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ABSTRACT

Numerous authors have highlighted that there is a dire crisis in leadership for which a new type of leader is required: an authentic leader. Greater authenticity is required from leaders if they are to restore the trust of their followers in them. Authenticity is furthermore something that others must attribute to a person and cannot be expressed freely. The expectations and roles of leaders are such that they have to control the express of their inner authenticity. The influence of temperament on the individual is such that every person’s experience and conceptualisation of authenticity could potentially differ from that of another. In light of the aforementioned the purpose of this study was to explore how leaders from different temperament types manage their individual authenticity to add more value to themselves as well as to others. The study followed a qualitative research approach and made use of the purposeful sampling technique. The Keirsey Temperament Sorter II was utilised to identify the temperament types of research participants with whom semi-structured interviews were conducted. The study found that leaders across the four temperament types of Guardian, Idealist, Artisan and Rational define authenticity as a commitment to the true "self", while self-awareness was identified as a critical component in the management of authenticity.

Keywords: authentic, inauthenticity, authenticity, persona, temperament, authentic leadership, self-awareness, Keirsey Temperament Sorter.
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SYNOPSIS

Globally there is a dire crisis in leadership which can be directly attributed to a lack of authenticity. Leaders have foregone the character ethics infused in leadership and are instead leading from a persona. It is only by being more authentic that the broken trust in leadership can be restored. Yet being authentic is not sufficient. The positions that leaders fulfil as well as the expectations of their followers require them to manage their individual authenticity to add more value to others as well as to themselves. The question thus remains how leaders can effectively go about managing their individual authenticity.

The purpose of this study was to explore how leaders with different temperament types manage their individual authenticity to add more value to themselves and to others. The specific aims of the study included establishing how leaders could enhance their individual authenticity, assessing how leaders can manage their individual authenticity, exploring how leaders can create more value and finally determining how leaders from different temperament types conceptualise and experience authenticity.

For the purposes of this study the qualitative research methodology was used. The research methods included concept analysis, review of literature as well as semi-structured interviewing. An extensive literature study covered concepts such as authenticity, inauthentic, persona and temperament. Participants in the semi-structured interviews were selected by means of the purposeful sampling technique. Participants were also required to complete the Keirsey Temperament Sorter II as to identify their specific temperament type. Following initial screening, seven leaders participated in the qualitative interviewing.

The study concludes by highlighting that, in order for leaders to become more authentic and, in effect, be able to manage their individual authenticity, they have to become self-aware and remain true to who they are at their core. The study offers both theoretical and practical value in that it provides leaders with insight into how they can go about managing their individual authenticity.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1. INTRODUCTION: PURPOSE OF THE CHAPTER

This chapter will focus on describing the particular context which gives eminence to the research problem. It will furthermore highlight how the set research question and aims will be addressed by the study. The chapter will also serve as an introduction to the research design and methodology that have been selected to address the aims of the study. Research methods and analysis will be described with the chapter ending off with a chapter outline of the study.

1.2. BACKGROUND

The notion of being true to self dates back to the words of William Shakespeare who instructed: “To thine own self be true, and it must follow, as the night the day, thou canst not then be false to any man”. Over the years the notion of being true to self has been interpreted and presented in various contexts and has in modern times featured prominently under the banner of authenticity.

In March 2008, Time Magazine published an article highlighting Synthetic Authenticity as one of the ‘10 Ideas that are Changing the World’ (Cloud, 2008). The article refers to ‘Authenticity’, the work of Gilmore and Pine (2007) in which they advocate that the global changes in the world has left the consumer with a deep desire for authenticity and it furthermore entails that “…the crucial factor dividing success from failure in the next few years will be whether a business is perceived as real or fake, authentic of inauthentic” (Cloud, 2008).

Authenticity does not merely have serious implications on the longevity of businesses but also directly for leadership. George (2007) argues that the problems exposed at Enron, Worldcom, Tyco and Arthur Anderson call attention to the crisis in leadership - a crisis which can be attributed directly to a lack of authenticity within leadership (George, 2003). The crisis in leadership is compounded by the fact that leaders who merely present a front
to others are indeed being inauthentic. They mask their inadequacies while also leading from a persona (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999). Over the past few years people have developed a distrust of such leaders and hence a new type of leader is required for the twenty-first century (George, Sims, Mclean & Meyer, 2007). Smith (2010) shares this view and reiterates that the world is currently in dire need of new leaders. In essence trust is everything in business (George, 2007) and therefore no business can thrive while there is a lack of trust in its leaders.

The answer to how the trust in leadership can be restored is to be found in authenticity (Morin, 2010). For any entrepreneur or business leader, the overarching goal of being the best ultimately starts with being authentic. George et al. (2007) shares this view and adds that no one can be successful without being authentic. People are simply more inclined to trust those who are genuine and authentic. Authentic leaders are those who promote trust and are able to inspire people to lift their performance because of the trust that they embody and convey (George, 2007).

1.2.1. Authenticity Defined

In an attempt to clarify what authenticity means from a business perspective Morin (2010, p. 23) described it as “…the values, purpose and passions that are at the heart of why any business, institution or organisation exist in the first place, which drives what your organisation is trying to achieve, as well as how it goes about doing it”. On the other hand George (2007) regards authentic leaders as those who are able to rally people around a common purpose, empower them to lead authentically while adding value for stakeholders. George (2007) furthermore argues that every authentic leader requires integrity. Times have changed dramatically and with this have come a fresh awareness of the need for authentic leaders to lead with integrity across the full leadership spectrum. Fry and Whittington (2005) see authentic leaders as those who are hopeful, transparent, and resilient, have high morals and ethics, future-oriented and focus on the development of others. Authentic leaders are hence understood as those individuals who are not merely concerned with the bottom line but also espouse the values, mission and purpose of the organisation while ensuring the development of others.
The perceived rise in corporate manipulation and/or guile is ultimately leading to increased interest in authenticity (Liedtka), while the growing dissatisfaction with “sleek, ersatz, airbrushed” leadership is what makes authenticity such a desirable quality in today’s corporations (Goffee & Jones, 2005, p. 87). Managing the perception of authenticity is considered as the primary new source of creating value, the new business imperative (Cloud, 2008).

However, outstanding leadership requires more than merely managing the perception of authentic behaviour. Cashman (2008) contends that leadership is essentially about influencing authentically while creating value, and in order for people to be truly authentic they have to be true to others as well (Clapp-Smith, Vogelgesang & Avey, 2009). The challenge for authentic leaders within organisations lie therein that, while they are expected to remain true to themselves, they are also required to live with an awareness of the needs, expectations, desires, wants and feedback of their followers (Day & Kilduff, 2003). Thus as a result of the demands and expectations associated with their jobs, leaders face additional challenges and pressure in remaining authentic to themselves as well as to their roles as leaders (Chan, Hannah & Gardner, 2005).

As has been argued thus far, there is a dire crisis within leadership for which a new type of leader is required: an authentic leader. In reference to the crisis in leadership Hutton (2010) argues that flawed and greedy leadership had been exposed by the credit crunch while Smith (2010) contests that the depth of misconduct by leaders in both corporate and government spheres continues to shock the world. The global leadership problem is compounded by the fact that many leaders who are driven to achieve success bypass the hard work associated with character development as well as the enhancement of self-awareness (Fry & Whittington, 2005). As a result history contains examples of numerous leaders who were once authentic, but when called upon to face a specific leadership challenge, failed miserably and behaved inauthentically (Chan, Hannah & Gardner, 2005). The world is therefore experiencing the aftermath of bad leadership ethic and desperately needs to rejuvenate its global leadership core if it is to steer through the current socio-economic and political challenges (Smith, 2010). No one disputes that leadership matters and hence the importance of exceptional leadership, especially during troubling times cannot be emphasised enough (Ulrich, Smallwood, & Sweetman, 2008).
Authenticity is what is missing from the world today and is furthermore the missing ingredient in the global leadership gap (Smith, 2010). This global leadership gap is not only experienced on the world stage but clearly has implication for South Africa as well, and hence what this country needs now is authentic leadership (Mthembu, 2009). It is furthermore evident that the success of South African organisations is intrinsically linked to authenticity (Yalokwu, 2008). Within the backdrop of the significant challenges faced by society and especially by business at large, there exists a dire need for authentic leaders to step up. We need a new generation of authentic leaders to restore public trust in our corporations (George, 2003).

In a study conducted by Sheldon, Ryan, Rawsthorne and Ilardi (1997) it was discovered that greater authenticity was related to improved self-esteem, identity integration, sense of autonomy, as well as less depression and perceived stress. Ryan, LaGuardia and Rawthorne (2005) found that authenticity contributes to positive well-being while inauthenticity is related to intrapersonal strife and conflict. Through their research Goldman and Kernis (2002 p. 18) found empirical support that authenticity is an important component of “psychological functioning and positive subjective well-being” whilst it also contributes to more positive and secure feelings of self-worth. Research has demonstrated that well-being is associated with reduced levels of stress as well as improved productivity (McCarthy, Almeida, Ahrens, 2011). The importance of authenticity for organisations is underscored by research that has demonstrated that authenticity contributes to a reduction in the levels of stress and depression, improvement of self-esteem and feelings of self-worth, whilst through its ties with well-being contributes to overall employee productivity.

It is imperative for leaders within organisations to act authentically. That being said, it is not merely sufficient for leaders to mimic an uncontrolled sense of authenticity - they have to ensure that their individual authenticity is adding value to others as well as to themselves (Goffee & Jones, 2005). Apart from adding value in a team and organisational context, the challenge of leadership ultimately relates to the management of the perception of individual authenticity (Goffee & Jones, 2005). Leaders are tasked with the responsibility of adding value yet they cannot sufficiently do so without adequately managing the perception of authenticity. They are therefore expected to add value to others and as well as to themselves by means of managing their individual authenticity.
With the aforementioned in mind it becomes clear that there is a need for leaders to employ greater skills in managing the perception of authenticity. Authenticity for leaders remains in itself a challenging construct as an unmanaged expression of the authentic self could have dire consequences for the leader as well as for the team and the broader organisation. Goffee and Jones (2005) accurately surmise that those who assume that their authenticity originates from an uncontrolled expression of their inner selves will never become truly authentic leaders. It is only by using our individual uniqueness to add value to others that we will be truly happy (Attwood & Attwood, 2007) and in order to accomplish this we have to manage the expression of our true selves, our very authentic natures.

From the literature it is evident that leaders are required to make a significant shift to embody behaviour which is indicative of their individual authenticity while at the same time ensuring that they are indeed adding value. Authenticity in this sense entails that others perceive the leader as being authentic. Authentic leaders are bound by their roles as leaders and hence do not have free reign to express their personalities as they see fit (Chan, Hannah & Gardner, 2005). Leaders can therefore not leave their individual authenticity to manifest of its own accord; it must be controlled and managed. Leaders must learn how to apply their authenticity in line with the situation at hand and in this way strike a balance between their uniqueness and the cultures in which they are immersed (Goffee & Jones, 2005).

While it has been established that it is imperative for leaders to be authentic and control their authentic expression, it must be acknowledged that people inherently differ from one another and thus their experiences of, and association with, authenticity may differ. According to Keirsey (1998, p. 1) “people are different... no amount of getting after them is going to change them...”. Keirsey (2008) ascribes the fundamental difference between people to temperament. There are vast behavioural differences among people which are caused by temperament and have an undeniable influence on how people naturally tend to behave and respond to environmental cues.

Authors such as Kagan (1994) and Pert (1997) argue that temperament is prevalent from birth, and is influenced by genetics and is subsequently reflected within a “person’s character, disposition and tendencies” (McLeod & Hanks, 1985, p. 1204). People are, as a result of the influence of temperament, naturally inclined to act differently from one another
while also displaying unique preferences, likes and dislikes. Based on the aforementioned grounds it can be deduced that individuals may describe “being authentic” in different ways and this may have a bearing on their ability to and manner of controlling their authentic expression. Whilst it has been established that it is a necessity for leaders to manage their authenticity, the possible influence of temperament on the expression as well as the control of authenticity merits further exploration.

There is currently little empirical research available that attempts to explain the relationship between temperament and authenticity. Keirsey (1998) states that authenticity is important for Idealists however no explanation is offered for understanding what being authentic may mean for individuals from each of the four temperament types. Considering that understanding authenticity holds numerous benefits for organisations and that temperament has a considerable influence on the behaviour of employees and leaders that make up those organisations, it becomes evident that there is merit for exploring the relationship between authenticity and temperament further.

1.3. RESEARCH PROBLEM

It has so far been argued that there is a dire crisis in global leadership for which greater authenticity is required. Leaders in business and organisations alike have to employ authenticity if they are to restore the trust of their followers in them. It has furthermore been argued that it is not merely sufficient for leaders to give an uncontrolled expression of their authentic natures; they have to demonstrate the necessary sensitivity for the environment as well as the expectations and desires of their followers. Within this context it is evident that, as a result of temperament, leaders may conceptualise and experience authenticity differently. This then alludes to the possibility that leaders within temperament types could experience different challenges in controlling the expression of their individual authenticity. In light of the importance of managing authenticity the research question arises: How can authenticity, as reflected within temperament, be managed by leaders to the extent that it adds value?
1.4. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1.4.1. Primary Research Question
The main research question has been identified as:
How can authenticity, as manifested within temperament, be managed by leaders to the extent that it adds value?

1.4.2. Sub-research Questions
In support of the primary research question the following sub-research questions will also be addressed:

a. How can leaders enhance their authenticity?
b. How do leaders within different temperament types define and experience authenticity within their work environments?
c. How can authenticity be managed?
d. How can leaders create value within relationships as a management function?

1.5. RESEARCH AIMS
In accordance with the specific research questions the following research objectives have been identified:

a. Establish how leaders can enhance their authenticity.
b. Determine how leaders from different temperament types define and experience authenticity within their work environments.
c. Assess how leaders can manage their authenticity.
d. Determine how leaders can create more value as a function of management.

1.6. VALUE ADDED BY THE STUDY

1.6.1. Theoretical Contribution
The study aims to make a theoretical contribution to the field of leadership by means of providing insight into the literature relating to the management of authenticity. It will furthermore through qualitative interviewing explore what insight research participants of
different temperament types could offer in terms of understanding the management of individual authenticity. It furthermore aims to provide clarity in terms of the application and use of the concepts: authenticity, persona as well as temperament. By exploring the potential link between authenticity and temperament the hope is expressed that the study can make a valuable contribution to building the body of knowledge related to these constructs. The study also aims to make a contribution to the leadership body of knowledge by way of underscoring how important it is for leaders to manage their individual authenticity and furthermore underscoring how they can actively go about doing so.

1.6.2. Practical Contribution
The research aims to make a practical contribution to the study of authenticity by highlighting those methods that leaders could employ in order to manage their authentic natures. In this regard the study aims to identify any practical tools, models, theories or perspectives which can assist leaders in managing their individual authenticity. Considering the importance of authenticity in restoring the trust in top leaders this study could take strides in providing business leaders with practical insight into how to mend the broken relationship with their followers. The study will offer new insight into how leaders from different temperament types go about managing their authentic natures. It will therefore provide the field of leadership with new information for understanding work relations and those elements critical to leading authentically.

1.7. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHOD

Following the identification of the particular research problem and associated research questions it is imperative to highlight how the study was conducted. Research methodology refers to the research process as well as the set of tools and procedures to be used in the study (Mouton, 2001). For the purposes of addressing the particular research questions an exploratory-descriptive design was used while also incorporating qualitative methods.

1.7.1. Qualitative Research Approach
The qualitative research methods were used with the semi-structured interviews in mind. This particular approach enabled the researcher to gain insight into understanding how
research participants understood authenticity as well as how they go about managing it. Qualitative research is an inquiry process of understanding: “The researcher analyses words to develop a complex, holistic picture to report the detailed views of informants, as determined in a natural setting” (Maree, 2007, p. 257). Qualitative Research is furthermore a broad approach to the study of social phenomenon whereby the researcher takes on an insider view of relevant phenomenon (Babbie & Mouton, 2001).

According Creswell (2007) ontology and epistemology play a critical role within the selection and identification of the appropriate research approach. Nieuwenhuis (2007) conceptualises of ontology as the study of the nature of reality. With ontology it is understood that reality is defined differently by individuals and thus multiple realities may exist. Nieuwenhuis (2007) furthermore points out that the qualitative research approach, which will be employed within this study, focuses on the social construction of the ideas and concepts of the various research participants. Through qualitative research the researcher is able to focus on people and explore the specific meanings behind social behaviour. From an ontological perspective the researcher believes that knowledge and meaning are acts of interpretation and through the subjective interpretation of reality, that reality can be understood (Creswell, 1994). It is furthermore understood that people attach different meanings and associations to their experiences in order to make sense of it.

