THE ROLE OF VALUE JUDGMENT IN CONGRUENT PERSONALITIES, TRAIT AUTHENTICITY, AND AUTHENTIC LEADERSHIP

Malcolm North, University of Central Arkansas
Julie Nelson, Grand Canyon University
Clifford Hurst, Westminster College

ABSTRACT

Research in value-behavior relations has yet to explore the role of value judgment in predicting authentic trait and behaviors. This study explored how individual value orientation and judgment relate to psychological maturity in the development of an authentic and congruent personality. A regression analysis with 346 working professionals examined if value judgment predicts psychological congruence and authenticity in personal and professional contexts. In addition, the relationship between value judgment and trait authenticity in 157 working adults and 83 supervisors from education, health, and non-profit organizations in the U.S was explored. Value judgment was measured by two profiles of the Hartman Value Profile (HVP), a judgment profiling instrument delineating the thinking, evaluation, problem-solving patterns, and orientation in 52 indices in personal (HVPII) and social domains (HVPI). Trait authenticity was measured with the Authenticity Scale (AS) comprising of three subscales measuring authentic living, self-alienation, and capacity to resist external influence. Support was found for all hypotheses testing for associations between value judgment and authenticity, and if value judgment predicted psychological congruence and authentic leadership and further identifies the type of value judgment used in the constructs of congruence and authenticity.

INTRODUCTION

This study explores to what degree value judgment is a predictor of congruent personality, trait authenticity, and authentic leadership. The present study is framed around Rogers' (1951) tripartite personality model, authentic leadership model (Luthans & Avolio, 2003); Hartman's value theory (1967); and Rogers' (1964) untested ideas that value judgment facilitates a congruent and authentic psychology of the self.

Authenticity has emerged as a ubiquitous modern value associated with the self-help movement as an ethical ideal for relating to self and others (Feldman, 2015; Guignon, 2004; Varga, 2012) and most commonly defined as a way of being that is consistent with one's true self by the accurate portrayal of one's experiences, thoughts, emotions, and values (Grégoire, Baron, Ménard, & Lachance, 2014; Rogers, 1951; Wang, 2016). Trait authenticity may be located on a broad spectrum with expression of the true self on one extreme and various degrees of self-alienation and psychopathology on the other (Carroll, 2015; Wood, Linley, Maltby, Baliousis, & Joseph, 2008). In this study, trait authenticity is informed by Rogers' (1951) tripartite personality model, which assumes the various alignment of three selves indicates varying degrees of congruent and authentic personality. Rogers (1951) saw the tripartite self as comprising of one's self-concept (how individuals see themselves), self-worth (how

individuals value themselves), and the ideal-self (the preferred, future-oriented ideas that individuals have for themselves). These have considerable conceptual relationship to Hartman's (1970) three self-appraisal value judgment factors that measure one's self-identity, self-concept, and self-image.

The importance of authenticity for psychological health in clinical, counseling, and coaching contexts has been established (Grégoire et al., 2014; Knoll, Meyer, Kroemer, & Schroder-Abe, 2015; Wang, 2016). Prior research has investigated the association between authenticity and well-being (Grégoire et al., 2014; Wang, 2016; Wood et al., 2008), subjective vitality (Akin & Akin, 2014b), optimism and hope (Ahmet & Umran, 2014), relational intimacy (Wang, 2016), and established the positive benefits to personal mental health and workplace contexts (Grégoire et al., 2014; Hannah, Walumbwa, & Fry, 2011; Knoll, et al., 2015; Wood et al., 2008). Rogers' person-centered-therapy is designed to allow clients to develop and align the three parts of the self to experience congruent living. This is explicit in his (1964) hypotheses that positive self-appraisal and value judgments result in increasing measures of a congruent personality bringing psychological health and reduced pathology. Alternatively, psychological illness and developmental pathology would result from poor value judgment, including low self-esteem and a sense of inadequacy and worthlessness. Rogers' (1951, 1964) ideas have received little empirical attention, owing perhaps to the lack of a value-judgment psychometric and the ability to measure the construct of psychological congruence within subjects. The purpose of this study is to explore if the only known psychometric for measuring value judgment is related and predictive of the constructs of congruence and authenticity.

AUTHENTIC LEADERSHIP

In the workplace, authenticity has also been associated with positive organizational outcomes, including worker productivity and satisfaction (Knoll et al., 2015; Miniotaitė & Bučiūnienė, 2013; Yukl, 2012). Authentic leadership is a values-based theory that has promise for developing ethical leaders who are trusted and able to lead their organizations with integrity (Copeland, 2014; Dhiman, 2011; Gardner, Cogliser, Davis, & Dickens, 2011; Gibson & Petrosko, 2014). This construct was developed from ethics and management literature in response to growing ethical failures, moral lapses, and corporate scandals, and focuses on authentic behaviors as opposed to traits (Berkovich, 2014; Copeland, 2014; Gardner et al., 2011; Hinojosa, Davis McCauley, Randolph-Seng, & Gardner, 2014; Leroy, Palanski, & Simons, 2012; Luthans & Avolio, 2003; Wang & Hsieh, 2013). Organizational failure has often been seen as a failure of leadership (Copeland, 2014; Kelly, 2013), which has prompted calls for research to identify ethical and authentic leaders who demonstrate sound judgment and behavioral consistency (Gardner et al., 2011; Yukl, 2012). Central to these calls is the role of authenticity in leadership that incorporates sound judgment and moral conscience amidst ethical working relationships (Copeland, 2014; Kelly, 2013; Neider & Schriesheim, 2011).

Authentic leadership has been associated with positive workplace outcomes such as employees' wellbeing and job satisfaction and with effective organizations and productive work climates (Datta, 2015; Gardner et al., 2011). Peus, Wesche, Streicher, Braun, and Fry (2012) found authentic leadership was positively related to organizational commitment, worker engagement, and employees' satisfaction with their supervisor. Important to this model is the alignment and consistency between a leader's espoused and enacted values (Clemmons & Fields, 2011; Hannah et al., 2011; Hitlin, 2003). Prior studies have focused on values and their alignment with personnel or organizational values and as vehicles of trust relationships (Wang & Hsieh, 2013), and behavioral consistency with espoused values (Fleeson & Wilt, 2010; Fusco, O'Riordan & Palmer, 2015; Leroy et al., 2012; Sherman, Nave, & Funder, 2012), or if inconsistent values predict burnout and attrition (Jambrak, Deane & Williams, 2014). Although values have been empirically shown to relate to behavior, few studies have explored if value judgment has the same relationship or can predict behavior. Since value judgment involves bringing one's ideas about values into action, we expect the construct to have more potential to relate to and predict behavior.

