

Authentic Leadership as an Effective Tool for Enhancing Productive Tendencies and Followership Motivation

Sunday Ewah, Ph.D, Joseph I. Ogah, Ph.D, and Uno Ilem Ajah.

*Cross River University of Technology
Faculty of Management Sciences
Ogaja Campus*

Abstract: The research paper is premised on authentic leadership as a modern management tool that is most likely to improve outcome and productivity in organization. The researchers formulated three research objectives, which also guided the formulation of research questions and hypotheses. The instrument for data collection was questionnaire administered randomly to respondents in ten cities in Nigeria. The researchers tested the three hypotheses developed for the study using analysis of variance (ANOVA) and the major findings include, (1) authentic leadership in an organization does not encourage or lead to corporate deficiencies and management malfeasance, (2) authentic leadership in practice does not degenerate to decline in productive tendencies and followers motivation, and (3) authentic leadership traits, such as vision, self-confidence, decisiveness, and good sense of judgment, positively influence outcome of events in work situation. In conclusion it was recommended that at all time the leader of a team in a work environment should maintain a high degree of truthfulness and consistency in actions and behaviour in order to command followership.

Keywords: Authentic, Leadership, Productivity, Organizations, Truthful, Consistency.

Introduction

Leadership is one of the basic management process that requires the leader in a work environment or otherwise to apply non-coercive influence to shape individuals or employees and motivate positive behaviour to enhance organizational goal attainment.

In the past, multiple definitions of authentic leadership had been introduced and explored with each emphasizing different components of the theory, which are all anchored on each proponent's school of thought. It is important to note that the concept of authenticity implies essential quality of a leader that can be acquired, through self-awareness, self-acceptance, faith, beliefs, values, morals, actions, relationships, as the case may be. Also in the context of this study, authenticity is understood as the alignment of a leader's behaviour with his or her inner values, beliefs, convictions, be they good or bad, but most society vouch for the former. A leader here represents an individual who influences individuals within the work environment to accomplish certain responsibilities for the common benefits of the organization or institution. This the leader does by applying his skills, experience, knowledge and training in order to achieve predetermined objectives (Sharman and Jain, 2003). And leadership simply implies the process of influencing others towards the achievement of organizational goals. This definition recognizes that leadership is typically an ongoing activity, is oriented towards having an impact on the behaviours of others, and is ultimately focused on realizing the specific aims of the organization. Authentic leadership also referred to as authentic leadership development is an important correlation of the leader's influence on followers attitude, behaviours, and work performance. Thus authentic followership is an important element of the construct of authentic leadership theory (Datta, 2015). The different types of authenticity include: emotional, behavioural, and social authenticity. This section is captured and explained in detail in literature review.

In some civilized societies, authentic leader have personality traits that include, vision, energy, confidence, decisiveness, good sense of judgment and so on that enable them pilot the affairs of the organizations or institutions, for productive results. This is because the mentioned organizations and institutions must be result oriented for the collective benefits of stake holders or else they will cease to exist; hence much is required from all the captains – leaders that are saddled with high demanding responsibilities. But in the case of some developing countries the concept of authentic leadership in a work environment means different things to different leaders, either amongst the political class or in organizational settings, the most recent development in Nigeria depicts scenario that see most political leaders as dictators or un-authentic to their earlier promises of delivering quality leadership to the people they are ruling. Within the productive sector, different managers exhibit leadership styles that often affects employees and the level of productivity in most organizations adversely. This is not far from the fact that these organizations are often run on family leauge. Where a member of one family becomes the boss or manager and rule over other employees in an organization.

Sometimes without the tenets of authentic leadership housing in the very individual, concerned, and the situation often affects whatever happens to the firm or organization severely. The more reason, the quest for a new construct in the leadership domain as a result of challenging and turbulent times as well as corporate deficiencies and management malfeasance has brought in greater demand for authentic leadership in all categories of leaders (Cooper, Scandura and Schriesheim, 2005). Thus the remaining part of this study include; objectives, research questions, and hypotheses, literature review, methodology, test of hypotheses, discussion and conclusion.

Objectives of the Study

The major objective of this study is to ascertain to what extent has authentic leadership leads to high level of productivity within a work environment amongst the different individuals who find themselves handling the task in their places of work. Other specific objectives include;

1. To find out if authentic leadership in an organization lead to corporate deficiencies and management malfeasance.
2. To find out if the leader's authenticity in practice degenerate to decline in productive tendencies and followers motivation.
3. To find out if authentic leaders traits, such as vision, confidence, decisiveness and good sense of judgment negatively influence the outcome of events in a work situation.