Epistemology relates to how things can be discovered and disclosed (Nieuwenhuis, 2007). While ontology asks questions relating to what exactly constitutes reality; epistemology on the other hand relates to how one can become familiar with reality. In accordance with the qualitative research approach reality is made known by exploring the experiences of others as they relate to a particular phenomenon (Nieuwenhuis, 2007). From an epistemological perspective the researcher believes that during a research study a researcher has to describe meanings, seek to understand research participants’ definitions of situations, interpret and examine how objective realities are produced. The research interacts and actively engages with that which is being researched (Creswell, 1994).

1.7.2. Research Methods
In accordance with the research questions the following research methods were employed for the purposes of this study: a literature review and semi-structured interviews.
1.7.3. Literature Review

The literature review is conducted to find material relating to the focus of the research problem (Du Plooy, 2001). According to Davies (2007) a literature review highlights that a student has gained a fair amount of knowledge separate of their own research project. A literature study was employed to establish the current body of knowledge and highlight any potential shortcomings. Literature applicable to the research topic was explored as to assess the different bodies of knowledge and perspectives relating to “authenticity”, “temperament” as well as “persona”. The study furthermore served the purpose of assessing how authenticity can be managed to the extent that it adds value to oneself as well as to others. Mouton (2001) notes that one of the benefits associated with a literature study relates to saving the researcher time, unwarranted duplication and repetition.

1.7.3.1. Semi-structured Interviews

Interviews were semi-structured and included a set of predetermined open-ended questions. In general, researchers use semi-structured interviews to gain a detailed picture of the participant’s beliefs about, or perceptions, or accounts of, a particular topic (De Vos, Strydom, Fouche & Delport, 2011). One of the benefits of conducting one-on-one interviews is that the researcher is able to establish a relationship and gain the participant’s cooperation (Maree, 2007). Semi-structured interviews require the participant to answer a set of predetermined questions, but also allows for further probing and clarifications of answers (Maree, 2007). In this format of the interview, the sequence of questions and wording can be changed and explanations of terms or additional questions can be added (Cohen & Manion, 1980).

The researcher recorded the interviews and used handwritten notes to support the recordings. Following the successful completion of all the interviews they were transcribed for further analysis.

1.7.3.2. Sampling

The researcher made use of the purposeful sampling technique to select participants that would best help address the research problem. Neuman (2003) considers purposeful sampling to be appropriate when 1) the researcher uses it to select cases that are especially informative, 2) members of a difficult-to-reach, specialised population, and 3) identification of particular types of cases for in-depth interviews. In order to answer the
research questions only individuals with more than more direct report were invited to participate in the study.

The sample size was limited to obtaining between one and two participants per temperament type. In order to ensure that there is sufficient representation for the various temperament types a number of participants were invited to participate in the initial meeting. Part of the selection criteria involved requesting that participants complete the Keirsey Temperament Sorter II during the initial meeting to identify their particular temperament types. Upon completion of the first interviews participants who represented one of the four temperament types in question were invited to the second interviews until a point was reached where sufficient representation in each category had been obtained.

1.7.4. Data Analysis

1.7.4.1. Analysing the Data

With analysis of qualitative data the focus is on reducing the data into specific themes by following a process of coding and presenting the findings via an informed discussion (Creswell, 2007). Thematic analysis was used to examine the data. Coding strategies were employed by breaking down the data into distinct units of meaning. Coding by directly examining the data and letting the data emerge from the data is called inductive codes. Another method of coding is developing codes before examining the data. As you do your literature review, you may identify certain codes from other empirical studies dealing with your topic and this method is called a priori codes (Maree, 2007). The researcher then assigned first level codes to the responses and clustered the first level codes into themes. The themes were based on the phrases or concepts used by the participants. The data was then reviewed to ensure that the content fit the identified themes. The themes were then reworked until all the data fit into the identified themes.

1.7.5. Quality Criteria

In qualitative research, the researcher is the data gathering instrument and validity and reliability usually refer to the credibility and trustworthiness of the research. This can be ensured through multiple methods of data collection (Maree, 2007). The internal validity and reliability of the study were ensured by employing the methods recommended by

1.7.6. Ethical Considerations
According to Strydom (2011) ethics in research relates to moral principles which are widely accepted and offers rules and guidelines regarding the most correct behaviour towards research participants, assistants, other researchers, experimental subjects and so forth. The ethical considerations therefore function as a guideline for researchers to evaluate their own behaviour.

For the purposes of this study the researcher was guided by the ethical issues as identified by Strydom (2011).

First of all the researcher ensured that participants gave their informed consent and furthermore informed them that all participation in the study was primarily on a voluntary basis. Participants were presented with a letter of consent prior to the interviews. The research process was explained to them (including the fact that the interviews would be recorded), and the participants were asked to read the letter, ask questions and sign the letter if he/she was willing to participate. It was furthermore highlighted that participants may withdraw at any time during the process. Secondly the researcher ensured that all of the research participants were protected against any harm. The researcher therefore strived to be honest, respectful and sympathetic towards participants. Thirdly the researcher ensured the privacy, confidentiality and anonymity of all the research participants. All information and responses shared during the study was kept confidential. Results were presented in an anonymous manner. Recordings, notes and transcriptions were destroyed upon completion of this research study. Finally, participants were provided with the option to receive feedback upon completion of the study. It was stipulated that if requested, the findings of the study could be made available to them.

1.7.7. Reliability and Validity of Keirsey's Temperament Theory and Instrument

Every effort was taken to select a reliable temperament tool that is methodologically sound and widely used for the purposes of helping people understand temperament. It is for this purpose that the Keirsey Temperament Sorter II was identified as the appropriate
instrument for identifying the temperament types of the research participants. A number of studies have been conducted on Keirsey’s temperament theory as well as on the Keirsey Temperament Sorter, with the results providing sufficient support for the validity and reliability thereof. Studies such as those conducted by Ruhl and Rogers (1992), Tucker and Gillespie (1993), Waskel (1995) as well as Kelly and Jugovic (2001) are some of the most noteworthy in this regard. Through her research Struwig (2006) concluded that the Keirsey instrument obtained an acceptable degree of validity and reliability. The Keirsey Temperament Sorter II was identified as the appropriate instrument for addressing the objectives of this study.

1.8. PERSONAL, INTERPERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL LEADERSHIP

This study is conducted within the domain of the Personal, Interpersonal and Professional Leadership (PiPL) approach as presented at the University of Johannesburg. PiPL instructs individuals as to what they can do to become what they would like to be (Bester, 2001). PiPL has its primary focus on the concept “leadership” as viewed from the inside-out model (Smith & Albertini, 2008). The approach is holistic and accounts for the different facets by which man is characterised. In this sense the focus is not on one particular characteristic or element of leadership, but on the holistic development of a person which includes acknowledging the fact that man is a complex and dynamic being.

1.9. CHAPTER OUTLINE

Chapter 2
In order to clearly understand what is intended with authenticity as a construct, this chapter will explore the meanings commonly associated with authenticity, inauthenticity as well as persona. Temperament will then be explored along with some of its most prominent theories. Finally the chapter will end by providing an exposé on the literature relating to the managing of individual authenticity, enhancing authenticity, how leaders can add more value as well as the possible link between temperament and authenticity.

Chapter 3
This chapter will clearly outline the research design and approach that was followed to answer and address the research questions and aims of this study. It will provide insight
into the sampling process, how participants’ temperament types were identified as well as the particular research questions that were utilised during the semi-structured interviews.

Chapter 4
Themes that were identified during the analysis and interpretation of the semi-structured interviews will be reflected in this chapter. These themes will be supported by directly quoting from the transcripts of the various interviews.

Chapter 5
The final chapter will critically reflect on the various research questions and summarise how they have been answered. It will furthermore provide insight into e limitations of the study while also identifying possible topics for future research.

1.10. CONCLUSION
The purpose of Chapter 1 was to describe the background within which the study finds prominence while also providing an adequate description of the research problem. The research problem gives rise to specific research questions and aims which were also identified in the introductory chapter. An overview of the research design and methodology selected to address the aims of the study were also presented while certain ethical issues were also identified and discussed. The following chapter will provide an in-depth exploration of the concepts relevant to the study while also examining how leaders can enhance and manage their individual authenticity.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW: AUTHENTICITY, TEMPERAMENT, PERSONA

“The conflict between who we are and who we want to be is at the core of the human struggle” (Chopra, Ford & Williamson, 2010, p. 1)

2.1. INTRODUCTION: PURPOSE OF THE CHAPTER

The focus of this chapter is on gaining greater clarity and understanding of the concepts specifically pertaining to this study. In this regard this chapter examines authenticity as a construct as well as temperament and persona. It will furthermore also seek to clarify the difference between temperament and personality as they are closely linked and are often used interchangeably. A comprehensive literature review of authenticity as well as temperament will be provided to gain sufficient theoretical insight into the subject matter at hand. Some of the prominent theories of temperament will be briefly traced and discussed. Theoretical issues relating to the construct of authenticity such as the management of authenticity, how leaders can enhance their individual authenticity as well the ways in which leaders can add more value will be explored further.

2.2. AUTHENTICITY

Authenticity, according to the Oxford dictionary (2000, p. 50) can be defined as “genuine or known to be true” and is originally derived from the Latin word *authenticus*. A saying from the writings of Shakespeare, “To thine own self be true” (eNotes.com, Inc., 2010), is often referred to in discussions about authenticity. In this regard being authentic is equated to the notion of being true to self. Authors who built on this understanding of authenticity include the likes of Maineiro and Sullivan (2006, p. 159) who highlighted that authenticity is “a striving to be genuine, to be one’s true self...”. Guignon (2004, p. 6) points out that “the basic assumption built into the ideal of authenticity is that, lying within each individual, there is a deep, true self – the real me – in a distinction from all that is really me”. Authenticity in this regard is positioned as a process of becoming familiar with that which is at the core of oneself and taking care to remain true to that in day to day behaviour (Harkness, 2005 and George, 2003).
Sartre (1943) described authenticity as a self-referential state of being. Authenticity thus entails being aware of who you are and then being exactly that. Trilling (1972, p. 93) describes the act of being authentic as “exist wholly by the laws of its own being”. In this sense it entails being intrapersonally committed to the self (Chan, Hannah & Gardner, 2005, p. 5). To be authentic is to be aware of what being true to self means and to give adequate expression of oneself through self-regulation (Lerner, 1993). By giving full expression from the core of oneself others perceive the individual as being authentic (Chan, Hannah & Gardner, 2005).

Through a heightened sense of self-awareness the authentic leader responds to cues from the environment and accordingly promotes certain aspects of the true self (Chan, Hannah & Gardner, 2005). They state that “authentic leaders can remain true to themselves and yet display a range of behaviours that are well-adapted to the demands of the situation at hand depending on the part of the true self that is activated” (Chan, Hannah & Gardner, 2005, p. 9). Within this process of living with a heightened sense of environmental awareness and adapting accordingly, a working self-concept is constructed (Markus & Wurf, 1987).

According to Goldman and Kernis (2002, p. 18) authenticity can be defined as “the unobstructed operation of one’s true self in one’s daily enterprise”. Authenticity then consists of the following four components:

1. **Awareness**
   Refers to the extent to which an individual is aware of his/her thoughts, feelings, desires and cognitions. This level of awareness includes being aware of strengths and weaknesses, especially “one’s multifaceted and potentially contradictory self-aspects” (Goldman & Kernis, 2002, p. 19), an awareness of the existence of polities within one’s self-concept.

2. **Unbiased processing**
   This relates to the processing of self-relevant information in an unbiased fashion. The authentic individual remains objective in evaluating positive and negative self-aspects, attributes, qualities and potentials (Goldman & Kernis, 2002).
3. Behaviour
The authentic individual acts in accordance with deeply held values, convictions, beliefs and needs and not for the acceptance and favour of others. According to Goldman and Kernis, “authentic behaviour reflects sensitivity to the fit (or lack of) between one’s true self and the dictates of the environment and an awareness of the potential implications of one’s behaviour” (Goldman & Kernis, 2002, p. 19).

4. Relational orientation
This relates to openness, valuing and truthfulness in all intimate relations. This encompasses self-disclosure and the concurrent development of mutual intimacy so that parties involved will both reveal and experience true self-aspects, both good and bad (Goldman & Kernis, 2002).

Authenticity is the process of becoming more self-aware as a holistic being, including strengths and weaknesses, while also acting in accordance with individually held beliefs, values, principles and behaviour (Cashman, 2008). This self-awareness embodied by authentic individuals includes having self-knowledge of one’s abilities and pitfalls, strengths and limitations. Being authentic invariably relates to developing an appreciation for who you are in a holistic sense of the word. Cashman (2008, p. 24) furthermore regards authenticity as “well-developed self-awareness that openly faces strengths, vulnerabilities, and development challenges”. In this regard the individual not only becomes aware of strengths but learns to utilise them and with regards to weaknesses ensures that potential developmental challenges associated with them are adequately accounted for. George (2003) reiterates that the individual who strives to be authentic has to learn to accept both strengths and weaknesses, and even learn to embrace the “shadow side”. Authenticity is therefore the result of a developmental process which will manifest in the wholesomeness of the individuals internal self (Chan, Hannah & Gardner, 2005). As Palmer (2002, p. 16) so accurately surmised, “our deepest calling is to grow into our own authentic self-hood, whether or not it conforms to some image of what we ought to be”.

Through their research Mainiero and Sullivan (2006, p. 166) described authenticity in terms of five different constructs namely “a longing for purpose, a hunger for spiritual growth, a need to follow one’s path, a desire for an unrealised dream, and a force for
overcoming a crisis”. Bugental (as cited in Rahilly, 1993, p. 50) highlights that: “a person is authentic in that degree to which his being in the world is unqualified in accord with the giveness of his own nature and of the world”. In a study conducted by Sheldon, Ryan, Rawsthorne and Ilardi (1997) it was discovered that greater authenticity was related to improved self-esteem, identity integration, sense of autonomy, and less depression and perceived stress.

Harkness (2005) is of the opinion that we will find fulfilment and meaning only when we are grounded in a strong authentic self and it is furthermore imperative to match the authentic self with opportunities and realities in the external world. As such the individual must truly learn to connect his authentic self with his environment. In this sense Leider and Shapiro (2001) also equate living authentically to answering our individual life calling and connecting what we do with who we are. For Robinson and Aronica (2007) authenticity in this sense relates to a person’s ability to be in The Element – the place where that which we are good at and love doing come together. Hence when we are in this space we are more likely to feel centred in our true selves (Robinson & Aronica, 2007). Masterson (1988) argues that the search for meaning in our lives and work entails the search for the expression of one’s real self - truly finding or creating opportunities to be true to oneself. In this regard authenticity encompasses both personal and work life and thus authenticity, in being considered as an expression of the real self, is something that must be carried out both at home and at work.

Harter (2005, p. 382) conceptualises authenticity as “owning one’s personal experiences, be they thoughts, emotions, needs, wants, preferences, or beliefs, and processes captured by the injunction to know oneself”. McGraw (2002, p. 39-40) postulated that each person has an authentic self which is the “composite of all your unique gifts, skills, abilities, interests, talents, insight and wisdom... it is all of your strengths and values that are uniquely yours and need expression”. Anthony (1991, p. 17) calls the person that reflects who we truly are the ‘Higher Self’ while Ford (2008, p. 13) refers to it as “the holy self, the higher self, our spiritual core, the spirit, and the true self”. From these definitions it is understood that authenticity does not merely pertain to the behaviour of the individual, but includes all other traits own to the individual’s personal “make up”.
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With a unique take on authenticity, Cashman (2008, p. 35) argues “we are always authentic to our present state of development”. In other words we are always perfectly aligned to the culmination of learning’s and experiences we have been exposed to. We invariably accurately express what we have become, in our relationships, behaviour etc. yet “we are inauthentic to our potential state of development” (Cashman, 2008, p. 35). A strong emphasis is placed on the potential of the individual and the developmental component associated with authenticity. The enhancement of authenticity is thus positioned as a by-product of the developmental processes an individual must go through to become all that he/she can be. In essence, the more an individual develops the more he/she becomes authentic to that which he/she has the potential to be. Authenticity thus in this regard relates to being yourself and being all that you were created to be (George, 2003).

Cashman (2008) refers to an authentic person as someone whose talk lines up with his/her being at a very deep level, and furthermore embodies a number of characteristics. First of all, the authentic individual is someone who is continually building self-awareness about his/her whole-person – his/her strengths as well as limitations. Secondly, such an individual reflects a considerable degree of openness: open to what they are capable of as well as those things that are limiting and stifling them. The person demonstrates a willingness to acknowledge individual abilities as well as those factors that inhibit them. Authenticity therefore resonates on valuing all that the person is in a holistic sense and not just one specific character trait.

