

Leader Authenticity: A Renewed Call for Research

James E. Henderson
Union Institute & University

This article encourages new inquiry into the concept of leader authenticity among cross-cultural and cross-generational researchers to improve leadership practice. Though the initial research was conducted in schools, subsequent investigation in other-than-school environments supported the heuristic nature of the instrument in a wide variety of organizational settings.

INTRODUCTION

Based upon the classic literature from several social science disciplines and from the results of the first successful empirical study on leader authenticity (Henderson, 1982), I found that the authentic leader was distinguished by the aspects of accountability and admitting to mistakes, perceived non-manipulation of followers, and a personal salience of self over role. In the initial research results, the followers of the authentic school principal saw a person who was real. They saw a person who accepted responsibility for his or her own actions and for the actions of those in the organization. They saw someone who made mistakes, admitted them, and obviously tried not to repeat those mistakes. Their school principal sometimes surprised them. The principal did not always act like a principal was supposed to act. If a benefit would accrue to the organization through dressing differently, behaving differently, or saying things out of the ordinary, their principal would not be constrained by perceived role requirements. Their principal was not viewed as a manipulator of people. Finally, there was a perceived congruence between the principal's expressions and the principal's actions. In short, this was an authentic person first, and an administrator second.

The followers of the inauthentic principal, on the other hand, saw a person who played everything strictly "by the book." Their principal functioned within the job very much the way the job description was written, but tended to maintain the effort at that routinized level. The personality of the principal was engulfed by the demands of the office. Those teachers felt that their principal not only lacked a sense of self beyond the role, but also tended to deal with them on that level. While that, in and of itself was not unethical or even a breeding ground for unethical conduct, the inauthentic principal was viewed as dealing with teachers in a sterile, objectified sense, at best. They saw this principal as one who willingly would scapegoat others to "save his (or her) own neck." This leader made no mistakes, or at least none to which the leader was willing to admit. Their principal tended to say one thing and do quite another. Subordinates viewed this principal as a two-dimensional being. This inauthentic principal often demonstrated a clear failure of character.

Accordingly, the concept of leader authenticity was defined as the extent to which followers perceived their leader to be maximizing the acceptance of organizational and personal responsibility for actions, outcomes, and mistakes; the non-manipulation of followers; and the salience of self over role.

Leader inauthenticity was defined as the extent to which followers perceived their leader to be “passing the buck” and blaming others and circumstances for errors and outcomes; to be manipulating followers; and to be concerned primarily with operating subordinate to the prescribed organizational role. The Leader Authenticity Scale (see Appendix A) was confirmed (and re-confirmed in numerous follow-up studies) as being a highly reliable instrument and substantial content and construct validity evidence was presented for its use. It was easy to argue that the ethical underpinnings of the authentic principal were apparent, and that the failures of character in the inauthentic principal were equally revealed.

Subsequent Selected Authenticity Studies

The concept of leader authenticity and the Leader Authenticity Scale (and that Scale’s subsequent derivatives) proved to be of substantial heuristic value and produced certain interesting and illuminating findings. The concept and scale have been used and cited in over 100 research studies, dissertations and articles. Several examples follow.

Blumberg and Greenfield (1986) and Hoy and Kupersmith (1984) demonstrated a link between leader authenticity and trust among staff in elementary schools. Hoy and Kupersmith, in fact, found that leader authenticity was significantly correlated with all three aspects of organizational trust: trust in principal, trust in colleagues, and trust in organization (1984, p. 85). Hoy and Henderson (1983) demonstrated that leader authenticity of elementary school principals was significantly related to openness in organizational climate and to humanism in pupil-control orientation of the school. Ding (1991) examined the relationship between principals’ authenticity and teacher job satisfaction and found a significantly positive relationship between principals’ authenticity and teacher job satisfaction. Given the ethical basis for the authentic principal’s behavior, none of these results are particularly surprising.

Meyer (1991) examined the relationship existing between the concepts of perceived leader authenticity and the perceived instructional leadership behaviors of middle-level principals. Meyer identified several findings of note that once again have clear and resonant ethical overtones:

1. A good instructional manager is an accountable, highly visible, supervisor of instruction who provides performance incentives to both teachers and learners without manipulation.
2. Teachers have different perceptions about authenticity and instructional management than supervisors and principals.
3. Male teachers have some perceptions different than female teachers.
4. Older teachers with more years of working with the current principal perceived the principal to be more manipulative than other groups did.
5. Teachers in higher enrollment schools have higher perceptions of the frequency or quality of some principal behaviors than teachers from smaller enrollment schools.

