how?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant ID</th>
<th>Current Age Range</th>
<th>Age identified self as AL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Uh, I would say yes. It's by, honestly, putting my money where my mouth is...I have gone to my executives when I felt my staff was underappreciated and undervalued and I wanted them to get increases and they said to me, "I'll give you five increases this year. Pick the five people"...I always take myself off that list and I put my money where my mouth is for others because in showing how much I value them-- when I know money is on the line here, I would take from myself and give to them because I believe they are undervalued and underappreciated by others.”

“I feel like I am more confident in myself now, and where my confidence comes from is knowing at the end of the day that I am a good person, with a big heart and an understanding mind for people. I am confident that I can help them solve problems, expand their horizons, guide them through difficulty and help ease discomfort with my leadership skills, which really are just guided mostly by my own guiding principles, sprinkled in with some effective leadership techniques picked up over the years.”

“I am absolutely becoming a better leader all of the time. I think that's because I work very hard to devote extraordinary amounts of time to research, reading, seminars, and networking to find the best ways to do it... So, it is devotion to the craft of leadership that constantly leads me to improving.”

“Yes, absolutely. And, I guess it comes back to life experiences. Maybe not my first rodeo on a lot of the stuff. I've seen that movie a few times. I get to, because I've seen that movie, maybe change the ending-- a little bit to a happier ending, maybe not. It just depends on what's going on but, uh, yes.”

“Oh, absolutely. I think just--I think a lot through self-reflection and trying, you know, the best that I can. It's really hard to face yourself-- like really, really face yourself 100% of the time (laughing). It's really, really hard but, I think, um, yea, I think just through self-reflection-- repeatedly, over time and, like, for the purpose of wanting to understand, and wanting to be better, and wanting to change, and wanting to evolve and wanting to just, you know, be the best self-- be my best self and historically, it's been 'be my best self for the sake of others' and now it's 'be myself for the sake of myself', you know.”

“I mean, I think it's a journey every day, right, a learning experience and so, I went back to school, uh, you know just trying to expand my knowledge base... trying to understand more--become more self-aware, right, and finding how I approach things and why I do certain things the way I do, how I process information best, how I'm able to really control my reactions and everything that I have control over, you know, because that's going to make me a better leader, right. If I'm able to handle (Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant ID</th>
<th>Current Age Range</th>
<th>Age identified self as AL</th>
<th>Do you feel you have become a more effective authentic leader over time? If so, how?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P8</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>(Continued) whatever I need to handle emotionally and/or handle each given situation because it's always going to be different—changing the experience, environment, information that you'll need to go through. So, I think that that's been a lot of it over the last year and a half or so.” “Yes, I do. I think I was like most people-- it's a lot like-- you know, I compare it to dieting where it's like you need to lose weight and see somebody who has lost all this weight, on the commercial, and they're like fifty pounds small and you're like, &quot;Oh my gosh, I want to be there. I want to lose all that weight and wear that bikini.&quot; ...But there's a process to it, you know what I mean. Yeah, it would be nice if I could just take a pill and be like, &quot;Hey, I'm swimsuit summer ready&quot; but, there was a process for that person to get there and I think we do the same thing in terms of leaders... An authentic leader recognizes that there's always something to learn. There's-- I don't care how great you get-- there's always something to learn, some way to better yourself as a leader.” “Oh yea, absolutely. And, you know, it's a pretty easy one to answer because you're going to be subjected to, uh, different situations, different factors and probably experience all the time and, you know, to the day that I retired, I was constantly facing new issues to deal with.” “Yes, and very simply going back to the tenacity, the work ethic. Every single day, relentlessly trying to get better, every day, every day, at every single thing. Just a little bit better. That's my mark. It's like the guy who's out in the middle of the desert, starving and thirsty. If he could just get one arm out in front of the other one more time, he's made progress. And that's where I am, every day.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P9</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P10</td>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P11</td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants were asked to reflect on how their identity as an authentic leader formed or emerged. Responses provided by participants centered around four specific influencers which participants believe to have contributed to their emergence as an authentic leader: (a) upbringing / parental influence, (b) religious upbringing / influence, (c) life experiences, and (d) leadership examples. These four influencers resulted in 94 coded phrases. Figure 7 provides participants’ perceptions of the influencers which contributed to their emergence as an authentic leader.
Figure 7. Participants’ perceptions of the influencers which contributed to their emergence as an authentic leader.
To further explore the emergence of authentic leadership, participants were asked to share examples of specific experiences, people, or events which contributed to or encouraged their identity as authentic leaders. Participants often provided responses recounting their experiences across several influencers identified in Figure 7 and/or provided multiple examples within one influencer type. For example, participant 9 spoke to several life experiences which constituted trial and error as the basis for her emergence. However, she also spoke to negative leadership examples which influenced her style as a leader. Table 18 provides a visual account of the types and variation of influencers reported by participants when describing their experiences.

Table 18

*Influencers reported by participants when asked to provide examples which contributed to or encouraged the development of an AL identity (N = 11)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant ID</th>
<th>Leadership Examples + or -</th>
<th>Life Experience + or -</th>
<th>Upbringing / Parental Influence</th>
<th>Religious Upbringing / Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P9</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P10</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P11</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participants provided multiple examples and accounts across their life experience which further supports the possibility that multiple influencers at different ages and stages of life contribute to an ongoing development of a participant’s authentic leadership identity.

*I ended up in leadership, uh, maybe earlier than I should've or felt comfortable with, I should say. Again, I--I had no training. I came out of college with a very technical degree, Computer Science, uh, and I really thought that's what I was going to do for the rest of my life, you know, code. And, all of a sudden, I think I was maybe twenty years into my working career, work life, when they said, "We want you to supervise these contractors." And, actually it was quite unusually because I was working in Germany at the time and there were different labor laws and I had to learn all kinds of things. But, uh, and so, I know that I made mistakes during those days. I didn't think about maybe what I was saying, you know (P10).

This participant, who was self-reported as being retired, also shared:

*One of my-- One of the last leaders that I had, a very senior level person, was a great strategist and incredibly gifted in thinking through where we needed to go and kind of how we could get there but, his approach to dealing with people was uh, just didn't need to be that way. It just didn’t. So, again, I think it's by example. You learn from what you seek out. Um, what is, I think, key in that process, for me, is stepping back and saying, "Ok, how do I think about that? Was that leader's behavior or even value system, uh, good, bad or indifferent as I perceived it?" (P10)

Participant 8 shared his experience playing sports and the influence of his coaches in his early adulthood, but he also referenced the impact of his teammates:

*I was in college playing on the football team and we went to a summer camp where it was just our team trying to get to know each other better and, uh-- you know, I'm-- I grew up in a middle class family-- we broke up into teams or in smaller groups and one of the kids on -- a question that was asked when doing some teambuilding was, "what's the toughest thing you ever had to go through and how did you get through it or whatever?" And, the answer that this kid had-- he was from somewhere local here--and he said, "Well, my dad killed my mom and, uh, he's in jail and, you know, I was raised by my grandma. I found football and x, y, z." And, then it comes to me and I'm like, "ah, yea. Uh, the hardest thing I've had to deal with?" and just really put things in perspective for what my life experience has been. So, I think, it's stuff like that where you kind of get knocked back and you kind of realize, you know, that sometimes your typical experience may not be, you know, typical for everybody, right. And, uh, so, when you have that mindset collective mindset of, "hey, I'm with that guy and I'm with this girl within this work environment.” You know, I think that's kind of where that [authentic leadership] stems from (P8).
While participant 7 initially spoke to a feeling of having always been an authentic leader from an early age, she described a few pivotal points in her life which influenced the emergence of her authentic leadership identity. The first was related to the influence of religion, she referenced a Christian upbringing but, at the age of 20 years old explored an alternate religious sect:

_I made a decision to be a Jehovah's Witness at a certain point in my life but then I was like, "hmm, this is too much for me." But, I learned that-- we read somewhere that Solomon asked for wisdom-- that's like something he asked for and he got it. I was like, "Oh, ok, great. I'll just do that." (laughing). I swear, I swear I remember saying the prayer and I swear I remember like feeling wiser after that. So, that's something that has always, uh, stuck with me because despite whether or not I'm sort of involved in a formal religion or not that's always been something that I know that if I pray, I can just rely on those prayers (P7)._  

The second pivotal moment for participant 7 was a work experience which occurred in her mid-twenties:

_There was a very pivotal point where my boss’s daughter got brain cancer and he just like-- she was sixteen. And, um, he left the company and he had to go deal with his kid, potentially, like, dying really soon. And that was very-- that was sort of like an event that was really a specific event that I can point to that's just burned into my memory as far as like a pivotal point where I got very comfortable with my leadership because I had no other choice. I was like, uh I don't know; 26, 27 and, like, my boss just left the company and we were a small development company and we had things like-- tens of millions of dollars on the line and somebody had to do something (P7)._  

Similarly, participant 5 spoke to his parents being significant influencers in his development as a child, however, he described his early professional experiences:

_I was always the leader so when I segued into professional life, I saw the emergence of my ability to show up real and as I was going along my leadership journey making adjustments, making a very concerted effort to strive for excellence and reevaluate. So, when I saw that, perhaps, in a certain environment or with a certain person, if my authentic leadership was not yielding the results that I was hoping to achieve, then I reevaluated and reassessed (P5)._  

Participant 11 spoke to his mother being a significant influencer throughout his life, yet added, all in one account multiple influencers:
If anything, my life from the age of 10 to 17 could be described as just hard work. I'm willing to do the work that most wouldn't be willing to do. Sports, whether it was a job, it didn't matter, at home. So, my mom always told me that I lead by example and I really like that. But then as you get into a professional career hard work wasn't enough. I didn't know that [laughs]. You know, young, naive, and just believed that being a stickler on things is enough and if you stick with it long enough and your tough enough about it then everybody else will get on board. Well, in a professional career that doesn't work so well and certainly as supervisors, managers or leaders, it's important that you still lead by example but it's equally important that you be able to communicate with people well (P11).

...there was no other way to describe him but than to be a mentor for me. It was long after I'd been there-- he didn't have very much in common with my dad or my mom but, he was very much a Christian. Some of the things we would discuss and some of the books he would share with me to read, I would call it a fellowship that we would have. We would have these conversations about what these books are trying to say and what it means to him and how it influenced him and what it meant to me and how it influenced me, and he would take something that I would say, and he would take it so much deeper and so much further than I could have ever gone, right. And that's by virtue of having 25-30 years over me and having the experience. But, I would say it's because of the willingness to be mentored by someone who was a good leader and my parents teaching me that from an early age to have some respect and reverence for some type of authority, and he was my boss, that I could listen to that and accept it (P11).

Interview participants were asked questions related to spirituality. Through the responses provided by participants and in conjunction with the research questions and a priori codes, two subthemes emerged: (a) influence of spirituality on identity, and (c) influence of spirituality on authentic leadership identity. These two subthemes were utilized 110 times when coding participant responses.

When completing the questionnaire, participants were asked to read the definition of spirituality and respond to the statement, “I believe myself to be a spiritual person.” According to data reported in an earlier section (Table 14), nine of eleven interview participants responded in the affirmative with four strongly agreeing and five somewhat agreeing that they believed themselves to be spiritual. The remaining two participants either responded with neither agree or disagree or somewhat disagreed.
During the interview, participants were read the definition of spirituality but, this time asked if they would describe themselves as a spiritual leader, why or why not (see Appendix Q for interview questions). Spirituality was defined as “a human belief in, movement toward, and relationship with a higher purpose or power, self, and others from which a sense of purpose, consciousness, interconnectedness, and destiny may be derived” (Swift, 2003, p. 5). Figure 8 aligns the results mined from the questionnaire with perceptions expressed by participants during the interview.

Responses provided during the interview were in alignment with responses reported from the questionnaire. The four participants who strongly agreed in the questionnaire, provided responses such as:

...I’m spiritual because I believe in that interconnectedness...that you draw and you bring what you—like you can manifest what you want (P7).

I definitely think that I am doing the job and the work that the Lord wants me to do in serving the community and leading the staff (P1).

...I believe that there is a purpose – everybody has a purpose (P3).

...I see myself as a vessel of God who has been placed on Earth to bring those things to fruition...I see much of what I do as bigger than me (P9).

Whereas those the five participants who somewhat agreed provided responses such as:

...I believe everything that I touch or am involved in has a connection to something else and I don’t see how possible that could be without a greater presence maybe driving those decisions or helping me make those decisions (P6).

I would describe myself as a spiritual leader because in my research and devotion to improving myself, not only as a leader but as a well-rounded individual... (P5).

I think it’s just that connection and, I think that we have, as human beings, with our surrounding, with each other, with, I don’t know, the world around us (P8).

Now I don’t identify religiously with any particular sect, I’m not atheist or agnostic. I do believe there is something greater than us (P11).
I would consider myself as a spiritual leader because if I really think about it and the guiding principles that I am motivated by do come from a place of spirituality (P4).