VALUE JUDGMENT

Values are bound irreducibly to human existence and important antecedents of behavior (Akhtar, Humphreys, & Furnham, 2015; Ergen,

2015). Some scholars have viewed values as subjective preferences and desires (Röpke, 2015). In philosophical and formal axiological approaches, values have an objective definition to denote degrees of meaning derived from the properties of a thing being valued (Frankl, 1988; Hartman, 1967; Röpke, 2015). In this view, all things have a set of properties with various degrees of quality and by which the thing is known or takes its meaning. Value is, therefore, both meaning and the richness of the set of properties that give it meaning and by which it can be understood (Hartman, 1967). To have meaning is to have value, and conversely, to have no meaning is to have no value (Hartman, 1967; Röpke, 2015). Values require meaning to be imputed by a valuer who ascribes a thing's value through positive or negative value judgments (Hartman, 1967; Röpke, 2015). In this way, values are directly related to value judgments, because meaning cannot be assigned without them. In contrast to other forms of judgment, value judgment includes an evaluation of something's worth based on a positive or negative appraisal and includes the act of assigning value or worth to people, physical objects, and actions or conceptual things like systems and ideas (Hartman, 1967; Röpke, 2015). Hartman (1967) identified three categories for all values and valuations, which can be distilled into the unique values and value judgments of intrinsic things such as people, the comparable values, and value judgments of extrinsic things such as behavior, actions, and objects; and the abstract values and value judgments of systemic things such as ideas, thoughts, logic, and systems. Value judgments can be both conscious acts of evaluation or the automatic judgments made in crisis or emergency (Tichy & Bennis, 2007). They can be frames of reference such as social values or group norms that have been unconsciously adopted as one's own (Aalberts, Koster & Boschhuizen, 2012). Judgment has been considered a core essential capacity of employees in effective organizations (Tichy & Bennis, 2007), though few studies have empirically addressed how value judgments influence and predict behavior.

Hartman's (1967) value theory posits that a value is judged as good when all the properties of its kind are present, making it possible to assess a thing's goodness by the quantity and quality of properties it possesses. This theory was operationalized with the Hartman Value Profile (1970), which measures how an individual assigns meaning (value) to a person, thing, or concept in their social domain (HVPI), or to themselves in their private domain (HVPII) using their own ideas of what is personally meaningful (Hartman, 1967). Value judgments were first measured with the Hartman Value Profile (HVP, 1970), which has been previously shown to be predictive of personality and behavior (Acquaviva, 2015; Hartman, 1967, 1970). Value judgments can be positive or negative, moral or immoral, good or bad, or be devaluations or transpositions as in valuing a negative thing positively or a positive thing negatively (Hartman, 1967, 2015). In Acquaviva's (2015) study, criminality was predicted by negative value judgment of positive values and positive judgment of negative values (e.g., stealing is good and honesty is bad). Prior studies have examined the relationship of value judgment to personality measures (Pomeroy, 2005) and in business and leadership judgment (Everett, 2010; Hurst, 2012; North, 2015), or for demonstrating individual differences in empathy (Bortă, 2015). However, value judgment has not been investigated for its relationship to congruency, authenticity, or authentic leadership despite the conceptual link to these constructs and overlap with the three value judgment factors (Rogers, 1951, 1964).

OBJECTIVES AND HYPOTHESES

Few studies have explored the psychological content of the thinking or judgment behind value orientations that inform behavior and of value judgment behavior. This study explores the nature of psychological congruence within individuals and examines what associations exist between value judgment and authentic behavior. Carl Rogers (1964) theorized that value judgment would predict psychologically congruent and self-authentic individuals. We examined these theories with two instruments measuring value judgment and two instruments measuring authenticity. We assumed that value judgment measuring self-appraisal and value judgment measuring social valuations would provide adequate basis for testing associations with trait authenticity and professional authenticity. The following hypotheses guided this investigation:

H_1 Self-appraisal value judgment predicts psychological congruence.

H_2 Personal problem-solving predict psychological congruence.

H_3 Value judgment is significantly correlated with trait authenticity.

H_4 Value judgment is significantly correlated with authentic leadership.

H_5 Social value judgment predicts authentic leadership.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

A multivariate design was used to investigate the associations among value judgment, congruency, and authenticity. A stepwise multiple regression determined if congruency was predicted by an individual's self-appraisal of identity, self-concept, and self-image. Standard multiple regression determined if problem-solving predicted congruency and if authentic behaviors were predicted by value judgment.

A sample of 346 working professionals (male = 205, female = 141) with a mean age of 39.2 years were drawn from health, education, and non-profit organizations in the USA. Participants completed four instruments online at XQresearch.com where demographic information was collected and informed consent documents signed. Survey attrition was extensive as the full-test battery took up to 45 minutes to complete (M = 17.25 minutes) and hypotheses 4 and 5 required matched data for the leader-follower dyads to run adequate analyses.

Measures

Value judgment was measured by the Hartman Value Profile (HVP, Hartman, 1970) and consists of two separate forced-rank instruments, each consisting of 18-item lists arranged according to individual value judgment in social (HVPI) and personal domains (HVPII). The social value judgment profile (HVPI) is a measure of the value ascribed to people, things, and ideas within an individual's social and professional world. Participants rank 18 externally located items such as, "love of nature" and "With this ring, I marry you," in order of personal meaning and significance. The self-appraisal profile (HVPII) is an existential measure of an individual's evaluation of their identity, life-roles, and ideas about themselves. Participants rank 18 internal items such as, "I enjoy being myself" and "I curse the day I was born," in the order of how each item reflects the truth in their perception. Each phrase represents an axiological structure so that "a baby" (Ii) represents a positive valuation of an intrinsically valued item and "love of nature" (Ei) represents a positive intrinsic valuation of an extrinsic item. Intrinsically ordered items ranked higher than systemic or extrinsic items (I>S>E) indicate value orientations with a people-focus. Participants ranking logic, order, or conceptual items such as ideas, will produce value orientations with a systemic bias (S>E>I).