Lasserre (1990) examined the relationship between teachers’ perceptions of the context variables of teacher interactions, principal-teacher relations, and leader authenticity and the personal variables of teacher self-efficacy and teacher self-confidence. Lasserre found a strong relationship between the context measure for school climate and the personal variable of self-efficacy. Teacher interaction was significantly related to personal teaching efficacy and principal-teacher relations was significantly related to teaching efficacy. The perception of the faculties regarding relationships between their own personal efficacy, teaching efficacy, and total efficacy and leader authenticity were found to be statistically significant. In short, if teachers were treated in an ontological fashion they tended to treat their peers in such a manner. This enhanced their sense that they could make a difference in the lives in their care. Such is the basis for ethical treatment of peers and clients.

Benjamin (1987) studied the relationships among teacher perceptions of clinical supervisory practices, principal authenticity, and supervisory outcomes. The importance of perceived principal authenticity in predicting a successful clinical supervisory experience was identified. Benjamin also concluded that, in assessing the potential for implementation of clinical supervision, the readiness and authenticity of the teacher, as well as the individuality of the principal-teacher relationship were important

factors. Once again, the importance and the effectiveness of genuine, ethical interpersonal behavior were demonstrated and the validity of the leader authenticity was again supported.

Teacher and Leader Authenticity.

Hoffman (1993) tested a short form of the Leader Authenticity Scale (see Appendix B) containing sixteen items, and found that instrument to be highly reliable. Because there was no similar measure of teacher authenticity, Hoffman developed and tested a new scale similar to the LAS, the Teacher Authenticity Scale (see Appendix C). Teacher authenticity is the degree to which other teachers are viewed as accepting responsibility for their actions, as being non-manipulating, and demonstrating a salience of self over role. Items from the shortened version of the LAS were adapted to measure authentic interactions between teachers. For example, "Teachers here manipulate other teachers" and "Teachers are very defensive about any criticism" was developed from "The principal is very defensive about any criticism." The sixteen new items referring to teacher behavior were called the Teacher Authenticity Scale (TAS). As expected, the two measures of authenticity were highly reliable and were supported in content and construct validity evidence. The scales emerged as predicted: a measure of leader authenticity and a measure of teacher authenticity. Both scales, then, were based upon perceived ethical behavior of the school's leader and the school's professional staff.

Hoffman (1993) also found that openness in school climate was related, as predicted, to authenticity; in general, the more open the climate of middle schools, the more authentic both teacher and principal. Collegial teacher-teacher relations best explained authenticity of teacher relations, while principal authenticity was best explained by supportive principal-teacher relations. Principal authenticity and principal trust were related in Hoffman's study, and open, authentic behavior appeared to be a key factor in generating faculty trust in the principal, trust being a manifestation of ethical interpersonal dealings. Further, principal authenticity and teacher authenticity were also related. Authentic behavior between the principal and teachers generated authentic interactions among teachers, or authentic interactions among teachers promoted authentic principal-teacher interaction. Hoffman speculated that the two levels of authenticity were most likely mutually dependent.

Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (1998) conducted an empirical analysis of faculty trust in colleagues and trust in the principal demonstrates that faculty trust is an important aspect of the openness and health of school climate. That relationship is related to the authenticity of both the principal's and the teachers' behavior.

McMahon (2006) investigated the relationship among leader authenticity, teacher empowerment, and organizational climate. She found that the more teachers perceive themselves as empowered (i.e., challenged by decision-making opportunities which invite individuals to think strategically and to take personal responsibility for the quality of their task) the more likely teachers will rate their principal as authentic (i.e., non-manipulating, accepting of accountability, and exhibiting a salience of self over role). Furthermore, findings of this study indicated that the more female teachers perceived themselves as empowered, the more they perceived their school organizational climate to be open (i.e., principals and teachers sharing a genuine commitment indicated by high levels of cooperation through the exchange of ideas, frequently offered praise, professional mannerisms, respecting competencies, a void in bureaucratic practices by promoting the freedom to perform without scrutiny). Also, noted in this study are the findings indicating that teachers who work in poor school districts perceive their principals' behaviors as more authentic than teachers who work in wealthy school districts. Additionally, the results of this study supported leader authenticity and teacher empowerment as important predictors of organizational climate. Consistent with past research, she also found that leader authenticity remained the strongest predictor of an open organizational climate.

Epstein (2011) identified leader authenticity as a key factor for leaders within a higher education environment to enable those leaders to recognize the ways in which they shape discourse in relation to stakeholders as an audience and the influence this shaping has on understanding the organizational culture.

Authenticity Beyond School Environments.