Authenticity should not be viewed as impression management or even as self-monitoring. Overall impression management lacks genuine commitment to a coherent self and manifests behaviourally as “hiding one’s true thoughts, being phony, or saying what one thinks others want to hear, rather than what one really wants to say” (Chan, Hannah & Gardner, 2005, p. 7). Its aims involve manipulating social information to achieve an image-related objective with a certain audience in mind. On the other hand “authenticity consists of knowing what being true to oneself means (self-awareness) and expressing oneself truly (self-regulation) (Chan, Hannah & Gardner, 2005, p. 7). The aforementioned description relates strongly with Cashman (2008) who regards leadership as an authentic influence that creates value.
According to Chan, Hannah and Gardner (2005) the authentic person is concerned with self-referential expression as opposed to the self-monitoring individual who is concerned with making a specific social impression. The authentic person therefore aims to express himself/herself from his/her core in a way which is consistent with whom he/she is. Cashman (2008) and George (2003) both advocate the important role character plays in being authentic. It is when we lead from character that we radiate qualities associated with authenticity (Cashman, 2008). “Real authenticity is an expression from the core of compassion, understanding and intuition (Childre & Bruce, 2000, p. 107).

Hart (1980) points out that Jung’s research is epitomised by the idea that the main task in life is “individuation”. In other words life resonates on becoming the unique individuals we were born to be. Each individual is tasked with the responsibility of finding his/her own way and becoming truly authentic. We will never be whole or at peace until such time as when we discover and follow our unique path (Hart, 1980). Chan, Hannah and Gardner (2005) conclude that authenticity consists of the following key components: (a) Affective component (feelings associated with being true to one’s self); (b) Cognitive component (self-aware of true self and socially prescribed roles); (c) Valance component (commitment to self); and (d) Self-referential expression (perceived by others as being authentic).

After considering various definitions of authenticity, the working definition of authenticity is viewed as: The experience of operating daily from the true self by reflecting behaviour that is in line with deeply held values, goals and norms.

2.3. AUTHENTIC LEADERSHIP

Authentic leadership incorporates transformational, moral and ethical leadership but is also a unique on its own accord (Walumbwa, Avolio, Gardner, Wernsing & Peterson, 2008). Cooper, Scandura, and Schriesheim, (2005) are of the opinion that one specific, agreed upon definition of authentic leadership does not yet exist and hence defining the construct remains a daunting task. Although a universal definition of authentic leadership is not currently available, a commitment to the true self, a high degree of self awareness, a commitment to moral leadership underpin much of the literature available on authentic leadership (Ladkin & Taylor, 2010).
Authentic leadership was defined by Luthans and Avolio (2003, p. 243) “as a process that draws from both positive psychological capacities and a highly developed organizational context, which results in both greater self-awareness and self-regulated positive behaviours on the part of leaders and associates, fostering positive self-development”. However Walumbwa, Avolio et al. (2008) indicate that authors such as (Shamir & Eilam, 2005; Sparrowe, 2005) were concerned about defining authentic leadership primarily in terms of reflecting positive psychological aspects.

According to Walumbwa, Avolio et al., (2008) authentic leadership consists of self-awareness, balanced processing, authentic behaviour and relational transparency. This is in accord with the aspects of authentic leadership identified by Ilies, Morgeson, and Nahrgang (2005). Authentic leadership is “a process that: (a) emanates from a leader; (b) is driven by the abilities and motives inherent in a highly developed moral self-concept; and (c) is fueled by leader virtue and an altruistic desire to exercise agentic control over the leadership domain” (Hannah, Lester, & Vogelgesang, 2005, p. 51)

Regarding authentic leadership it is evident that it is a lifelong journey to which a leader must remain committed to. “Authentic leadership is a lifelong developmental phenomenon that involves acquiring greater self-awareness along with an unwavering commitment to and regulation of the self” (Chan, Hannah, and Gardner, 2005, p. 35). Goffee and Jones (2005) established that an individual is never completely authentic or inauthentic. In this regard an individual has to learn through trial and error to lead more authentically.

2.4. AUTHENTIC LEADER (TRAITS)

According to George (2003, p. 12) authentic leaders strive to serve people through their leadership, are focussed on empowering others, are guided by their hearts and minds, “lead with purpose, meaning and values” and build relationships with others that last. They are principle oriented, self-disciplined and focussed on developing themselves as leaders. Authentic leaders are guided by values that direct their behaviour in doing what they deem to be right for their followers (Luthans & Avolio, 2003).

Authentic leaders are “hopeful, optimistic, resilient, and transparent” (Fry and Whittington (2005, p. 185). They have a high sense of moral regard, are future-oriented and concerned
about the development of others. Authentic leaders are willing to take the lead when required, even when considerable risk is involved. Shamir and Eilam (2005, p. 399) described authentic leaders as those who reflect the following attributes: (a) “the role of the leader is a central component of their self-concept, (b) they have achieved a high level of self-resolution or self-concept clarity, (c) their goals are self-concordant, and (d) their behavior is self-expressive”.

Authentic leaders are moral, and remain committed to their principles and high ethical standards (Avolio & Gardner, 2005; Fry & Whittington, 2005). Their behaviour, intentions and motivations are centred in moral behaviour (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999). Inauthentic leaders on the other hand are primarily concerned with their own welfare and manipulate others to achieve their selfish aims (May, Chan, Hodges & Avolio, 2003).

2.5. INAUTHENTICITY

For the purposes of further clarifying the construct of authenticity it may prove beneficial to also explain what authenticity is not. The construct ‘inauthenticity’ will be explored further as to achieve this particular aim.

While authenticity is regarded as the experience of being true to oneself, inauthenticity is understood as not being true to oneself (Vanini, 2006). Berman (1970, p. 60) is of the opinion that inauthenticity is “the determination of men to hide themselves not merely from others but from themselves”. Inauthenticity relates to hiding one’s true thoughts, being fake or merely saying what one believes others would like to hear (Chan, Hannah & Gardner, 2005).

As opposed to authenticity which advocates being true to oneself in day to day activities, inauthenticity is characterised by an individual’s lack openness about who the true self is. Inauthenticity is thus reflected in the act of betraying one’s relationship with oneself (Gardner, 2005). Inauthenticity lacks the openness and deep committed to one’s own values and ideals. It is a self-referential betrayal deep at the core of one’s true self. When individuals lack harmony among their goals, focus as well as their daily activities they will experience inauthenticity (Cranton & Caruseta, 2004). Inauthentic individuals seem to have awareness that the self they are presenting to others are indeed phony and may
judge it to be the result of situational cues and expectations (Chan, Hannah & Gardner, 2005).

The work of Heidegger (1962) and Ericson (1995) are important for the purpose of clarifying inauthenticity. Both authors posit that authenticity and inauthenticity are not dichotomous constructs, but should rather be understood to exist on a continuum. An individual may over a period of time shift between authenticity and inauthenticity (Heidegger, 1962). As a result of classifying authenticity as a feature on the continuum it is contested that a person may grow from a bout of inauthenticity to one of authenticity, with no individual ever being completely authentic or inauthentic. Inauthenticity is of paramount importance as it is ultimately able to keep someone from truly living a full life (Heidegger, 1962). Luckily an individual has the aptitude to shift from inauthenticity to authenticity over a period of time (Harvey, Martinko & Gardner, 2006).

Inauthentic leaders are *per se* also regarded as those who are compliant with the expectations that others attribute to the leadership roles they hold (Seeman, 1960). These individuals fail to give full expression from the core of who they are and hence comply with the roles and expectations that others assign to them. This notion ties in with self-regulation as presented by Goldman and Kernis (2002) who argued that inauthenticity will be the natural result of an individual’s self-regulation being influenced by the need to meet the demands and expectations of others. As such the individual is overly concerned with meeting specific societal or organisational roles that may be bestowed upon him or her by others.

In accordance with Goldman and Kernis (2002), Chan, Hannah and Gardner (2005, p. 7) argue that “authenticity is not self-monitoring”. There is a vast difference between authenticity and self-monitoring and as such the two constructs should not be confused. First of all false self-behaviour is characteristic of inauthenticity (Lerner, 1993, as cited by Chan, Hannah & Gardner, 2005) while individuals who regard themselves as high self-monitors do not as a rule view their behaviour as a departure from their true natures; secondly, authenticity is committed to upholding the identity and values of the individual while self-monitoring is an attribute of personality which manifests when a decision regarding the appropriate social behaviour has to be taken; thirdly, authentic leaders are
focused on the extent of self-referential expression while individuals high in self-monitoring are concerned with the extent of social impression (Chan, Hannah & Gardner, 2005).

The link between inauthenticity and social pressure and expectations is evident in that inauthenticity tends to develop from a sense of false self which is entrenched within the individual via socialisation (Harter, 2002). Chan, Hannah and Gardner (2005, p. 7) argue that the inauthentic person behaves indifferently from external information because the person has no coherent internal information to draw from. The person is furthermore unable to be true to self, even when removed from the social setting.

The individual high in self-monitoring is therefore concerned with making a social impression which is most relevant to the specific social context (Chan, Hannah & Gardner, 2005, p. 9). The person with a heightened degree of self-monitoring, which is commonly associated with inauthenticity, may thus be more inclined to engage in activities associated with impression management than that of giving expression from the true self (Killduff & Day, 1994). When the individual makes use of self-regulation to guide the expression of individual authenticity this should be done in line with individually-held goals, values, beliefs and so forth.

The subsequent effect of inauthenticity on the individual is of paramount importance. Turner and Billing (1991) highlight that negative moods are commonly associated with inauthenticity while Vannini (2006) contests that inauthenticity hampers employee job satisfaction while also having a detrimental effect on holistic wellness.

2.6. PERSONA

As this study is in particular concerned with the authenticity of individuals it is also important to gain insight into “persona”, which specifically refers to the mask individuals wear in society and which may have a potential bearing on the individual’s ability to be authentic (Stein, 1998).

According to the Oxford dictionary, persona is “the personality that a person presents to other people” (2000, p. 598). Persona is borrowed from the Roman stage where it initially referred to an actor’s mask and was used by Jung to explain the masks people wear in
society (Stein, 1998). In this regard Jung was the first person on record who used this construct for this particular purpose.

Maddi (2001) regards the persona as the mask that people wear as a result of the demands of social convention and tradition, as well as people’s own archetypal needs and states that “the purpose of the persona is to make a good impression both on others and on oneself” (Maddi, 2001, p. 90). The fulfilment of the persona archetype by making use of a “public” personality can defend one against unwarranted thoughts and feelings yet this leads to the alienation from self within the personal unconscious (Maddi, 2001). Persona is what we become as a result of acculturation, education, conformity and adaption to the world we reside in (Stein, 1998).

The persona is described as a “complicated system of relations between individual consciousness and society”, a “mask” to make an impression on others and to conceal the true nature of an individual (Storr, 1983, p. 94). The constant pressure to look great and to focus attention on getting the approval, acknowledgement or acceptance of others means that the person is living from an image persona (Stein, 2008). Persona is thus the everyday face we use to relate with the social world (Stein, 1998, p. 106). From these perspectives it is clear that persona seems to stand in opposition to authenticity and in contrast to revealing and remaining true to self as is the case when the individual is in fact being authentic. The individual instead opts to conceal self by means of wearing a mask.

The true nature of an individual is only concealed by this “mask” if one is so identified with his persona that he no longer knows himself (Storr, 1983, p. 94). Stein (1998) warns that the challenge with the persona lies therein that the individual becomes so concerned with pleasing others and adapting to the social world that eventually he/she believes that the constructed image is his/her true nature. The problem with continually employing the persona is that we come to believe that we are indeed as we appear to others. Casement (2006) is of the opinion that if the persona becomes too much of an integral part of the individual’s identity the individual will eventually live a false self which is identical with their own inauthentic biography.

To a certain extent the persona can contain elements of the true self as people can ultimately choose the roles for which they are best suited, therefore making the persona
individualistic, yet it doesn’t account for the whole person (Fordham, 1953). Fordham in referring to the persona remarks that “human nature is not consistent, yet in filling a role it must appear so, and is therefore inevitably falsified” (Fordham, 1953, p. 48).

Von Franz (1998) however notes that many people have enough insight and a sense of humour to avoid getting attached to this “mask” and are able to discriminate between their public role and their personal ego. Stein (1998) is of the opinion that a good persona can both express social aspects of personality as well as that which is genuine to the individual. The individual is thus able to identify with the persona to the degree that it becomes a true expression of personality. While the persona is commonly referred to as a mask it could also enable the individual to filter through certain aspects of his/her true nature into the world.

The persona is constructed out of the individual’s nature and that which he/she, according to society, should appear to be (Fordham, 1953). A fireman will try to appear brave, a speaker in control, a sports player knowledgeable, etc. The persona is therefore the person-as-presented and not the person-as-real (Stein, 1998). Thus the construction of a persona is strongly influenced by societal expectations and pressures that are placed on individuals. Broadly speaking the persona stands in contradiction to authenticity as it inhibits the individual from remaining true to self and ultimately from being truly authentic. Yet the persona still seems to be of some value as it ultimately helps us to relate to the world (Fordham, 1953).

2.7. TEMPERAMENT

Within the many definitions and descriptions of temperament throughout literature there is an on-going referral to temperament as something that is inborn and characteristic of the individual. In this regard McLeod and Hanks (1985, p. 1204) state that temperament is “a person’s character, disposition and tendencies”. Temperament appears to be genetically based and characterises individuals for a lifetime (Pert, 1997), while it is also governed by certain biochemicals (Braverman, 2004). Weiten (2001, p. 440) defines temperament as “characteristic mood, activity level, and emotional reactivity”. It can also be regarded as observed, individual differences which are to a certain extent inheritable and at hand from
birth (Watson, 2000). Thus it “refers to stable behavioural and emotional reactions that appear early and are influenced in part by genetic constitution” (Kagan 1994, p. 40).

The link with the inherent nature of temperament is also found in the works of LaHaye (1984, p. 24) who views it as “the combination of traits we were born with”. He furthermore argues that temperament is the number one influence on a person’s life. Temperament is seen as “the combination of inborn traits that subconsciously affect man’s behaviour” (LaHaye, 1984, p. 23), with the traits genetically arranged on the basis of nationality, race, gender, and other hereditary factors.

From research it is evident that a number of the significant components of temperament are influenced by genetics (Shaffer, 2002). In this regard Strelau (1983, p. 171) views temperament as the “relatively stable features of an organism, primarily biologically determined, as revealed in the formal traits of reactions which form the energy level and temporal characteristics of behaviour”. In summary on this point, temperament could be regarded as a set of biological interwoven characteristics which lead to individual differences in behaviour; it is present from birth and remains relatively stable over time and in different environments although elements such as experience, learning, maturity and the environment could potentially lead to changes in the temperament (Cloete, 2003).

Kagan (1994) argued that in reference to the most prominent definitions of temperament, a temperament category refers to a quality that, (a) varies among individuals; (b) is moderately stable over time and situation; (c) is under some genetic influence; and (d) appears early in life.

According to Braverman (2004) a person’s temperament is the vehicle through which he/she gives expression of his/her emotions and values to others. In addition Shaffer (2002) says of temperament that it refers to an individual’s way of responding both emotionally and behaviourally to developments in the environment and includes traits such as activity level, irritability, fearfulness and sociability. The four primary biochemicals in the brain are processed in different ways by the brain and this interaction determines temperament and personality (Braverman, 2004).
Allport (1961, p. 8) in turn defines temperament as “the characteristic phenomenon of an individual’s nature, including his susceptibility, his customary strength and speed of response, the quality of his prevailing mood, and all the peculiarities of fluctuation and intensity of mood, these being phenomena regarded as dependent on constitutional make-up, and therefore largely hereditary in origin”.

Keirsey (1998) regards temperament as something that is inborn to human nature and functions as a component of personality. For the purposes of this paper Keirsey’s view on temperament is accepted as the working definition and will be discussed in greater detail when temperament theories are discussed.

2.7.1. Difference between Temperament and Personality

The focus of this section is on clearly differentiating between temperament and personality. In evaluating the difference between personality and temperament there seems to be a common theme within some published works that temperament is something innate while personality is the result of external influences. In light of the aforementioned Cloete (2003) regards temperament as the result of biological evolution and innate physiological structures form the foundation thereof, while personality is the result of varying socio-historical contexts. In this regard Strelau (1983) highlighted that temperament essentially entails the differences in the behaviour of individuals which are influenced by physiological factors, while personality is the product of external conditions. Strelau (1983) regards it as a popular trend for personality theorists to view personality as a product of external conditions of character or social conditions. The early appearance thereof as well as the inheritance suggests that temperament functions as a basic building block of personality (Buss in Kohnstamm et al. 1989). Temperament is the result of biological evolution coupled with innate physiological structures that form the foundation, while personality is the result of varying socio-historical contexts (Cloete, 2003).