Interestingly, the last two participants who responded either with neither agree or disagree with or somewhat disagree provided some insight into their beliefs on spirituality. Participant 2 (neither agree or disagree) acknowledged some sense of being a spiritual leader when he shared:

One situation I would describe myself as a spiritual leader, in one situation. When they [referencing his employees] asking for some help in the field of education that they need support, so I can guide them, I can mentor them as a leader, a teacher, as a boss...that's a strong connection (P2).

Whereas participant 10 (somewhat disagree) and while he acknowledged he was raised in a pretty strong Christian environment and attended one year at a Lutheran College, he did share:

...I've tended to drift [referencing from religion] and having said that, that doesn't mean that my time, um during those days and through the teaching that I learned didn't have an effect on who I am today (P10).

As highlighted in Figure 8, the justifications reflected self-held beliefs about themselves and their spirituality.
Figure 8. Participants’ perceptions related to their spirituality as leaders.
Interview participants were asked how spirituality may have influenced their identity. Given nine of the eleven participants acknowledged themselves as spiritual leaders, while the remaining two acknowledge a sense of spiritual influence, this question was analyzed along with two items from questionnaire. The first was “spirituality influences my beliefs about leadership,” and the second was “spirituality influences the way I behave as a leader.” Referenced from data provided in an earlier section (Table 14), 90% of interview participants provided some level of agreement that spirituality influences their beliefs about leadership. Similarly, 90% provided some level of agreement that spirituality influences the way they behave as a leader.

Figure 9 highlights participants’ perceptions related to the influence of spirituality on their identity. Quotes were not linked to the questionnaire item responses of specific participants due to the high levels of agreeance that spirituality influences participants’ leadership beliefs and behaviors. The examples provided when participants were asked how spirituality influences their identity further support and acknowledged the influence spirituality has on their beliefs and behaviors. Several participants acknowledged that their upbringing and the nurturing from their parents, who were religious or believed in God, had strong influences on their core values, principles and beliefs:

*I’d say every part of my nurturing had everything to do with the principles and values from the Bible, the teachings of Christianity (P11).*

*My parents still go to church and, obviously, they had a huge impact on my life. I think they’ve had a huge impact on my life and so, those core values I don’t think have changed (P8).*

A few participants described the influences of a higher power or God on their journey or purpose, and even who they are as individuals:
God has placed you on this Earth to do some big things and those big things aren’t always going to necessarily be something that you directly benefit from but, at the end of the day, you’ll be able to – I’ll be able to rest my head on my deathbed and say, “Ok, these were some things that I did.” (P9)

The ideas that I have about a universal power very much guide me in actions and behaviors I choose to display in everyday life and in my work (P4).

Participants acknowledged that spirituality helps them define who they are and who they want to be, as well as how to behave and how to treat others:

Spirituality is helping me to have a more clear understanding of my actual identity (P7).

So, by surrounding myself with a constant reminder of what I want to do and who I want to be serves to fulfill my authenticity (P5).

I can guide them, I can mentor them as a leader, a teacher, as a boss because I know what I am talking about, you know? That’s the strong connection (P2).

I think people acknowledge you based on the things you say, the deeds you do and just in general the type of individual you display yourself as (P3).

The key tenants of all those religions, I think, are all about being a good person and making the world a better place... So, I truly believe that while you ought to be trying to make it the best, not just for yourself but everybody you come into contact with (P10).
Figure 9. Participants’ perceptions related to the influences of spirituality on their identity.
As part of the final interview questions, participants were asked how spirituality may have influenced or contributed to the emergence of their authentic leadership identity. They were also asked to share a few experiences or events they felt capture the way spirituality has influenced or contributed to the emergence of their authentic leadership identity. Throughout these responses, participants credited their spirituality with influencing their values and beliefs, defining their principles and ethics, and providing a framework for how to live and treat people. Nine of the 11 participants spoke to the belief that spirituality encouraged their purpose or destiny in life or acted as a guide or energy which lead them.

The following are perceptions of participants as to how spirituality influenced their emergence as authentic leaders. Participants credited their spirituality with shaping their value system, ethics and sense of right and wrong which now influences the values they hold as authentic leaders:

“I'd go back to growing up in the church and my family. My parents still go to church and, obviously, they had a huge impact on my life. I think they've had a huge impact on my life and so, those core values I don't think have changed, um. So, I think that value system plus what I mentioned just of how I approach now.” (P8)

I-- that question makes me immediate think back to being-- my ethical leadership. This idea that, you know, kind of like do unto others as you would have them do unto you and if you don't, uh, you will suffer negative consequences at some point and so, I think that's the, in terms of spirituality, it has been that universal principle of 'do unto others as you would have them do unto you' (P9).

It goes back to me making my decisions and how I operate according to what I was taught in the word is correct, that's how I operate and handle my everyday life. I've been asked to do things that don't align with that and I've said no. It may not be the easiest thing but at the end of the day, I still did what was right based on what my beliefs were.” (P1)

Participants credited their spirituality with providing a framework or frame of reference:

“I think more than anything, it provided me with a framework, a proper, and appropriate and feel good framework for my own mind to work from. I knew it was good starting
point, because it felt real, and good and not filled with bad intentions, or faulty intentions or meaninglessness.” (P4)

“Well, you know, again it's saying what I mean, meaning what I say, being honest in my approach to people. If something is wrong, there’s no way I'm going to sugarcoat it and agree that it’s right; it just isn't. Again, this is according to me. It may be right according to others but it’s not right according to me and I can only speak for myself. My ethics play a large part in this. You know, I would never-- I would have to say -- I just don't, I just don’t...this is kind of hard. I think my spirituality is something that I feel is personal (P3).

Participants also expressed that spirituality provided guidelines as to how to behave and how to treat others:

...I’m a walking case study that reinforces the principles that I believe in and how they can facilitate a marvelous life and a marvelous leadership life (P5).

The main word that comes to my mind when you talk about spirituality is to touch the heart. That’s something when you started these questions-- the only way to make people believe is to touch their hearts. This is a powerful interest from spirituality, no? They need to feel that you are authentic, that what you are doing is touching their heart and I don't think that’s a kind of technique or leadership skill. I strongly believe that this is something that you are doing because you love to do it not because the position requires or the companies demanding. It's a kind of leadership skill for free, I don't know the right word (P2).

Uh, I think it has put me in check a few times. I definitely think I could have been a rather nasty person if went unchecked. By staying in check and thinking about the Golden Rule a lot it’s helped me and kept me well balanced (P6).

The key tenants in all of those religions, I think, are all about being a good person and making the world a better place. Now, the key in all of this is, for me, has always been about being careful not to-- well, more than just on leadership-- being careful not to think of the afterlife as being a place to get to, uh, and completely ignoring your time here on earth. So, I truly believe that while you ought to be trying to make it the best, not just for yourself but everybody you come into contact with.” (P10)

Study Key Findings

Throughout this chapter, data were analyzed to provide a quantitative and qualitative story of the beliefs, values and life experiences of individuals as a way to understand their emergence as authentic leaders. Specifically, data were gathered and thematically analyzed to understand if
spirituality may influence or contribute to the emergence of an authentic leadership identity. A diverse sample of 61 participants were nominated as authentic leaders by others responded to the invitation to participant in this study (Table 10). A sub-set of 11 participants completed semi-structured interviews. The rich responses gathered from the questionnaire completed by all 61 participants, as well as the semi-structured interviews completed by 11 participants inspired several key findings.

A slightly higher amount of men (62%, n = 38) than women (38%, n = 23) are represented as authentic leaders in this study. A significant percent of participants is between the ages of 35-64 years old (82%, n = 50). Minorities represent 51% of the population (n = 31). A little over a third of the population is married or in a domestic partnership (77%, n = 47). Most participants are either employed full-time or self-employed (87%, n = 59) with 10 or more years in the workplace (72%, n = 44), and have 10 or more years of experience leading others (75%, n = 45). Participants are highly educated with 89% holding some type of post-secondary degree or professional degree (n = 54).

In addition to being nominated as authentic leaders, the ALQ instrument assisted in confirming that nominated individuals were authentic leaders (Table 13). Nearly all but one participant believes themselves to be an authentic leader (98%, n = 60). Most of the participants scored within the very high range (82%, n = 50) while the remaining eleven participants scored within the high range (n = 11). The highest dimension of authentic leadership expressed by the ALQ instrument for participants was internalized moral processing (3.63) followed by relational transparency (3.35), then balanced processing (3.32), and self-awareness (3.31).

Participants affirmed the influence of spirituality on the beliefs and behaviors of their identity as leaders (Table 12). Nearly all participants, who confirmed themselves as authentic
leaders, also believed themselves to be spiritual (94%, n = 57). A significant number of authentic leaders affirmed the belief that spirituality influences their beliefs about leadership (90%, n = 55) and their behaviors as leaders (90%, n = 55). Additionally, authentic leaders affirmed the belief that their spirituality influences their authenticity as a leader (90%, n = 55), as well as their self-awareness as a leader (90%, n = 55) (Table 12).

Participants who completed the semi-structured interview closely represented the overall population in this study (Table 10). A mix of men (55%, n = 6) and women (45%, n = 5) are represented as authentic leaders. A significant percent of participants is between the ages of 35-64 years old (91%, n = 9). Minorities represent 36% of the population (n = 4) with 64% being Caucasian (n = 7). The majority of interview participants are married or in a domestic partnership (82%, n = 9). Most participants are either employed full-time or self-employed (82%, n = 9) with 10 or more years in the workplace (82%, n = 8), and have 10 or more years of experience leading others (73%, n = 8). Interview participants are highly educated with 91% holding some type of post-secondary or professional degree (n = 9).

All interview participants believe themselves to be an authentic leader (100%, n = 11) (Table 12). Most participants fell within the very high range (82%, n = 9) while the remaining two participants fell with the high range (18%) on the ALQ. The highest dimension of authentic leadership expressed for interview participants was internalized moral processing (3.50) followed by self-awareness (3.34), then transparency (3.31), and balanced processing (3.27) (Table 13).

Participants affirmed that spirituality influences their beliefs and behaviors as leaders (Table 12). All except two interview participants believed themselves to be spiritual (82%, n = 9). Nine of the eleven interview participants affirmed the belief that spirituality influences their
beliefs about leadership (82%, n = 9) and their behaviors as leaders (82%, n = 9). Additionally, interview participants affirmed the belief that their spirituality influences their authenticity as a leader (73%, n = 8), as well as their self-awareness as a leader (82%, n = 8) (Table 12).

When asked to provide a meaning of authentic leadership, interview participants defined the concept in terms of characteristics, behaviors, and interactions with others. Characteristics such as being authentic and true to oneself, genuine, transparent and compassionate with others, and expressive or open with their feelings and emotions were common. Interview participants spoke of authentic leaders as having consistency or agreement between what one says and what one does; highlighting the natural ability of authentic leaders to be who they are no matter the situation. Participant 4 best represented all responses by summing up the meaning of authentic leadership as follows:

Authentic leadership means that you act in accordance with your thoughts, beliefs and morals when dealing with people and employees within a working environment or even in personal life as a leader. That, as an authentic leader, you can be open and honest and communicate with transparency and compassion for others, while keeping an open mind and looking for a mutually beneficial relationship with colleagues and staff.

When asked to describe themselves as authentic leaders, half of the participants admitted to not considering themselves to be an authentic leader before being asked to participate in this study. This sentiment was not because participants did not believe themselves to be authentic leaders but rather they had not differentiated themselves beyond whom they are naturally as individuals. More than half acknowledged that they either knew they were different, naturally saw themselves as leaders, and/or expressed that they had always been called on to represent or lead a group, whether in the workplace or in school.

Interview participants described themselves in terms of values, beliefs, behaviors, and/or interactions and relationships with others. Descriptors of behaviors provided by participants
confirmed the four dimensions of authentic leadership (self-awareness, internalized moral perspective, balanced processing, and relational transparency). However, participants also described themselves in a way that fell outside the four dimensions. This fifth aspect was identified as social skills and represent socially acceptable, learned competencies and behaviors which facilitate interactions and communications with others (Gresham & Elliot, 1984). These social skills, while possibly inferred by the four AL dimensions, go beyond the qualities of self-awareness, transparency, fair-mindedness, temperance, fortitude, and morality. The social skills described by interview participants speak to:

- Establishing a sense of loyalty with others.
- Listening and communicating empathically.
- Behaving with humility, altruism, advocacy, and compassion.
- Emotionally expressive, and acts in ways that are respectful, considerate, optimistic, encouraging, and inspirational towards themselves and others.
- Having a mindset of purpose and vision that extends beyond sense of self.

Interview participants are values driven, expressing 21 different values. This was also established when reviewing the ALQ scores and determining that internalized moral perspective was the highest average dimension of interview participants, followed by self-awareness, relational transparency and balanced processing. The values expressed by participants also aligned with the behaviors reported by participants when describing themselves as authentic leaders (Figure 6).