Gerber (2006) in his doctoral dissertation pointed out a need in leader authenticity research:

While promising for helping us better understand and move past the current leadership crisis, the research on Authentic Leadership should be considered in its infancy. As just detailed, only a small number of researchers have attempted to characterize and study the construct. Of these, only Henderson and colleagues have moved past the conceptual stage to begin to offer empirical evidence in support of their model. Even still, Henderson's work has been carried out predominately in school settings. There remains a need for a model of Authentic Leadership that applies more broadly to other organizations. (p. 27)

Henderson and Brookhart (1996) designed a revised Leader Authenticity Scale (the Organizational Leader Authenticity Scale or OLAS—see Appendix D) for use in determining the authenticity of both educational leaders and leaders outside of educational settings. As has been discussed, the initial Leader Authenticity Scale had focused on ascertaining a school principal's authenticity as perceived by the school's faculty and staff. A Staff Authenticity Scale (SAS—see Appendix E), derived from the Teacher Authenticity Scale and designed for use in educational and non-educational organizations, was also developed and tested. Leader and staff authenticity were related as predicted to organizational health, organizational climate, and leader effectiveness. A causal model predicting organizational health and organizational climate from leader authenticity and staff authenticity was constructed.

This study supports the concept of leader authenticity as central to leadership in a broader variety of institutional contexts than elementary schools and supports the use of the Organizational Leader Authenticity Scale to measure it. The relationship between perceived leader authenticity and leader effectiveness was also tested for the first time and that relationship was found to be very strong. Further, the Staff Authenticity instrument was constructed and tested and found to be predictive (when working with leader authenticity) of organizational climate and organizational health. Predicted relationships between OLAS and SAS and other variables were obtained in a sample of educational leaders in a variety of positions in basic education, higher education, and other public institutions. This study forms the basis for further study of this expanded conception of leader authenticity and staff authenticity.

CONCLUSION...AND AN OPPORTUNITY

The linkages between notions of effective and ethical leadership and the leader's authenticity seem apparent. The leader's selflessly working to perform in the best interest of others—internal and external organizational “clients”—is a respectful act. This is directly analogous to the leader authenticity aspect of non-manipulation. The leader's possessing courage and a strength of character is another ethical imperative. To accept responsibility for actions and mistakes and to move to correct those difficulties is a *sine qua non* of effective organizations. This attribute directly relates to the leader authenticity aspect of accountability. Finally, the authentic leader exhibits the actions of servant leadership and is clearly honest, both to herself or himself and also to the organization's stakeholders. The authentic leader is not a puppet, but is, rather, a real person possessing a moral compass for that leader's expressions and actions. This leader is not just a role incumbent per the leader authenticity aspect of salience of self over role; this leader is a real person. In fact, Gardner, Cogliser, Davis and Dickens (2011) assert in their comprehensive review of authentic leadership, “Of the three dimensions proposed (in Henderson and Hoy's formulation), salience of self over role comes closest to the philosophy-based conception of authenticity” (p. 1123).

If we believe the empirical evidence presented in these studies, in what will authentic and ethical behavior on the part of organizational leaders and their colleagues result? We will have organizations in which interpersonal trust and respect, ethical behavior, and positive morale and job satisfaction predominate. Moreover—and of great importance to those who would call for increased organizational productivity and enhanced standards—authentic behavior also results in organizations in which accountability, employee self-efficacy, effective employee supervision, and leader effectiveness are

evident. These ethically-based organizations are places where organizational stakeholders have a chance to model behavior on the part of leaders that is accepting of responsibility, that exhibits a sincere concern for all of the stakeholders in the organization, and that demonstrates that the leaders and employees are real human beings who treat others according to their needs and not according to monolithic rules. These are organizations where both staff and clients are encouraged to succeed.

However, more work remains. Connections between other organizational variables and leader and staff authenticity need to be tested. Qualitative, historical and creative research regarding leader and staff authenticity could be most useful and illuminating. Finally, effective means of enhancing leader and staff authenticity in practice need to be developed, tested and put into practice. Are you interested? Will you help?