Research Questions

The following research questions were formulated in line with the general objectives of the study

1. Do you think authentic leadership in an organization lead to corporate deficiencies and management malfeasance?
2. Does a leader's authenticity in practice degenerate to decline in productive tendencies and followers motivation?
3. Do you agree that authentic leadership traits, such as vision, self-confidence, decisiveness and good sense of judgment negatively influence the outcome of events in a work situation?

Research Hypotheses

The research hypotheses were formulated to encapsulate the three research questions earlier developed.

1. Ho: Authentic leadership in an organization does not encourage corporate deficiencies and management malfeasance.
H1: Authentic leadership in an organization encourages corporate deficiencies and management malfeasance.
2. Ho: Authentic leadership in practice does not degenerate to decline in productive tendencies and followers motivation.
H1: Authentic Leadership in practice degenerate to decline in productive tendencies and followers motivation.
3. Ho: Authentic leadership traits, such as vision, self-confidence, decisiveness and good sense judgment does not negatively influence the outcome of events in a work situation.
H1: Authentic leadership traits such as vision, self-confidence, decisiveness and good sense of judgment negatively influence the outcome of events in a work situation.

All the three hypotheses were tested in data analysis section and the result stated.

Literature Review

The theory of authentic leadership often place emphasis on authenticity as an essential trait of a leader that helps a leader to be authentic, i.e. genuine, original, not fake, through self – awareness, self – acceptance, self – knowledge, faith, trust, integrity, high moral standards, transparency, actions and relationships with followers or associates (Besen, et. al., 2015). Walumbwa, et.al. (2008) defined authentic leadership as a pattern of leader behaviour that draws upon and promotes both positive psychological capacities and a positive ethical climate in order to achieve positive self development in followers. In the words of Leroy, et. al., (2015) authentic leaders are more aware of the values that drive their decisions, which makes them better able to describe those values accurately and so align their words and actions.

Authenticity in leadership per se does not imply that it concerns positive ethical, or moral behaviour (Shamir and Eilam 2005). But it should be seen as the alignment of a leader's behaviour with the leader's inner values, beliefs, convictions, be they good or bad. Datta (2015) postulates that authentic leadership has elements of self-awareness and is a process of making meaning that occur overtime. Furthermore, George, et. al. (2007)

elucidated that leaders must take responsibility for developing themselves professionally in an authentic manner. In the same way George, (2010) enunciated strategies for increasing authentic leadership to include; awareness of internal weaknesses, development of personal leadership style, recognizing internal and external factors associated with positive and negative behaviours, recognize personal values and understanding self-purpose.

It is agreed that all researchers may not conclusively accept an operational definition of authentic leadership but it is noted that three basic antecedent factors influence authentic leadership development. This include; positive psychological disposition, moral reasoning and critical life events. This is because leaders possess the earlier mentioned including confidence, hope, optimism, and resilience (Northouse, 2013). Gardner, et. al. (2015) developed a model in which self-awareness and self-regulation constitute the central elements of authentic leadership. In a similar vein, Ilies, Morgeson and Nahrgang, (2005) developed a model that focused on self-awareness, unbiased processing, behaviour and rationality as the core variables of authenticity and consider their influences on leaders and employees or followers in a work place and how it translates to high productivity for the benefit of all.

Suffice to say that the contributions of these models are merely for academic consumption, because they help us to understand the processes and outcomes of authentic leadership from a theoretical perspective.

Goffee and Jones, (2005) affirmed that authenticity in leadership is a quality others must attribute to the leader and it's a rational phenomenon rather than an individual trait. Thus they concluded by saying that a leader can be perceived as being authentic or behaving authentically or not based on the leader's practice or action. It was also further confirmed that authenticity was closely linked with behavioural integrity of the leader, (Goffee and Jones, 2005). However, the relationship between the two constructs is contestable. Some school of thought conceptualized integrity as an antecedent of authenticity (Cooper, et. al. 2005). Lerner, (1993) see the two constructs as independent of each other, but influenced by a third same variable. Further linked to the concept of authenticity in contemporary literature is trust and credibility (Simon, 2002). In the same spirit, George (2007) popularized authentic leadership in management studies and popular culture by reflecting on his success in the business world spanning over the years. George (2010) further explained that authentic leaders lead with their hearts and learn from their own and other people's experiences, but strive to be authentic with values and convictions. The central tenet of his authentic leadership model is the importance of the leader's life story in his or her own development, which implies the authenticity of the leader is most important no matter the style of leadership used. For the purpose of empirical validation .George, Sims, Mc Lean and Mayer (2007) conducted a study of more than 125 leaders of various ages, race, ethnic and religious backgrounds, found out that there were no universal traits, styles or skills of successful authentic leaders, but rather concluded that being authentic to their personal life story makes them more effective leaders. Avolio (2010) while conducting his empirical research indicated that there was an absence of leader self-awareness and he saw this omission as an avenue to include authentic leadership models and methods as new addition to the study of leadership. Tibbs, Green, Gergen, and Montoya, (2016) outlined numerous studies that posted relationships between authentic leadership and positive ethical leadership behaviour. Wong, Laschinger, and Cummings, (2010) in their study discovered that authentic leadership significantly and positively influenced nurses' trust in their manager, their work engagement and perceptions of unit care equality. Avolio, Walumbwa, and Weber, (2009) in their findings concluded that increased self-awareness and self-regulation, leaders facilitate the development of authenticity in their followers, which contributes to sustainable performance.