For the purposes of this study the researcher will make use of Keirsey’s view of the composition of personality and temperament, namely that temperament serves as a component of personality. In this regard Keirsey (1998, p. 20) states that “there are two sides to personality, one of which is temperament and the other character. Temperament is a configuration of inclinations, while character is a configuration of habits. Character is disposition, temperament pre-disposition. Put another way, our brain is a sort of computer
which has temperament for its hardware and character for its software. The hardware is the physical base from which the character emerges, placing an identifiable fingerprint on each individual's attitude and actions. Thus temperament is the inborn form of human nature; character, the emergent form, which develops through the interaction of temperament and environment. I want to emphasise that temperament, character and personality are configured, which means that, not only are we predisposed to develop certain attitudes and not others, certain actions and not others, but that these actions and attitudes are unified – they hang together”.

2.7.2. Different Theories of Temperament

2.7.2.1. Galen - The Four Classical Temperaments

Some of the first initial references to temperament are found in the works of Galen who tried to conceptualise and explain the phenomenon of temperament. Using the four humours identified by Hippocrates, Galen identified four temperament types.

Galen (Eysenck, 1970) theorised that the four temperaments originated from bodily fluids and classified them as:

1. Choleric (Bile)
2. Sanguine (Blood)
3. Melancholic (Black bile)
4. Phlegmatic (Phlegm)
A summary of Galen’s (Eysenck, 1970) four temperament types is presented in Figure 2.1:

1. Choleric
   • The individual is described as being strong willed, tend to get angry on occasion, independent, excitable, practical, natural leader, productive, domineering.

2. Melancholic
   • The individual is described as having good self-control, worry too much, analytic, artistic, hold high standards, gifted, and searches for self-actualisation

3. Sanguine
   • The individual is described as positive, outgoing, sociable, concerned about others, responsive; they can tend to be insensitive and unbalanced.

4. Phlegmatic
   • The individual is described as calm, reserved, objective, diplomatic, practical, easy going and slow moving, lack motivation and tend to be hesitant in making decisions, caring, dry humour, responsible and good friend.

In Figure 2.1 above a brief summary of the four temperament types as identified by Galen is presented. From the depiction it is evident that there are significant differences between the various temperament types.

2.7.2.2. Chess and Thomas
Some of the influential work done by Chess and Thomas included the first large-scale assessment of infant temperament in 1970 through the New York Longitudinal Study (NYLS).
Table 2.2: Thomas and Chess’ nine categories of Temperament Thomas and Chess (1977).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY OF TEMPERAMENT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity level</td>
<td>This relates to the motor component of a child’s behaviour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythmicity (regularity)</td>
<td>This relates to the predictability and unpredictability of a child’s behaviour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach or Withdrawal</td>
<td>It relates to the nature of the child’s initial response to a newly introduced stimulus. Approach responses are typically positive while Withdrawal responses are negative. It can be initiated by new stimuli such as toys, food, persons, situations and places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptability</td>
<td>Relates to how the child responds to changes in his or her environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold or Responsiveness</td>
<td>It directly relates to the intensity of stimulation required to induce a response from the child.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensity of Reaction</td>
<td>Directly relates to the energy level of the particular response as conducted by the child.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Mood</td>
<td>Relates to the child’s amount of pleasant behaviour in relation to the amount of unpleasant and unfriendly behaviour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distractibility</td>
<td>It indicates the extent to which a child’s behaviour can change or adjust due to the introduction of external stimuli.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention Span and Persistence</td>
<td>This aspect relates to the length of time a child will pursue a specific activity, and includes the time that the child will pursue such activity once obstacles or other stimuli that disrupt the maintenance of the activity are introduced.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 2.2 above the nine categories of temperament as identified by Thomas and Chess are presented. From the description of each of the temperament categories it is evident that they specifically relate to child behaviour.

Based on the categories in Table 2.2 above, Chess and Thomas (1987) identified three temperament types: Difficult, Easy and Slow-to-warm-up or shy.
The three temperament types are described by Carey and McDevitt (1995, p. 12) and presented in Figure 2.3:

1. The difficult child
   This child is seen as irregular, low in approach, intense, and slow to adapt.

2. The easy child
   This child is regarded as being regular, easy to approach, can adapt with relative ease and mostly in a positive mood.

3. The slow-to-warm-up
   The child is regarded as withdrawn, finds it difficult to adapt, overall negative and low in intensity and activity.

In Figure 2.3 above the three temperament types visible in children have been identified and described. The description categorises the child on the basis of whether he/she is difficult, easy or slow to warm up.

2.7.2.3. Buss and Plomin
Buss and Plomin identified the following three elements of temperament: Emotionality, Activity, and Sociability. For these researchers Temperament is composed of personality traits that are inherent to the individual (Buss and Plomin, 1984).

1. Emotionality
   It refers to the inclination of the individual to express negative emotions like anger and fear on a regular basis. Emotionality is regarded as a form of distress that manifests along with intense automatic arousal (Buss, 1991, p. 47)

2. Activity
   Relates to physical movement, tempo and life energy. It is the nature in which physical energy gets expended (Buss, 1991, p. 43).

3. Sociability
   Highlights the extent to which an individual prefers the company of others to that of being alone. It includes all activities undertaken to connect with others.
2.7.2.4. Smith’s Temperament Typology

Prof. Dawie Smith, a former lecturer at the University of Johannesburg developed the PiPL-Temperament Typology, a framework specifically designed for the measurement of temperament along with its own unique temperament classification. In this regard Smith (2005, p. 4) views temperament as “an authentic expression of who you really are”. Temperament could be the physiological combination of one’s DNA, chemical composition of one’s blood, hormones that have to do with bodily functions, the nature of one’s central nervous system as well as individual brain dominance (Smith, 2004). Smith (2005) argues that the individual’s dominant mood is indicative of his temperament and that it furthermore also includes the inherited physical and psychological constitution. Temperament is a reflection of our authentic nature; in essence temperament then is correlated with character (Smith, 2005)

A summary of the four temperament types according to Smith (2005, p. 31) are presented in Figure 2.4.

In Figure 2.4 above the four temperament types as identified by Smith (2005) are depicted. Smith makes a distinction between the types based on specific behavioural characteristics.

While the researcher acknowledges the contribution of Smith (2005) as reflected in Figure 2.4 in understanding temperament, this research study will primarily make use of the Keirsey Temperament Sorter II as developed by David Keirsey to identify the temperament types of the research participants.
2.7.2.5. The Keirsey Temperament Sorter

In 1978 Keirsey and Bates published “Please Understand Me” in which they categorised temperament within four types: Artisan, Guardian, Idealist and Rationalist. Keirsey and Bates (1978, p. 2) regard temperament as: “A person’s unique way of doing or unique way of experiencing things”. David Keirsey’s work is most widely known for the comparison which he drew between four intelligence types and the four functional types of Meyers and Jung: Thinking vs. Feeling, Intuition vs. Sensory, along with Extraversion vs. Introversion and Judgement vs. Perception (Keirsey, 1998).

The Psychological Types originated with Carl Jung in 1920. Jung argued that humans were essentially characterised by their inclination for extraversion or introversion along with a preference for one of the four psychological functions: Thinking, Feeling, Sensation or Intuition (Keirsey, 1998). According to Von Franz (1998) a person will throughout the course of his or her life cultivate one of these functions more than the other. Maddi (2001) reasoned that the function will become dominant through learning.

Jung’s Psychological Functions are described as:

- Sensation Function: regarded as an irrational function. Relates to the experience of things in an unevaluative or open way (Maddi, 2001, p. 96);
- Thinking Function: refers to the way in which one establishes a rational or logical order among concepts (Von Franz, 1998, p. 46). Involves classifying ideas or observations under general concepts and organising these to determine meaning (Maddi, 2001, p. 96);
- Feeling Function: the focus is on evaluating whether a particular observation or idea is liked or disliked (Maddi, 2001, p. 97). It is considered a rational function; and
- Intuitive Function: relates to the irrational and may refer to a type of perception relating to the future possibilities of something (Von Franz, 1998, p. 46-47).

Sensing and Feeling do not lead to the identification of some order or value judgements and therefore they are regarded as irrational functions. On the other hand Thinking and Feeling lead to specific value judgements and therefore they are regarded as rational functions (Maddi, 2001).
Keirsey & Bates (1984) made the following distinction between the respective Functional Types (Figure 2.4):

**Extraversion** vs. **Introversion**

Individuals who regard people as a source of energy will gravitate towards Extraversion while individuals who prefer solitude would gravitate towards Introversion as a source of replacing energy.

**Intuition** vs. **Sensation**

Individuals who demonstrate an affinity for Sensation will in all probability regard themselves as practical individuals while those individuals who demonstrate an affinity for Intuition will most likely be regarded as innovative.

**Thinking** vs. **Feeling**

Thinking types refer to individuals who make decisions on an impersonal basis while individuals regarded as Feeling types are those who make decisions on a personal basis.

**Judging** vs. **Perceiving**

Individuals who demonstrate a high need for closure are regarded as Judging types while individuals who prefer to keep their options open are regarded as the Perceiving types.

In Figure 2.4 above a distinction between the Keirsey and Bates Functional types are presented. From the presentation it is evident that there are specific differences between a respective functional type and it’s opposite.
As mentioned earlier, the Keirsey Temperament Theory holds that there are four temperament types that describe human behaviour (Keirsey.com, 2011). These four temperament types, known as Artisans, Guardians, Rationals and Idealists, can further be divided into four “Character Types” for each of the four temperament types (Keirsey, 1998, p. 11-12) (Figure 2.5).

In Figure 2.5 above the various Character Types of the Four Temperament Types have been listed.

The four main temperament types can be summarised as follows:

1. **Artisans**
   Artisans show a natural affinity for the arts, which include politics, music, drama, painting etc. Artisans are optimistic, focus on the here and now, are unconventional, prefer working with their hands and has the ability to work well with tools and all forms of instruments. They also value variety and adventure; they hold freedom in high regard, don’t want to feel tied up or bound, and live to enjoy each moment to the fullest. Artisans make up 30-35% of the population (Keirsey.com, 2011).
2. Guardians
Guardians are known as the hard-working individuals of society. They hold their duties and responsibilities in a high regard, are trustworthy, value traditions and customs, follow the rules and regulations, and work in unison with others, are dependable and ultimately cautious of change. Guardians make up 40-45% of the total population (Keirsey.com, 2011).

3. Idealists
These individuals' value personal growth and development, they are on a quest of self-improvement to become the best that they can be. They are characterised as being loving and authentic, and place a high value on remaining true to who they are. Idealists make up 15-20% of the total population (Keirsey.com, 2011).

4. Rationals
Rationals are made up of individuals with an affinity for problem solving and system analysis. These individuals value intelligence, are independent, ingenious, and pragmatic, use their logic, not overtly concerned with diplomacy, rely on their will power and are also deeply sceptical, even of their own ideas. Rationals make up 5-10% of the total population (Keirsey.com, 2011).

In Table 2.3 a brief summary and classification of the respective temperament types is presented. From the presentation it can be deduced that there are significant differences among the various temperament types.
Table 2.3: The Four Temperament Types as Identified by Keirsey (1998, p. 195).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication Character</th>
<th>Utilitarian ARTISAN</th>
<th>Cooperate GUARDIAN</th>
<th>Cooperate IDEALIST</th>
<th>Utilitarian RATIONAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language</strong></td>
<td>Harmonic</td>
<td>Associative</td>
<td>Inductive</td>
<td>Deductive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referential</td>
<td>Indicative</td>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>Interpretive</td>
<td>Categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntactical</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>Comparative</td>
<td>Metaphoric</td>
<td>Subjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetorical</td>
<td>Heterodox</td>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>Hyperbolic</td>
<td>Technical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intellect</strong></td>
<td>Tactical</td>
<td>Logistical</td>
<td>Diplomatic</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive role</td>
<td>Operator</td>
<td>Conservator</td>
<td>Advocate</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Expressive role</td>
<td>• Promoter</td>
<td>• Provider</td>
<td>• Counselor</td>
<td>• Inventor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reserved role</td>
<td>• Crafter</td>
<td>• Inspector</td>
<td>• Champion</td>
<td>• Architect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informative role</td>
<td>Entertainer</td>
<td>• Performer</td>
<td>• Healer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Expressed role</td>
<td>• Composer</td>
<td>• Protector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reserved role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interest</strong></td>
<td>Art craft</td>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Technique</td>
<td>Morality</td>
<td>Morale</td>
<td>Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preoccupation</td>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Future</td>
<td>Past</td>
<td>Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Hedonism</td>
<td>Optimism</td>
<td>Cynism</td>
<td>Here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>Stoicism</td>
<td>Pessimism</td>
<td>Fatalism</td>
<td>Yesterday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>Credulism</td>
<td>Mysticism</td>
<td>Tomorrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Optimism</td>
<td>Stoicism</td>
<td>Pessimism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Hedonism</td>
<td>Optimism</td>
<td>Pessimism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>Listening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-image</strong></td>
<td>Artistic</td>
<td>Dependable</td>
<td>Empathic</td>
<td>Ingenious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>Audacious</td>
<td>Beneficent</td>
<td>Benevolent</td>
<td>Autonomous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-respect</td>
<td>Adaptable</td>
<td>Respectable</td>
<td>Authentic</td>
<td>Resolute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value</strong></td>
<td>Excited</td>
<td>Concerned</td>
<td>Enthusiastic</td>
<td>Calm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being</td>
<td>Impulse</td>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>Intuition</td>
<td>Reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trusting</td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Belonging</td>
<td>Romance</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearning</td>
<td>Stimulation</td>
<td>Security</td>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking</td>
<td>Generosity</td>
<td>Gratitude</td>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>Deference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prizing</td>
<td>Virtuoso</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>Sage</td>
<td>Wizard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspiring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social role</strong></td>
<td>Mating</td>
<td>Helpmate</td>
<td>Soul mate</td>
<td>Mindmate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting</td>
<td>Liberator</td>
<td>Socialiser</td>
<td>Harmoniser</td>
<td>Individuator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading</td>
<td>Negotiator</td>
<td>Stabiliser</td>
<td>Catalyst</td>
<td>Visionary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the 1978 publication, “Please Understand Me”, Keirsey & Bates included a Temperament sorter which individuals could complete to identify their particular temperament type. Keirsey went on to publish “Please Understand Me II” in 1998 in which he included the Keirsey Temperament Sorter II (KTS-II), a 70-question questionnaire which reveals an individual’s particular temperament type. For the purposes of this study the KTS-II which is freely available at www.keirsey.com was used to determine the temperament types of the participants.

For the purposes of this study temperament as defined by Keirsey will be accepted as the working definition.

2.8. POSSIBLE LINK BETWEEN AUTHENTICITY AND TEMPERAMENT

A review of prominent literature on temperament and authenticity revealed little empirical evidence that attempts to explain the relationship between the two constructs is currently available. However, Keirsey’s (1998) view of temperament along with his description and classification of the four temperament types may offer some insight into understanding the relationship between temperament and authenticity.

Keirsey (1998) indicated that the striving for authenticity is a defining characteristic of the Idealist temperament but made no direct pronunciation on how authenticity per se manifests within each of the four temperament types. Regarding temperament, character and personality Keirsey (2011b) says the following: “I want to emphasize that temperament, character, and personality are configured, which means that, not only are we predisposed to develop certain attitudes and not others, certain actions and not others, but that these actions and attitudes are unified – they hang together”.

In Keirsey’s view individuals are by virtue of being born with a certain temperament type naturally inclined to develop certain attitudes and behave in a certain manner as is predetermined by the compounds of their temperament types. In this regard Artisans will base their self-image on “graceful action, bold spirit, and adaptability to circumstance”; Idealist on “empathy, benevolence, and authenticity”; Guardians on “reliability, service, and respectability”; and Rationals on “ingenuity, autonomy, and willpower” (Keirsey, 2011b). According to Keirsey (1998) the development of the traits within a specific temperament
type precludes the development of a self-image based on the traits of another temperament type. Based on Keirsey’s view of temperament it could be expected that an individual would link authenticity, being true to self, with the traits that are inherently characteristic of their temperament type. Being true to self as understood within the compounds of authenticity would thus entail being true to those traits that are characteristic of an individual’s temperament type.

Authors such as Maineiro and Sullivan (2006), Harkness (2005) and Goldman and Kernis (2002) describe authenticity as the act of remaining true to the real self. In reference to this notion Guignon (2004, p. 6) states that “the basic assumption built into the ideal of authenticity is that, lying within each individual, there is a deep, true self – the real me – in a distinction from all that is really me”. From the aforementioned description of authenticity one derives that being authentic entails becoming aware and remaining true to all the characteristics of the individual that make up the real self.