REFERENCES

- Abravanel, E. A. (1965). A psychological analysis of the concept of role. In R. Brown, *Social Psychology*. New York: The Free Press.
- Argyle, M. & McHenry, R. (1971). Do spectacles really affect judgments of intelligence? *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 10, 27-29.
- Argyris, C. (1957). *Personality and organization*. New York: Harper and Brothers.
- Aronson, E., & Linder, D. E. (1965). Gain and loss of esteem as determinants of interpersonal attractiveness. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 1, 156-171.
- Aronson, E., Willerman, B., & Floyd, J. (1966). The effect of a pratfall on increasing interpersonal attractiveness. *Psychonomic Science*, 4, 227-228.
- Aronson, E., & Worchel, P. (1966). Similarity versus liking as determinants of interpersonal attractiveness. *Psychonomic Science*, 5, 157-158.
- Bales, R. F. (1958) Task roles and social roles in problem solving groups. In Maccoby, E., Newcomb, T., & Hartley, E. (Eds.), *Readings in social psychology*. New York: Holt.
- Benjamin, S. M. K. (1987). An investigation of the relationships among teacher perceptions of clinical supervisory practices, principal authenticity, and supervisory outcomes (Doctoral dissertation, Northeastern University, 1987). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 48, 1361A.
- Bennis, W. (1989). *On becoming a leader*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Blumberg, A., & Greenfield, W. (1986). *The effective principal: Perspectives on school leadership*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Brandt, R. (Ed.). (1992). Transforming leadership. *Educational Leadership*, 49 (5).
- Brumbaugh, R. B. (1971). Authenticity and theories of administrative behavior. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 16, 108-112.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Byrne, D., & Clore, G. L. (1970). A reinforcement model of evaluative responses. *Personality: An International Journal*, 1, 103-128.
- Carling, F. (1962). *And yet we are human*. London: Chatto and Windus.
- Carter, L. (1954). Recording and evaluating the performance of individuals as members of small groups. *Personnel Psychology*, 7, 477-484.
- Clifton, D. O., & Nelson, P. (1992). *Soar with your strengths*. New York: Delacorte Press.
- Cooper, J., Darley, J. M., & Henderson, J. E. (1974). On the effectiveness of deviant and conventionally appearing communications: A field experiment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 29, 752-757.
- Covey, S. R. (1992). *Principle-centered leadership*. Provo, Utah: Covey Leadership Center.
- Darley, J., & Cooper, J. M. (1972). The 'clean for Gene' phenomenon: Deciding to vote for or against a candidate on the basis of the physical appearance of his supporters. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 2, 24-33.
- DePree, M. (1989). *Leadership is an art*. New York: Doubleday.

- Ding, W. (1993). Relationships among principals' leadership behavior, principals' authenticity, and teacher job satisfaction in selected junior high schools (Doctoral dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, 1992). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 53, 2617A.
- Dion, K., Berscheid, E., & Walster, E. (1972). What is beautiful is good. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 24, 285-290.
- Efran, M. G. (1974). The effect of physical appearance on the judgment of guilt, interpersonal attraction, and severity of recommended punishment in a simulated jury task. *Journal of Experimental Research in Personality*, 8, 45-54.
- Epstein, S. (2012). Students and stakeholders: How college presidents publically portray the urban college student (Doctoral dissertation: Union Institute & University). Available from ProQuest, UMI Dissertations Publishing. (UMI No. 3521006)
- Erikson, E. H. (1956). The problem of ego identity. *The Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 4, 56-121.
- Etzioni, A. (1968). Basic human needs, alienation and inauthenticity. *American Sociological Review*, 33, 880-881.
- Festinger, L. (1964). *A theory of cognitive dissonance*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Festinger, L. (1957). *Conflict, decision, and dissonance*. New York: Row, Peterson.
- Festinger, L., Riecken, H., & Schachter, S. (1956). *When prophecy fails*. Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press.
- Gardner, W.L., Cogliner, C.G., Davis, K.M., & Dickens, M.P. (2011). Authentic leadership: A review of the literature and research agenda. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22, 1120-1145.
- Gerber, E. (2006). Authentic leadership: The development and initial validation of a measure. (Doctoral dissertation: University of Georgia).
- Getzels, J. W., & Guba, E. G. (1957). Social behavior and the administrative process. *School Review*, 65, 423-441.
- Goffman, E. (1961). On the characteristics of total institutions: The inmate world. In D. Cressey (ed.) *The prison*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc.
- Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Gouldner, A. W. (1960). The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. *American Sociological Review*, 25, 161-178.
- Halpin, A. W. (1966). *Theory and research in administration*. New York: Macmillan.
- Helmreich, R., Aronson, E., & LeFan, J. (1970). To err is humanizing--sometimes: Effects of self-esteem, competence and a pratfall on inter-personal attraction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 16, 259-264.
- Henderson, J. (1982). Leadership authenticity: The development and validation of an operational measure (Doctoral dissertation, Rutgers University, 1981). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 43, 993A.
- Henderson, J. E. & Brookhart, S. M. (1996). Leader authenticity: Key to organizational climate, health and perceived leader effectiveness. *The Journal of Leadership Studies*, 3 (4), 87-103.
- Henderson, J. E., & Hoy W. K. (1982). Leader authenticity: The development and test of an operational measure. *Educational and Psychological Research*, 3, 63-75.
- Hill, M. A. (1984). The law of the father: Leadership and symbolic authority in psychoanalysis. In B. Kellerman (Ed.), *Leadership: Multidisciplinary perspectives*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Hoffman, J. D. (1993). *The organizational climate of middle schools and dimensions of authenticity and trust*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ.
- Horney, K. (1950). *Neurosis and human growth: The struggle toward self-realization*. New York: W. W. Norton and Company.
- Hoy, W. K., & Henderson, J. E. (1983). Pupil authenticity, school climate, and pupil-control orientation. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 29, 123-130.