Criticism of The Model of Authentic Leadership

It is assume that as authenticity is solely dependent on the authentic leader's life story, it will be affected by the leader's socio economic status, race, national origin, or ethnocentrism and other factors (Zhang, Everett, Elkin and Cone, 2012). In like manner, the extent and effectiveness of a leader's authenticity is relative to the cultural, organizational and situational context and so no singular interpretation of the theory may likely be possible (Zhang, et.al.2012). According to Sanchez, Runde, Nardon and Steers, (2011) leadership is a cultural construct that has meanings depending on various cultures where it is exercised and therefore global leaders should act in authentic ways that are compatible with local expectations. Surprisingly the practices of an authentic leader in an organization based in an individual society may be regarded as rude or disrespectful in a collective society. Furthermore, Gardiner, (2011) suggested that the construct of authentic leadership is deeply flawed because it failed to realize the social and historical circumstances that affects leaders' ability to perform or be true leaders. In the same vein, Zhang, et.al. (2012) in their work concluded that authentic leadership theory lacks validity in non Western countries or context, however as economic growth of countries also occurs outside the Western Bloc, the construct can be used to form greater cross-cultural understanding, which implies its applicability maybe feasible in non- Western countries.

Despite its criticism authentic leadership continues to hold sway, studied, measured, and considered as a modern leadership theory. In conjunction with three primary antecedents factors, which include; positive

psychological disposition, moral reasoning, and critical life story. Reasonable number of researchers also accept four core element of the theory that comprises self-awareness, relational transparency, balance processing, and internalized moral perspective (Avolio, et. al. 2009, Avolio, 2010, and Gardner, et.al; 2011).

Typology of Authenticity

Depending on the situation a leader finds himself any of the under mentioned authenticity may prevail.

Emotional Authenticity: The leader considers his passion and personal disposition. He has a feeling of being happy with his working condition. Sometimes exhibit humility by willing to accept mistakes. But basically some leaders tell their personal story of what they have done in life, both ups and downs and learn as a result. The heart factor, be yourself with passionate humility explains these attributes of emotional authenticity, especially when leaders show confident humility, their employees report higher engagement at work

Behavioural Authenticity: The leader creates and instill in others a growth mindset that brings about climate of psychological safety and development. The leader is often optimistic of getting the job down well and his resilience give room for feedback from others when facing adversity to facilitate personalized learning. Thus the greater the fit between organizational and employees values, the more effective the business will be in the long-run. Managerial implication,-the habit of learning grow into your best authentic self. This explains the attributes of behavioural authenticity. Therefore sharing your growth mindset with others creates culture of innovation, development and growth.

Social Authenticity: This portray an exemplary leader, who walk the talk to embody the values of a collective identity whose actions serve as example. He cares about the development of others and create a balance culture of empowerment within the community. The leader often try to integrate solutions to improve employees' work experience that will have a positive impact in future or remains as a legacy. Managerial implication. harmony in agency and communion – be true to yourself and others explains these attributes of social authenticity. The greater the fit between organizational and employees values, the more effective the business will be in the long – run.

Effects of Authentic Leadership on Organizations Performance

Khan, (2014) pin-pointed four basic effects of authentic leadership on organizations bearing, Which include;

1. Contemporary authentic leaders play pivot roles for the organizations' values, as they focus on people's strength and efficacy and always try to enhance it in them rather than their weaknesses, because it is directly linked to work performance and productivity.
2. Authentic leaders instill hope in employees, which help them achieve task oriented efficiency and enthusiasm. This is because hope motivates employees and individuals to bring to bear their best in a productive environment.
3. In most cases authentic leaders raise optimism, which is linked to their success and those of their followers, because through optimism they exercise positively.
4. In periods of difficulties caused by business or economic trends, authentic leaders display resilience and equally teach it to their followers as well. On the whole authentic leadership behaviour is positively related to job performance, followers behaviour, work engagement, this has been proven empirically (Walumbwa, et.al.2008)

Common Leadership Styles.