In order to be authentic an individual has to be self-aware. This entails becoming aware of strengths and weaknesses as well as all aspects that make up the self (Goldman & Kernis, 2002). Considering Keirsey’s view of personality, namely that it is made up of temperament and character, it can be inferred that awareness also entails becoming familiar with that which is characteristic of one’s own temperament type. With reference to the description of authenticity, namely that it entails being true to self and that through a process of becoming self-aware discovering what the true self is, it could be inferred that awareness of temperament is fundamental to the act of being authentic.

Pert (1997) indicated that temperament appeared to be genetically based while Kagan (1994) also highlighted that temperament referred to behavioural disposition that is influenced by genetics. This is in accord with Keirsey (1998) view of temperament as being part of an individual from birth. Braverman (2004) on his part reaffirmed that temperament is ultimately the means by which the individual gives expression of emotions as well as values. If authenticity then entails remaining true to that which is at the core of the then being authentic entails becoming aware of temperament and remaining true to it as a composite of the authentic self. Chan, Hannah and Gardner (2005) argue that the authentic individual is concerned with self-referential expression. It could thus be argued that authentic individuals should also be concerned with giving expression in accordance
with their temperament types. This would entail remaining true to the traits and characteristics of the self as influenced by temperament.

2.9. ENHANCING INDIVIDUAL AUTHENTICITY

In exploring how individuals can go about enhancing their individual authenticity it is imperative to first refer back to common definitions associated with the construct. As has been highlighted beforehand, authenticity is commonly regarded as a commitment to the phenomenological true or core part of oneself. Goldman and Kernis (2002) are of the opinion that authenticity relates to the operation of an individual’s core or true self in daily activities. Authenticity as such is made up of the following four components: awareness, unbiased processing, behaviour and relational orientation. Each of these components will briefly be discussed below:

1. Awareness
This pertains to having an awareness of strengths and weaknesses, motives, feelings, desires, characteristics, emotions, as well as polarities that exist in one’s self-concept (Goldman & Kernis, 2002, p. 18-19). In accepting contradictions in self-concept the individual shies away from rigidly accepting only those self-aspects that are deemed internally consistent with the self-concept.

2. Unbiased processing of self-relevant information
This relates to the objectivity that is inherent in evaluating both positive and negative aspects of the self along with various attributes, qualities and potential (Goldman & Kernis, 2002, p. 19). The individual therefore refrains from exaggerating, distorting or denying private knowledge, as well as externally produced evaluative information (Kernis, 2003).

3. Behaviour/Action
As opposed to merely trying to please others, avoid punishment or obtain a reward, authentic individuals behave in accordance with deeply held values, likes, and needs (Goldman & Kernis, 2002, p. 19). Authenticity in this regard is
not merely reflected in a desire to be true to self, but in the natural expression from the core of the individual.

4. Relational orientation

This relates to openness and truthfulness that are present in close relations which allow the individual to engage in a process of active self-disclosure. This enables those close to the individual to see both the good and bad aspects of the true or core self (Goldman & Kernis, 2002, p. 19).

From the aforementioned discussion it is clear that self-awareness is a key component of enhancing individual authenticity. This is supported by Harkness (2005), Sharma (2006), McGraw (1999) and Cashman (2008) who highlight that those individuals who aspires to be authentic have to obtain a deep knowledge of self. Authenticity hence relates to a well-developed self-awareness that enables the individual to face vulnerabilities and developmental challenges (Cashman, 2008). Before the individual can be true to self, a key characteristic of authenticity (Maineiro & Sullivan (2006), it is imperative that adequate self-knowledge be obtained. This can be achieved by becoming familiar with strengths and weaknesses, core values, needs, preferences, desires, expectations, etc. (Goldman & Kernis, 2002).

A number of authors advocate that “true to self” as is associated with the definition of authenticity entails behaving in accordance with one’s true or core self. Hannah and Gardner (2005) make reference of the importance of having self-knowledge and giving expression according to the situation at hand. The individuals who aspire to be authentic should not merely become aware of their core selves but also take care to ensure that their behaviour tie in with those deeply held values, needs, preferences, etc. Ultimately authenticity requires an extraordinary dedication to one’s true nature and to the process of reflecting it in everyday behaviour (Maineiro & Sullivan, 2006). The authentic individual is not concerned with impression management but with expressing that which is at the core of his/her being.

Goldman & Kernis (2002) point out that the authenticity of the individual is not primarily reflected in the one-dimensional compulsion to be true to self, but within the expression of core feelings, preferences, needs, desires, etc. within the environmental context within
which the individual is vested. This is line with Cashman’s (2008) take on authenticity, namely that it relates to an expression from the core of the individual. Individuals thus enhance individual authenticity by taking care to give expression from the core.

Goffee and Jones (2005) argue that authenticity isn’t something that an individual can claim for himself or herself, but rather that others must perceive that individual as being authentic. These authors thus see authenticity as having strong social ties in that it is ultimately something that others have to attribute to you. In this regard enhancing individual authenticity entails establishing authenticity as a leader. First of all the leader has to ensure that his/her words and deeds line up, otherwise other will refute that he/she is indeed being authentic (Goffee and Jones (2005). This entails that the leader do more than pay mere lip service by truly reflecting individual held beliefs in behaviour. Secondly the leader has to find common ground with the people he/she seeks to recruit as followers (Goffee and Jones (2005). While challenging to tie in with the notion of authenticity, the leader is ultimately required to present different ‘faces’ to different people. In this regard Goffee and Jones (2005, p. 3) are clear that “if a leader is playing a role that isn’t a true expression of his authentic self, followers will sooner or later feel like they’ve been tricked”.

2.10. MANAGING INDIVIDUAL AUTHENTICITY

Rob Goffee and Gareth Jones (2005) in their article: ‘Managing Authenticity: The Paradox of Great Leadership’ argue that leaders face considerable challenges when they are appointed to leadership positions and fail to manage how they express themselves in those environments. Leaders fail to manage their authenticity and hence constrain their own effectiveness as leaders. Goffee and Jones (2005, p. 1) argue that authenticity isn’t something that can solely be claimed by the individual but that “no leader can look into a mirror and say, ‘I am authentic’”. A person cannot be authentic “on his or her own”. This argument ties in with the point made by Goldman and Kernis (2002, p. 19) who postulated that through a process of self-disclosure we reveal our true selves to those closest to us and hence they are the ones who will perceive us as being authentic or not. “Authenticity is a quality that others must attribute to you”, and therefore authenticity is largely determined by what other people see in you, and is furthermore fundamentally under your control (Goffee & Jones, 2005, p. 1). To lead effectively, leaders have to exercise control over the expression of their authentic selves, in other words they have to manage their authentic
natures. For these authors managing individual authenticity strongly relates to managing the perception that others have of you.

With the view that authenticity is tied to what others ascribe to the leader, the leader is required to show different faces of himself or herself to different followers in order to establish common ground with them. The leader thus engages in series of role playing that is in line with a true expression of his authentic nature.

There are three things a leader can do to ensure that the fragments of his/her true self that he/she is presenting to others via role playing is not perceived as being inauthentic:

**Know yourself and others**

Goffee and Jones (2005) explain that with time a leader develops a repertoire of roles which entails being perceived differently by different people. This is because the focus of the leader is on effectively showing different faces to different people to establish and maintain that common ground with them. Using this complex self (selves) requires that the leader obtain self-knowledge and through the process of self-disclosure be willing to share that self-knowledge with others (Goffee & Jones, 2005).

To acquire these attributes leaders can first of all keep their goals simple. Leaders who are authentic pursue three to four goals at a time which are connected to one of his authentic selves (Goffee & Jones, 2005). Secondly, leaders should seek honest feedback. Leaders should keep people close to them who can provide them with honest and unbiased feedback. Thirdly, leaders should identify which aspects of authentic selves followers are looking for. Mobility early in life along with obtaining experiences outside of one’s comfort zone can help gain greater insight into recognising which aspects of the authentic selves followers would like to see.

**Use your unique story**

A person who wants to be effective as a leader while also ensuring that he is perceived as authentic by followers should use personal stories and individual history to establish common ground with followers (Goffee & Jones, 2005). Authenticity is closely tied to the origins of the person and therefore it is something
the leader can use to find common ground with followers. Leaders can use their unique stories, background, childhood, education, etc. to connect with their followers and thus ensure that they transcend barriers such as race, gender, culture etcetera. “Authentic leaders are not threatened by people with other origins; they welcome them” (Goffee & Jones, 2005, p. 6).

**Conform to some extent**

Part of the authentic leader’s task includes deciding which aspects of themselves they should reveal to others and to what extent they should conform to specific social and organisational norms (Goffee & Jones, 2005). A leader has to be cognisant of the norms, practices, standards and traditions of a specific group or organisation and to a degree show acceptance and respect for them by conforming to behavioural expectations. Ultimately the leader’s ability to influence others is dependent on whether he/she is accepted as a member of the particular organisation or group (Goffee and Jones, 2005).

Fry and Whittington (2005) are of the opinion that pseudo-authentic leaders are those who bypass the hard work of character development as well as the enhancement of self-awareness. They wear a mask over their inadequacies and focus on promoting a particular image or persona, one which is not consistent with their true nature or character. Their focus is on the enhancement of a particular persona. The pseudo-authentic leader temporarily displays himself/herself as authentic to followers, yet this is primarily done for the purposes of impression management. Chan, Hannah and Gardner (2005) view authenticity as an expression from the core of the individual and reinforces the idea that a
great deal of character development is required to ensure that the management of authenticity is done from the core of the individual and not to uphold a specific persona.

The leader should take full cognisance of the environment or context within which he/she is required to lead. By having a proper grasp of the environmental cues, such as emotions, behaviours, non-verbal communication etc. leaders would be able to adapt like “authentic chameleons” without losing a sense of self (Goffee & Jones, 2005). Self-exposure also requires that leaders pay particular attention to the somatic cues of their bodies while they are in the particular situation and then decide how they will express themselves (Ladkin & Taylor, 2010).

As part of the authenticity management process the leader should consider all the variables in the communication process. They should “consider the message, the context, … [their] followers, and … [their] strengths and weaknesses as a communicator” (Goffee & Jones, 2009, p. 17). Ladkin and Taylor (2010) make reference of the need of leaders to be present in the here and now, and stand in communion (relation) with the self, others and the situation at hand. When people are present in the moment and live in communion with others they will be experienced by others as being authentic (Ladkin & Taylor, 2010).

Kernis (2003) is of the opinion that behaving authentically includes displaying the required sensitivity to the fit (or not) of one’s true self and the demands and expectations of the environment. Thus authenticity is not merely reflected in the natural urge to be true to self, but rather in the expression of core emotions, feelings, motives, and inclinations within the specific environmental context within which one is situated (Goldman & Kernis, 2002).

Goffee and Jones (2005, p. 88) explain it the following way: “Let us be absolutely clear: Authenticity is not the product of pure manipulation. It accurately reflects aspects of the leader's inner self, so it can't be an act”. The authors are therefore of the opinion that contrary to what may be deduced, authenticity and the subsequent management thereof is not concerned with putting on an act for others, but on connecting better with followers and revealing something about the true self to them. Authenticity management thus attempts to explore how leaders can be authentic and discover better ways of connecting with their followers, and it is exactly there where the management of authenticity finds its niche.
2.11. HOW CAN LEADERS CREATE VALUE WITHIN RELATIONSHIPS AS A MANAGEMENT FUNCTION?

Value is frequently used in conversations about leadership with a number of meanings currently associated with it. Value means anything from the morals that guide individual and organisational decision making, customer value as reflected in the experience of the customer, market value as highlighted by investors, value proposition of the employees, as well as the economic value created by making use of capital assets (Ulrich, Brockbank, Smallwood, 2006). Value becomes tangible once the stakeholders of the value are identified and leaders make choices in line with creating value for all stakeholders (Ulrich, Brockbank, Smallwood, 2005)

According to Ulrich, Brockbank, Smallwood (2006, p. 12) the parameters of value are defined by the “receiver more than the giver”. In the context of the organisations the way in which leaders can add value will be determined by their role as leaders as well as the expectations of the organisation. Sustained value is created by leaders by building capabilities throughout the organisation that can contribute to its functioning whilst also contributing to the development of individual abilities of organisational leaders. Leaders should also rely on the (HR) practices—“the processes and programs that institutionalize actions”. to create sustainable value throughout the organisation (Ulrich, Brockbank, Smallwood, 2005 p. 12)

There is a significant gap between the results delivered to an organisation by authentic leaders as opposed to those delivered by counterfeit leaders (Shelton, 2008). As a result of the “erosion of vision, purpose, passion, ethics, discipline and willpower” leaders become counterfeit and the direct result is SILT (suboptimal implementation of leadership talent) (Shelton, 2008, p. 2).

Crossan, Mary; Gandz, Jeffrey; Seijts, Gerard (2008) are of the opinion that leaders add value by becoming cross-enterprise leaders. Such leaders have the ability to analyse issues at any level of the organisations and response accordingly with the entire organisation in mind. These leaders do the right thing even if it might be to their own detriment.
Walsh (2008) proposes three ways in which leaders can be more authentic whilst also creating value for their organisations. First of all leaders have to deepen their authenticity. Authenticity is the foundation of sustainable leadership and is a necessity for building trust in relationships. It entails being self-aware and specifically pertains to the “congruence of our inner and outer person” Walsh, (2008, p. 12). Secondly leaders have to enhance their self-expression. Self-expression is the voice of leaders by which they connect with those around them and inspire them to effectiveness. Thirdly leaders have to engage in activities that create optimal value. Creating value relates to “reconciling self-interest with the common interest” Walsh, (2008, p. 12). Leaders are required to think and act beyond the stipulations of the bottom line to create more value for stakeholders.

Leadership is the result of an authentic self-expression that creates value (Cashman, 2008). Cashman (2008, p. 96) identified six points which, when they are Interpersonally Mastered, would bridge the gap between influence and creating true value:

1. **Know yourself authentically**
   It is important that the leader develops a deep sense of self-knowledge as well as become authentically aware.

2. **Listen authentically**
   The leader must develop into an empathetic listener and take care to be fully present in the moment. It entails seeking first to understand the world of the other before inviting the other person into your own world.

3. **Influence authentically**
   To influence more authentically the leader has to develop total congruence between who he/she is and what he/she does. The individual has to speak from that which is at his/her core, and be courageous enough to express the thoughts and feelings that he/she is really having.

4. **Appreciate authentically**
   A deep sense of appreciation has to be brought into relationships if they are to be more authentic and thrive. Leaders can do this by consciously developing a concern for others and expressing appreciation for work being done.
5. Share stories authentically
By making use of stories the individual is enabled to relay facts accurately and information while it also brings values to life. It is furthermore also important to pay particular attention to the stories being told by others.

6. Serve authentically
Value creation can only be done by actively being in the service of others. Service is the means by which the leader can make an active contribution.

For Cashman (2008) value creation is the result of the intersection of talents and values. Values and talents thus combine to give the authentic individual his Core Purpose. It is then the responsibility of the individual to use both his/her natural talents as well as his/her values to find that place where he or she can make a difference. Robinson and Aronica (2007, p. 90) refer to that place where what we love doing and what we are good at as “The Element”. It’s in that space that leaders can truly be authentic and make valuable contributions to their organisations.

Cashman (2008, p. 83) is of the opinion that “while leaders lead by virtue of who they are, they also create value by virtue of their authentic relationships.” Relationships are the means by which authenticity, influence and value creation are connected with one another (Cashman, 2008). Leaders are to cultivate authentic relationships with others. The act of adding value cannot be done without engaging in some form of relationships with others. The skill required to successfully manage key relationships begins with being authentic, indeed learning to act from feelings one are genuinely experiencing (Goleman, Boyatzis & Mckee, 2002).

2.12. CONCLUSION
The purpose of Chapter 2 was to establish a clear understanding of what is meant by the concepts authenticity, inauthentic, persona and temperament while also exploring how individuals can enhance and manage their individual authenticity. The first aim was achieved by exploring the various meanings associated with authenticity and distinguishing it from inauthenticity as well as persona. The various definitions and theories
of temperament were discussed with Keirsey’s view of temperament accepted as the working definition for this paper.
CHAPTER 3
EMPIRICAL RESEARCH/QUALITATIVE METHODOLOGY/RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. INTRODUCTION – PURPOSE OF THIS CHAPTER

The focus of this chapter is on the presentation and discussion of the research design that was followed to address the research aims and objectives. This particular chapter will highlight the research approach and methods, guidelines followed with sampling and conducting the interview, as well as the nature by which the data will be analysed. Finally the chapter will end with a note on reliability and validity as well as ethical considerations relating to the study.

3.2. RESEARCH AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

3.2.1. Primary research question
The main research question as reflected in 1.4.1 has been identified as:
How can authenticity, as reflected in temperament, be managed by leaders to the extent that it adds value?