- Hoy, W. K., & Kupersmith, W. (1984). Principal authenticity and faculty trust: Key elements in organizational behavior. *Planning and Changing, 15*, 80-88.
- Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2013). *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice* (9th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hunt, S. M. (1984). The role of leadership in the construction of reality. In B. Kellerman (Ed.), *Leadership: Multidisciplinary perspectives*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Jones, E. E., Bell, L., & Aronson, E. (1972). The reciprocation of attraction from similar and dissimilar others. In C. McClintock (Ed.), *Experimental social psychology*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Jones, E. E., Jones, R. G., & Gergen, K. J. (1963). Some conditions affecting the evaluation of a conformist. *Journal of Personality, 31*, 270-288.
- Jones, E. E., & Wortman, C. (1973). *Ingratiation: An attributional approach*. Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.
- Jourard, S. (1959). Healthy personality and self-disclosure. *Mental Hygiene, 43*, 499-507.
- Kelley, H. H. (1950). The warm-cold variable in first impressions of persons. *Journal of Personality, 18*, 431-439.
- Kleinke, C. L., Staneski, R. A., & Weaver, P. (1972). Evaluation of a person who uses another person's name in ingratiating and noningratiating situations. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 8*, 457-466.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1993). *Credibility: How leaders gain and lose it, why people demand it*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Laing, R. D. (1960). *The divided self*. London: Tavistock Publications.
- Landy, D., & Sigall, H. (1974). Beauty is talent: Task evaluation as a function of the performer's physical attractiveness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 29*.
- Lasserre, C. M. (1990). Relationships between selected school context variables and teacher self-efficacy and self-confidence (Doctoral dissertation, University of New Orleans, 1989). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 51*, 364A.
- Lott, A. J., & Lott, B. E. (1968). A learning theory approach to interpersonal attitudes. In A. Greenwald, T. Brock, & T. McOstrom (Eds.), *Psychological foundations of attitudes*. New York: Academic Press.
- Lowe, C. A. & Goldstein, J. W. (1970). Reciprocal liking and attribution of ability: Mediating effects of perceived intent and personal involvement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 16*, 291-298.
- Lynd, H. M. (1961). *On shame and the search for identity*. New York: Science Editions, Inc.
- Manz, W. & Lueck, H. (1968). Influence of wearing glasses on personality ratings: Cross cultural validation of an old experiment. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 27*, 704.
- Maslow, A. H. (1961). Peak experiences as acute identity-experiences. *American Journal of Psychoanalysis, 21*, 254-260.
- McCullough, D. (1992). *Truman*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- McMahon, E. (2006). A descriptive study of authentic leadership, teacher empowerment, and organizational climate. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, PA.
- Mettee, D. R. (1971). Rejection of unexpected success as a function of the negative consequences of accepting success. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 17*, 332-341.
- Meyer, T. M. (1991). Perceived leader authenticity as an effective indicator of perceived instructional leadership behavior in middle school principals (Doctoral dissertation, Andrews University, 1990). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 53*, 2617A.
- Perlmutter, H. V. (1959). *Person to person: A psychological analysis of cross-cultural relationships*. Topeka: Menninger Foundation.
- Phillips, D. T. (1992). *Lincoln on leadership*. New York: Warner Books.
- Rinder, I. D., & Campbell, D. T. (1952). Varieties of inauthenticity. *Phylon, 13*, 270-275.

- Rosen, D. M. (1984). Leadership systems in world cultures. In B. Kellerman (Ed.), *Leadership: Multidisciplinary perspectives*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Rosenthal, R. & Jacobson, L. (1968). *Pygmalion in the classroom: Teacher expectations and pupil's intellectual development*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Schachtel, E. G. (1959). *Metamorphosis*. New York: Basic Books.
- Seeman, M. (1953). Role conflict and ambivalence in leadership. *American Sociological Review*, 18, 373-380.
- Seeman, M. (1960). *Sociological status and leadership*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press.
- Seeman, M. (1966). Status and identity: The problem of authenticity. *Pacific Sociological Review*, 9, 67-73.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1992). *Moral leadership: Getting to the heart of school improvement*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Starratt, R. J. (1993). *The drama of leadership*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Terry, R. W. (1993). *Authentic leadership: Courage in action*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Tiryakian, E. A. (1968). The existential self and the person. In C. Gordon & K. Gergen (Eds.), *The self in social interaction*. New York: Wiley.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, W. (1998). Trust in schools: A conceptual and empirical analysis. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 36 (4), 334 – 352.
- Ury, W. (1991). *Getting past no: Negotiating with difficult people*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Walster, E., & Walster G. W. (1963). Effect of expecting to be liked on choice of associates. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 67, 402-404.