Both instruments produce continuous, ordinal, and ratio data in 24 indices. Additionally, the two profiles are coded with identical value combinations making post hoc comparisons between self-appraisal and social judgment within-subjects possible. Comparison and congruence scales effectively measure the congruence or dissonance individuals experience between their self-appraisal and social judgment. A comparative fit between the two profiles produces four indices measuring absolute balance (Ba), relative balance (Br), and the overall combined balance (CQ) within a subject. Comparing the mean difference of each profile's balance scores produces a final index, value congruence (XQ), which measures the level of alignment or dissonance experienced by an individual. It is expected that rising levels of congruence is predicted by increased capacity in self-appraisal value judgment, specifically in considering one's own identity, self-concept, and image. These three self-appraisal scales conceptually overlap Rogers' (1951) authentic personality and his theories that value judgment predict congruent and psychologically healthy individuals (1964).

The HVP is scored with Hartman's calculus—a 24 step statistical process outlined in his manual (Hartman, 1970). The reliability of each profile is tested with Spearman's rho (*rs*) and those with $rs < .700$ are normally rejected as unreliable for further statistical analyses. The HVP has previously been validated in tests with Mexican and North American populations (Hartman, 1970) and in Germany and Japan in more recent cross-country studies (Pomeroy, 2005; Smith, 2007).

Authenticity was measured by the Authenticity Scale (AS; Wood et al., 2008) with items such as, "I

think it is better to be yourself than to be popular" and "I am true to myself in most situations." The AS produces interval data and was completed by all participants through an online survey. The AS was developed from Rogers' (1951) tripartite personality model and measures authenticity with three components, a) self-alienation, b) accepting external influence and, c) authentic living. Rogers' (1964) expected that people with healthy value orientations would move away from facades and meeting the expectations of others and move toward positive self-value judgments. Four questions measure each component so that, "I feel out of touch with the real me" (self-alienation) and, "I am strongly influenced by the opinion of others" (accepting external influence) together reflect the ability of the AS to measure an individual's movement toward a congruent authentic self. This tests participants' knowledge of themselves to make valid self-value judgments. The AS has test-retest reliability coefficients ranging from .78 to .91 and tested Cronbach alphas from .69 to .78. (Wood et al., 2008). In the recently developed Turkish version, Cronbach alphas range from .82 to .86 (Akin & Akin, 2014a, 2014b). Given its conceptual link to Rogers (1951) person-centered theory and tripartite personality, together with the reliability coefficients, the AS was considered an acceptable instrument for the present study.

Authentic Leadership was measured by the Authentic Leadership Inventory (ALI; Neider & Schriesheim, 2011), which is a 14-item Likert-style scale producing interval data from four sub-scales, a) self-awareness, b) relational transparency, c) balanced processing, and d) moral judgment. It is completed by followers who assess their supervisors by answering such phrases as, "My leader is clearly aware of his/her impact on others" (self-awareness) and, "My leader demonstrates consistency between his/her beliefs and actions" (moral judgment). The ALI differs from trait authenticity in that the 14 items reference observable knowledge about leaders' behavior in the work context and so emphasize doing authentic acts as opposed to being authentic. However, like the AS, the ALI requires followers to use value judgment to assess their experience of their supervisors' level of leader authenticity and rely on observable consistency. Consequently, the ALI has conceptual overlap with the external profile of the HVP (HVPI) and is related to leaders with the addition of moral judgment as an essential function of leadership. Together, the AS with its focus on authenticity and the ALI with its focus on leader authenticity conceptually relate to both parts of the HVP and will be explored using multiple regression to investigate which value judgment factor best predicts authentic leadership. The ALI tested for internal reliability using Cronbach's alphas with the lowest a =.74 (self-awareness subscales) and the highest a = .85 with three of the four ALI subscales >.80 (Neider & Schriesheim, 2011).

Data from all four measures were collected with demographic information online at XQresearch.com. All participants were recruited through the website and through site human resource offices where they were directed to the instructions and to sign informed consent releases. The instruments were scored and leader-follower dyads were paired at XQresearch.com before sending to the principal investigator for cleaning and screening for further analysis. The HVP produces two profiles, and these were assessed for within-subjects mean difference between the combined balance scores to produce the XQ variable measuring congruent fit between the two profiles.

RESULTS

The combined sample from all participants returned 365 surveys, of which 346 were suitable for hypotheses 1 and 2, which required two completed and valid profiles. A total of 19 surveys, which presented with incomplete data or with rho values rs <.700 from either HVPI or HVPII were eliminated as per Hartman's (1970) scoring instructions for testing reliability of ordered sets. The lower limit for HVPI was rs = .743 and the upper limit was rs = .989. The lower and upper limit rho values for HVPII were rs <.710 and rs <.982 respectively. Cronbach's alpha for the Authenticity Scale and the Authentic Leader Inventory were .858 and .940 respectively.

Hypothesis 1 was tested with a stepwise multiple regression to examine if self-appraisal value judgment predicts congruence and to check weights of each factor. A visual inspection of histograms, standardized residuals P-P plots, and the partial regressions plots indicated general linearity and normal distribution. There was homoscedasticity as determined by a scatterplot of the studentized residuals and the unstandardized predicted values.

There was no multicollinearity detected with all tolerance values < 1. Outliers and high leverage points were assessed with Cook's distance < 1, leverage values < 0.2, and studentized residuals values ± 2.8 standard deviations, indicating no undue influence from extreme points. Three self-appraisal scales, self-identity (Iq.2), self-concept (Eq.2), and self-image (Sq.2) significantly predicted congruence F(3, 342), 196.871, p < .0005. R squared for the overall model was .633 with an adjusted R2 of 63% for a large effect. Beta coefficients indicated that congruence was predicted by self-appraisal scales of value judgment, self-identity (β = .166, p < .0005), self-concept (= .254, p < .0005), and self-image (β = .473, p < .0005). Zero order correlations were self-identity (r = .365), self-concept (r = .451), and self-image (r = .695), indicating the role of self-image in the model. Self-image is a systemic valuation using conceptual thinking, indicating that a large portion of participants' congruence is provided by value orientations that favor ideal or projected ideas about themselves (Table 1).