3.2.2. Sub-research questions
In support of the primary research question the following sub-research questions as discussed in 1.4.2 will also be addressed:

a. How can leaders enhance their authenticity?
b. How can authenticity be managed?
c. How can leaders create value within relationships as a management function?
d. How do leaders with different temperament types conceptualise authenticity?

3.3. RESEARCH DESIGN

Research is a systematic, controlled, empirical and critical investigation of social phenomena and is guided by theory and hypotheses about the presumed relation between
such phenomena (De Vos et al., 2011). Research needs a design or a structure before data collection or analysis can commence (De Vaus, 2009). The research design is essentially the “plan” of how this investigation is intended to be conducted, and it also refers to the structure of an enquiry – it is a logical matter rather than a logistical one (Mouton, 2001; De Vaus, 2009, p. 9). The function of the design is to ensure that the evidence obtained enables us to answer the research question as unambiguously as possible (De Vaus, 2009). The research design for this particular study was exploratory-descriptive in nature.

An exploratory study is undertaken when no theory or research specifically pertaining to the matter yet exists (Ivankova, Cresswell & Clark, 2007 and Neuman, 2003). Considered from a research perspective “...an exploratory study explores a research question about which little is yet known” (De Vos et al, 2002, p. 124). This study explored how authenticity as reflected in temperament could be managed by leaders.

The research approach for this research study was qualitative in nature. Qualitative research is broadly defined by Golafshani (2003, p. 600) as "any kind of research that produces findings not arrived at by means of statistical procedures or other means of quantification". Qualitative research is thus the kind of research that produces findings arrived from real-world settings where the "phenomenon of interest unfold naturally" (Patton, 2001, p. 39). It can furthermore also be described as an inquiry process of understanding: the researcher analyses words to develop a complex, holistic picture to report the detailed views of informants, as determined in a natural, “real-world” setting (Maree, 2007, p. 257). Creswell (2003, p. 18) defines a qualitative approach as one in which the researcher often makes “…knowledge claims based on constructivist perspectives (i.e., the multiple meanings of individuals experiences, meanings socially and historically constructed, with an intent of developing a theory or a pattern), or advocacy/participatory perspectives, or both” (Verrier, 2004, p. 15).

In line with the overall focus of the study semi-structured interviews will be conducted with research participants from each of the four temperament types as identified by Keirsey (2008): Artisan, Rational, Guardian, and Idealist. The purpose of these interviews are both to understand how leaders from these temperament types conceptualise and experience authenticity while it will also be used to explore the dynamics involved in how these
leaders go about managing their individual authenticity. With the stated purpose in mind potential research participants will be approached and asked to complete the Keirsey Temperament Sorter II which is freely available at www.keirsey.com. Based on the needs of the study at each juncture participants will be invited to attend the semi-structured interviews. Details on the sampling process will be covered in the following section.

3.4. SAMPLING

For the purpose of this study research participants were selected on purpose because they demonstrated some significant characteristic which was of value to this particular research study. The selection was also done in a way that was convenient to the researcher. Samples selected in this nature are not intended to be statistically representative of the population and units are deliberately selected to reflect particular features of a population (Ritchie & Lewis, 2003).

It is believed by some authors that convenience sampling constitutes the most common form of sampling in qualitative research (Ritchie & Lewis, 2003). Convenience sampling, also known as haphazard, or accidental sampling is said to lack a clear sampling strategy and “...the researcher chooses the sample according to ease of access” (Richie & Lewis, 2003, p. 81). This method is mainly used when, as with the current study, the sample size does not permit any statistical generalisation and therefore it does not matter how cases are chosen (Richie & Lewis, 2003). However, many contemporary authors believe that a more systematic and predefined approach should be used (Ritchie & Lewis, 2003; Neuman, 2003). Therefore, the current study used purposive sampling and members of the sample were chosen “...with a ‘purpose’ to represent (a location) or type in relation to a key criterion” (Richie & Lewis, 2003, p. 81).

Two important principles of purposive sampling as described by Richie and Lewis (2003) are recognised: Firstly all key constituents of relevance to the subject matter are covered. Secondly, within the key criteria, some diversity is included to allow exploration of the impact of the characteristic concerned. Neuman (2003, p. 213) considers purposive sampling to be appropriate when 1) the researcher uses it to select cases that are especially informative, 2) members of a difficult-to-reach, specialised population, and 3) identification of particular types of cases for in-depth interviews.
3.4.1. Selection Criteria
The current study aims to investigate how leaders can manage authenticity to add value to themselves as well as to their teams. For this purpose research participants were purposively selected according to the following criteria: (a) represent one of the four temperament types as defined by the Keirsey (2008), (b) work in leadership role with more than 1 direct report and (c) willing to participate and comply with interview requirements.

The following criteria were not included in the selection of the samples and allowed for sample diversity: age, gender, ethnic origin, level of leadership and regional location.

3.4.2. Sample Size
Eleven potential participants attended the first interview and completed the Keirsey Temperament Sorter II. Seven of the initial eleven participants were selected for follow-up interviews.

3.4.3. Sample Description

3.4.3.1. Age
The participants' ages ranged from 25 to 38 years of age.

3.4.3.2. Gender
For the purposes of this particular study gender was not used as a criterion in the selection of the sample. In the end five males and two females participated in the study.

3.4.3.3. Ethnic origin
Race was not a factor when the final selection of participants was made. As a result of convenience sampling all the participants who participated in this study were white.

3.4.3.4. Industries
Industries that were represented in this study included financial, telecommunications as well as health and wellness.
3.4.3.5. Positions of leadership
Research participants were made up leaders that occupied middle management positions within their organisations. Research participants furthermore had more than one direct report.

3.5. RESEARCHER AS PRIMARY RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

For the purpose of this study I employed reflexivity as to critically reflect on my role within the research process. According to Flick (2009) reflexivity refers to the process whereby researchers reflect on their own actions as well as observations within the field. In this way the impressions, irritations, thoughts, perspectives and ideas of the researcher become data in their own right and are accordingly documented in research diaries. With regards to research diaries it is understood that relevant interpretations, generalisations, perceptions, deductions etc. as viewed from the perspective of the researcher should be recorded (Flick, 2009).

Reflexivity is also characterised by the fact that the researcher experiences a degree of personal change during the research process (Terre Blanche & Kelly, 1999). In this regard the research diary or journal that I kept for the duration of the study enabled me to keep track of changes in my views, perceptions, deductions and ideas. It furthermore served the purpose of allowing me to keep track of my own development as primary researcher. Some of the key insights and reflections which I had gained during the course of this study are presented in accompanying chapters.

3.6. DATA COLLECTION METHODS

Data was collected by means of semi-structured interviews that were conducted with research participants.

In this regard it was important to assess the temperament types of the leaders who would be participating in the study. The Keirsey Temperament Sorter (KTS-II) as developed by David Keirsey was identified as the appropriate instrument for identifying the particular temperament types of the participants. The Keirsey Temperament Sorter (KTS-II) is a free, 70-question personality questionnaire that individuals can access and complete over the
internet. The Keirsey Temperament Sorter was first released by Keirsey & Bates (1978), after which the Keirsey Temperament Sorter II (KTS-II) as published in “Please understand Me II” was released by Keirsey in 1998.

According to Keirsey (1998) the questionnaire measures preferences along the following lines:

- Intuition vs. Sensation;
- Judging vs. Perceiving;
- Extraversion vs. Introversion; and
- Thinking vs. Feeling.

During the initial meeting the participants completed the questionnaire in the presence of the researcher, as described in Section 2.1.1.

### 3.7. SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEWS

#### 3.7.1. Developing the Interview Guide

In order to address the research questions and aims of this study, the interview guide was developed by making use of the literature review as is presented in Chapter 2. According to Greef (2011) a literature study can guide the researcher to understand the construct and to determine which questions to ask to sufficiently cover the construct. The literature review revealed various important themes and perspectives that were prominent in understanding authenticity as a construct. The identified questions were peer reviewed to ensure its relevancy and applicability to this study.

Semi-structured interviews were employed as part of the qualitative approach to the particular study. The questions formulated for the interviews were based on an extensive literature review based on authenticity. During semi-structured interviewing, the interviewer uses an outline of the topics to be covered during the interview as a reference (Corbetta, 2003). For the purposes of this study a list of predetermined questions were used. This method gives boundaries and structure to the interview, but is also flexible in allowing the researcher to create other themes which he/she may deem important for gaining deeper understanding (Corbetta, 2003).
For the purposes of this study two interviews were scheduled with the research participants. Graziano and Raulin (2000) highlight that within longitudinal research specific features of the research participants are observed over a period of time. Thus a study of such a nature would entail interacting with research participants on more than one occasion. However Babbie (2005) points out that such observation and data gathering should be conducted over at least one year and at two different points in time. Within the compounds of the aforementioned description the current study is not a longitudinal study in the pure sense of the word although it shares salient features.

**a. First Interview**

The purpose of the first interviews was to introduce and orient the participants to the study while matters relating to the research approach and confidentiality would also be explained. I noted in the interview guide that in the introduction participants would be: thanked for their participation, provided with an overview of the research aim and focus, reminded that the interview would be recorded while they would also receive a briefing on the confidentiality with which all information would be treated. Participants would be presented with and requested to sign the confidentiality forms once they had resolved to participate in the study. Once the forms had been signed the participants would be requested to complete the Keirsey Temperament Sorter (KTS-II) as previously described in (Section 2.1.1). Following the completion of the KTS-II I the researcher would make a note of the specific temperament type within which the participants were identified. Once all the first interviews were conducted a select few participants each representing one of the Temperament Types would be invited to attend the second interviews.

**b. Second Interview**

The second interviews were focused on gaining insight into that which participants understood as authenticity, the ways in which they ensured that they remain authentic at work as well as the nature in which they were managing their individual authenticity to add more value to themselves as well as to their teams.
In the Interview Guide I noted that: Participants would be welcomed to the second interview, reminded of the purpose of the study, after which the discussion would flow into the interview.

The relevant questions for the **Second Interview** were identified and are reflected in the Annexure under **Interview Guide: Second Interview**

It was furthermore noted that the interviews would end with a conclusion during which the discussion would be summarised and participants would be invited to make any additional comments.

### 3.7.2. Planning the interviews

#### 3.7.2.1. Contacting the Participants

Formal letters of invitation were sent to prospective participants inviting them to participate in the study. Within the letter of invitation the purpose and nature of the study was explained, the particular research approach highlighted and the required involvement of the participant addressed. Participants willing to participate were requested to identify two dates during which the assessment and interview could be conducted. Issues relating to the recording of the interviews as well as the confidentiality with which information would be treated were addressed.

#### 3.7.2.2. Planning the Venue and Duration of Interview

In accordance with the letter of invitation participants were requested to identify two dates along with times that were convenient for them. All participants requested that the interviews be conducted at their offices and undertook to secure venues for the interviews. It was confirmed that the venues should allow for the interviews to be conducted without any interruptions while it should also be appropriate for recording purposes.

According to Greef (2011) the interview should be conducted in a quiet environment, free of interruptions, and could include the participant’s home, a professional setting or a venue as agreed upon by all parties involved. The venue should ultimately be private and discreet, comfortable and should be accessible for both parties (Greef, 2011).
3.7.2.3. Preparations Involved in Conducting the Interviews
In order to ensure the smooth transition of the interview the researcher went through a number of activities in preparation of it. An Interview Guide was firstly developed to assist the researcher and guiding the researcher’s thoughts regarding the interview. By reading through the Interview Guide and especially the interview questions a few times the researcher was able to mentally rehearse the flow of the interview. Secondly it was ensured that the recording equipment was working sufficiently. Greef (2011) suggests that, if possible and permission has been obtained, the interview should be recorded. For easy use a portable PC and microphone was used to record the interviews. It was tested a few times by listening to the playback of test recordings.

3.7.3. Conducting Semi-structured Interview
Once the participants are put at ease and their comfort ensured, it is imperative for the researcher to guide and facilitate the interview rather than dictating the discussion (Greef, 2011). Interviews were conducted by making use of the Interview Guide as a structure to direct the course of the interview. I tried to pay particular attention to any question or themes that seemed of particular importance to the participant during the interview.

3.7.4. Transcribing Interviews
Henning (2004) suggests that the researchers should preferably be responsible for transcribing their own transcripts as it enables them to familiarise themselves with the data. To ensure a coherent format was followed in transcribing the interviews the guidelines of Flick (2009) were utilised. As researcher I was both responsible for facilitating the interview as well as for transcribing the recordings afterwards. I ensured that the transcripts were a true reflection of the interview by reading through them a few times and comparing them with the actual recordings.

3.8. DATA ANALYSIS
The nature of the study required a thoroughly analysis of the relevant qualitative data. Qualitative data analysis involves providing a thorough description of the “characteristics, processes, transactions and contexts” (Terre Blanche & Kelly, 1999, p. 139) of the issue being studied, the aim of which is to place events into perspective. According to Creswell (2007), data analysis in qualitative research involves reducing the data to themes, through
a process of coding, and finally representing the data in a discussion. Marshall and Rossman (2006) describe qualitative data analysis as the search for general statements about relationships and themes. They recommend that the preliminary research questions and related literature review should guide the data analysis (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). I used the preliminary research questions and the literature review to guide my analysis of the data in this research study. Data analysis was conducted along the following steps: preliminary analysis during which familiarisation with the text took place, thematic analysis, coding, interpretation and content analysis (see Creswell, 2007; Marshall & Rossman, 2006; Terre Blanche & Kelly, 1999).

3.8.1. Preliminary Content Analysis
As part of the preliminary analysis the researcher is required to continually reread through the interviews as well as field notes and any other additional personal notes (Greef, 2011). In this way the researcher is able to gain insight into any developing themes and interpretations that may feature prominently. The researcher thus develops a sense of familiarity with the data by rereading through all the available notes and information relevant to the study. In preparation for the analysis of the data I read through the transcripts of the interviews as well as my field notes quite a number of times.

3.8.2. Thematic Analysis
For the purposes of analysing the semi-structured interviews I made use of thematic analysis. During this phase the researcher attempts to trace thinking patterns of the interviewees as well as patterns within the text by identify themes based on the phrases or concepts used by the participants as well as relevant information derived from the literature review. According to (Neuman, 2003) the researcher has to learn to identify and recognise various themes in the data in order to adequately code the data into themes. The researcher searches for main themes in the text by intensive rereading while also making notes and drawing concept maps as themes are identified (Henning, 2004).

By direct referral to the phrases and concepts of the participants as well as information derived from the literature review I identified relevant themes and subthemes that featured prominently. Direct quotations from the interviews were utilised to stand in support of the
identified themes. The focus is ultimately on identifying the themes as well as the frequency with which it occurs (Ritchie & Lewis, 2003).

3.8.3. Coding
The steps in the coding process as presented by Brymann and Bell (2003) were considered during the coding of the data. This included conducting coding as soon as possible, getting familiar with the transcripts and field notes as well as reviewing all applicable codes. During coding the researcher reads through all transcripts and field notes and subsequently identifies units of meaning within the text (Henning, 2004). The researcher pays special attention to key phrases and sentences and highlights the units of meaning with colour markers or makes use of abbreviations for keywords.

3.9. VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

In qualitative research, “the researcher is the instrument” (Patton, 2001, p. 14). The validity and reliability relates to the credibility, which in the case of qualitative research, depends on the ability and effort of the researcher (Golafshani, 2003). Although the concepts of validity and reliability have been challenged in qualitative research, it has been argued that validity and reliability are two factors which any qualitative researcher should be concerned about while designing a study, analysing results and judging the quality of the study (Golafshani, 2003).

Validity means truthful, to avoid false or distorted accounts (Neuman, 2003). Neuman (2003) explains that qualitative researchers are more interested in authenticity than validity. He defines authenticity as “...giving a fair, honest, and balanced account of social life from the viewpoint of someone who lives it every day” (Neuman, 2003, p. 185).

In order to ensure the internal validity of the study the following methods as recommended by Lincoln and Guba (1985), Golafshani (2003) and Creswell (2003) were employed:

Peer debriefing
According to Cresswell (2003) peer debriefing entails identifying a person who acts as reviewer of and enquirer into the qualitative study. This contributes to the overall soundness of the study and ensures that the format would reverberate with others.
Peer debriefing was employed by continually sharing thoughts and questions regarding the study with the promoters, peers and other persons of interest. In this regard Dr R. Viljoen in particular offered constant guidance during the course of the study.

**Member checking**
Member checks entail that the researcher obtain additional feedback from the participant as to confirm the correct interpretation of the interview (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). Member checking ultimately assists the researcher in fusing qualitative data and findings (Daymon & Holloway, 2002). With regards to this study member checks were limited to data for which additional clarity and validation were required.