The most common leadership styles are briefly discussed below as enunciated by scholars and in particular Bezuidenhout and Schultz, (2013).

1. Democratic Leadership: It is exactly what it sounds like -- the leader makes decisions based on the input of each team member. Although he or she makes the final call, each employee has an equal say on a project's direction. This leadership style is one of the most effective because it allows lower-level employees to exercise authority they'll need to use wisely in future positions they might hold. It also resembles how decisions can be made in company board meetings.

For example, in a company board meeting, a democratic leader might give the team a few decision-related options. They could then open a discussion about each option. After a discussion, this leader might take the board's thoughts and feedback into consideration, or they might open this decision up to a vote. This leadership style is commonly effective.

2. Autocratic Leadership: This is the inverse of democratic leadership. As far as this leadership style is concerned, the leader makes decisions without taking input from anyone who reports to the leader. Employees are neither considered nor consulted prior to a decision, and are expected to adhere to the decision at a time and pace stipulated by the leader.

An example of this could be when a manager changes the hours of work shifts for multiple employees without consulting anyone -- especially the affected employees.

Frankly, this leadership style stinks. Most organizations today cannot sustain such a hegemonic culture without losing employees. It's best to keep leadership more open to the intellect and perspective of the rest of the team. This style is rarely effective in today's society.

3. Laissez-Faire Leadership: The French term "laissez faire" literally translates to "let them do," and leaders who embrace it afford nearly all authority to their employees.

In a young startup, for example, you might see a laissez-faire company founder who makes no major office policies around work hours or deadlines. They might put full trust into their employees while they focus on the overall workings of running the company.

Although laissez-faire leadership can empower employees by trusting them to work, sometimes however the way they like, it can limit their development and overlook critical company growth opportunities. Therefore, it's important that this leadership style is kept in check, because it's sometimes not effective, except when guided.

4. Strategic Leadership: Strategic leaders sit at the intersection between a company's main operations and its growth opportunities. He or she accepts the burden of executive interests while ensuring that current working conditions remain stable for everyone else. This is a desirable leadership style in many companies because strategic thinking supports multiple types of employees at once. However, leaders who operate this way can set a dangerous precedence with respect to how many people they can support at once, and what the best direction for the company really is if everyone is getting their way at all times. Though this style is commonly effective

5. Transformational Leadership: This leadership style is always transforming and improving upon the company's conventions. Employees might have a basic set of tasks and goals that they complete every week or month, but the leader is constantly pushing them outside of their comfort zone. When starting a job with this type of leader, all employees might get a list of goals to reach, as well as deadlines for reaching them. While the goals might seem simple at first, this manager might pick up the pace of deadlines or give you more and more challenging goals as you grow with the company. This is a highly encouraged form of leadership among growth-minded companies because it motivates employees to see what they are capable of doing. But transformational leaders can risk losing sight of everyone's individual learning curves if direct reports don't receive the right coaching to guide them through new responsibilities. It is sometimes very effective.

6. Transactional Leadership: Transactional leaders are fairly common today. These managers reward their employees for precisely the work they do. A marketing team that receives a scheduled bonus for helping generate a certain number of leads by the end of the quarter is a common example of transactional leadership.

When starting a job with a transactional boss, you might receive an incentive plan that motivates you to quickly master your regular job duties. For example, if you work in marketing, you might receive a bonus for sending 10 marketing emails. On the other hand, a transformational leader might only offer you a bonus if your work results in a large amount of newsletter subscriptions.

Transactional leadership helps establish roles and responsibilities for each employee, but it can also encourage bare-minimum work if employees know how much their effort is worth all the time. This leadership style can use incentive programmes to motivate employees, but they should be consistent with the company's goals and used in addition to unscheduled gestures of appreciation. The method sometimes works effectively

7. Coach-Style Leadership: Similarly to a sports team's coach, this leader focuses on identifying and nurturing the individual strengths of each member on his or her team. They also focus on strategies that will enable their team to work better together. This style offers strong similarities to strategic and democratic leadership, but puts more emphasis on the growth and success of individual employees. Rather than forcing all employees to focus on similar skills and goals, this leader might build a team where each employee has an expertise or skill set in something different. In the long-run, this leader focuses on creating strong teams that can communicate well and embrace each other's unique skill sets in order to get work done. A manager with this leadership style might help employees improve on their strengths by giving them new tasks to try, offering them guidance, or meeting to

discuss constructive feedback. They might also encourage one or more team members to expand on their strengths by learning new skills from other teammates. The style is very effective and encouraging.