Hypothesis 2 was examined with problem-solving and decision-making scales of HVPII to examine if congruence was predicted by the same value-orientations used in problem-solving. The assumptions for a second multiple regression were met. Three judgment scales—personal problem-solving (xIq.2), solving practical and role issues (xEq.2), and solving problems about one's direction and self-image (xSq.2) significantly predicted congruence F(3, 342), 134.529, p < .0005. An adjusted R2 of .537 explained 54% of the variance. Zero order correlations for personal problem-solving were r = .353, self-concept problem-solving (r = .338), and self-image (r = .652). As an individual's thinking and value-patterns are foundational to how they solve issues about their identity, role, and self-image, these correlations are to be expected.

Hypothesis 3 examined correlations between value judgment and trait authenticity with a severely reduced data set. From the initial survey, 230 participants continued with the AS and ALI. After cleaning and screening AS surveys, 157 were considered adequate for testing Hypothesis 3. Significant positive correlations were found between trait authenticity and the sub-factors of intrinsic judgment *rs* = .198 and systemic judgment *rs* = .201 with small effect. Significant correlations were also found between trait authenticity and the secondary factors of integration judgment in the intrinsic sub-factor, *rs* = .199 and systemic sub-factor *rs* = .222 with small effect. Generally, hypothesis 3 for this data set was supported, although with small effects (Table 2).

Hypothesis 3 was also examined with matched -pairs data from n = 83 leader-follower dyads. Notably, significant correlations appeared in secondary scales depicting various nuance of judgment that were not indicated with the first data set. There were significant correlations between trait authenticity and social judgment, *rs* = .228 extrinsic judgment, *rs* = .317 .004 and proportion in judgment, *rs* = .331, which is a scale commonly depicting realistic thinking. Trait authenticity was also significantly correlated with distortion in judgment, *rs* = .267 and systemic integrative judgment *rs* = .244. The latter is conceptual judgment specific to an individual's future direction and self-image (Table 3).

Hypothesis 4 examined correlations between value judgment and authentic leadership with the leader data set n = 83. Positive correlations were found between authentic leadership and intrinsic judgment, *rs* = .452 and authentic leadership and global judgment, *rs* = .372. A negative correlation was found between balance in judgment (bq.1) and authentic leadership, *rs* = -.328 and a positive correlation between objective judgment (Vq.1) and the balanced processing sub-factor of authentic leadership, *rs* = .323. A moderate correlation was found between internal distortion in judgment and authentic leadership *rs* = .352. The internal distortion in judgment scale is often described as a morality scale (Hartman, 1970) and correlated significantly with the inner morality sub-factor of the ALI, *rs* = .371 (Table 4).

In hypothesis 5, a multiple regression determined which value judgment factor best predicted authentic leadership. The assumptions for linearity was met as assessed by partial regression plots and a plot of studentized residuals against the predicted values. There was independence of residuals and homoscedasticity. Multicollinearity was absent, as assessed by tolerance values less than 1.00. There were no studentized deleted residuals greater than ±3 standard deviations, no leverage values greater than 0.2, and no high influence values for Cook's distance above 1. The assumption of normality was

met, as assessed by Q-Q Plot. The regression model indicated that intrinsic judgment significantly predicted authentic leadership, $F(3, 79) = 20.098$, $p < .0005$, with an adjusted $R2 = .41$. In this model, only intrinsic judgment was statistically significant to the prediction, $p < .05$ (Table 5). A second regression test examined if authentic leadership was predicted by global intrinsic judgment (social + self-appraisal) and integrated problem-solving. The model significantly predicted authentic leadership, $F(2,80) = 25.380$, $p < .0005$ with an adjusted $R2$ of .373, indicating that the role of interpersonal understanding and people-judgment in leadership.

DISCUSSION

This study investigated the value orientations that are associated with authentic behavior and if value judgment predicts congruence and authenticity in personal and professional domains. Hypothesis 1 was supported with self-identity, self-concept, and self-image, explaining 63% of the variance in congruence. This offers compelling support for Rogers' (1964) intuitive claims that individuals with positive self-appraisal also experience higher degrees of congruence among the three selves that constitute their personality. It was expected that valuing one's identity (intrinsic judgment) would have large effects on congruence; however, self-image (systemic judgment) had the largest zero-order correlations in testing self-appraisal. As a systemic value, valuations about one's self-image uses conceptual thinking and entertains ideas and future-oriented notions about the self. This contrasts with self-identity, which is an intrinsic measure of individual self-esteem and the extrinsic measure of self-concept, which indicates the life-roles a person plays. In the second regression, systemic problem-solving predicted congruence. Combined, these two analyses indicate that when individuals think about and solve issues of personal identity, they project an ideal construct of themselves before considering their role or individuality. This may be an unusual finding considering the sample consisted of working professionals with established personalities and roles; however, recent scholarship locates authenticity as an ideal construct where individual behavior emerges from conscience (Feldman, 2015; Varga, 2012). All hypotheses featured large portions of systemic value-orientations in specific systemic value judgments, indicating a large portion of identity is the projection of an ideal self.

Bivariate correlations for hypotheses 2 and 3, though supported, revealed small effect. However, it is interesting to note where these correlations lie. Trait authenticity was measured with three sub-factors describing an individual's self-familiarity and self-knowledge (self-alienation sub-factor); consistency in living (authentic living sub-factor); and to the extent they have internal locus of control and are independent of others (resisting external influence) (Wood et al., 2008). These generally correspond to the respective intrinsic, extrinsic, and systemic value factors (Hartman, 1967). Self-alienation was measured with statements such as, "I don't know how I really feel inside" and, "I feel out of touch with the real me"—clearly intrinsic items, which are presumably best answered with intrinsic value judgment such as self-appraisal. As expected, this correlated significantly with the intrinsic measure of self-identity (Iq.2). Value judgment is about assigning meaning and worth (Hartman, 1970) and is derived from HVPII valuations such as, "I enjoy being myself" or devaluations such as, "I curse the day I was born." Clearly, there is conceptual overlap between the two sub-factors which explain the correlations. Such ideas are consistent with Pomeroy (2005) who also discovered associations between the self-alienation index of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory and several indices of the HVPII, including the intrinsic self-judgment index. However, significant correlations were also found in the authentic living sub-factor, which is arguably a behavioral measure (with extrinsic value structure) of authenticity.