**Triangulation**
According to Golafshani (2003, p. 603) “triangulation is typically a strategy (test) for improving the validity and reliability of research or evaluation of findings”. Triangulation thus contributes to the overall soundness and quality of the study by means of combining certain methods (Patton, 2001). For the purposes of this study triangulation was achieved by means of linking my own field notes with various theories derived from the literature review along with data gathered during the semi-structured interviews.

**Reliability** means dependability or consistency (Neuman, 2003). A variety of techniques can be used by qualitative researchers to ensure consistency, e.g. interviews, document studies etc. (Neuman, 2003). However, as opposed to the quantitative approach to reliability, qualitative researchers most often study processes that are not stable over time and it is believed that the subject matter and the researcher’s relationship to it should be a growing, evolving process (Neuman, 2003). Lincoln and Guba (1985, p. 316) point out that "since there can be no validity without reliability, a demonstration of the former [validity] is sufficient to establish the latter [reliability]". Reliability on the other hand, cannot guarantee validity. Neuman (2003) states that although reliability is necessary to achieve validity, it does not guarantee it, because “...a measure can produce the same result over and over (i.e. it is reliable), but what it measures, may not match the definition of the construct such
as validity”. Reliability will be achieved by the same methods employed for ensuring the validity of the study.

The Keirsey Temperament Sorter II was used because of its foundation in the personality methodology as was initially developed by Jung. The focus was thus on selecting a tool that could accurately classify the research participants according to the applicable temperament type.

3.10. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

3.10.1. The Individual Researcher
The following ethical issues pertaining to the individual researcher were considered: Ethical research depends on the integrity of the individual researcher and his/her values and most unethical behaviour results from a lack of awareness (Neuman, 2003). Scientific misconduct constitutes research fraud and plagiarism (Neuman, 2003).

3.10.2. Ethical Issues Involving Research Participants
Informed consent is required from participants participating in any research study (Ritchie & Lewis, 2003, p. 66). Participants were provided with information about the purpose of the study, the researcher, how the data will be used, and what is required by participation. It was explained that participation is voluntary and that participants may withdraw at any time. Participants were asked to read the letter, ask questions and sign the letter if he/she was willing to participate.

Participants were guaranteed privacy, anonymity and confidentiality. Privacy is protected by not asking a participant to answer questions regarding beliefs, background and behaviours in such a way that private intimate details are revealed (Neuman, 2003). Anonymity meant that the identity of the participant will only be known by the researcher (Ritchie & Lewis, 2003). Confidentiality meant that the attribution of comments is avoided to prevent identification of participants (Ritchie & Lewis, 2003). Audiotapes, notes and transcriptions will be destroyed upon completion of this research.
The researcher strived to be honest, respectful and sympathetic towards participants and to protect them from harm. If requested, the findings of the study can be made available to the participants and they will be given feedback.

3.11. CONCLUSION

The intent of Chapter 3 was to give a detailed presentation of the research design and methodology that will be used to answer the specific research questions. It was furthermore highlighted that for this particular study purposeful sampling was used to identify and select research participants. Data was gathered by making use of semi-structured interviews. Questions for the interviews were based on an extensive literature review as reflected in Chapter 2. The validity and reliability of the study were discussed while ethical issues were also addressed. Chapter 4 will present the various themes that were derived from the semi-structured interviews while also directly quoting from the transcripts of the interview to substantiate those themes.
CHAPTER 4
PRESENTATION AND INTEGRATION OF RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1. INTRODUCTION: PURPOSE OF THIS CHAPTER

The purpose of this chapter is to reflect on specific themes that were derived from the semi-structure interviews. This will be done by presenting themes as well as sub-themes and then substantiating them by making reference to comments made by the participants during the interview.

4.2. DEMOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

Seven respondents participated in the current study which included five males and two females. As a result of convenience sampling all of the participants were white.

4.2.1. Temperament Types
Participants were selected to represent each of the four main Keirsey Temperament Quadrants. In Table 4.1 below a general summary of the demographical information of the research participants is presented. From the information the age and gender of the participants in the various temperament groups can be clearly identified.

Table 4.1: Summary of the demographical information of the participants in the four quadrants of the Keirsey Temperament Sorter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ARTISAN (n=2)</th>
<th>GUARDIAN (n=2)</th>
<th>IDEALIST (n=2)</th>
<th>RATIONAL (n=1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>28 years</td>
<td>30 years</td>
<td>30 years</td>
<td>38 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25 years</td>
<td>29 years</td>
<td>32 years</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.2. Age of the Participants
The age of the participants ranged from 25 to 38 years. The median age of the participants is 30 years (Figure 4.1).

In Figure 4.1 above the age of the participants is clearly reflected. A number of participants ranged between the ages of 26-30 while the ages of the other participants fell within three different age categories.

4.2.3. Gender of the Participants
The majority of the participants were male as demonstrated in Figure 4.2.

In Figure 4.2 above the gender breakdown of the research participants are reflected. As can be seen the majority of the research participants, five were male while only two females participated in the study.
4.3. THEMES DERIVED FROM QUALITATIVE INTERVIEWING

In Table 4.2 below the particular themes that were derived through a process of data analysis are presented and will now be discussed in detail.

Table 4.2: Themes Derived from Qualitative Interviewing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Theme 1: Leaders describe authenticity as being true to self

The participants were requested to describe what authenticity meant for them. On face value it appeared that no definition of authenticity could be attributed to anything directly related to the participants’ specific temperament type.

There appeared to be a common thread in the participants’ definition of the construct authenticity. In this regard the participants in some way or the other referred to authenticity as being true to self. This relates to the definition of authenticity offered by Harkness (2005), George (2003) and Chan, Hannah & Gardner (2005). Participant 5 (P5) introduced his understanding of authenticity by quoting Shakespeare: “To thine own self be true”. In reference to the aforementioned quote he went on to describe his understanding of
authenticity as: “Authenticity then is being true to your unique character traits, your strengths, your talents, a way you experience inner peace with what you do, with what you say”. This reference to authenticity correlates strongly with Cashman’s (2008) view that authenticity entails being committed to individually held beliefs and values, while also embracing strengths and weaknesses.

It is interesting to note that of the seven participants, four participants made use of the phrase “being true” in some form or the other. Participant 1 (P1) for instance noted: “it is being true, being honest in what you believe, your core beliefs, who you are and what you are, I think also what it means for me is: being genuine, I'll appreciate you, not being genuine I think I'll walk away”. Within this phrase we find a sense of acknowledgement that being true to self includes being true to individual beliefs, core values, as well as who you are at your core and so forth. This explanation of authenticity also demonstrates significant links with the proposition made by Goffee and Jones (2005), namely that authenticity is ultimately a quality that others has to attribute to a person. Within these participants understanding of authenticity we find something of the social implications inherent within the construct under discussion.

In reference to the aforementioned, participant 1 (P1) highlighted that authenticity entailed “sticking to your guns”. This implied staying true to your morals, principles, norms, and beliefs. This participant expanded on the description of authenticity by noting that consistency is a key component of authenticity and noted that by being authentic people enable those around them to know what they should expect of them. As the participant remarked: “if you are not authentic most of the time at least you can’t be consistent, so for me it’s more about consistency”

Originality as a means of understanding authenticity was only highlighted by one participant. In this regard it was noted by participant 6 (P6): “...my understanding of it, being original, being who you are and being true to yourself”.

Participant 7 (P7) distinguished between two ways of looking at authenticity: one which entailed being authentic to yourself at your core and another relating to being authentic to information about yourself. In this regard the participant referred to authenticity as: “...being true to the self you were born with, the genetic self. And being true to the facts
about yourself”. In this regard authenticity was described as a combination of these two elements. On the one hand there is a core self which the person must be true to and on the other the person must be true to historical information that is characteristic of that particular person.

Self-awareness or self-knowledge also featured prominently in the description of authenticity. In this regard participant (P6) stated that authenticity is: “...knowing who you are and what your strengths would be”. The person also likened self-awareness to work and noted that by knowing yourself, a person would be empowered to take on work that is in line with his/her key strengths. “So, it’s knowing who you are and taking those skills and strengths into account and doing those things”. This correlates with the view of Cashman (2008) who postulated that authenticity entailed being aware of and embracing strengths and weaknesses. Participant 4 (P4) supported this understanding of authenticity and highlighted the importance of strong and weak points, as well as the person’s immediate environment. “Authenticity for me is more if you… it’s an understanding of yourself and also circumstances around you and being honest about and embracing… you know, the weak points and also your strong points”.

Theme 2: Authentic behaviour is related to temperament and engaging in work activities that individuals enjoy and prefer doing, out of personal interest or liking

The purpose of the questions relating to the activities that enhance feelings associated with being authentic was to establish whether there was any correspondence among the activities noted by the respective participants within each of the different temperament types. From initial screening and rereading of the transcribed interviews it appeared that there was no correspondence among the activities noted by the participants. It appears that activities that contribute to feeling more authentic or less were related to the participant’s interest in the type of work he/she was engaged in. Thus on face value activities that enhance feelings associated with authenticity seem to be more related to the individual’s interest, likes and dislikes, than anything commonly associated with the participants temperament description.

Guardians

The two participants that represented the Guardian temperament type had vastly different occupations and hence it appeared that the activities they associated with
being authentic specifically related to the work they were engaged in. It is however interesting to note that both participants felt that they were more authentic when they worked with people, and thus one striking commonality was identified. Participant 1 (P1) described it as follows: “I do feel when I am working with teams and specifically when I’m working with my immediate teams and when I start adding value, and, when I am assisting in self-development of other people and individuals not, not only on a skills base but on a personal base as well”. This participant is a trainer and life coach by occupation, and associated the experience of authenticity with helping people develop.

Participant 2 (P2) is employed as a technician and hence feels authentic when he empowers and enables musicians to perform their work: “so for me enabling the artists and everybody else to do their job just makes my job so much more worth it, I think also when I work with people, laying down systems or designing stuff and we actually can interact properly”. As was the case with participant 1 (P1), participant 2 (P2) also hinted to the experience of authenticity that is associated with the development of others: “...Also in a way being able to instil values in people”

**Artisans**

Participant 3 (P3) highlighted Strategic thinking, interacting with people face to face, leading by example as well as driving delivery as examples of activities that enhanced feelings associated with authenticity. “Strategic thinking for me, probably more when I interact with humans more directly, I actually feel more authentic, so I would rather speak to someone face to face than communicate on email. When I drive delivery that is when I feel most authentic. Pushing for efficiency, pushing for delivery, etc. that is where I really feel authentic. I feel more authentic leading by example than by telling someone this is what you must do”.

Participant 4 (P4) felt that the company she was employed at allowed workers the freedom to be who they were and furthermore attributed her feelings of authenticity to the tasks she was required to perform at work. The job which the participant was performing and to which a sense of authenticity is felt is described as: “I am an entry base stock broker who buys and sells stocks the whole day, who creates screens when trades go wrong”.
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Idealist
Participant 5 (P5) described the activities that promoted authenticity by using his work as the frame of reference: “the way that I would describe my calling and my vocation in life is to be a conversation partner in life”. Thus the activities that the participant highlighted seemed to be in line with that which the participant had referred to as his life calling. Participant 5 (P5) further elaborated on this by stating: “You know probably deeper than just...on, you know normal facts and figures, but going into emotions, and I feel most myself when those conversations could be through my writing, through one-on-one conversations, through coaching, some of those behavioural stuff is when it’s a conversation, two ways...”. Participant 5 (P5) then added: “Part of conversation for me as well is also I feel most myself when...I listen to, when people feel after they have spoken to me they’ve been heard”. The activities the participant described are thus more related to the participants’ individual likes and dislikes than to aspects characteristic of the particular temperament type of which the participant is a representative.

Participant 6 (P6) described those activities that promoted individual authenticity as those that made it feel as though time was going by faster while also bringing about feelings of joy and happiness, as well as what is known as “flow”. Specific activities were described as: “if there is a new idea that, that fascinates me, spending time on that. ...If it’s writing ideas or concepts down”. Participant 6 (P6) furthermore elaborated to explain that spending time working on ideas promotes this sense of heightened authenticity: “It is spending time on a new way to see the world, so it would be those things. So for me personally it would be taking initiative to think of new ideas and concepts and putting them into practice”.

Rationals
Regarding activities that enhanced a sense of authenticity Participant 7 (P7) specifically made reference to work and explained: “I am a trainer and a change manager, it is entirely authentic for who I am.” Participant 7 (P7) is not only responsible for the development of training material but also for managing change on a large-scale project. Furthermore Participant 7 (P7) felt that the nature of the work enabled the person to be authentic at work. The fit between worker and environment was once again confirmed by the following remark: “…either, because
Theme 3: Behaving in an inauthentic manner is the result of not remaining true to temperament type, in conjunction with external rules, expectations and responsibilities
Participants were requested to identify the activities during which they feel that they were being inauthentic, or not true to themselves. In this regard the attempt was made to establish whether there were any significant differences among the responses provided from participants from the respective temperament types.

Guardians
Participant 1 (P1) was particularly vague in describing the activities that were associated with feeling inauthentic: "when I’m forced to do something that doesn’t make sense and that there’s no logical explanation for, but I still got to complete it". Taking the entire interview with this person into account it was understood that the participant deeply valued assisting in the development of others and was drawn to activities that were associated with this type of behaviour.

Participant 2 (P2) was more descriptive in his experience of activities that were associated with being inauthentic and included stressful moments, doing that which feels unnatural, and being expected to work on tasks that demand a sense of creativity. Participant 2 (P2) felt that the dominance of the emotional side during highly stressful periods contributed to inauthentic behaviour, while work demands that were beyond what the person felt were in line with core beliefs also contributed to feeling inauthentic.

Artisans
Participant 3 (P3) gave a vivid description of activities that didn’t promote feelings associated with authenticity: “When I plan things to the nth degree I don’t feel authentic, when I report things on a daily basis, that for me, I don’t feel authentic, when I take people on because of a lack of performance, I don’t feel authentic. I really don’t feel authentic when I have to tell someone step 1, do this, step 2, do this, that for me is inauthentic”.
Participant 4 (P4) placed greater emphasis to the norms, rules and regulations that govern organisations and to which employees are expected to conform to: “I think a lot of times in the work environment we are expected to behave in a certain way and I don’t usually follow all the rules, like what dress code.” Expanding on this idea of the social norms and expectations inhibiting authenticity Participant 4 (P4) remarked: “I guess I am a bit of a free spirit and in church there is like certain expectation and norms, you know sex before marriage, and I can’t sit there and pretend that I haven’t done it so guess when we are having that discussions I feel less true to myself if I just say nothing”.

**Idealist**

Participant 5 (P5) remarked that: “I feel the least myself, when I have to tell people what to do cause then I feel it’s not a conversation”. This remark was made in reference to the persons’ personal focus of being a “conversation partner” to others. Other activities that led the person to feel less authentic included working on strategic plans right to the finer details of it, as well as when specific and measurable numerical goals have to be put in place.

Participant 6 (P6) spoke generally and specifically in terms of identifying activities that led him to feeling inauthentic. “Getting up in the morning going to work and you are not passionate about work”. In general terms participant 6 (P6) mentioned that not doing things that one is passionate about or feel driven to do enhance feelings associated with not being authentic. In more specific terms the participant expressed very little interest in all administrative tasks and thus associated such activities with feeling inauthentic. Participant 6 (P6) thus described feelings associated with performing administrative tasks as inauthentic, although acknowledging the importance of completing such tasks.

**Rationals**

In relating activities that promoted feelings associated with being inauthentic the participant 7 (P7) first of all referred to dress code: “If, if I am told by my wife for instance, that we are going to a wedding and that I have to dress in chinos and a checked blue shirt, I would feel completely unauthentic”. In further expanding on specific experiences associated with being inauthentic participant 7 (P7) also
referred to attending meetings which required him to contain himself: “For instance I might be in a meeting that is not a meeting I called, it is somebody else’s meeting and in the meeting feel I know more and can input in a more constructive and productive manner than anyone else in that meeting. And then sort of harness myself in, because it is not my meeting, and if they need my opinion I’ll give it, but at the same time feel unauthentic for doing so”.

Theme 4: Authenticity is constrained by internal (lack of self-awareness and internal congruence) and external variables (expectations and pressures)

Participants were requested to identify what they felt prevented them from being authentic. With regards to this particular theme it was felt that no significant distinction could be made on the basis of temperament and thus the resulting theme was identified by taking the responses from all the participants into account.

A range of factors were attributed to keeping individuals from being authentic or per understanding, being true to themselves. In this regard both internal and external variables and pressures seemed to influence the extent to which individuals felt that they could be authentic. Participant 2 (P2) attributed it to a lack of self-awareness: “Knowing yourself properly, if you know yourself you can actually then build yourself or teach yourself to a point where you can actually find true authenticity”.