APPENDIX A

Leader Authenticity Scale

On the following pages are some statements about the school setting. We are interested in the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statements as they relate to your particular school. Read each statement carefully. Then indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree by circling the number in front of each statement. The numbers and their meanings are indicated below:

1- Strongly Agree **2-** Moderately Agree **3-** Agree slightly more than disagree
4- Disagree slightly more than agree **5-** Moderately Disagree **6-** Strongly Disagree

1. The principal is obsessed with rules. 1 2 3 4 5 6
2. The principal is willing to admit to mistakes when they are made. 1 2 3 4 5 6
3. When dealing with a teacher, the principal behaves like a know-it-all. 1 2 3 4 5 6
4. The principal is not afraid to admit when he (or she) doesn't know something 1 2 3 4 5 6
5. The principal is very defensive about any criticism. 1 2 3 4 5 6
6. The principal is honest in face-to-face interactions. 1 2 3 4 5 6
7. Many times the principal will say one thing to teachers and something quite different to students or parents. 1 2 3 4 5 6
8. The principal is authentic. 1 2 3 4 5 6
9. It's not uncommon to see the principal pit one teacher against another. 1 2 3 4 5 6
10. The principal's beliefs and actions are consistent. 1 2 3 4 5 6
11. The principal finds it difficult to accept failure. 1 2 3 4 5 6
12. It's an unwritten rule around here that you don't criticize the principal. 1 2 3 4 5 6
13. If the principal makes a mistake, a reason is made to cover-up for the error. 1 2 3 4 5 6
14. The principal accepts and learns from mistakes. 1 2 3 4 5 6
15. The principal usually has teachers do things to make the principal look good. 1 2 3 4 5 6
16. After meeting together in situations like evaluation conferences, I feel that I know the principal better as a person. 1 2 3 4 5 6

APPENDIX A (continued)

1- Strongly Agree 2- Moderately Agree 3- Agree slightly more than disagree
4- Disagree slightly more than agree 5- Moderately Disagree 6- Strongly Disagree

17. The principal doesn't have much to do with teachers unless a teacher can help the principal in some way..... 1 2 3 4 5 6
18. The principal is an opportunist in dealing with teachers..... 1 2 3 4 5 6
19. The principal encourages "give-and-take" discussion with individual teachers..... 1 2 3 4 5 6
20. If something goes wrong in the school, the principal is sure to blame someone else on the staff..... 1 2 3 4 5 6
21. The principal is easily swayed by parent pressure. 1 2 3 4 5 6
22. The principal appears to have "rehearsed" answers for teachers during conferences..... 1 2 3 4 5 6
23. The principal is a person first, and an administrator second..... 1 2 3 4 5 6
24. The principal manipulates the teachers..... 1 2 3 4 5 6
25. The principal is a phony. 1 2 3 4 5 6
26. Discussing serious issues, the principal likes to "play games." 1 2 3 4 5 6
27. The principal accepts responsibility for the principal's own actions and for the progress of the school..... 1 2 3 4 5 6
28. Teachers are afraid if they confide in the principal that the information will be used against them. 1 2 3 4 5 6
29. The principal seems to talk at you and not with you. 1 2 3 4 5 6
30. Whenever authority is delegated to a staff member, the principal stands behind that person..... 1 2 3 4 5 6
31. The principal would not hesitate to put a board member or parent in his/her place if necessary..... 1 2 3 4 5 6
32. The principal likes to take credit for teachers' accomplishments, but doesn't want to be blamed for any failures..... 1 2 3 4 5 6

© James E. Henderson and Wayne K. Hoy, 1982. Cited with permission.