Wood et al. (2008) describe authentic living as the experience of minimal variability between the roles an individual plays. Hartman (1970) categorizes valuation about life roles (whether personal, social, or work roles) as internal extrinsic value judgment or one's self-concept (Eq.2). The strongest correlations featuring intrinsic judgment are those with the behavioral construct of authentic living, $rs = .209$ (primary intrinsic) and $rs = .200$ (integrative intrinsic). One plausible explanation lies in the Wood et al. (2008) content of the sub-factor and not in the "behavioral" term of the construct. The authentic living sub-factor is measured with items such as, "I think

it is better to be yourself than to be popular," which conceptually resonate more with intrinsic valuations of self-appraisal about being and less with doing or performing. The second intrinsic scale (xIq.2) refers to the individual's capacity to integrate data and solve personal problems such as identity issues. However, the index for integrating data and solving extrinsic personal problems about life roles (xEq.2) had no correlations.

Stronger correlations were found between trait authenticity and value judgment in the primary systemic index (*rs* = .201) and the integrative index (*rs* = .222). These are even larger in the self-alienation sub-factor (*rs* = .229 and *rs* = .251 respectively). This is unusual given that external systemic judgment is used for conceptual and system thinking, logical analysis, or intellectual behavior such as planning, projecting, strategizing, and designing (Hartman, 1970). To confound the issue, the behavioral content of authentic living has the following items: "I live in accordance with my values and beliefs," and "I always stand by what I believe in." These are categorically systemic items given the inclusion of the intellectual items of belief and values. Systemic judgment always deals with ideation, construction, strategy, standards, and conceptual systems of thought (Hartman, 1970). By definition, self-alienation involves a lack of intimate knowledge of a familiar self (Wood et al., 2008). Those individuals high on self-alienation experience various pathologies, including dissociation disorders (Pomeroy, 2005). These systemic correlations indicate that participants use intellectual or ideation part of themselves to answer questions on identity. It appears the HVP has effectively identified that systemic thinking and projected value orientations form a large explanation of the authenticity construct. This agrees with modern revisions of the construct as an ideal birthed in systemic thinking (Feldman, 2015; Varga, 2012).

The second data set of 83 supervisors showed similar, though larger correlations, and in various judgment indices (Table 3). In this data set, global judgment (a measure of congruence between both internal and external judgment) correlated with trait authenticity *rs* = .334 (self-alienation). Global judgment comprises all three value dimensions in both social and self domains. This data set showed extrinsic judgment correlated with trait authenticity *rs* = .317 (*rs* = .311 self-alienation; *rs* = .231 authentic living). Extrinsic judgment is used in behavior, utility decisions, and practical thinking (Hartman, 1970), and like the first data set, shows evidence of transposed judgment in correlating with the self-alienation sub-factor. This suggests that supervisors most identify with practical thinking when it comes to answering questions about self-alienation such as, "I don't know how I really feel inside."

Similarly, the first data set featured the strongest correlations with intrinsic judgment and the intrinsic sub-factor, self-alienation, *rs* = .344. However, this is not an appraisal of self-identity (Iq.2) but rather social judgment (Iq.1). Pomeroy (2005) also noticed this phenomenon where indices from both social and self-appraisal profiles correlate with personality measures of self. Another transposition exists in the systemic valuation of integrative judgment (xSq.2) where supervisors correlated significantly with authentic living (an extrinsic value). As discussed, this sub-factor contains systemic items that deal with belief and values. This seems to be further evidence of Hartman's (1970) initial hypothesis and Montague's (Hardman, 2009) insight that people tend to make valuations by relying on a single framework that they transfer to multiple contexts. It could also indicate the public nature and responsibility of supervisors to be more engaged in their role as a leader in providing judgment and decision-making functions for others and the organization (Neider & Schriesheim, 2011).

A closer look at the value structure of the ALI reveals systemic items in at least 10 of the 14 questions. Items such as, "my leader asks for ideas that challenge his/her core beliefs" and, "my leader expresses thoughts and ideas clearly to others," involve the systemic content of thoughts, ideas, and beliefs. However, this data set presented no correlation with systemic judgment in any primary index. While correlations exist, they are not all in the expected areas.

At first analysis intrinsic social judgment (Iq.1) and its global derivative (Iq.Global) are responsible for producing significant correlations with the ALI, *rs* =.495, specifically in the intrinsic sub-factors of self-awareness, *rs* =.305 and relational transparency, *rs* =.310. This supports previous studies that showed this index correlated with

empathy, relational, and interpersonal skills (Bortă, 2015; Pomeroy, 2005). This is fairly compelling evidence that good leadership involves good relationships, and participants who scored their leaders highly in these two areas likely experience a supportive relationship with their supervisor. Intrinsic judgment also correlated significantly with the remaining two sub-factors of the ALI, balanced processing, *rs* =.447, and inner morality *rs* =.461.

The next significant finding is how employees' perceptions of their supervisor also correlated with objective judgment *rs* = .260, balance in judgment *rs* = -.328, and ethical judgment *rs* =.352. These correlations are even more significant when considering the appropriate sub-factor. In addition to intrinsic judgment, relational transparency correlated with objective judgment, *rs* =.222, balance in judgment *rs* =-.273, integrative judgment *rs* =.289, and distortion (or ethical) judgment *rs* =.259. Ethical leaders have trust relationships with their employees (Klaussner, 2012; Meng, Cheng, & Gao, 2016), and this translates into job satisfaction, higher work engagement, and productivity, making these leaders more effective. Supervisors whose followers rated them as being relationally transparent had objective, balanced, and ethical judgment. Objective judgment also correlated with balanced processing *rs* = .323 suggesting that employees' accurately see their supervisors' decisions as balanced, fair, and objective. This sub-factor has items such asm "my leader objectively analyzes relevant data before making a decision" and, "my leader carefully listens to alternative perspectives before reaching a conclusion." This supports leadership scholars who have posited the importance of objective judgment in authentic and ethical leadership (Lawton & Páez, 2015). The authentic leader sub-factors of relational transparency and balanced processing can now be described in more specific terms of the type of thinking and value-orientations leaders use in judgment.