All interview participants shared the belief that they have become more effective leaders over time. Participants used terms such as grow, growing, or becoming and metaphors such as journey or process to describe their perceived effectiveness over time (Table 18). The age at
which participants identified themselves as authentic leaders fell between the ages of 14 and 43 years old with the average age being approximately 31 years old (Table 17). As part of this journey or process, interview participants acknowledged four specific influencers which are believed to have contributed to their emergence as an authentic leader: (a) upbringing / parental influence, (b) religious upbringing / influence, (c) life experiences, and (d) leadership examples (Figure 7). Participants provided narratives recounting their experiences across several of the influencers identified.

Interview participants affirm that spirituality influenced their identity. Nine of the eleven participants acknowledged themselves as spiritual leaders, while the remaining two acknowledge a sense of spiritual influence. The examples provided by participants identify spirituality as an influence to their values, beliefs, and behaviors. Participants acknowledged that their upbringing and the nurturing from their parents, who were religious or believed in God, had strong influences on their core values, principles and beliefs. Participants also described the influences of a higher power or God on their journey or purpose in life. Participants acknowledged that spirituality helps them define who they are and who they want to be, as well as how to behave and how to treat others (Figure 9).

As it relates to how spirituality contributed to their emergence as authentic leaders, all participants credited their spirituality with influencing their values and beliefs, defining their principles and ethics, and providing a framework for how to live and treat people. Nine of the 11 participants spoke to the belief that spirituality encouraged their purpose or destiny in life or acted as a guide or energy which leads them (Table 18). The remaining two spoke to spirituality encouraging the way they should treat people. Figure 10 provides an integrated view of key findings from interview participants. Further discussion of these findings and their implications
will be shared in the next chapter in addition to conclusions and recommendations for future research.
Figure 10. Integrative view of participants’ perceptions related to the influences of spirituality on the emergence of an AL identity.
Chapter Five: Discussion and Conclusions

“The medium for developing into an authentic leader is not a destination, but the journey itself- a journey to find your true self and purpose of your life’s work” (George & Sims, 2007).

The purpose of this study was to explore what role, if any, spirituality played in the initial formation and emergence of an authentic leadership identity. Presented here is a discussion of the connections and discoveries gleaned from individuals who were nominated as authentic leaders. This section reviews the significance of the findings, provides research study conclusions, as well as discusses implications, and recommendations for future research related to the following research question(s):

1. What role does spirituality play, if any, in the initial formation and emergence of authentic leadership identity?
   a. What do the personal histories and experiences of authentic leaders reveal about the initial formation, emergence and/or continued development of their authentic leadership identity?
   b. What are the perceptions of authentic leaders concerning the role of spirituality in their authentic leadership identity formation?

Issues and Significance

The growing complexity and highly competitive landscape of the 21st century calls into question the business values, ethics, and social responsibility of its leaders. Despite the available research on leadership and corporate investment in leadership development, significant scandals and unethical decision-making by top leaders continue to plague the American workplace. The widespread distrust of American institutions is signaling for a change in the way we approach and think of leadership. As a solution, a renewed interest in the research and application of
authentic leadership has been undertaken to restore confidence and regain trust in contemporary leadership.

The need to better understand the formation and emergence of authentic leadership lies at the heart of this research study. Recent research suggests that spirituality may impact the development of leadership identity, especially related to a leader’s transcendent purpose, meaning, and values (Conger, 1998; Fry, 2003, 2005b; Kanungo & Mendonca, 1996; Mitroff & Denton, 1999). Limited research is available regarding the connection between spirituality and authentic leadership. Therefore, this researcher focused on filling the gap in research by exploring the potential influence spirituality has on the formation or emergence of an authentic leadership identity. To support this effort, a review of literature in Chapter 2 explored several key concepts related to authentic leadership, spirituality, spiritual leadership, and human development.

**Research Study Conclusions**

Three significant conclusions for this research were established related to the research questions. Each conclusion is discussed below and includes implications for practice, education, and scholarship. To reinforce the research conclusions, Figure 10, which represents the integrative findings from the semi-structured interviews, are explored and expanded upon further.

**Conclusion One: Values provide a direct link between authentic leadership and spirituality.** This researcher set out to understand the perspectives and identities of authentic leaders by way of their personal beliefs and life stories to uncover a potential link to spirituality. Overall, the study’s findings indicate that authentic leaders have a strong moral and ethical perspective which stems from their core values and belief systems. Participants’ personal
narratives and life experiences reinforced and often elucidated their deeply held values and beliefs about who they are and how they treat people. These values reinforce the perceptions that participants hold about themselves and establish the standards by which they live and interact with others.

Values are principles and fundamental convictions which inform authentic leaders’ decisions, guide their behaviors, and underpin their beliefs about themselves and the world around them (Rokeach, 1973). Values become the standard by which authentic leaders order their lives, make choices, and facilitate their behaviors and relationships with others on both a personal and professional levels. The values of authenticity, honesty, integrity, openness, courage, trust, empathy, compassion, and the golden rule were most commonly cited by participants. However, values such as loyalty, optimism, confidence, consistency, and being an example for others were identified as well. The list of 21 values identified by participants were included in Figure 6.

To further demonstrate the strong relationships between values and authentic leadership, the dimension with the highest average score, captured by the ALQ instrument, was the dimension of internalized moral perspective (3.63) (Figure 4). The next highest average score was relational transparency (3.35) followed by balanced processing (3.32), and self-awareness (3.31). Internalized moral processing was also the highest average score when isolating the ALQ scores of the interview participants. The next highest score was reported as self-awareness (3.34), then relational transparency (3.31), and balanced processing (3.27) (Table 13).

The findings emphasize that there is a strong link between a participants’ values, what they believe, and how they behave in their personal and professional lives (Figure 6). All participants acknowledged that they hold true to their values across all areas of their lives, even
when it is not convenient for them to do so. This congruency between values, beliefs, and behaviors is evidenced by the ability of authentic leaders to authentically and genuinely match their words with their actions. These findings support the literature that authentic leaders act and behave in alignment with their values and beliefs and remain true to both even in challenging and complex situations.

The abilities to be authentic and self-aware are considered the most important aspects of leadership. Self-awareness is instrumental to a leaders’ abilities to understand their own motivations, emotions, values, and behaviors. This study’s findings recognize that an increased sense of self-awareness has helped facilitate a greater level of consciousness and understanding of personal values, beliefs, and behaviors. When authentic leaders are clear on their values and beliefs, they can be true to themselves and authentic and genuine with others. A heightened sense of self-awareness also contributes to a leaders’ abilities to self-regulate and, in turn, embrace and leverage their values to monitor and evaluate their own behavior.

**Implications for practice.** A growing number of Americans desire to work for ethical and authentic organizations, especially amongst the younger generations of the workforce (Mitroff, 2003; Gallup, 2016). Millennials, those individuals who were born between 1981 and 1996, are projected to surpass baby boomers as the largest living U.S. adult cohort as early as 2019 (Fry, 2018). Currently, more than one-in-three Americans in the labor force are millennials (Fry, 2018), and projections anticipate these numbers will grow to represent three-quarters of the workforce within the next five to ten years (Croce & Plowman, 2017).

Millennials represent the largest potential leadership population ever in the American workforce which makes attracting, retaining and developing leaders a critical aspect all organizations must undertake. The Hartford’s 2015 Millennial Leadership Survey found that
80% of millennials believe themselves to be natural leaders currently and 69% of Millennials aspire to be in leadership positions, preferably within the business segment, within the next five years. Due to the increased pace of change and growth in today’s global business market, leadership talent will be a scarce commodity (Croce & Plowman, 2017). Hiring managers and corporate recruiters will not have the luxury to wait for millennials to gain and experience the necessary life and work experiences typically needed to evolve into their true selves, as did their predecessors (Croce & Plowman, 2017).

These future leaders are values-driven, and they care about the social consciousness of an organizations, especially those for which they work (Wendover, 2012). The younger generations are more interested in acquiring new skills and the knowledge they needed to grow both personally and professionally (Moore, 2016; Largent, 2016) than being committed to institutions and traditional pathways to development (Clifton, 2016). An article published in Forbes, *Authenticity: The Way to the Millennial’s Heart*, suggests that millennials desire to work for organizations with inclusive cultures and strong values that encourage and empower authentic self-expression (Moore, 2016). According to a study conducted by IBM Institute for Business, Millennials want to work for organizations that invest in their personal and professional development and employ leaders who are ethical, fair, and transparent (2014).

Interestingly, while participants indicated that their emergence as an authentic leader was influenced by multiple factors over their lifespan, the values they identified were found to be transmitted to them by their parents early in life and/or by way of their religious upbringing. According to the literature, parents are the first and most significant influencer of a child’s character and core values (MacElroy, 2003; Schwartz, 2000). “If parents do their job well, by high school a young person will know, care about, and practice a set of core values—such as
honesty, patience, and compassion” (Schwartz, 2000, p. 68). As children grows beyond adolescence, their peers, teachers, and other prominent figures also play a part in shaping their sense of self and beliefs about the world (MacElroy, 2003; Schwartz, 2000).

Authentic organizations with strong corporate values will have an edge over attracting and retaining these next generation leaders (Croce & Plowman, 2017). Moreover, organizations that emphasize what the company or institution is doing regarding career and leadership development will have the advantage in inspiring millennials’ loyalty and engendering trust. The finding that authentic leaders are values centered and beliefs driven suggest that organizations that are also values driven can attract and retain authentic leaders more easily.

While there are no established shortcuts or defined timelines on the path to becoming an authentic leader, there are some suggested actions and opportunities for which organizations and AL practitioners can focus on. For example, an organization may wish to develop opportunities or programs which allow for values discussions. Organizations must actively create or center professional development around opportunities which encourage self-awareness through reflection and proactive introspection. Leaders need time and opportunities to understand themselves better. Authentic leaders are authentic and honest about whom they are or hope to become, hence, opportunities to encourage and engage leaders in self-discovery and self-reflection will be advantageous.

Literature has already established the link between self-awareness and self-regulation (Gardner et al., 2005). Cultivating relationships and increasing opportunities to build trust, express emotions, empathize with others, and do the right thing for and with others are necessary building blocks for authentic leaders. Millennials want to bring their whole selves to work and enjoy being part of a team which means inclusive, open, and collaborative cultures will be
critical for stimulating and encouraging authentic behaviors. This makes millennials a potential population for authentic leadership development.

**Implications for education.** Nearly 89% of the participants in this study hold some type of academic or professional degree ($n = 54$). According to a report released in May 2016 by the U.S. Department of Education, business was the top field of study amongst undergraduate and graduate students. The U.S. Department of Education projects a 14% increase in enrollment in postsecondary institutions through 2024 (2016). Traditional approaches in higher education programs may not engage or address the learning preferences of millennials or future students (Hussar & Bailey, 2016).

Educators, from kindergarten to college, play a central role in imparting and modeling values to students (MacElroy, 2003). There are many ways to support the development or exploration of values in education. First and foremost, educators may wish to lead by example which includes imparting and supporting values such as respect, authenticity, good citizenship, self-discipline, courage, honesty, tolerance, accountability, transparency, and compassion. Additionally, educators can:

- Discuss the process by which values are developed and the cognitive process by which they are understood.
- Encourage students to actively reflect on and define what values and principles guide their lives.
- Actively engage students by creating scenarios or exploring case studies or biographies which confront or reinforce values and ethics or assign reflective writing assignments which include prompts or values related topics.
Incorporate the use of virtual learning spaces, collaborative software, and/or online resources such as Second Life and TEDtalks in order to explore values.

Engage students to create classroom norms which speak to the values and principles students wish to live by throughout the course or school year.

Related specifically to higher education, character education becomes a significant topic as students begin to explore career options, new life choices, and experience an increased amount of responsibility and freedom (Schwartz, 2000). Colleges or universities have opportunities to provide and encourage character development, considering the fact that students are potential future leaders in the American workforce (Blimling, 1990). Colleges and universities might wish to offer educational programs and courses specifically related to values and values development. Educational institutions could also provide peer-support networks and campus-wide moral modeling to encourage and instill a sense of respect for themselves and their community. A goal for educators should be to increase the cognitive processing of their students related to self-awareness and self-reflection, as well as to encourage students to make sound moral choices that influence positive outcomes for their future (Blimling, 1990; Murray, 1995).

**Implications for scholarship.** Scholars on authentic leadership have been called upon to lead the charge in addressing and restoring public confidence and trust in leadership, as well as to offer updated and restorative models of leadership (Avolio & Luthans, 2006; Brown, Trevino, and Harrison, 2005; George, 2003, Lorenzi, 2004). Thus, scholars of authentic leadership may wish to be prepared to launch a wider, multi-disciplinary, and multi-dimensional approach to understanding authentic leadership from a whole person perspective.