APPENDIX B

Leader Authenticity Scale (Modified Version)

On the following pages are some statements about the school setting. We are interested in the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statements as they relate to your particular school. Read each statement carefully. Then indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree by circling the number in front of each statement. The numbers and their meanings are indicated below:

1- Strongly Agree **2-** Moderately Agree **3-** Agree slightly more than disagree
4- Disagree slightly more than agree **5-** Moderately Disagree **6-** Strongly Disagree

1. The principal doesn't have much to do with teachers unless the teacher can help him/her in some way 1 2 3 4 5 6
2. The principal is willing to admit to mistakes when they are made 1 2 3 4 5 6
3. The principal finds it difficult to accept failure 1 2 3 4 5 6
4. If the principal makes a mistake, a reason is made to cover-up for the error 1 2 3 4 5 6
5. The principal is very defensive about any criticism 1 2 3 4 5 6
6. The principal is honest in face-to-face interactions 1 2 3 4 5 6
7. The principal likes to take credit for accomplishments but doesn't want to be blamed for any failures 1 2 3 4 5 6
8. The principal runs the school "by the book." 1 2 3 4 5 6
9. The principal's beliefs and actions are consistent 1 2 3 4 5 6
10. If something is wrong in the school, the principal is sure to blame someone else on the staff 1 2 3 4 5 6
11. The principal manipulates teachers 1 2 3 4 5 6
12. When dealing with a teacher, the principal behaves like a know-it-all 1 2 3 4 5 6
13. The principal seems to talk at you and not with you 1 2 3 4 5 6
14. Whenever authority is delegated to a staff member, the principal stands behind that person 1 2 3 4 5 6
15. The principal accepts and learns from mistakes 1 2 3 4 5 6
16. The principal accepts responsibility for the principal's own actions and for the progress of the school 1 2 3 4 5 6

© James D. Hoffman, 1993. Cited with permission.

APPENDIX C

Teacher Authenticity Scale

On the following pages are some statements about the school setting. We are interested in the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statements as they relate to your particular school. Read each statement carefully. Then indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree by circling the number in front of each statement. The numbers and their meanings are indicated below:

1- Strongly Agree **2-** Moderately Agree **3-** Agree slightly more than disagree
4- Disagree slightly more than agree **5-** Moderately Disagree **6-** Strongly Disagree

1. Whenever authority is delegated to a staff member, other teachers stand behind that person 1 2 3 4 5 6
2. Teachers in this school operate "by the book." 1 2 3 4 5 6
3. The teachers' beliefs and actions are consistent 1 2 3 4 5 6
4. Teachers here like to take credit for accomplishments but don't want to be blamed for any failures 1 2 3 4 5 6
5. Teachers here accept and learn from mistakes 1 2 3 4 5 6
6. Teachers in this school are honest in face-to face interactions 1 2 3 4 5 6
7. Teachers here are willing to admit to mistakes when they are made..... 1 2 3 4 5 6
8. Teachers here accept responsibility for their own actions and for the progress of the school 1 2 3 4 5 6
9. Teachers are very defensive about any criticism 1 2 3 4 5 6
10. Teachers don't have much to do with other teachers unless the teacher can help them in some way 1 2 3 4 5 6
11. Other teachers here find it difficult to accept failure 1 2 3 4 5 6
12. If a teacher in this school makes a mistake, a reason is made to cover-up for the error 1 2 3 4 5 6
13. If something is wrong in this school, the teachers are sure to blame someone else on the staff 1 2 3 4 5 6
14. Teachers here manipulate other teachers..... 1 2 3 4 5 6
15. When dealing with a teacher, other teachers behave like know-it-alls 1 2 3 4 5 6
16. Teachers here seem to talk at you and not with you 1 2 3 4 5 6

© James D. Hoffman, 1993. Cited with permission.

APPENDIX D

ORGANIZATION: _____

Organizational Leader Authenticity Scale

INSTRUCTIONS: What follows are some statements about organizational settings. We are interested in the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statements as they relate to your particular organization. Please read each statement carefully. Then indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree by circling the number in front of each statement. The numbers and their meanings are indicated below:

- 1-** Strongly Agree **2-** Moderately Agree **3-** Agree slightly more than disagree
4- Disagree slightly more than agree **5-** Moderately Disagree **6-** Strongly Disagree

First impressions are usually the best in such matters. Read each statement, decide if you agree or disagree and the strength of your opinion, and then circle the appropriate number to the right of each statement. Please give your opinion on every statement. If you find that the numbers to be used in answering do not adequately indicate your own opinion, please use the one closest to the way you feel about your own organization.