The third significant contribution of the findings in hypothesis 4 relates to the strong correlations of distortion in judgment to authentic leadership. The distortion index is the sum of transposed judgments made when completing the HVP and reflects an inner conscience or internal ethic (Dis.2). This correlated significantly with the ALI, *rs* = .352, most notable with inner morality *rs* = .371 but also with balanced processing *rs* = .294 and relational transparency *rs* = .259. This emphasizes the importance of authentic leaders and their need to make ethical decisions and relate with their followers ethically (Cullen, Gentry, & Yamarino, 2015; O'Connell, 2014; Zeni, Buckley, Mumford, & Griffith, 2016). This is arguably one of the most significant traits of an authentic leader, and similarly to intrinsic judgment, had a direct correlation with the corresponding sub-factor of inner moral judgment of the ALI. Demonstrating ethical behavior is paramount to authentic leadership, especially as it relates to dealing with and leading people (Lawton & Páez, 2015; Zeni et al., 2016). This is evidenced by the intersection of one of the highest correlations in the study that deal with treatment of people and morality *rs* = .461. Clearly, employees who are treated ethically perceive their supervisors as authentic, balanced, and relational leaders.

The final hypotheses tested if value judgment predicted authentic leadership. Two tests were run featuring intrinsic judgment as the key predictor and explained 41% and 37% of the variance. These are medium-size effects that reinforce the correlation tests that are suggestive of the importance of knowing self and understanding people in leadership contexts. In both regression tests, the form of judgment was external intrinsic that significantly explained the variance in the model. Intrinsic judgment is a leader's capacity to understand other people, demonstrate empathy, and generally have positive and effective interpersonal relationships with others supported by a valuing capacity that recognizes the value and worth of others (Hartman, 1970; North, 2015). Psychological well-being follows when people sense they are being valued, which in turn allows the leader to exercise influence toward meeting organizational goals (Den Hartog, & Belschak, 2012; Shu, 2015). In addition to augmenting studies on the positive outcomes of authentic leadership, relational leader proponents will value the evidence that indicates self-awareness and self-knowledge have positive, collateral impact and influence on followers.

This study provided evidence that value judgment significantly interacts with personal congruence, authenticity, and authentic leadership and is a predictor of overall congruence and intrinsic judgment in leadership. It further gave evidence

of the specific value orientations used in value judgment. Authentic leaders exercise objective, balanced, and ethical judgment in the context of solid, transparent workplace relationships. Finally, the variables of congruence and authenticity are clearly broad-spectrum constructs heavily informed by systemic thinking and idealistic value orientations. Future research could unpack these constructs and provide alternate ways to measure the complex nature of authenticity. Further research could also identify and investigate additional traits and behaviors that potentially can be predicted by value judgment.

References

Aalberts, J., Koster, E., & Boschhuizen, R. (2012). From prejudice to reasonable judgment: integrating (moral) value discussions in university courses. Journal of Moral Education, 41(4), 437-455. doi:10.1080/03057240.2012.677600

Acquaviva, G. J. (2015). Assessing the valuation imbalance of criminal personalities. Journal of Formal Axiology: Theory and Practice, 8, 119-130.

Ahmet, A., & Umran, A. (2014). Authenticity as a predictor on hope in Turkish university students. Education Sciences & Psychology, 28(2), 64-70. Retrieved from https://lopes.idm.oclc.org/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/ login.aspx?direct=true&db=ehh&AN=98856563&site=eds

Akhtar, R., Humphreys, C., & Furnham, A. (2015). Exploring the relationships among personality, values, and business intelligence. Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 67(3), 258-276. doi:10.1037/cpb0000040

Akin, A., & Akin, U. (2014a). Examining the relationship between authenticity and self-handicapping. Psychological Reports, 115(3), 795-804. doi:10.2466/09.PR0.115c26z1

Akin, A., & Akin, U. (2014b). Investigating the predictive role of authenticity on subjective vitality with structural equation modelling. Educational Sciences, Theory and Practice, 14(6), 2043-2048. doi:10.12738/estp.2014.6.2500

Bamford, M., Wong, C. A., & Laschinger, H. (2013). The influence of authentic leadership and areas of worklife on work engagement of registered nurses. Journal of Nursing Management, 21(3), 529-540. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2834.2012.01399.x

Berkovich, I. (2014). Between person and person: Dialogical pedagogy in authentic leadership development. Academy of Management Learning & Education, 13(2), 245-264. doi:10.5465/amle.2012.0367

Bortă, A. (2015). Axiometric and psychological structure of empathy. Journal of Formal Axiology: Theory and Practice, 8, 25-46.

Carroll, J. (2015). Authenticity in question. Society, 52(6), 611-615. doi: 10.1007/s12115-015-9955-6

Clemmons, A. B., & Fields, D. (2011). Values as determinants of the motivation to lead. Military Psychology, 23(6), 587-600. doi:10.1080/08995605.2011.616787

Copeland, M. K. (2014). The emerging significance of values based leadership: A literature review. International Journal of Leadership Studies, 8(2), 105-135. Retrieved from http://0-search.ebscohost.com.ucark.uca.edu/login.aspx? direct=true&db=edb&AN=112931785&site=eds-live&scope=site

Cullen, K. L., Gentry, W. A., & Yammarino, F. J. (2015). Biased self‐perception tendencies: Self‐enhancement/self‐diminishment and leader derailment in individualistic and collectivistic cultures. Applied Psychology: An International Review, 64(1), 161-207. doi:10.1111/apps.12026

Datta, B. (2015). Assessing the effectiveness of authentic leadership. International Journal of Leadership Studies, 9(1) 62-76. Retrieved from http://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/ijls/new/vol9iss1/2-IJLS.pdf

Den Hartog, D., & Belschak, F. (2012). Work engagement and Machiavellianism in the ethical leadership process. Journal of Business Ethics, 107(1), 35-47. doi: 10.1007/s10551-012-1296-4

Dhiman, S. (2011). Personal mastery and authentic leadership. Organization Development Journal, 29(2), 69-83. http://ebscohost.com/c/articles/73348233/

Ergen, G. (2015). Hierarchical classification of values. International Journal of Progressive Education, 11(3), 162-186. Retrieved from https://lopes.idm.oclc.org/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ1077842&site=eds-live&scope=site

Everett, M. J. (2010). Leader-follower congruence and its relationship to follower self-efficacy (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Central. (Order No. 3408009)

Feldman, S. (2015). Against Authenticity: Why you shouldn't be yourself. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Fleeson, W., & Wilt, J. (2010). The relevance of big five trait content in behavior to subjective authenticity: Do high levels of within-person behavioral variability undermine or enable authenticity achievement? Journal of Personality, 78(4), 1353-1382. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.2010.00653.x

Frankl, V. E. (1969, 1988). The will to meaning: Foundations and applications of Logotherapy. New York, NY: Meridian Penguin.