8. Bureaucratic Leadership: Bureaucratic leaders go by the books. This style of leadership might listen and consider the input of employees unlike autocratic leadership but the leader tends to reject an employee's input if it conflicts with company policy or past practices. You may run into a bureaucratic leader at a larger, older, or traditional company. At these companies, when a colleague or employee proposes a strong strategy that seems new or non-traditional, bureaucratic leaders may reject it. Their resistance might be because the company has already been successful with current processes and trying something new could waste time or resources if it doesn't work.

Employees under this leadership style might not feel as controlled as they would under autocratic leadership, but there is still a lack of freedom in how much people are able to do in their roles. This can quickly shut down innovation, and is definitely not encouraged for companies who are chasing ambitious goals and quick growth. The leadership style is rarely effective.

In any case authentic leadership is a multi-dimensional leadership theory therefore has similarities with transformation and several other leadership theories including ethical, transactional, democratic, strategic, charismatic, servant leadership, etc. it is of note that conceptually, there are series of similarities between them and authentic leadership. Sufficed to say that transformational, servant, democratic, strategic, autocratic, bureaucratic authentic leadership all share a moral component (Northouse, 2013). The primary difference between these, however is that servant leaders strive to serve first by putting the goals and needs of others before their own and then lead, ethical leaders desire to exhibit ethical character in all their doings, charismatic leaders aspire to be charming, democrats believes in collective opinion or ideology, transactional leaders favour all positive behaviour amongst employees with reward and bonuses, bureaucratic strictly official, while authentic leaders strive above all else to be truthful, precise and consistently authentic no matter the situation on ground. Thus authentic leaders are those with various skills, styles, experiences, that are incorporated in one and fits the specific context the leaders are exposed to and they take appropriate measures (George. 2010) in (Mason, 2017). Therefore, the major difference between authentic leadership and other forms of leadership is that a leader may be more or less authentic and possess various characteristics, of each of the aforementioned leadership styles. What matter most, a leader may be democratic, charismatic, strategic, transformational, etc., but not authentic or not the earlier discussed. It is important to note that, the most essential variable of authentic leadership is not the leader's style of whether the leader is transformation or democratic or non but rather the extent or magnitude of the leader's authenticity in practice in every circumstances (George, 2010) in (Mason, 2017)

Methodology of the Study

The researchers X-rayed the research topic and equally circumscribed the research questions and hypotheses within a manageable limit considering other challenges. To further give credence to this work, the phenomena area covered was authentic leadership and its proxies. The geographical scope was not in context as a result of the current pandemic ravaging the world.

In continuation empirical data were solicited from possible respondents in selected ten (10) Cities in Nigeria with the characteristics of interest. Consequently the researchers used topman's formula to derive the desired sample size, which implies, $n = \frac{z^2 P \times Qx}{E^2}$ where n = Sample size, $Z = 1.96$, P = Probability of positive response, Q = Probability of negative response, $E = 0.05$, which represented the amount of error that can be allowed.

Using inferential judgement of the researchers and convenience, P is represented as 76%, suffice to say that sample size is only determined based on the circumstances and convenience, while being cautions of time, cost, and precision (Anyanwu, 2005).

$$\text{Solution therefore, } n = \frac{(1.96^2) \times 0.76 \times 0.24}{0.05^2}$$

$$n = \frac{3.841 \times 0.1824}{0.0025} = \frac{0.7005984}{0.0025}$$
$$n = 280$$

Data Analysis and Interpretation of Result

The decision to administer 280 questionnaires was based on the operation carried out in trying to arrive at an ideal sample size.

Table 1. Number of Questionnaires Distributed and Response Rate

No. Questionnaires Administered	No. of Questionnaires Returned (%)	No. Of Questionnaires Not Returned (%)
280	243 (86.8%)	37(13.2%)

Source: Researchers' Field work, 2020

It is important to note that table 1 describes the total number of questionnaire administered to all the respondents from different institutions and corporate organizations in ten (10) major cities in Nigeria. The actual number was 280 out of which 243 were returned, representing 86.8%, while the remaining 37 were not returned, also representing 13.2%. The above interpretation clearly showed that the response rate was quite commendable and the research instrument was justified.