- 1-** Strongly Agree **2-** Moderately Agree **3-** Agree slightly more than disagree
4- Disagree slightly more than agree **5-** Moderately Disagree **6-** Strongly Disagree

- 1. My supervisor doesn't have much to do with staff members unless the staff member can help him/her in some way. 1 2 3 4 5 6
- 2. My supervisor is willing to admit to mistakes when they are made. 1 2 3 4 5 6
- 3. My supervisor finds it difficult to accept failure. 1 2 3 4 5 6
- 4. If my supervisor makes a mistake, a reason is made to cover-up for the error. 1 2 3 4 5 6
- 5. My supervisor is very defensive about any criticism. 1 2 3 4 5 6
- 6. My supervisor is honest in face-to-face interactions. 1 2 3 4 5 6
- 7. My supervisor likes to take credit for accomplishments but doesn't want to be blamed for any failures. 1 2 3 4 5 6
- 8. My supervisor runs the organization "by the book." 1 2 3 4 5 6
- 9. My supervisor's beliefs and actions are consistent. 1 2 3 4 5 6
- 10. If something is wrong in the organization, my supervisor is sure to blame someone else on the staff. 1 2 3 4 5 6

Organizational Leader Authenticity Scale (continued)

1- Strongly Agree **2-** Moderately Agree **3-** Agree slightly more than disagree
4- Disagree slightly more than agree **5-** Moderately Disagree **6-** Strongly Disagree

- 11. My supervisor manipulates staff members. 1 2 3 4 5 6
- 12. When dealing with a staff member, my supervisor behaves like a
know-it-all. 1 2 3 4 5 6
- 13. My supervisor seems to talk at you and not with you. 1 2 3 4 5 6
- 14. Whenever authority is delegated to a staff member, my supervisor
stands behind that person. 1 2 3 4 5 6
- 15. My supervisor accepts and learns from mistakes. 1 2 3 4 5 6
- 16. My supervisor accepts responsibility for the supervisor's own actions
and for the progress of the organization. 1 2 3 4 5 6

Please return your completed questionnaire in the addressed envelope. Your responses will be held anonymous and will only be reported as aggregated data. Thank you for your assistance with this project.

© James E. Henderson and Susan M. Brookhart, 1996. Cited with permission.

APPENDIX E

ORGANIZATION: _____

Staff Authenticity Scale

INSTRUCTIONS: What follows are some statements about organizational settings. We are interested in the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statements as they relate to your particular organization. Please read each statement carefully. Then indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree by circling the number in front of each statement. The numbers and their meanings are indicated below:

- 1-** Strongly Agree **2-** Moderately Agree **3-** Agree slightly more than disagree
4- Disagree slightly more than agree **5-** Moderately Disagree **6-** Strongly Disagree

First impressions are usually the best in such matters. Read each statement, decide if you agree or disagree and the strength of your opinion, and then circle the appropriate number to the right of each statement. Please give your opinion on every statement. If you find that the numbers to be used in answering do not adequately indicate your own opinion, please use the one closest to the way you feel about your own organization.

- 1-** Strongly Agree **2-** Moderately Agree **3-** Agree slightly more than disagree
4- Disagree slightly more than agree **5-** Moderately Disagree **6-** Strongly Disagree

- 1. Whenever authority is delegated to a staff member, other staff members stand behind that person. 1 2 3 4 5 6
- 2. Staff members in my organization operate "by the book." 1 2 3 4 5 6
- 3. Staff members' beliefs and actions are consistent. 1 2 3 4 5 6
- 4. Staff members here like to take credit for accomplishments but don't want to be blamed for any failures. 1 2 3 4 5 6
- 5. Staff members here accept and learn from mistakes. 1 2 3 4 5 6
- 6. Staff members in my organization are honest in face-to face interactions. 1 2 3 4 5 6
- 7. Staff members here are willing to admit to mistakes when they are made. 1 2 3 4 5 6
- 8. Staff members here accept responsibility for their own actions and for the progress of the organization. 1 2 3 4 5 6
- 9. Staff members are very defensive about any criticism. 1 2 3 4 5 6

Staff Authenticity Scale (continued)

1- Strongly Agree 2- Moderately Agree 3- Agree slightly more than disagree
4- Disagree slightly more than agree 5- Moderately Disagree 6- Strongly Disagree

- 10. Staff members don't have much to do with other staff members unless the other staff member can help them in some way. 1 2 3 4 5 6
- 11. Other staff members in my organization find it difficult to accept failure. 1 2 3 4 5 6
- 12. If a staff member in my organization makes a mistake, a reason is made to cover-up for the error. 1 2 3 4 5 6
- 13. If something is wrong in my organization, the staff members are sure to blame someone else on the staff. 1 2 3 4 5 6
- 14. Staff members here manipulate other staff members. 1 2 3 4 5 6
- 15. When dealing with a staff member, other staff members behave like know-it-alls. 1 2 3 4 5 6
- 16. Staff members here seem to talk at you and not with you. 1 2 3 4 5 6

Please return your completed questionnaire in the addressed envelope. Your responses will be held anonymous and will only be reported as aggregated data. Thank you for your assistance with this project.

© James E. Henderson and Susan M. Brookhart, 1996. Cited with permission.