The findings that participants are values driven is supported by the literature which describes authentic leaders as value centered with a strong moral/ethical component which drives
and regulates their behavior. While the finding that authentic leaders are values driven aligns with existing literature on authentic leadership, the identification of 21 specific values, one that are tied to and/or are believed to facilitate the behaviors of authentic leadership, contributes to expanding the current literature. This finding also encourages the possibility that values act as a root construct of authentic leadership and/or as a critical element in the development of authentic leaders. Values are shown to inform decisions, guide behaviors, and underpin beliefs about self and others (Rokeach, 1973). Further research efforts must be made to identify and understand the role values play in the lives and development of authentic leaders.

**Conclusion Two:** While the emergence of one’s identity continues to develop in an ongoing, dynamic process across the human lifespan, core values are shaped during the early formative years and highly sensitive to parental and spiritual influences. An aspect of this study’s focus was to understand the emergence or formation of authentic leadership identity influenced by spirituality linked to theories on human development. The study’s findings acknowledge a sense of increasing effectiveness and growth of a leader’s identity over time. While the emergence of an individual’s identity (values, beliefs, and sense of self) continues to be shaped and influenced across a person’s life time, core values are established during the early formative years, informed by parental and spiritual influences.

Participants described their emergence as authentic leaders by using terms such as grow, growing, learning, or becoming and metaphors such as journey or process occurring over time. Several participants offered anecdotes to help describe their development in relation to time and experience. Biographical accounts and personal narratives of authentic leaders provided examples of how each life experiences or significant events influenced self-reflection, change or growth, and contributed to their emergence as authentic leaders. Research reinforces the belief
that the development of a leader happens in an ongoing, dynamic process which occurs across the leader’s life span.

In general, human development takes place in a series of common stages as children become progressively more independent as their social, emotional, and mental processing and skills increase (Erikson, 1975). The four stages of human development are defined as formative years (0-18 years old), young adulthood (18-35 years old), middle adulthood (35-65 years old), and late adulthood (65 years and older). The average age at which study participants identified themselves as authentic leaders was approximately 31 years old. This age falls within what human development scholars refer to as early adulthood. Early adulthood is characterized by achieving autonomy, establishing identity, developing emotional stability, establishing relationships, and pursuing a career (Havighurst, 1972).

Participants provided multiple personal examples across their life experience which support the assumption that multiple influencers, at different ages and stages of life, contribute to an ongoing development of the participant’s authentic leadership identity. The study’s findings pointed to four specific influencers that participants believe contributed to their emergence as an authentic leader: (a) life experiences (positive and negative), (b) leadership examples (more negative than positive), (c) parental influence, and (d) religious upbringing / spiritual influence (Figure 7). Findings indicate that the development of authentic leadership is an ongoing, multidimensional process influenced largely by participants’ life and work experiences.

Literature advanced by scholars suggests that it takes time and conscious effort to develop authentic leadership. Researchers also suggest that development as authentic leaders may be triggered by specific life events such as crisis situations or essential experiences. Theorists have reported that multiple social and organizational contextual factors contribute to the formation of
a leadership identity. In 2006, a suggested model of leadership development outlined six stages of identity development: awareness, exploration/engagement, leader identified, leadership differentiated, generativity, and integration/synthesis. In 2007, Bill George suggested that the leaders’ journey spanned a life time differentiated by three phases, each lasting about approximately 30 years. George referred to this journey as moving from individually focused to collectively focused, through growth and experience in life (2007).

The finding that an authentic leadership identity is developed over time by life experiences is also supported from a human development perspective. Leadership development is thought to be a human development process that involves the development of an individual’s perceived self-concept or identity. Erikson’s theory of development concluded that a healthy, developing individual passes through a series of eight interrelated stages within their life cycle motivated by a desire to find meaning (1968). Erikson believes that a person’s identity serves as the foundation of their life pursuits and each stage of development involves a psychosocial crisis of two contrary dispositions or opposing emotional forces which significantly disturb a person’s development and personality (1982). People experience these stages in a fixed sequence across their lifetime, but the timing and results vary according to the individual and circumstances.

Additionally, constructivist development theorist assert that individuals construct their reality across many domains of human experience (Kegan, 1994; Kegan & Lahey, 1984). Individuals’ meaning-making systems shapes their experiences and influences their way of thinking, feeling, and behavior. Constructivist development theorists also affirm that identity development occurs in response to a crisis of differentiating one’s self and is marked by continual shifts or transitions which influence an ongoing construction and reconstruction of consciousness (Kegan, 1982).
Similarly, research on spirituality suggests that spiritual growth is a product of the maturation process and journey towards finding meaning and purpose, i.e. self-actualization. Researchers suggest that during midlife (middle adulthood between the ages of 35-65), individuals begin to contemplate mortality which signals an introspective exploration of the spiritual aspects of self and consciousness. Similarly, researchers believe that spiritual growth is a product of the cognitive development process which takes place due to the constraints and adversity in adulthood.

**Implications for practice.** Early adulthood, ranging from late teens or early twenties to their late thirties, is a life period emphasized by identity formation and self-discovery in the context of society and relationships (Erikson, 1975; Levison, 1986). Young adults in their late teens and early 20s face a number of life issues as they finish primary school, pursue a post-secondary education, enter the workforce, and take on various responsibilities of adulthood (Birch, 1997). The challenge for young adults is that they are faced with making important choices regarding work, family, marriage, and lifestyle before they are seen to have the maturity or life experience to support these decisions (Levinson, 1986).

As millennials continue to saturate the workforce and advance in leadership roles, they will need help stimulating and expanding their experiences and increasing their knowledge base. According to Gallup, 87% of millennials want to work for organizations that focuses on development (Adkins, 2016). Organizations may become the critical partners and primary settings for which this next generations’ pursuit of personal and career development will occur. Organizations may wish to provide an environment ripe with stimulating and reflective learning experiences. Human development theorists suggest that it is not how individuals progress through determined life stages, but rather how they adapt to life’s circumstances. As such,
organizations may be able to re-create opportunities for budding authentic leaders to develop adaptive skill sets through creative assignments and collaborative, shared responsibilities. Moreover, budding authentic leaders can be encouraged to imbue authenticity by becoming more self-aware and reflective during these concentrated leadership moments (Avolio & Luthans, 2006).

Organizations, with a strong vision and sense of purpose that actively communicate and engage employees on the direction of the company, will engender and encourage potential authentic leaders to do the same. Millennials do not want to work merely for a paycheck, they want a purpose and meaning in their work (Clifton, 2016). Organizations are encouraged to help millennials share and connect their personal stories with the company’s key strategic initiatives so that experimentation, responsibility, and learning become embedded in ongoing development process (Croce & Plowman, 2017). “Life-stories provide authentic leaders with a self-concept that can be expressed through the leadership role” (Shamir & Eilam, 2005, p. 402).

Millennials and future generations will be searching for coaches and mentors in the workplace in order to develop their strengths (Clifton, 2016; Daloz-Parks, 2000). Researchers believe that leaders can develop authenticity through self-discovery and by being self-aware and reflective in order learning from significant life or leadership moments. Organizations which provide opportunities for self-reflection and self-awareness can encourage self-discovery. Specifically, reverse mentoring opportunities, group coaching, and job rotations assignments offer collaborative, stimulating, and shared development opportunities. Now more than ever, organizations are must create a strengths-based culture where the focus is primarily on developing or maximizing the strengths of their potential leaders and not their weaknesses.
Implications for education. The development of a person’s identity continues across their life span and is influenced, in part, by the experiences and people encountered during their formal education. At different times in our history, American educational institutions have been called upon to educate and cultivate civic virtues and character of its students (Lickona, 1993; Ryan, 1993). However, over time, the focus of education started to turn away from character development in favor of scientific reasoning and logic (Lickona, 1993). Now more than ever, the American educational system (at all levels) may wish to increase efforts and opportunities for students’ self-discovery. The development of critical thinking skills, self-reflection, and moral reasoning is essential to assist students with understanding themselves, their purpose, and what is right or wrong based on the standards they have set for themselves (Doka, 2011).

Implications for scholarship. Leadership development is thought to be a human development process that involves and encourages the development of an individual’s perceived self-concept or identity as a leader. The personal histories and life experiences of this study’s participants heavily contributed to and supported the development of their authentic leadership identity. The findings of this study highlight the challenge within current leadership research by pointing to the lack of research on core personal processes and personal operating systems which influence the initial and ongoing development of leaders. While scholars may share the concern, traditional leadership studies fail to provide an integrative understanding of leadership from a whole person perspective.

The findings of this study have linked the development of authentic leaders to the human lifespan. Participants have acknowledged development of values and beliefs which transcend their adulthood work experience and point back to their early formative years and upbringing. Human development theorists assert that individuals construct their reality across many domains
of the human experience (Kegan, 1994; Kegan & Lahey, 1984). Moreover, an individual’s meaning-making system shapes their experiences and influences their way of thinking, feeling, and behavior (Cook-Greuter, 1990; 1999; Kegan, 1982; 1994; Loevinger, 1976). Yet, current authentic leadership literature has not fully acknowledged or linked the development of authentic leaders to the ongoing construction and reconstruction of one’s consciousness, nonetheless, to the crisis of differentiating one’s self in relation to the various experiences or negative leaders one encounters.

**Conclusion Three: Spirituality mediates the emergence of authentic leadership identity by way of values and beliefs formed early on in life and continues to encourage a sense of purpose, life-direction, and/or journey toward self-actualization.** The purpose of this research study was to explore the influence, if any, that spirituality may have on the emergence or formation of authentic leadership identity. It is clear by this study’s findings that spirituality and authentic leadership are linked by values and beliefs established during formative years of life and a sense of purpose or direction in their current lives.

The findings of this study identified that most participants who consider themselves as authentic leaders also consider themselves to be spiritual. Nearly all participants (94%) who completed the questionnaire believed themselves to be spiritual \((n = 57)\). A significant number of all participants (90%) affirmed the position that spirituality influences their beliefs about leadership and their behaviors as leaders \((n = 55)\). Additionally, most of all participants (90%) affirmed the belief that their spirituality influences their authenticity as a leader \((n = 55)\), as well as their self-awareness as a leader \((n = 55)\). Similar findings were noted for the subset of interview participants as well (Table 12). Nine of the eleven interview participants acknowledged themselves as spiritual leaders, while two referenced earlier spiritual influences
within their lives. Even when interview participants did not consider themselves to be a spiritual leader, they did acknowledge some sense of spirituality.

Interview participants credited their spirituality or understanding of spirituality with influencing their values and beliefs, defining their principles and ethics, and providing a framework for how to live and treat people. For most participants, these values, beliefs, and sense of self were influenced during their formative years by their parental influences and religious upbringing. When a participant did not reference a religious parent or religious upbringing, a sense of God, a higher power or, a strong sense of service was identified early on in life which the participants believed influenced his or her beliefs and sense of self. While participants may have moved away from a formalized religion or do not claim a formal religion currently, they still acknowledged the contributions made by their spiritual experiences or religious upbringing or religious parents.

The findings also acknowledged that spirituality, or their belief in a higher power or God, encouraged and continues to encourage the participants’ journey or purpose. Nine of the eleven participants spoke to the belief that spirituality has encouraged a purpose or destiny in life, their ideas of success and happiness, as well as acted as a guide or energy. The remaining two participants spoke to spirituality encouraging the way they should treat people. Often, participants spoke to living their lives according to the golden rule. Participants acknowledge that spirituality has helped them define who they are and who they want to be, as well as guided their behaviors and regards for others. Several participants described the influences of a higher power or God on their journey or movement toward a purpose in life. When participants did not acknowledge that spirituality helped to define a purpose, they did acknowledge that spirituality helps to define who they are, as well as how to behave and how to treat others (Figure 9).
The integrated model contained in Figure 10 provides a view of the perceived influences spirituality has had on participants’ emergence as authentic leaders. As participants moved through life, they constructed their identity and gained perspective through life and work experiences, education, and leadership examples, more often negative ones than positive ones. While participants may have formulating and discovering a sense of self and, ultimately, their leadership identity, they acknowledged that their core values and foundational beliefs developed in the early stage of life and have helped throughout their lives.

These findings support the literature on spirituality. The meaning of spirituality has changed and developed over time to represent more of a quest for sacred meaning, experience or evolving inner dimension, and not simply about religion. Research cites that spirituality is about individuals who are true to themselves and act with integrity (Smith and Rayment, 2007). Researchers suggest that spirituality can provide a sense of meaning or inspire feelings of connectedness and inner wholeness. Many of the accounts provided by participants describe their spirituality as not having ties to a formal religion, align with the five distinct categories of spiritual but not religious (Table 6).