Test of Hypotheses

The three earlier formulated hypotheses are re-stated here both in null (Ho) and alternative (H1) form.

Hypothesis 1

1. Ho: Authentic leadership in an organization does not encourage corporate deficiencies and management malfeasance.

H1: Authentic leadership in an organization encourages corporate deficiencies and management malfeasance.

Table 2. Authentic Leadership and Corporate Deficiencies/Management Malfeasance

Sources of Variance	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Squares	F. Ratio Cal.	F. Table Val.
Explained Between Columns	120.5	1	120.5	1.30	5.32
Error Unexplained Within Columns	740	8	92.5		
Total	860.5	9			

Source: Result of Researchers Computation from Appendix (table 5) 2020

Result and Implication: In the case of hypothesis one, it was discovered that the calculated F.ration is 1.30, while the table value is 5.32 at 5% level of significance and 1 and 8 degree of freedom. The implication is that Ho is accepted and H1is rejected. This is as a result of the fact that calculated F. ration is less than F. table value, (i.e. cal. Val. 1.30 < tab. val. 5.32). This result invariably implies that authentic leadership in an organization does not create room for corporate deficiencies and management malfeasance, because the leader in true sense lead by example of being truthful or sincere. The tendency of suffering or experiencing the earlier mentioned is often minimized if the leader of the team see authenticity as vital management tool for moving the organization and people forward.

Hypothesis 2

1. Ho: Authentic leadership in practice does not degenerate to decline in productive tendencies and followers motivation.
 H1: Authentic Leadership in practice degenerate to decline in productive tendencies and followers motivation.

Table: 3 Authentic Leadership in Practice and Decline in Production/Motivation

Sources of Variance	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Squares	F. Ratio Cal.	F. Table Val.
Explained Between Columns	120.5	1	120.5	3.31	5.32
Error Unexplained Within Columns	290	8	36.3		
Total	410.5	9			

Source: Result of Researchers Computation from Appendix (table 6) 2020

Result and Implication: The result of test of hypothesis two clearly showed that the calculated value of F.ratio is 3.31 and the value of F. table is 5.32 at 5% level of significance and 1 and 8 degree of freedom. The implication of this result means Ho is accepted and H1is rejected. Thus the rejection of H1invariably means that the calculated F. value is less than the F. table value, (i.e. cal. Val. 3.31 < tab. val. 5.32). In conclusion when leaders exhibit authenticity in their leadership quality by being practical in all ramification, certainly such actions cannot degenerate productive tendencies but will spur or motivate followership and boost productivity.

Hypothesis 3

1. Ho: Authentic leadership traits, such as vision, self-confidences, decisiveness and good sense of judgment does not negatively influence the outcome of events in a work situation.
 H1: Authentic leadership traits such as vision, self-confidence, decisiveness and good sense of judgment negatively influence the outcome of events in a work situation.

Table 4: Authentic Leadership Traits and Influence or Outcome of Events in a Work Situation

Sources of Variance	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Squares	F. Ratio Cal.	F. Table Val.
Explained Between Columns	120.5	1	120.5	1.92	5.32
Error Unexplained Within Columns	500	8	62.5		
Total	620.5	9			

Source: Result of Researchers Computation from Appendix (table 7)2020

Result and Implication: When hypothesis three was tested, it was observed that the calculated value of F. ratio is 1.92, while the table value of F. distribution is 5.32 at 5% level of significance and 1 and 8 degree of freedom. The implication of the above result implies that Ho is accepted and H1is rejected. Therefore, the rejection ofH1means that the calculated F. ratio is less than F. table value, (i.e. cal. Val. 1.92 < tab. val. 5.32). It maybe deduced that authentic leadership traits, such as vision, self-confidence, decisiveness and good sense of judgement does not negatively influence the outcome of events in a work situation but impact positively.

Discussion of Findings

The researchers formulated questions as well as tested hypotheses based on the research problem. The major findings are discussed in relation to earlier scholars work.

When questionnaires were administered to respondents based on authentic leadership and corporate deficiencies and management malfeasance, their responses and test of hypothesis one clearly showed that authentic leadership in an organization or institution does not encourages corporate deficiencies and management malfeasance. This is because in its true sense the leader try as much as possible to be the real self and inculcate same ideology to followers or employees in an organization or society. Thus the findings are consistent with the work of Cooper, Scandura and Schriesheim, (2005) that really dealt on the quest for a new construct in the leadership field as a result of challenging corporate deficiencies and malfeasance. But on the other hand Gardiner, (2011) suggested that construct authentic leadership deeply flawed because it failed to realize the social and historical circumstances that affects leaders to perform or be true leaders, hence those challenges earlier mentioned in organizations must always surface.