Fusco, T., O'Riordan, S., & Palmer, S. (2015). Authentic leaders are... conscious, competent, confident, and congruent: A grounded theory of group coaching and authentic leadership development. International Coaching Psychology Review, 10(2), 131-148. Retrieved from https://lopes.idm.oclc.org/login?url=http:// search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=109268098&site=ehost-live&scope=site

Gardner, W., Cogliser, C., Davis, K., & Dickens, M. (2011). Authentic leadership: A review of the literature and research agenda. The Leadership Quarterly, 22(6), 1120-1145. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.09.007

Gibson, D., & Petrosko, J. (2014). Trust in leader and its effect on job satisfaction and intent to leave in a healthcare setting. New Horizons in Adult Education & Human Resource Development, 26(3), 3-19. doi: 10.1002/nha3.20069

Grégoire, S., Baron, L., Ménard, J., & Lachance, L. (2014). The Authenticity Scale: Psychometric properties of a French translation and exploration of its relationships with personality and well-being. Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science / Revue Canadienne Des Sciences Du Comportement, 46(3), 346-355. doi:10.1037/a0030962

Guignon, C. (2004). On being authentic. New York, NY: Routledge.

Hannah, S. T., Walumbwa, F. O., & Fry, L. W. (2011). Leadership in action teams: Team leader and members' authenticity, authenticity strength, and team outcomes. Personnel Psychology, 64(3), 771-802. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2011.01225.x

Hardman, D. (2009). Judgment and decision making: Psychological perspectives. West Sussex, England: John Wiley & Sons.

Hartman, R. S. (1967). The structure of value: Foundations of scientific axiology. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Hartman, R. S. (1970). The Hartman Value Profile: Manual of interpretation (2nd ed.). Knoxville, TN: Robert S. Hartman Institute.

Hartman, R. S. (2015). Fundamental terms in ethics. Journal of Formal Axiology: Theory and Practice, 8,133-154

Hinojosa, A. S., Davis McCauley, K., Randolph-Seng, B., & Gardner, W. L. (2014). Leader and follower attachment styles: Implications for authentic leader–follower relationships. The Leadership Quarterly, 25, 595-610. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.12.002

Hitlin, S. (2003). Values as the core of personal identity: Drawing links between two theories of self. Social Psychology Quarterly, 66(2), 118-137. Retrieved from http://library.gcu.edu:2048/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=9989867&site=eds-live&scope=site

Hurst, C. G. (2012). Discerning entrepreneurial judgment as reflected in entrepreneurs' responses to feedback (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses. (Order No. 3503420)

Jambrak, J., Deane, F. P., & Williams, V. (2014). Value motivations predict burnout and intentions to leave among mental health professionals. Journal of Mental Health, 23(3), 120-124. doi:10.3109/09638237.2013.869576

Kelly, T. F. (2013). Effective leaders are ethical leaders. Journal of Leadership, Accountability & Ethics, 10(4), 90-93. Retrieved from http://www.na-businesspress.com/JLAE/kelly_abstract.html

Klaussner, S. (2012). Trust and leadership: Toward an interactive perspective. J. Change Manage, 12(4), 417. doi:10.1080/14697017.2012.728766

Knoll, M., Meyer, B., Kroemer, N., & Schroder-Abe, M. (2015). It takes two to be yourself: An integrated model of authenticity, its measurement, and its relationship to work-related variables. Journal of Individual Differences, 36(1), 38-53. doi:10.1027/1614-0001/a000153

Lawton, A., & Páez, I. (2015). Developing a framework for ethical leadership. Journal of Business Ethics, 130(3), 639-649. doi:10.1007/s10551-014-2244-2

Leroy, H., Palanski, M., & Simons, T. (2012). Authentic leadership and behavioral integrity as drivers of follower commitment and performance. Journal of Business Ethics, 107(3), 255-264. doi:10.1007/s10551-011-1036-1

Luthans, F., & Avolio, B. J. (2003). Authentic leadership development. In K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton, & R. E. Quinn (Eds.), Positive organizational scholarship: Foundations of a new discipline (pp. 241-258). San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Meng, H., Cheng, Z. C., & Gao, T. C. (2016). Positive team atmosphere mediates the impact of authentic leadership on subordinate creativity. Social Behavior & Personality: An International Journal, 44(3), 355-368. doi:10.2224/sbp.2016.44.3.355

Miniotaitė, A., & Bučiūnienė, I. (2013). Explaining authentic leadership work outcomes from the perspective of Self-Determination Theory. Management of Organizations: Systematic Research, (65), 63-75. doi:10.7720/MOSR.1392-1142.2013.65.5

Morris, J. (2014). Self-Awareness and self-development as key drivers in leadership development practices. Journal of Formal Axiology: Theory and Practice, 7, 19-29

Neider, L. L., & Schriesheim, C. A. (2011). The Authentic Leadership Inventory (ALI): Development and empirical tests. The Leadership Quarterly, 22(6), 1146-1164. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.09.008

North, M. A. (2015). Congruent and incongruent selves: Exploring the structure of authenticity. Journal of Formal Axiology: Theory and Practice, 8, 79-86

O'Connell, P. K. (2014). A simplified framework for 21st century leader development. The Leadership Quarterly, 25(2), 183-203. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.06.001

Peus, C., Wesche, J., Streicher, B., Braun, S., & Frey, D. (2012). Authentic leadership: An empirical test of its antecedents, consequences, and mediating mechanisms. Journal of Business Ethics, 107(3), 331-348. doi:10.1007/s10551-011-1042-3

Pomeroy, L. (2005). The new science of axiological psychology. Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi.

Rogers, C. R. (1951). Client centered therapy: It's current practice, implications, and theory. Boston, NY: Houghton Mifflin.