These findings are supported by literature on spirituality, spiritual leadership, and human development. Spiritual leadership theory is grounded in the belief that spiritual leaders are driven by a spiritual calling or a focus on making a difference in the world around them. Researchers view spirituality as a multifaceted human construct which focuses on finding connections to something meaningful. Spirituality facilitates character development in leaders, specifically the aspects of self-identity, social awareness, and personal core values. Several researchers emphasized that individuals with high levels of spirituality are more effective leaders (Cacioppe, 2000; Fry, 2003; Fry et al., 2005).
While much has been written on identity and the identity formation, little research has been directed toward understanding the development of a spiritual identity. Early psychologists such as Erikson and Maslow, in the pursuit of understanding how people know and understand themselves, noted spirituality as an orientation or tendency of human nature (Erikson, 1968; 1980; Maslow, 1971). More recent theorists on spiritual identity posit that spiritual identity is a “persistent sense of self that addresses ultimate questions about the nature, purpose, and meaning of life, resulting in behaviors that are consonant with the individual’s core values” (Kiesling, Montgomery, Sorrell, & Colwell, 2006, p. 1269). Some human development scholars support the belief that spiritual growth is related to the cognitive development process in adulthood and conceptualize the link between spirituality and development more in terms of a response to constraints and adverse life experiences (Atchley, 1997; Burke, 1999). Some theorists suggest that spirituality may be especially meaningful in older adulthood due to the complexity and broader social forces.

**Implications for practice.** Americans are searching for greater meaning and purpose from their careers (Gallup, 2016). Recent research suggests that while millennials may be turning away from formalized religion, a majority still believe in God or a universal power and consider themselves spiritual (Alper, 2015). According to a recent study published by Pew Research Center (2017b), 80% of U.S. adults believe in a higher power or some kind, while 48% acknowledge that God or a higher power directly determines what happens in their lives. Research findings acknowledge that millennials are not as religious as other generations before them, but they do feel a deep sense of wonder about the universe and a strong sense of gratitude or thankfulness (Alper, 2015).
Americans are searching for greater meaning and purpose from their work lives. This search has fueled a revival of spirituality in the workplace. While spirituality, in the past, has been a more private matter, organizations are experiencing a growing number of employees who want to bring their spirituality to work. As such, organizations are becoming the stage for the practice of spirituality and supporting spirituality in the workplace benefits everyone. Companies such as Evian Springs, Tom’s Maine, Ford, Southwest Airlines, and the Container Store are known for their support of spirituality in the workplaces and have been found to outperform their competitors.

Organizations that allow employees to bring their whole selves to work, which includes their spirituality, report more positive outcomes such increased performance, employee engagement, well-being, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction. Moreover, when individuals can express spirituality in the workplace, variables such as creativity, kindness, honesty, and trust are increased. Organizations that focus on creating an inclusive environment which encourages spirituality can regain a sense of trust and confidence in leadership and higher levels of engagement from employees. Spiritual workplaces may become the ideal environment to accelerate the emergence and ongoing development of budding authentic leaders.

Implications for education. For some adolescents, the transition to college maybe a time when they reject or question the beliefs and values they were taught early in life to explore alternative explanations and possibilities. College students are often “caught in the middle of the values they have been taught by their family and the values of the new community in which they live. Students internalize what they see their peers and role models doing and make decisions on how to live their own lives” (MacElroy, 2003, p. 4). Even though students may return to the
family’s faith or beliefs, they will likely confront their own spirituality and self of identity (Barra et al., 1993).

Educators must understand the development of identity in the formative years and may wish to consider the impact spirituality has on identity. Also, educators are encouraged to find ways to encourage a sense of spirituality in the classroom. Open discussions about spirituality and spiritual practices may help to accelerate the process of self-discovery, purpose, and meaning. Educators may wish to begin teaching for self-transcendence and incorporating spiritual practices into their classrooms. In a highly connective and highspeed, technologically wired world, being able to unplug, disconnect, and turn inward through breathing exercises, guided meditation, and intention setting can facilitate an increased awareness, consciousness, wholeness, and overall well-being while decreasing stress, anxiety, depression, and dissatisfaction (Markway, 2016).

**Implications for scholarship.** The meaning of spirituality has changed and developed over time to represent a more of a quest for sacred meaning, experience or evolving inner dimension. Research cites that spirituality is about individuals who are true to themselves and act with integrity (Smith and Rayment, 2007). Findings from this research indicate that participants believe their spirituality can provide a sense of meaning and/or inspire feelings of connectedness and inner wholeness. Moreover, findings from this study indicate that authentic leaders credit their spirituality with a sense of right or wrong, by developing guidelines on how to behave and interact with others. However, research on spirituality and its influence on identity, values, and leadership development is scarce.

Limited literature suggests there is a strong connection between spiritual beliefs, values, and leadership activities (Fry, 2003). Some theorists suggest that spirituality may be especially
meaningful in older adulthood due to the complexity and broader social forces. However, the influence of spirituality in the formation and ongoing development of authentic leadership is non-existent. Moreover, what research is available suggests that there is not enough evidence to identify antecedents and requisite preconditions which could predict the emergence of authentic leadership. Without further empirical evidence, recommendations for accelerating the development of authentic leaders and/or creating environments which support and retain potential authentic leaders, may prove to be incomplete and inadequate.

**Internal Validity and Study Limitations**

Given this is a mixed method research study, the researcher focused on ensuring both the validity and reliability of the quantitative and qualitative data. The researcher used research from more than one theoretical perspective as the framework to more fully understand and explain the phenomena being studied (i.e., the emergence of an authentic leadership identity). The researcher used four of the eight strategies identified by Creswell and Miller (2009) to enhance validity of the research findings: member checking, rich, thick description, researcher reflexivity, and a peer-reviewer for coding reliability.

Data were collected using a questionnaire and semi-structured interviews. Additionally, the researcher kept field notes and a reflexivity journal which were also considered as part of the data collection. To validate the accuracy of the information shared by the participant during the interview, the researcher used the practice of member checking. Member checking was used at two points during the data collection process: first, during the interview by restating or summarizing the responses given by the participant; and secondly, after the interview by providing a file of the transcriptions of the interviews via email for review. The researcher recognizes that the reliability and representativeness of data may be compromised to a certain
extent due to a participant’s ability to recall information and/or possibility that he/she may misrepresent responses or experiences.

Note taking, digital recording, and the transcription of all interviews were used to safeguard the accuracy and validity of interview data. Additionally, HyperRESEARCH software was used to assist with analyzing the data and providing consistency and transparency of findings. To maintain validity and ensure rigor in analyzing the data, the researcher followed the 15-point checklist of criteria established by Bruan and Clarke (2006) for conducting good thematic analysis (see Appendix U). Additionally, to ensure the reliability and dependability of coding, the researcher enlisted the help of a secondary researcher who holds a doctorate and has previously completed a qualitative research study as a way to ensure the consistency of coding. A statement of personal bias (see Appendix V) was prepared prior to the onset of data collection and a separate journal documenting researcher’s efforts was maintained.

This study’s adoption of an interpretive approach may be a limitation as the researchers concentrates on understanding phenomena through the subjective meaning individuals attribute to the world and their experiences in relation to being in the world (Orlikowski & Baroudi, 1991). This study focused on the life experiences and events of a sample of authentic leaders. Views and perspectives of followers of authentic leaders were not explored. Only nominated authentic leaders within the western region of the United States were interviewed. Given the sample of authentic leaders is limited to the western part of the United States, this study does not claim generalizability to the entire United States population.

While the sample is diverse demographically, survey participants are limited due to the selected social media sites and professional networking site used to announce the Call for Nominations. Individuals who nominated individuals as authentic leaders were limited by a
prescribed definition of authentic leadership identified from the literature. Additionally, only those participants who scored very high or high on the Authentic Leadership Questionnaire (ALQ) were interviewed. A potential weakness of narrative interviews is that the interview responses are highly subjective. Leadership practices and spiritual orientation of authentic leaders may differ.

**Recommendations for Further Research**

**Recommendation one.** Although there is considerable amount of literature written on the topic of authentic leadership, the topic is still in its infancy as an emerging theory of leadership. Additional research should be undertaken to explore and expand the literature, especially related to the emergence and development of authentic leadership identity. While this study found that spirituality mediates the emergence of authentic leadership identity by way of values and beliefs formed early on in life-- and continues to encourage a sense of purpose, life-direction, and/or journey toward self-actualization-- further research might be undertaken to expand this finding. In addition to replicating this study with a larger population of authentic leaders, researchers may also consider exploring the level/depth of participants’ spirituality and how it has evolved or changed throughout their lifetime. Additionally, further studies regarding the spiritual practices of authentic leaders is suggested to gain insight how spirituality may encourage or mediate the development of authentic leadership identity.

**Recommendation two.** Additional efforts must be made to identify and catalogue the values of authentic leaders and the role that values plays in the development process. As a suggestion, in 1973, psychologist Milton Rokeach first theorized about the nature of human values and defined a value as, “an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end-
state of existence” (Rokeach, 1973, p. 5). Rokeach explored and identified the impact of personal and social values, as well as created the Rokeach Value Survey (RVS) to operationalize the value concept and measure instrumental and terminal values. One of the recommendations for future research would be to utilize the RVS to survey confirmed authentic leaders in hope to determine more specific values of authentic leadership.

**Recommendation three.** Many of the participants’ descriptors reinforced the four existing components of authentic leadership: self-awareness (know thyself), internalized moral perspective (do the right thing), relational transparency (be genuine), and balance processing (be fair-minded) (Walumbwa et al., 2008). However, participants also described behaviors that may be inferred, but fell outside of the four AL dimensions. These behaviors, identified as social skills, speak to a standard of how others should be treated. Social skills, as defined by Gresham and Elliot (1984) represent socially acceptable, learned competencies and behaviors which facilitate interactions and communications with others and, ultimately, influences how others are treated. These social skills are only inferred by the literature and not specifically called out by authentic leadership scholars. Additional research should be conducted to explore or expand on these social skills.

**Recommendation four.** Authentic leaders cannot be true to themselves, authentic, and genuine with others if they are not clear about their values and beliefs. This leads to another recommendation. Further research might be undertaken with regards to explore the cognitive processing or operating systems of authentic leaders. One possible way is to explore the variable of self-awareness as a cognitive process in the consciousness development of authentic leaders. The theory of emotional intelligence may be a focus in which to start as posits self-awareness as the capacity to be aware of, in control of, and expressive with one's emotions (Colman, 2008;
Goleman, 1998, 2006). Also, the evolving field of neuroscience may help provide additional insights into the brain, cognition development, and its capacity as an individual’s underlying operating system.

In addition, a leader’s identity development is a complex, multidimensional cognitive process which influences the way they see themselves. Identity answers the who, what, where, and why of an individual’s essence. During the interviews, nearly half the participants admitted that they had not differentiated themselves as authentic leaders prior to being asked to participate in this research study. This sentiment was not because participants did not believe themselves to be authentic leaders but, rather, because they had not differentiated themselves beyond who they are naturally as individuals or as leaders. The remaining half of participants either acknowledged that they knew they were different, or naturally saw themselves as a leader, and/or had been frequently called on to represent or lead a group at work or in school. This was an interesting finding and one that should be explored further since none of the literature on authentic leadership discusses how authentic leaders come to know or identify themselves as authentic leaders prior to being distinguished as an authentic leader through some means of training, education or testing.

**Recommendation five.** The last few recommendations suggested by this researcher involve organizational culture and the role it has in attracting, retaining, and developing authentic leaders. An exploration into the influence of spiritual workplaces and/or authentic workplaces is suggested. A focus on workplace culture may shed some light on understanding how these workplaces can encourage and expedite the development of budding or emergent authentic leaders as well as potential attract and retain the largest cohort of potential leaders in American history, the millennials.
As an unrelated finding, this researcher found that a high number of study participants were either married or in a domestic partnership. Additional research might be undertaken to explore the relationship between significant personal relationships, such as spouses or domestic partners, and their influence on authentic leaders. Motivational theory, i.e., Maslow’s hierarchy of needs, suggest that individuals satisfy lower level needs such as personal relationships, prior to satisfying higher order needs or self-actualization and transcendence (Maslow, 1971).

**Closing Remarks**

Despite the overwhelming amounts of information available, the topic of leadership remains a paradox of the universal human experience (Bass, 2008, Bennis, 2007). Leadership is not limited to an age or gender, profession or industry, a role or title, nor does it exist solely to a few who acquired the genetic code. Leadership requires constant development and conscious effort. Leaders learn to become leaders throughout their lifetime. Perhaps former President John F. Kennedy said it best in one of his last speeches, “leadership and learning are indispensable to each other” (Iodice, 2017, p. 5).