The question based on authentic leadership in practice and productive tendencies as well as followers or employees' motivation findings indicated that if really leaders adopt authenticity as leadership ideology or philosophy there is every possibility that the productive capability of the organization will increase and the organization is likely to produce a highly motivated workforce. The more reason when the hypothesis was tested the result confirmed that in its true sense, authentic leadership in practice does not degenerate to decline in productive tendencies and follower's motivation but rather improve production and followership. The current exposition is an affirmation of the scholarly work of Ilies, Morgeson, and Nahrgang, (2005) who discussed exhaustively on the influence of authenticity on employees or followers and enhanced productive capability. Furthermore, Wong, Laschinger, and Cummings, (2010) confirmed that authentic leadership significantly and positively influence work engagement and followers or employees' motivation. In the same direction, Avolio, Walumbwa, and Weber, (2009) made it clear that leaders self – awareness and self-regulation often result to the development of followership and contributes to sustainable performance in a working environment or amongst societies. Khan, (2004) summarized it all with the assertion, authentic leadership behaviour is positively related to job performance, follower behaviour, work engagement, etc. (Walumbwa, et.al. (2008). All the above mentioned studies gave credence to the current research findings, because all bothered on the same premise. The last but not the least of the major findings was based on authentic leadership traits and the influence of outcome of events in a working situation. It was discovered that the leaders' traits such as, vision, self confidence, decisiveness, good sense of judgment does not negatively influence the outcome of events in a work situation. This is basically capitalized on the leaders' creative ingenuity and ability to be real and truthful in all ramification, especially in a work environment. The current research findings is in conformity with the scholarly work of the following; Goffee and Jones, (2015), Leroy, et.al. (2005), Besen, et.al. (2015) and Wong, Laschinger, and Cummings, (2010). But the only divergent view or study that contradicted this work was the case of George, Sims, Mc Lean and Mayer (2007) who all did mentioned that there are no universal traits for the description of authentic leaders and likely outcome of their actions in a work situation. They believed that different actions and inactions may occur in the course of discharging leadership or entrusted power.

Conclusion and Policy Statement

Despite the divergent view of authentic leadership as portrayed in the literature review and the empirical validation, it is important to note that, the core domain of authenticity in leadership simply require the leader to be truthful, honest, ethical, morally upright, this will foster positive long-term outcomes for leaders, their employees, followers, and organizations/institutions they pilot. This is because the common unifying theme among authentic leaders is that their leadership practices are shaped by various experiences that occur throughout the course of their lives, especially critical events that maybe positive or negative as the situation permits. The more reason they must align their values, intentions, and behaviours and demonstrate consistency between what they say and what they do. It is therefore recommended that leaders in a work environment or otherwise should maintain a high degree of truthfulness and consistency in their actions and behaviour to continually enjoy the obedience of subordinates and followers.

References

- [1]. Anyanwu, A. (2005) *Research Methodology in Business and Social Sciences*. First Edition. Owerri, Nigeria Canun Publishers Nig, Ltd. 259p
- [2]. Avolio, B. (2010) *Pursuing Authentic Leadership Development*. In N. Nohria and R. Khurana (Eds), *Hand*
- [3]. *Book of Leadership Theory and practice: A Harvard Business School Centennial Colloquium*, Boston

[4]. Avolio, B., Walumbwa, F. and Weber, T. (2009) Leadership; Current Theories, Research and Future Direction. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60, 421 – 449

[5]. Besen, F., Tecchio, E., and Fialho, F. A. P. (2015) Authentic Leadership and Knowledge Management. *Gestao and Producao*, 24(1) <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/0104-530x898>

[6]. Bezuidenhout, A. and Schultz, C. (2013) Transformational Leadership and Employee Engagement in the Mining Industry. *Journal of Contemporary Management*, 10(1), 279 – 297

[7]. Cooke, R. A. (1991) Danger Signs of Unethical Behaviour: How to Determine if your Firm is at Ethical Risk. *Journal of Business Ethics*. Vol 3.

[8]. Cooper, C.D., Scandura, T.A. and Schriesheim, C.A. (2005) Looking Forward but Learning from Our past: Potential Challenges to Developing Authentic Leadership Theory and authentic Leaders Quarterly. *The leadership Quarterly*. 16, 475 – 493

[9]. Datta B. (2015) Assessing The Effectiveness of Authentic Leadership. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, 9 (1), 62 – 75

[10]. Gardiner, R. (2011) A Critique of The Discourse of Authentic Leadership. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*. 2 (15), 99 – 104

[11]. George, B. (2010) Authentic Leadership. In J.T. Mc Mahon (Ed.), *Leadership Classic* (Pp. 574 – 583). Long Grove, K: Waveland Press.