Rogers, C. R. (1964). Toward a modern approach to values: The valuing process in the mature person. Journal of Abnormal & Social Psychology, 68(2), 160-167. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0046419

Röpke, W. (2015). A value judgment on value judgments (1941). Journal of Markets and Morality, 18(2), 497-519. Retrieved from http://0-search.proquest.com.ucark.uca.edu/docview/1770214086?accountid=10017

Sherman, R. A., Nave, C. S., & Funder, D. C. (2012). Properties of persons and situations related to overall and distinctive personality-behavior congruence. Journal of Research in Personality, 46(1), 87-101. doi: 10.1016/j.jrp.2011.12.006

Shu, C. (2015). The impact of intrinsic motivation on the effectiveness of leadership style on work engagement. Contemporary Management Research, 11(4), 327-350. doi:10.7903/cmr.14043

Smith, K. R. (2007). Validation studies for the Hartman Value Profile and the Hartman-Kinsel Profile. Retrieved from http://www.cleardirection.com/docs/validation/validation.asp

Tichy, N., & Bennis, W. (2007). Making judgment calls. The ultimate act of leadership. Harvard Business Review, 85(10), 94-104. Retrieved from https://lopes.idm.oclc. org/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edswss&AN=000249682100019&site=eds-live&scope=site

Varga, S. (2012). Authenticity as an ethical ideal. New York: Routledge.

Wang, D. S., & Hsieh, C. C. (2013). The effect of authentic leadership on employee trust and employee engagement. Social Behavior & Personality: An International Journal, 41(4), 613-624. http://dx.doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2013.41.4.613

Wang, Y. N. (2016). Balanced authenticity predicts optimal well-being: Theoretical conceptualization and empirical development of the authenticity in relationships scale. Personality and Individual Differences, 94, 316-323. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2016.02.001

Wong, C. A., & Laschinger, H. K. (2013). Authentic leadership, performance, and job satisfaction: The mediating role of empowerment. Journal of Advanced Nursing, 69(4), 947-959. doi-10.1111/j.1365-2648.2012.06089.x

Wood, A. M., Linley, P. A., Maltby, J., Baliousis, M., & Joseph, S. (2008). The authentic personality: A theoretical and empirical conceptualization and the development of the Authenticity Scale. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 55(3), 385-399

Yasinski, L. (2014). Authentic leadership: Develop the leader within. ORNAC Journal, 32(1), 35-38.

Yukl, G. (2012). Effective leadership behavior: What we know and what questions need more attention. Academy of Management Perspectives, 26(4), 66-85. doi:10.5465/amp.2012.0088

Zeni, T. A., Buckley, M. R., Mumford, M. D., & Griffith, J. A. (2016). Making 'sense' of ethical decision making. The Leadership Quarterly, 27(6), 838-855. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2016.09.002

Appendix

Table 1. Summary of Regression Analysis of Self-appraisal and Congruence

	B	SE_B	β
Intercept	23.712	3.021	
Self-Identity (Iq.2)	.153	.029	.194
Self-Concept (Eq.2)	.201	.027	.271
Self-Image (Sq.2)	.452	.028	.584

Note. B = unstandardized regression coefficient, SEB = standard error of coefficient, β standardized coefficient

Table 2. Bivariate Correlations of Value Judgment and Trait Authenticity n= 157

	AS	Alienation	Living	Influence
Global Judgment 1 (Dif.1)	.115	.156	.102	.050
Intrinsic Judgment (Iq.2)	.198*	.166*	.209*	.100
Extrinsic Judgment (Eq.1)	.012	.061	.000	-.037
Systemic Judgment (Sq.1)	.201*	.229**	.128	.083
Integrative Judgment (Int.1)	.188*	.205*	.170*	.099
Intrinsic Integrative (xIq.2)	.199*	.164*	.200*	.123
Systemic Judgment (xSq.1)	.222**	.251**	.161*	.094

Note. N=157 AS=Authenticity Scale **p <.001 , * p <.05

Table 3. Bivariate Correlations of Leaders' Value Judgment and Trait Authenticity n= 83

	AS	Alienation	Living	Influence
Global Judgment 1 (Dif.1)	.228**	.334**	.116	.018
Intrinsic Judgment (Iq.1)	.209	.344**	.140	.058
Extrinsic Judgment (Eq.1)	.317**	.311**	.231*	.177
Objective Judgment (Vq.1)	.086	.241*	.006	.052
Integrative Judgment (Int.1)	.063	.249**	.040	.059
Intrinsic Integrative (xIq.1)	.003	.222*	.044	.217*
Extrinsic Integrative (xEq.1)	.267*	.297**	.155	.196
Systemic Judgment (xSq.2)	.244*	.244*	.293**	.024
Proportionate Judgment (D%.1)	.331*	.107	.299**	.220*
Distortion in Judgment (Dis.1)	.267*	.252*	.275*	.118

Note. N=83 AS=Authenticity Scale **p <.001 , * p <.05

Appendix (cont.)

Table 4. Bivariate Correlations of Value Judgment and Authentic Leadership n=83

	ALI	Self-Awareness	Relational Transparency	Balanced Processing	Inner Morality
Social Judgment (Dif.1)	.312**	.166	.175	.375**	.242*
Global Judgment (Glob)	.372**	.230*	.250*	.334**	.347**
People Judgment (Iq.1)	.452**	.286**	.296**	.469**	.358**
Intrinsic Global (Iq.Global)	.495**	.305**	.310**	.447**	.461**
Objective Judgment (Vq.1)	.260*	.088	.190	.323**	.187
Objective Judgment (Vq.2)	.232*	.072	.222*	.222*	.201
Balance in Judgment (Bq.1)	-.328*	-.192	-.273*	-.322*	-.257*
Balance in Judgment (Bq.2)	-.238*	-.124	-.253*	-.218*	-.155
Integrative Self-Judgment (xE.2)	.156	.075	.289*	.166	.103
Inner Moral Judgment (Dis.2)	.352**	.197	.259**	.294**	.371**

Note. N=83 ALI = Authentic Leadership Inventory * significant at 0.05, ** significant at 0.01.

Table 5. Summary of Leaders' Multiple Regression Analysis with Authentic Leadership

	B	SE_B	β
Intercept	17.930	1.933	
Intrinsic Judgment	1.365	.210	.658
Extrinsic Judgment	-.038	.167	-.022
Systemic Judgment	.037	.165	.022

Note. B = unstandardized regression coefficient, SEB = standard error of coefficient, standardized coefficient