Several gaps and differing perspectives around the construct, mediating variables, and development path of authentic leadership have been identified in the literature (Banks et al., 2016, Cianci et al., 2014; Gardner et al., 2011; Ford & Harding, 2011; Popper & Mayseless, 2007). Many agree, there is a need for a more empirical approach to understanding the factors which initially influence or encouraged the emergence of an authentic leadership identity (Gardner et al., 2011; Klenke, 2007). The goal of this research study was to contribute to the literature an understanding the of the formation of an authentic leadership identity by exploring what role spirituality may have played in its development.
Results suggest that spirituality is a possible mediating or requisite variable at the values level which encourages the beliefs and behaviors of budding authentic leaders. As reported by participants, spirituality has influenced their formative development of values, beliefs, sense of service, and provided guidelines as to how to treat others. Values lie at the heart of authentic leaders’ beliefs and influence their behaviors. Values are inextricable aspects of an authentic leader’s operating system, yet literature is sparse on the topic and/or avoids defining specific values held by authentic leaders. Spirituality continues to influence and guide leaders in their journey toward self-actualization, achieving success, and finding and living in a purpose-driven manner. The need for further exploration and research on values, spirituality, spiritual practices, and spiritual workplaces holds promising opportunities to understand the emergence and development of authentic leadership.
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APPENDIX A

Notable 20th century American authorities and their contribution to Leadership Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notable American Authority</th>
<th>Contribution to Leadership Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bernard M. Bass (1925-2007):</td>
<td>Bass was Distinguished Professor Emeritus in the School of Management at Binghamton University and director of the Center for Leadership studies and He was founding editor of <em>The Leadership Quarterly</em>. He is known for extending the work of Burns (1978) and introduced the term &quot;transformational&quot; in place of &quot;transforming.&quot; Since 1946, he has published more than four hundred journal articles and twenty-six books concentrating on leadership, behavior, and international management with his most significant contributions being four editions of the Bass Handbook of Leadership (Avolio, 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Bennis (1925-2014):</td>
<td>American scholar, organizational consultant and author, widely regarded as a pioneer of the contemporary field of Leadership Studies. Bennis is the Distinguished Professor of Business Administration and Founding Chairman of The Leadership Institute at the University of Southern California (USC). He has written approximately thirty books, with his most significant contribution to leadership being On Becoming a Leader, originally published in 1989.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Blanchard (1939- ):</td>
<td>American author and management expert. In 1969, Blanchard and Paul Hersey introduced Life Cycle Theory of Leadership which, in 1970’s, was renamed Situational Leadership Model. Blanchard has published over sixty books with the most notable book selling over thirteen million copies being <em>The One Minute Manager</em>. In 1979, He established The Ken Blanchard Companies is an international management training and consulting firm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James MacGregor Burns (1918-2014):</td>
<td>American historian and political scientist, presidential biographer, and principal authority of leadership studies with his 1978 book <em>Leadership</em>, Woodrow Wilson Professor (emeritus) of Political Science at Williams College, and scholar at the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Biography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James MacGregor Burns Academy of Leadership at the University of Maryland, College Park</td>
<td>He received a Pulitzer Prize and National Book Award in 1971 for his <em>Roosevelt: The Soldier of Freedom 1940–1945</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen R. Covey (1932-2012):</td>
<td>An American educator, businessman, international respected leadership authority, author of more sixteen books, including <em>Principle Centered Leadership</em> (1989), <em>Seven Habits of Highly Effective People</em> (1989), and <em>The 8th Habit</em> (2004), and Founder and vice chairman of Franklin Covey Company (est. 1985).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Drucker (1909-2005):</td>
<td>Austrian-born American management consultant, educator, author and self-described social ecologist (1992). He is one of the best-known and most widely influential thinkers and writers on the subject of management theory and practice. He is widely considered to be the father of modern management (Denning, 2014). He authored over thirty-nine books and countless scholarly and popular articles on business, government and the nonprofit world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Z. Posner (1949-):</td>
<td>Dean of the Leavey School of Business as well as a Professor of Leadership at Santa Clara University. Posner is the Accolti Professor of Leadership at the Leavey School of Business at Santa Clara University. He also serves on the advisory board of the Global Women's Leadership Network. Best known for co-authoring <em>The Leadership Challenge</em> with James M. Kouzes (1987).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph C. Rost (1931-2008):</td>
<td>Distinguished scholar in leadership studies and was most noted for his conception of followership. Rost was a professor emeritus of leadership studies at the University of San Diego (USD) from 1976 to 1996. Rost published the landmark book entitled <em>Leadership for the 21st Century</em> (1991), which is still used in many universities throughout the USA and abroad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Wheatley (1941-present):</td>
<td>American writer, researcher and management consultant who studies organizational behavior. Wheatley has been Associate Professor of Management at the Marriott School of Management, Brigham Young University, and Cambridge College. She is currently president of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the Berkana Institute, a global charitable leadership foundation. Her most noteworthy contributions are *Leadership and the New Science: Discovering Order in a Chaotic World* (1996) and *Finding Our Way: Leadership for an Uncertain Time* (2003). Wheatley has received many awards and honorary doctorates. The American Society for Training and Development (ASTD) has named her one of five living legends with an award of highest honor: Distinguished Contribution to Workplace Learning and Performance.

**Victor Vroom (1932-present):** Business school professor at the Yale School of Management. Vroom's primary research was on the expectancy theory of motivation (1964), which attempts to explain why individuals choose to follow certain courses of action in organizations, particularly in decision-making and leadership. His most well-known books are *Work and Motivation*, *Leadership and Decision Making*, and *The New Leadership*. Vroom has also been a consultant to a number of corporations such as GE and American Express.
APPENDIX B

Erik Erickson’s 8 Stage Theory of Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Resolution “Virtue”</th>
<th>Culmination in old age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infancy (0-1 year)</td>
<td>Basic trust vs. mistrust</td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>Appreciation of interdependence and relatedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood (1-3 years)</td>
<td>Autonomy vs. Shame</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>Acceptance of the cycle of life, from integration to disintegration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play age (3-6 years)</td>
<td>Initiative vs. guilt</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Humor; empathy; resilience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School age (6-12 years)</td>
<td>Industry vs. Inferiority</td>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>Humility; acceptance of the course of one’s life and unfulfilled hopes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescence (12-19 years)</td>
<td>Identity vs. Confusion</td>
<td>Fidelity</td>
<td>Sense of complexity of life; margining of sensory, logical and aesthetic perception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early adulthood (20-25 years)</td>
<td>Intimacy vs. Isolation</td>
<td>Love</td>
<td>Sense of the complexity of relationships; value of tenderness and loving freely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adulthood (26-64 years)</td>
<td>Generativity vs. Stagnation</td>
<td>Care</td>
<td>Caritas, caring for others, and agape, empathy and concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Age (65- death)</td>
<td>Integrity vs. Despair</td>
<td>Wisdom</td>
<td>Existential identity; a sense of integrity strong enough to withstand physical disintegration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Open Call for Nominations

Do you know someone whom you believe to be an Authentic Leader? Someone who is genuine, true to themselves, and what they believe in? Someone whose behavior is consistent with their personal values and beliefs?

If you currently work with or for an Authentic Leader or have worked for one in the past OR know of someone whom you feel represents an Authentic Leader, I would like to invite you to nominate this person to participate in my doctoral research study on Authentic Leadership.

My name is Rosalie Peterson and I am a doctoral student in the Graduate School of Education and Psychology (GSEP) at Pepperdine University. I am conducting a research study examining what role, if any, spirituality plays in the initial formation and emergence of an authentic leadership identity.

If you would like to nominate someone whom you believe to be an Authentic Leader, please text or email me their name and email address. The nominated individual will be emailed an Invitation to Participate with the details of the research study and how to complete a web-based questionnaire, anticipated to take no more than 10-15 minutes of their time. Select participants will be given the option to participate, if applicable, in a follow-up interview, to be scheduled at a later date and time.

If you have questions or would like to nominate someone, please contact me at (951) 271-2026 or rosalie.peterson@pepperdine.edu.

Thank you for your time and consideration!

Best regards,
Rosalie Peterson
Pepperdine University, GSEP
Doctoral Candidate
APPENDIX D

Response-Thank You email

Dear xxxx,

Thank you for nominating someone whom you believe to be an Authentic Leader. He or she will receive an Invitation to Participate with the details of study shortly. I truly appreciate your time and support. Should you come across another person whom you believe to be an Authentic Leader, please feel free to send me that person’s contact information.

Thank you again!

Best regards,
Rosalie Peterson
Pepperdine University, GSEP
Doctoral Candidate
APPENDIX E

Invitation to Participate

Congratulations! You were recently nominated by xxxxx as an authentic leader. Authentic leaders are described as authentic when their behaviors are in alignment and are consistent with their personal values and beliefs. I would personally like to invite you to participate in a doctoral research study that explores what role, if any, spirituality plays in the initial formation and emergence of an authentic leadership identity.

My name is Rosalie Peterson. As the primary researcher, I will be conducting this research study as a doctoral candidate at Pepperdine University and guided by Dr. Barbara Mather, Ph.D., the Faculty Advisor for this dissertation research.

Your participation is completely voluntary and at any point may opt out of participating. You should read the information below and ask questions about anything that you do not understand, before deciding whether to participate. Please take as much time as you need to read this informed consent acknowledgement. You may also decide to discuss participation with your family or friends.

Study procedures
If you volunteer to participate in this study, you will be asked to complete a brief questionnaire next. This questionnaire is anticipated to take no more than 15 minutes. It includes 31 questions: (10) demographic questions and (22) rating scaled questions about your beliefs and behaviors.

At the end of the questionnaire, you will have the option of electing to participate in a follow-up interview if selected. Individuals who are willing to participate AND meet select research criteria, will be invited to participate in a follow-up interview which will last up to approximately 60 minutes. During the interview, participants will be asked questions about meaningful experiences which helped shaped their authentic leadership identity.

The interview will be scheduled at a time and location/method that is mutually acceptable. Your willingness to participate in the follow-up interview is purely voluntary. You are welcome to complete only the questionnaire and not participate in the interview.

Risks and Benefits
This research will hopefully contribute to the understanding of the initial formation and emergence of authentic leadership identity and the relationship, if any, between spirituality and authentic leadership. Participation in this study carries minimal risk, or approximately the same amount of risk that individuals will encounter during a usual meeting of colleagues.

As a result of your participation, you may have an increased understanding regarding how your authentic leadership identity developed over your life time. Additionally, you may experience an emotional reaction by reflecting on your life experiences. The only potential and foreseeable risks associated with participation in this study may be that there is a possibility that your score
on the authentic leadership survey may not match the level (higher or lower) of authentic leadership you believe you represent.

There are no costs associated to you for taking part in this study. You will not receive any tangible benefits from taking part in this study.

**Confidentiality**
I will keep your records for this study confidential as far as permitted by law. However, if I am required to do so by law, I may be required to disclose information collected about you. Examples of the types of issues that would require me to break confidentiality are if you tell me about instances of child abuse and elder abuse. Pepperdine’s University’s Human Subjects Protection Program (HSPP) may also access the data collected. The HSPP occasionally reviews and monitors research studies to protect the rights and welfare of research subjects. The data will be stored on a password protected computer in the principal investigators place of residence. Any identifiable information obtained in connection with this study will remain confidential.

If you decide to participate, for confidentiality purposes, you will be assigned a study code which will be used instead of your name on all data including the survey and interview transcripts. Please refer to this study code when completing the survey. Your name will not be used in the dissertation at any time. Your study code is ________________.

Your questionnaire responses and all transcript data will be maintained separately from any identifiable information linked to your study code. The audio-recordings will be destroyed once they have been transcribed. The survey and transcription data will be stored for a minimum of three years.

**Participation and Withdrawal**
Your participation is voluntary. You may withdraw your consent at any time and discontinue participation without penalty. You are not waiving any legal claims, rights or remedies because of your participation in this research study.

**Alternative to Full Participation**
The alternative to full participation in the study is not participating or completing only the items or answering the questions which you feel comfortable.

**Emergency Care and Compensation for Injury**
If you are injured as a direct result of research procedures you will receive medical treatment; however, you or your insurance will be responsible for the cost. Pepperdine University does not provide any monetary compensation for injury.

**Investigator’s Contact Information**
If you have any questions related to this research, you may contact me at any time at ___________________. You may also contact Dr. Barbara Mather via email at ___________________ if I have any other questions or concerns about this research.
Rights of Research Participant - IRB Contact Information
If you have questions, concerns or complaints about your rights as a research participant or research in general please contact Dr. Judy Ho, Chairperson of the Graduate & Professional Schools Institutional Review Board at Pepperdine University 6100 Center Drive Suite 500 Los Angeles, CA 90045, 310-568-5753 or gpsirb@pepperdine.edu.

By clicking on the link below to the hyperlink below, you are acknowledging you have read the study information and informed consent information. You also understand that you may end your participation at end time, for any reason without penalty.

Thank you for your willingness to participate!

[enter hyperlink here]
## APPENDIX F

Master Tracking Spreadsheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Study Code</th>
<th>Invitation to Participate sent?</th>
<th>Questionnaire Completed?</th>
<th>Thank You Sent?</th>
<th>Willing to participate in Interview?</th>
<th>ALQ Results</th>
<th>ALQ Results Sent?</th>
<th>Invitation for Interview sent?</th>
<th>Interview scheduled</th>
<th>Thank you sent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<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></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G

Thank You Reply

Dear [insert name of participant],

Thank you for consideration to participate in my research study. I truly understand that not everyone has the availability nor interest to participate. Should you know of anyone whom you believe to be an Authentic Leader and are willing to nominate them to participate, please feel free to send me the person’s name and email address.

Thank you again!