[12]. George, B. Sims, P. Mc Lean, A. and Mayer, D., (2007). *Discovering Your Authentic Leadership*. Harvard Business Review, 129 – 138

[13]. Goffee, R. and Jones, G. (2005) Managing Authenticity: The Paradox of Great Leadership. Harvard Business Review, Dec, 85, 86 – 94

[14]. Khan, S. (2010) Impact of Authentic Leaders on Organization Performance, *International Journal of Business Management*, 5(12) 167 – 172

[15]. Leroy, H., Palanski, M. and Simons, T. (2012) Authentic Leadership and Behavioural Integrity as Drivers Of Follower Commitment and Performance. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 107 (3), 255 – 264

[16]. Lerner, H.G. (1993) *The Dance of Deception*. Harper Collins, New York.

[17]. Northouse, P. (2013) *Leadership Theory and Practice* (6th Ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

[18]. Simons, T. (2002) Behaviourial Intergrity: The Perceived Alignments Between Managers’ Words and Deeds as a Research Focus. *Organization Science* 13, 18 – 35.

[19]. Sanchez-Runde, C., Nardon, L. and Steers, R. M (2011) Looking Beyond Western Leadership Models Implications For Global Managers. *Organizational Dynamics*, 40, 207 – 213

[20]. Tibbs, S., Green, M.T, Gergen, E. and Montoya, J.A. (2016). If You are Like me, I Think you be more authentic. An analysis of The Interaction of Followers and Leader Gender. *Administrative Issues Journal of Education, Practice and Research*, 6(1), 11 – 133.

[21]. Walumbwa, F., Avolio, B., Gardner, W., Wernsing, T. and Peterson, S. (2008). Authentic Leadership: Delopement and Validation of a Theory – Based Measure. *Journal of Management*, 89 – 126.

[22]. Wong, C., Laschinger, S. and Cummings, G. (2010) Authentic Leadership and Nurses’ Voice Behaviour And Perception of Care Quality. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 18 (2), 889 – 900.

[23]. Zhang, H., Everett, A., Elkin, G., and Cone, M. (2012). Authentic Leadership Theory Development: Theorizing on Chinese, *Philosophy. Asia Pacific Business Review*, 18 (4), 587 – 605.

Appendix

Table 5: Computation of Test of Hypothesis one

Sources of Val. variation	Sum of Squares	Degree of Freedomsquare	Mean Cal	F. Ratio	Tab.
Explained B/W Columns	SSA = 120.5	c-1 = 2-1 = 1	MSA = $\frac{120.5}{1}$ = 120.5	$\frac{MSA}{MSE} = \frac{120.5}{92.5}$	
5.32 Error or Unexplained Within Columns	SSE = 740	(r-1)c 4×2 = 8	MSE = $\frac{740}{8}$ = 92.5	= 1.30	
Total	SST = 860.5	9			

Source: Researchers’ Computation, 2020.

Table 6: Computation of Test of Hypothesis two

Sources of Val. variation	Sum of Squares	Degree of Freedom	Mean Square	F. Ratio	Tab.
Explained B/W Columns	SSA = 120.5	c-1 = 2-1 = 1	MSA = $\frac{120.5}{1}$ = 120.5	$\frac{MSA}{MSE} = \frac{120.5}{36.3} = 3.31$	
Error or Unexplained Within Columns	SSE = 290	(r-1)c = (5-1)2 = 4×2 = 8	MSE = $\frac{290}{8}$ = 36.3		5.32
Total	SST = 410.5	9			

Source: Researchers' Computation, 2020.

Table 7: Computation of Test of Hypothesis three

Sources of Val. variation	Sum of Squares	Degree of Freedom	Mean Square	F. Ratio	Tab.
Explained B/W Columns	SSA = 120.5	c-1 = 2-1 = 1	MSA = $\frac{120.5}{1}$ = 120.5	$\frac{MSA}{MSE} = \frac{120.5}{62.5} = 1.92$	5.32
Error or Unexplained Within Columns	SSE = 500	(r-1)c = (5-1)2 = 4×2 = 8	MSE = $\frac{500}{8}$ = 62.5		
Total	SST = 620	9			

Source: Researchers' Computation, 2020.