Best regards,
Rosalie Peterson
Pepperdine University, GSEP
Doctoral Candidate
APPENDIX H

Participation Reminder

Dear [insert name of participant],

Congratulations! You were recently nominated by [insert name of person who nominated participant] as an authentic leader. Authentic leaders are described as authentic when their behaviors are in alignment and are consistent with their personal values and beliefs. I would personally like to invite you to participate in a doctoral research study that explores what role, if any, spirituality plays in the initial formation and emergence of an authentic leadership identity.

Recently an Invitation to Participate was sent to you on ______________. Your contribution to this study would be greatly appreciated. If you would like me to resend the invitation to you or have questions regarding the invitation or this study, please let me know.

Thank you again!

Best regards,
Rosalie Peterson
Pepperdine University, GSEP
Doctoral Candidate

[Phone number redacted]
APPENDIX I

Questionnaire

[participant launches link contained in the Invitation to Participate email which brings them to the Questionnaire landing page within Qualtrics site]

Exploring the Influence of Spirituality in the Initial Development of Authentic Leadership Identity

Welcome and thank you for agreeing to take part in this research study! The goal of this doctoral research study is to explore what role, if any, spirituality plays in the initial formation and emergence of authentic leadership identity.

This questionnaire is anticipated to take no more than 15 minutes. It includes 31 questions: (10) demographic questions and (22) rating scaled questions about your beliefs and behaviors.

At the end of the questionnaire, you will have the option of electing to participate in a follow-up interview. Individuals who are willing to participate AND meet select research criteria, will be invited to participate in a follow-up interview which will last up to approximately 60 minutes. The interview will be scheduled at a time and location/method that is mutually acceptable. Your willingness to participate in the follow-up interview is purely voluntary. You are welcome to complete only the questionnaire and not participate in the interview.

By clicking on the “I Agree” button below, you are acknowledging that you have read the informed consent information contained in the Invitation to Participate email and agree to participate in this research study. You also understand that your participation is completely voluntary and that you may end your participation at any time, for any reason. Thank you for your willingness to participate!

[participant selects “I Agree” and takes participant to start of questionnaire]

Please enter the study code provided in your Invitation to Participate email: ________________

Demographic Questions

Please answer each question as accurately as possible by selecting the correct answer or filling in the space provided.

1. To which gender identity do you most identify?
   - Female
   - Male
   - Transgender Female
   - Transgender Male
   - Gender variant/Non-Conforming
   - Not Listed _________
2. What age range do you fall in?
☐ 18-24 years old
☐ 25-34 years old
☐ 35-44 years old
☐ 45-54 years old
☐ 55-64 years old
☐ 65-74 years old
☐ 75 years old or above

3. Please identify your race (select all that apply)?
☐ American Indian or Alaska Native
☐ Asian
☐ Black of African American
☐ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
☐ Caucasian/White
☐ Hispanic/Latino
☐ Other ____________
☐ Prefer not to say

4. What is your marital status?
☐ Single (never married)
☐ Married, or in a domestic partnership
☐ Divorced
☐ Separated
☐ Widowed

5. What is your current employment status?
☐ Employed Full Time (40 or more hours per week)
☐ Employed Part Time (up to 39 hours per week)
☐ Self Employed
☐ Unemployed
☐ Military
☐ Retired
☐ Homemaker
☐ Student
☐ Unable to work
☐ Other ____________
6. Which of the following categories best describe the industry in which you primarily work (regardless of your actual position)? Check here if you are retired or unemployed □
☐ Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting
☐ Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation
☐ Broadcasting
☐ Construction
☐ Consulting
☐ Education: Higher Education
☐ Education: Primary/Secondary (K-12)
☐ Finance and Insurance
☐ Government and Public Administration
☐ Health Care and Social Services
☐ Homemaker
☐ Hotel and Food Services
☐ Information Services and Data Processing
☐ Legal Services
☐ Manufacturing: Computer and Electronics Manufacturing
☐ Manufacturing: Other
☐ Military
☐ Mining
☐ Other Information Industry
☐ Publishing
☐ Real Estate, Rental and Leasing
☐ Religious
☐ Retail
☐ Scientific or Technical Services
☐ Software
☐ Telecommunications
☐ Transportation and Warehousing
☐ Utilities
☐ Wholesale
☐ Other __________

7. If you are employed, what is your current role or job title? _______________

8. How many years have you been in the workplace?
☐ 0-3 years
☐ 4-6 years
☐ 7-9 years
☐ 10-12 years
9. How many years of experience do you have leading others?
- 0-3 years
- 4-6 years
- 7-9 years
- 10-12 years
- 13-15 years
- 16-18 years
- 19-21 years
- 22-25 years
- Over 25 years

10. What is the highest level of education you have completed?
- Less than a high school diploma
- High school degree or equivalent (e.g. GED)
- Some college, no degree
- Associate degree (e.g. AA, AS)
- Bachelor’s degree (e.g. BA, BS)
- Master’s degree (e.g. MA, MS, MEd)
- Professional degree (e.g. MD, DDS, DVM)
- Doctorate (e.g. PhD, EdD)

The following questions relate to your beliefs and how you see yourself.

As clarification, for the purpose of this research study,

Authentic Leadership is defined as, “A pattern of leader behavior that draws upon and promotes both positive psychological capacities and a positive ethical climate, to foster greater self-awareness, an internalized moral perspective, balanced processing of information, and relational transparency on the part of leaders working with followers, fostering positive self-development” (Walumbwa et. al, p. 94).

Spirituality is defined as, “a human belief in, movement toward, and relationship with a higher purpose or power, self, and others from which a sense of purpose, consciousness, interconnectedness, and destiny may be derived” (Swift, 2003, p. 5).
On a scale of 0 to 4, with 0 being “strongly disagree” and 4 being “strongly agree”, please indicate your degree of agreement with the following statements?

The following questions refer to your leadership style, as you perceive it.

Please estimate how frequently each statement fits your leadership style on a scale of 0-4, with 0 being “not at all” and 4 being “frequently, if not always”.

### Leadership Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>As a leader I….</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Once in a while</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Fairly Often</th>
<th>Frequently, if not always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I believe myself to be an authentic leader.</td>
<td>□ 0</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I believe myself to be a spiritual person.</td>
<td>□ 0</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Spirituality influences my beliefs about leadership.</td>
<td>□ 0</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Spirituality influences the way I behave as a leader.</td>
<td>□ 0</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My authenticity as a leader is influenced by my spirituality.</td>
<td>□ 0</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My self-awareness as a leader is influenced by my spirituality.</td>
<td>□ 0</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Say exactly what I mean</td>
<td>□ 0</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Admit mistakes when they are made</td>
<td>□ 0</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Encourage others to speak their mind</td>
<td>□ 0</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Tell you the hard truth</td>
<td>□ 0</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Display emotions exactly in line with feelings</td>
<td>□ 0</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Demonstrate beliefs that are consistent with actions</td>
<td>□ 0</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Make decisions based on my core values</td>
<td>□ 0</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Ask you to take positions that support your core values</td>
<td>□ 0</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Make difficult decisions based on high standards of ethical conduct</td>
<td>☐ 0</td>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>☐ 2</td>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>☐ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Listen carefully to different points of view before coming to conclusions</td>
<td>☐ 0</td>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>☐ 2</td>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>☐ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Would you be willing, if applicable, to participate in a follow up interview?**

Individuals who are willing to participate AND meet select research criteria, will be invited to participate in a follow-up interview which will last up to approximately 60 minutes. The interview will be scheduled at a time and location/method that is mutually acceptable. Your willingness to participate in the follow-up interview is purely voluntary.

☐ Yes
☐ No

Thank you for completing this questionnaire.
Qualtrics is dedicated to protecting all customer data using industry best standards.

Many of our biggest customers demand the highest levels of data security and have tested our services to verify that it meets their standards. In each case, we have surpassed expectations and received high praise from large international organizations.

Qualtrics’ most important concern is the protection and reliability of customer data. Our servers are protected by high-end firewall systems, and scans are performed regularly to ensure that any vulnerabilities are quickly found and patched. Complete penetration tests are performed yearly. All services have quick failover points and redundant hardware, with complete backups performed nightly.

Most important is our confidential system component design. It uses multiple checks to certify that packets from one subsystem can only be received by a designated subsystem. Access to systems is severely restricted to specific individuals, whose access is monitored and audited for compliance.

Customer data are stored in a specific location; it does not float around in the “cloud.” In addition, all data are processed in that location, and are not moved to another jurisdictional area. In other words, if data are collected in the U.S., all data are processed in the U.S.

Qualtrics uses Transport Layer Security (TLS) encryption (also known as HTTPS) for all transmitted data. We can also protect surveys with passwords and HTTP referrer checking. Our services are hosted by trusted data centers that are independently audited using the industry standard SSAE-16 method.

Qualtrics deploys the general requirements set forth by many Federal Acts, including the FISMA Act of 2002. We meet or exceed the minimum requirements as outlined in FIPS Publication 200.

Since our subscribers control their users and their data, it is important for the users to practice sound security practices by using strong account passwords and restricting access to their accounts to authorized persons.

Regarding HIPAA, HITECH, and specific data types: Qualtrics provides general research software and other services where all data are processed equally, without regard to how a customer might classify their data. As such, Qualtrics cannot declare or represent any data entered into its services. Any processing of specific data types are purely incidental, and not required to use the services.

HITECH (Health Information Technology for Economic and Clinical Health Act) updated HIPAA rules to ensure that data are properly protected, and best security practices followed. Qualtrics safeguards all customer data and uses secure data centers to ensure the highest
protection as per HITECH requirements. Questions regarding this statement may be sent to contact support: https://www.qualtrics.com/support-center/?Product=survey-platform
APPENDIX K

Authentic Leadership Questionnaire (ALQ Version 1.0 self)
Bruce J. Avolio, Ph.D.

Instructions: The following survey items refer to your leadership style, as you perceive it. Please judge how frequently each statement fits your leadership style using the following scale:

0- Not at all, 1- Once in a while, 2- Sometimes, 3- Fairly often, and 4- Frequently, if not always

As a leader I…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>say exactly what I mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>admit mistakes when they are made</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>encourage everyone to speak their mind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>tell you the hard truth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>display emotions exactly in line with feelings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>demonstrate beliefs that are consistent with actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>make decisions based on my core values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>ask you to take positions that support your core values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>make difficult decisions based on high standards of ethical conduct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>solicit views that challenge my deeply held positions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>analyze relevant data before coming to a decision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>listen carefully to different points of view before coming to conclusions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>seek feedback to improve interactions with others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>accurately describe how others view my capabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>know when it is time to reevaluate my position on important issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>show I understand how specific actions impact others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Copyright 2007. Bruce J. Avolio, William L. Gardner, and Fred O. Walumbwa. All rights reserved in all medium. Published by Mind Garden, Inc. www.mindgarden.com
APPENDIX L

Permission to use ALQ

Rosalie Peterson

mind garden

To whom it may concern,

This letter is to grant permission for Rosalie Peterson to use the following copyright material for his/her research:

Instrument: Authentic Leadership Questionnaire (ALQ)
Authors: Bruce J. Avolio, William L. Gardner, and Fred O. Walumbwa
Copyright: 2007 by Bruce J. Avolio, William L. Gardner, and Fred O. Walumbwa

Three sample items from this instrument may be reproduced for inclusion in a proposal, thesis, or dissertation.
The entire instrument may not be included or reproduced at any time in any published material.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Mind Garden, Inc.
www.mindgarden.com
APPENDIX M

Thank You for Participating [Not selected for interview]

Dear [insert name of participant],

Thank you for taking time to participate in my research study by completing the Questionnaire. Your contributions to this research are truly valued and appreciated.

As part of the Questionnaire, you completed the Authentic Leadership Questionnaire (ALQ). Your ALQ score was _____ on a scale of _______. To review more information on the ALQ instrument or access research conducted by the creators of the ALQ, please visit Mind Garden, Inc. by going to www.mindgarden.com

As a reminder, your questionnaire responses and all transcript data will be maintained separately from any identifiable information linked to your study code. The questionnaire and transcription data will be stored for a minimum of three years and then destroyed.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me directly.

Thank you again!

Best regards,
Rosalie Peterson
Pepperdine University, GSEP
Doctoral Candidate
APPENDIX N

Thank You- Response Rate Reached

Dear [insert name of participant],

Thank you for taking time to participate in my research study by completing the Questionnaire and indicating interest in participating in a follow up interview. Your contributions to this research are truly valued and appreciated. Thanks to the interest of individuals like you, the maximum response rate for participants willing to take part in an interview has been reached.

As part of the Questionnaire, you completed the Authentic Leadership Questionnaire (ALQ). Your ALQ score was _____ out of a possible score of ______. To review more information on the ALQ instrument or access research conducted by the creators of the ALQ, please visit Mind Garden, Inc. by going to www.mindgarden.com

As a reminder, your questionnaire responses and all transcript data will be maintained separately from any identifiable information linked to your study code. The questionnaire and transcription data will be stored for a minimum of three years and then destroyed.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me directly.

Thank you again!

Best regards,
Rosalie Peterson
Pepperdine University, GSEP
Doctoral Candidate
APPENDIX O

Invitation to Participate in Interview

Dear [insert name of participant],

Thank you for taking time to participate in my research study by completing the Questionnaire and indicating interest in participating in a follow up interview. You scored high on the authentic leadership scale with a score of _____ out of ______. As a reminder, authentic leaders are described as authentic when their behaviors are in alignment and are consistent with their personal values and beliefs.

Based on your results and specific research criteria, I would like to invite you to participate in a follow-up interview which will last up to approximately 60 minutes. During the interview, participants will be asked questions about meaningful experiences which helped shaped their authentic leadership identity. Additionally, participants will be asked what role, if any, spirituality may have played in the initial formation and emergence of an authentic leadership identity.

The interview will be scheduled at a time and location/method that is mutually acceptable. Participants have three options by which the interview can take place: (1) an in-person (face-to-face) interview, (2) a telephone interview, or (3) a Skype interview.

I reside in the Inland Empire and would be willing to meet you at a location that is mutually acceptable. If you could provide me with several options of your availability, I would truly appreciate it. You can reach me at (951) 271-2026 to discuss options. I look forward to speaking with you.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me directly.

Thank you again!

Best regards,
Rosalie Peterson
Pepperdine University, GSEP
Doctoral Candidate

[Redacted]
APPENDIX P

Reminder Email for Interview

Dear [insert name of participant],

Thank you for confirming your availability to participate in a follow-up interview. As discussed, we agreed to the following interview details:

Date: [insert date] Method of Interview: [insert method] Time: [insert time]
Location: [insert location] Contact Number: [insert contact number]

Please dress comfortably and feel free to bring something to drink with you. My goal is to make this experience as smooth and as comfortable as possible.

During the interview, participants will be asked questions about meaningful experiences which helped shaped their authentic leadership identity, as well as, what role, if any, spirituality may have played in the initial formation and emergence of an authentic leadership identity.

Four reflective questions are included below to encourage you to begin thinking of your emergence and formation as an authentic leader prior to the interview. You may choose to write down or simply reflect on your answers.

1. How would you describe yourself as an authentic leader?
2. Was there a specific turning point you can recall which signified your emergence as an authentic leader?
3. What were some of the specific events or experiences which encouraged your emergence as an authentic leader?
4. Spirituality is defined as defined as, “a human belief in, movement toward, and relationship with a higher purpose or power, self, and others from which a sense of purpose, consciousness, interconnectedness, and destiny may be derived” (Swift, 2003, p. 5). How may spirituality have influenced your emergence as an authentic leader?

To accurately capture all that we discuss, a digital recorder will be used during the interview with your permission. Your willingness to participate in the follow-up interview is purely voluntary and if for any reason, you feel uncomfortable, would like to stop the interview, or the interview gets interrupted, the recording will be stopped immediately. Only the principal researcher will have access to written and recorded materials and all data will be maintained with the strictest confidentiality. Your name or any potentially identifying information will not be used in the dissertation at any time. Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me directly. Thank you again!

Best regards,
Rosalie Peterson,
Pepperdine University, GSEP, Doctoral Candidate
Rosalie.peterson@pepperdine.edu
APPENDIX Q

Interview Questionnaire

Participation Study Code: ____________ Date: ________ Start time: _____ End time: _______

Interview Type: [ ] Face to Face [ ] Telephonic [ ] Skype

Thank you for participating in this doctoral research study. I appreciate your time today. The purpose of this research study is to explore what role, if any, spirituality plays in the initial formation and emergence of an authentic leadership identity. I would like to ask you questions about meaningful experiences which helped shape your authentic leadership identity.

I would like to cover a few items before we begin. Your participation is voluntary, and you may withdrawal from this study at any time for any reason. During the up to 60-minute interview, I will be using a digital recorder to accurately capture all we discuss today. Only the principal researcher will have access to written and recorded materials and all data will be maintained with the strictest confidentiality. Your name or any potentially identifying information will not be used in the dissertation at any time.

If for any reason, you feel uncomfortable, would like to stop the interview, or the interview gets interrupted, the recording will be stopped immediately. During the interview, I will also be taking notes as well. Should you need me to report a question, please let me know. Also, if at any time you feel uncomfortable answering a certain question, please let me know.

1. What does authentic leadership mean to you?
2. How would you describe yourself as an authentic leader?
3. Describe your values as an authentic leader?
4. Are these values consistent with the values you hold in your everyday life? If not, explain.
5. Thinking back, how has your identity as an authentic leader formed or emerged?
6. Were there specific experiences, people, or events which contributed or encouraged you to become an authentic leader? Please share.
7. At what age would you say you clearly identified [or began to identify?] yourself as an authentic leader?
8. Do you feel you have become a more effective authentic leader over time? If so, how?
9. Spirituality is defined as “a human belief in, movement toward, and relationship with a higher purpose or power, self, and others from which a sense of purpose, consciousness, interconnectedness, and destiny may be derived” (Swift, 2003, pg. 5). Would you describe yourself as a spiritual leader? Why or why not?
10. Thinking back, how has spirituality influenced your personal identity?
11. How may spirituality have influenced or contributed to the emergence of your authentic leadership identity?
12. Please share a few experiences or events you feel capture the way spirituality has influenced or contributed to the emergence of your authentic leadership identity.
13. Is there anything else you would like to share as part of what we discussed today?
Dear [insert name of participant],

Thank you for taking time to participate in my research study by taking part in a follow up interview. Your contributions to this research are truly valued and appreciated.

Your questionnaire responses and all transcript data will be maintained separately from any identifiable information linked to your study code. The audio-recordings will be destroyed once they have been transcribed. The questionnaire and transcription data will be stored for a minimum of three years.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me directly.

Thank you again!

Best regards,
Rosalie Peterson
Pepperdine University, GSEP
Doctoral Candidate
APPENDIX S

GSEP Education Division SBE Certification

This is to certify that:

Rosalie Peterson

Has completed the following CITI Program course:

GSEP Education Division
GSEP Education Division - Social-Behavioral-Educational (SBE) 1 - Basic Course

Under requirements set by:

Pepperdine University

Verify at www.citiprogram.org/verify/?wa66b6bb0-aaa7-4823-a966-ab8f6c656705-24994068
APPENDIX T

Pepperdine IRB Approval

NOTICE OF APPROVAL FOR HUMAN RESEARCH

Date: April 30, 2018

Protocol Investigator Name: Rosalie Peterson

Protocol #: 17-11-673

Project Title: EXPLORING THE INFLUENCE OF SPIRITUALITY IN THE INITIAL DEVELOPMENT OF AUTHENTIC LEADERSHIP IDENTITY

School: Graduate School of Education and Psychology

Dear Rosalie Peterson:

Thank you for submitting your application for exempt review to Pepperdine University’s Institutional Review Board (IRB). We appreciate the work you have done on your proposal. The IRB has reviewed your submitted IRB application and all ancillary materials. Upon review, the IRB has determined that the above entitled project meets the requirements for exemption under the federal regulations 45 CFR 46.101 that govern the protections of human subjects.

Your research must be conducted according to the proposal that was submitted to the IRB. If changes to the approved protocol occur, a revised protocol must be reviewed and approved by the IRB before implementation. For any proposed changes in your research protocol, please submit an amendment to the IRB. Since your study falls under exemption, there is no requirement for continuing IRB review of your project. Please be aware that changes to your protocol may prevent the research from qualifying for exemption from 45 CFR 46.101 and require submission of a new IRB application or other materials to the IRB.

A goal of the IRB is to prevent negative occurrences during any research study. However, despite the best intent, unforeseen circumstances or events may arise during the research. If an unexpected situation or adverse event happens during your investigation, please notify the IRB as soon as possible. We will ask for a complete written explanation of the event and your written response. Other actions also may be required depending on the nature of the event. Details regarding the timeframe in which adverse events must be reported to the IRB and documenting the adverse event can be found in the Pepperdine University Protection of Human Participants in Research: Policies and Procedures Manual at community.pepperdine.edu/rb.

Please refer to the protocol number denoted above in all communication or correspondence related to your application and this approval. Should you have additional questions or require clarification of the contents of this letter, please contact the IRB Office. On behalf of the IRB, I wish you success in this scholarly pursuit.

Sincerely,

Judy Ho, Ph.D., IRB Chair
## APPENDIX U

A 15-Point Checklist of Criteria for Good Thematic Analysis Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transcription</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>The data have been transcribed to an appropriate level of detail, and the transcripts have been checked against the tapes for ‘accuracy’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coding</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Each data item has been given equal attention in the coding process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Themes have not been generated from a few vivid examples (an anecdotal approach), but instead the coding process has been thorough, inclusive and comprehensive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>All relevant extracts for all each theme have been collated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Themes have been checked against each other and back to the original data set.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Themes are internally coherent, consistent, and distinctive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Data have been analyzed-interpreted, made sense of - rather than just paraphrased or described.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Analysis and data match each other – the extracts illustrate the analytic claims.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Analysis tells a convincing and well-organized story about the data and topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.</td>
<td>A good balance between analytic narrative and illustrative extracts is provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Enough time has been allocated to complete all phases of the analysis adequately, without rushing a phase or giving it a once-over-lightly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written report</td>
<td>12.</td>
<td>The assumptions about, and specific approach to, thematic analysis are clearly explicated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.</td>
<td>There is a good fit between what you claim you do, and what you show you have done – i.e., described method and reported analysis are consistent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.</td>
<td>The language and concepts used in the report are consistent with the epistemological position of the analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.</td>
<td>The researcher is positioned as active in the research process; themes do not just ‘emerge’.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Braun and Clark, 2006, p. 37)
APPENDIX V

Statement of Personal Bias

Growing up as a Christian, much of my personal beliefs about life are grounded in spirituality and influenced by Christianity. I am a true believer each person has a purpose and fulfill this purpose as part of their life journey. Faith and prayer are very much a part of my daily life. Integrity and authenticity have always guided me both personal and professionally. As a faculty member within the College of Business and Public Management, much of my experience and research has been centered around leadership and management. Authentic leadership theory has been the focus of much of my interest in leadership, specifically because it aligns with my personal beliefs and approach in the workplace. I believe that authenticity is a prerequisite to leadership and the more self-awareness one becomes, the more authenticity is displayed and the greater a leader one is. The more alignment a leader can achieve between beliefs and character, the more impactful, inspirational, and compassionate he/she can be towards others. I believe the spirituality influences and guides a personal towards his/her purpose. The all things happen for a reason and life lessons and development are encouraged and created to guide each person toward their purpose in fulfilling God’s plan. Great leaders are those who realize their purpose, continue to support and encourage those around him/her, and live each day with the desire to align themselves with God’s will. The more time one spends understanding themselves and cultivating their gifts, the more fulfilling of a life he/she will lead.
### APPENDIX W

#### List of Industries Specified by Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>All Participants ((N = 61))</th>
<th>Interview Participants ((N = 11))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation</td>
<td>4 (7%)</td>
<td>1 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcasting</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>2 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired or unemployed</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>1 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education: Higher Education</td>
<td>7 (11%)</td>
<td>1 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education: Primary/Secondary (K-12)</td>
<td>3 (5%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Insurance</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government and Public Administration</td>
<td>6 (10%)</td>
<td>2 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care and Social Services</td>
<td>8 (13%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemaker</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel and Food Services</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Services and Data Processing</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>1 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Services</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing: Computer and Electronics</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing: Other</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8 (13%)</td>
<td>2 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Information Industry</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate, Rental and Leasing</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>1 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific or Technical Services</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunications</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Warehousing</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>4 (7%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 61 \(100\%\) | 11 \(100\%\)
APPENDIX X

List of Job Titles Specified by Participants

Participants were asked to indicate their job title in section one, question number seven.

Below is the full list of responses collected from the questionnaire:

Administrator
Adult protection Social Worker
Aerospace Engineer / President
Business Consultant
C-130 Aircraft Loadmaster
Case manager
CEO
CEO
CEO
Co-Founder
Council member and Life Coach/Mentor
Creative Minds Instructor
CTE Program Specialist
Dean
Deputy Director
Director
Director and Coach
Director of Engineering
Director of Program Management Office
Director of Professional Services
Director, Internal Communications
Educator
Environmental Attorney
Fire Captain II
Global Payroll Manager
Head of human capital consulting firm
High School Counselor
Homemaker
HR Director
Human Resources Generalist
Manager
Manager, Production Operations
Managing Consultant
Marketing Director
Merchandiser and Behavioral Therapist
Operations Supervisor
Para Educator
Pastor
Director of Pharmacy
Political Coach
President
President
President
Principal Analyst
Principal Manager
Professor
Professor of Kinesiology
Professor, Management and Leadership
Program Manager
Project manager, expert
Retired
Retired
Safety Division Manager
Senior Adjunct Instructor
Senior Events Manager
Senior Manager
Sr. Business Intelligence Analyst
Supervisory Radar Specialist
Supply Chain Manager
Training Store Manager
Vice President