Participant 4 (P4) echoed this sentiment and highlighted that lack of internal congruence restrain authenticity: “One factor could be internally where I don’t always give myself permission to be myself and that might be out of fear of not being accepted in a group, so it could be where there’s a context where I feel that I have to be or act a certain way to be accepted or to grow in that context”.

While participants acknowledged the influence of internal variables in preventing authentic behaviour, they furthermore also acknowledged the influence and role of external variables such as expectations and pressures. Some participants reasoned that the external pressures to conform along with a longing for acceptance and understanding prevent them from feeling truly authentic.
In accordance with the aforementioned participant 5 (P5) reasoned along similar lines by highlighting that it was first of all internal factors, in this case a lack of self-awareness and secondly, external variables, in this case life itself, that inhibits an individual from truly being authentic. In this regard the participant 5 (P5) describes the 2 factors that prevent authenticity as: **First, not being self-aware. So, ignorance is bliss if you know - if you don’t know the concept of authenticity then you won’t even bother to be authentic. Second thing: life. So you have to get up in the mornings, you have to do work, you have to earn money, and that would probably involve things that you don’t like doing**.

Participant 3 (P3) expanded on the constraints posed by external variables by highlighting: “when you are prescribed to do things and you can’t follow your own personality and your own.. and you can’t do things according to your own strengths”. From this description it is clear that the participant feels that there are certain demands or expectations that must be met and these are often not reconcilable with internal beliefs, desires, **personality and so forth**. This participant perfectly surmises this tension between individual will and the expectations and regulations of the environment: “…there are certain guidelines which I think we work according to; which really… You know… just goes against the grains of one’s beliefs”.

Being more specific, participant 6 (P6) exclaimed that it is indeed work that prevents authenticity: “I think a lot of times in the work environment we are expected to behave in a certain way…” Participant 6 (P6) was of the opinion that there are rules and expectations especially within the work context to which employees as such are expected to conform to and thus inhibit individual authenticity. It appeared that the participants experienced such expectations as factors that undermined the extent to which the participant could feel authentic in the work environment.

Two participants in particular noted that it is not only internal factors or generally speaking external factors that prevent authenticity, but are also their relationships with others. In this regard participant 7 (P7) described it as following: **“One very broad term is the negotiation we do in life with everybody that we value. So take a marriage relationship for instance, or any close intimate relationship. We are constantly negotiating the terms our behaviour with each other”.** Participant 7 (P7) continued to add that: **“Another would be the social structures that are put on us”**. This description is thus a direct reference to the social
structures, pressures, and expectations that seem to prevent individuals from truly being authentic.

Expanding on the relation factors some more, one participant 2 (P2) noted that: “Probably managing relationships within a…Specifically within a stakeholder concept, on a work level. Knowing what other people’s expectations are, and having to push myself not to be authentic... to please people, at the end of the day”. It is interesting to note that the participant in this case openly remarked that work expects of one to please others and that this entails that you cannot be as freely authentic as one would like to. “You can’t always be as honest, open and frank because not everyone wants to hear that.” A possible solution to resolving the tension between striving to be authentic and pleasing others was offered in: “Package your authenticity to actually make sure that you just manage the relationship and make sure that you actually get delivery...”

Theme 5: Strengths utilised by offering them in service of the team while relying on others to compensate for weaknesses

The question that elicited this theme related to how participants used their strengths and compensated for their weaknesses. It was felt that by virtue of the question that there could potentially be specific temperament difference and hence the participant responses were treated as such.

Guardians

In addressing this question both participants referred to their strengths and weaknesses. Participant 1 (P1) acknowledged that ultimately the support from a persons’ team is vital in effectively compensating with weaknesses: “When it comes to ones weaknesses that’s where your team starts playing a prominent role”. Participant 1 (P1) reasoned that within a team context team members should value one another’s weaknesses while allowing the team to make use of individual strengths. “...you know not all of us got the same strengths but that’s where we fill in the blank spots in other people’s lives and…I believe that my weaknesses can be filled with someone else who are strong in certain categories in their lives”. The word “resourcing” was used to describe this process of asking others to assist in the team context where the person felt that a particular weakness was present.
Participant 2 (P2) also spoke about the importance of being aware of individual weaknesses and utilising key strengths. Participant 2 (P2) later expanded by saying that those strengths that may be lacking should be developed further instead of merely focusing on developing weaknesses.

**Artisans**

Participant 3 (P3) demonstrated the importance of a heightened sense of self-awareness in effectively utilising strengths: “I know what my strengths are so I concentrate on my strengths, and I contribute to the team with my strengths rather than focusing on weaker points”.

Participant 4 (P4) inadvertently shared the aforementioned view and highlighted that a heightened sense of self-awareness does not merely apply to being aware of strengths but also in terms of weaknesses: “I must say that I try to understand where I’m lacking so in terms of verbal communication, written communication, conflict management those are the things that I know that I have to work on and I can still be authentic by making sure that I do that in a way that is suitable for me”. The importance of self-awareness underscores the emphasis placed on it by George (2003) as well as Cashman (2008).

There was a definite commonality between the participants within this temperament category, namely that a person must be aware of both strengths and weaknesses.

**Idealists**

The participants seem to acknowledge that weaknesses and strengths are two sides of the same coin and thus inherently make up the individual. Participant 1 (P1) acknowledged the importance of collaborating with others in a team setting and relying on their strengths in areas where the participant was weak: “...have an awareness of what my weaknesses are and then to see in what way I can partner with people whose strengths are in those areas where I am weak”. Participant 1 (P1) furthermore emphasised the importance of honesty and openness within a team context and having the freedom to ask others for assistance. Regarding utilising strengths participant 1 (P1) deemed honesty within a team context important and furthermore underscored to the importance of being self-aware:
“...have a good grasp of who I am so that when I am in a situation where there is a team or there is a discussion and I can be honest about what I can bring to the team or what I feel hesitant or not strong enough and be able to ask for help”.

Participant 2 (P2) referred to admin as a weakness and argued that although one does not feel entirely competent or authentic in performing certain tasks, they are a natural part of life. “What I have learnt is you can't just swipe the table clean off all things you don't like. So, you have to do things you don't like”. It was also noted that there will be times when one could also do what it is that one wanted to do. In this context weaknesses were identified as doing those things that makes one feel inauthentic while strengths were regarded as those things that make one feel authentic.

Rationals
Participant 7 (P7) acknowledged that he often viewed himself as having no shortcomings and furthermore labelled such a view as a weakness. In relation to this ego was also identified as a weakness. To address the challenge with ego the Participant 7 (P7) highlighted: “To combat that, I find myself, elevating or, affirming is the word I’m looking for, I find myself affirming other people a lot. So what I’ll do is I go out of my way to affirm people I might not necessarily feel are better than me, in a particular area, but I'll affirm their skills anyway because it is hard to do”.

Other activities Participant 7 (P7) employed to compensate for weaknesses included: “I bite my tongue and allow the other person to finish their story and maybe not even input at all into it”. Lastly it was highlighted that connecting with trusted people regarding the set weaknesses was also an important activity: “I think just affirming my weaknesses constructively, regularly, with people I trust like my lady friend and my best friend, just to say, you know, I’m not very good at that”.

Theme 6: Ease of being authentic varies
During the interviews participants were requested to describe how easy it was for them to be authentic. On face value it was felt that this question could elicit whether participants from some of the temperament types struggled with being authentic.
Guardians

There seemed to be no real commonality between the answers of the participants within the Guardian temperament type.

Participant 1 (P1) described how the authenticity he was experiencing today was the direct result of a journey of self-discovery that commenced two years before. Regarding the present moment Participant 1 (P1) remarked: “I definitely know it’s part of who I am, being authentic, and I also believe it’s the stage where I am in at my life at this moment in time”.

Participant 2 (P2) from the outset commented on the struggles associated with being authentic: “It is not easy being authentic; it takes quite a lot out of a person, even myself, to be authentic. Getting to the point where you are so true to yourself and committed to it, it’s a natural thing, it takes effort and it takes time, it’s like building a routine”.

Within the Guardian temperament type Participant 1 (P1) felt it was relatively easy to be authentic while participant 2 (P2) appeared to struggle with it.

Artisans

Participant 3 (P3) gave a short and direct answer when probed regarding how easy it was to be authentic: “I think it comes naturally” and later on added: “I prefer being authentic”.

Participant 4 (P4) appeared to be very cognisant of her work environment and pointed out that the environment in fact contributed to her ability to be authentic. The participant remarked: “I don’t think it’s for me a process and I don’t think it takes lot of effort, what does take effort is knowing the environment within which you operate, working the protocols etc. of that, that probably takes more effort than actually being authentic.” It was evident that participant 4 (P4) found it easy to be authentic but at the same time articulated that the ease with which one could be authentic was ultimately dependent on the immediate environment: “It’s something that does come natural but it also depends on the environment”. In this sense
participant 4 (P4) felt that one had to continually be cognisant of the environment, especially expectations and responsibilities.

**Idealists**

“I feel more and more comfortable in being myself. I don’t know if it has anything to do with the fact that I recently turned 30.” Participant 5 (P5) viewed being authentic as a process that had unfolded over the last few years and had culminated into the present state whereby the participant experienced a heightened sense of authenticity. Participant 5 (P5) furthermore added: “So it feels to me that I’m growing more comfortable in being myself”.

Participant 6 (P6) appeared to struggle more with being authentic: “Authenticity to me is not something I’m always aware of.” Taking the whole interview into account it became clear that the participant struggled with authenticity at work and that the participant felt that work obligations and responsibilities kept him from truly being authentic. It furthermore became clear that stressful situations as well as those involving conflict with others hampered the participant’s ability to be authentic.

**Rationals**

Within the Rational temperament type participant 7 (P7) reflected a natural appetite for being authentic and hence didn’t find being authentic in particular challenging. Participant 7 (P7) furthermore highlighted: “I think my first, my knee-jerk response to life is an authentic response. I tend to just not apply much energy to it at all. It just comes naturally. I say what I think; I do what I feel I should do. So, for me it doesn’t require much energy.”

**Theme 7: Authenticity trigger events vary**

In line with the research of Puente, Crous and Venter (2007) entitled *The Role of a Positive Trigger Event in Actioning Authentic Leadership Development*, participants were requested to identify whether there were any significant trigger events that contributed to their development as authentic leaders. From discussions that ensued during the interviews it became apparent that some participants felt that there were significant factors that contributed to their growth as authentic individuals. Some of the other participants felt that nothing in particular contributed to their authenticity and that their inclination to be
authentic was instead the result of a number of small events or just life and personal growth in itself.

With regards to specific life events that contributed to authenticity participant 2 (P2) described it as follows: “...one of the biggest points for me in my life was growing up, I was one of the introverted kids in school so I was always picked on and teased, so it also became a real core value for me to not be a bully or not to be like that one day. I think in the same breath also to be more expressive...in who I am and what I want to do and what I believe. So I think that was one of the biggest trigger points”.

Participant 5 (P5) made reference to two significant events that contributed to the journey of becoming more authentic: “…for about two years or so I have been going through a process with a Clinical Psychologist who has helped me make shifts in terms of who I am and who I am not, so I think that is an on-going process”.

While both of the aforementioned defining moments were influenced by self-awareness, the following description includes an awareness that resulted from restructuring at work: “More of a defining moment maybe is that during a process last year at my place of work I went through a process where my performance and my function and my role was re-evaluated and restructured. Through that process I started to become aware more and more of who I am and also who I am not. And maybe how trying to overcompensate for who I am not isn’t as fruitful as I thought. That really in a way forced me to go inside and then really focus on, but who am I?”

Participant 6 (P6) recounted the influence of a positive and negative event: “Yes, two things. The one didn’t have a big impact and the second one had a bigger impact. The first one was in 2004. Leap year’s day, 2004, I was hijacked. After that I realised I’m not doing the things I like, that make me authentic”. Participant 6 (P6) elaborated that following on this horrific event he felt compelled to change but that this change eventually wore off as the trauma associated with the hijacking faded. With regards to the second event participant 6 (P6) exclaimed that he had a number of properties which he eventually lost following the challenging economic period of 2009. It was only after a holiday during that same year that participant 6 (P6) came to the following conclusion: “Then, the answer became clearer, it was to start within. Don’t try and change everything around you, try and
change yourself. So then I realised I never labelled it as authenticity but I started labelling it as: “I need to fulfil my purpose in life”...and out of that came authenticity. For me to be authentic I need do the things in life that address my skills, or that utilises my skills, my strengths”.

This personal reflection is testament of a personal transformation that took place inside the participant and a decision that was taken to live a life of purpose and hence be more authentic.

Participant 7 (P7) felt that there was nothing significant that contributed to being more authentic: “I think life is about experiences. It’s not one specific event, it’s small things, it’s all in the details”.

Participant 1 (P1) highlighted that the journey to becoming more authentic started about two years ago and included the following events: A commitment that was made to God in 2009 at a conference, the completion of various tests that highlighted strengths, weaknesses and preferences and lastly honesty with self. However the person remarked at the end of the conversation that while the aforementioned were important, the person still viewed them as: “...nothing more significant than the other”.

Finally Participant 7 (P7) also acknowledge the magnitude of small and insignificant things from which he had learned and thus contributed to his growth: “I think there would have been probably millions of small thing that have taken place throughout life that I have learnt from, filed, and moved forward with them, and adapted my behaviour accordingly. I’ve been happy to just be who I am; always. I was never susceptible to peer pressure as a child, so I can’t remember a specific event. I think it’s just been part of my nature”.

Theme 8: Little distinction made between home and work environments in terms of being authentic

Participants were requested to identify whether they felt that they were more authentic at home or at work. After the answers provided by the participants were screened, it was felt that no obvious distinction could be made on the basis of temperament. Most of the participants communicated that they were able to reflect their authenticity in more or less equal measure in both the home and work environment.
Participant 3 (P3) offered this elaborate explanation when she was prompted “At home when I am around people who know me really well yes, when I am with strangers I am probably less authentic because I am not one of those people that really open up to someone at the onset. So I would say probably equally so but with people I know well or when I am on my own I am authentic, no doubt about it. At work I think I am in a space where I can be authentic, I have the space to live my authentically so I don’t think that I am hampered. There’s nothing that prevents me from being authentic”. Participant 3 (P3) highlighted that the familiarity and trust that was found in close relationships provided more room to be authentic while she also felt that the same level of trust or familiarity was not present in an interaction with a stranger per se. However the participant pointed out that because of the way in which the internal team had been set up that the opportunity was there for every member of the team to be authentic at work. The person therefore felt that authenticity could be lived and reflected both at work and at home.

The other participants who felt that they could be authentic at home and work made no distinction between the two environments. Participant 4 (P4) for example said: “There’s no difference wherever, it doesn’t matter. I stay true to myself”. While another exclaimed: “…it is not a thing that I can switch on and off… there’s not a big difference between how I act at home and how I act at work”. Participant 7 (P7) added: “I don’t think there is any difference at all. I think if my wife was with me at work, she wouldn’t notice any difference and vice versa. In fact, I bring all my personal life into work and I bring my work into my personal life, and there is very little distinction between the two”.

Following further prompting to explain answers it appeared that the determination to be authentic in both environments was influenced by a personal decision. One example of a decision that was taken to be more authentic in both environments is found in the response of participant 1 (P1): “…I got to a point where I don’t necessarily want to split the two because we need both, and the majority of the people I touch base with at work I also see at home so it doesn’t help to be two-sided person in either”.

Participant 1 (P1) explained that it was a range of developments that influenced the decision to be authentic at work and at home: “…for me it was definitely a turn of events and at this current moment in time… it took me a long time but people started accepting
me at work now as well as the person I am at home as well… and where I use to have regrets driving home I don’t have them anymore cause I am exactly the person who I am”.

Participant 6 (P6) was forthright in acknowledging that authenticity was not necessarily something that he was reflected within his work environment: “I think I am more authentic at home. Purely because at home when I can use my own time I can do the things that I really feel add value to me personally, or it makes me add value to the world out there. At work its normally someone else’s ideas and I need to fit into that picture, but once again, being authentic to me has two definitions, doing what I believe is right, and doing what someone else believes is right. So, uhm, I think I resist authenticity more at work than at home. At home I can be myself, to my skills. At work, I don’t always believe that authenticity is practiced (in some way), but I do try and live myself out”.

This response should be seen in context of the participants’ view of authenticity, namely that it related to both what the participant was passionate about doing and specific work expectations. The negotiation between the two thus enabled authenticity. This corresponds with Goffee and Jones (2005) who contended that the management of individual authenticity required of an individual to be aware of the expectations associated with a particular leadership role. There was thus a strong focus on doing. Participant 6 (P6) that authenticity was a direct result of doing what the person felt most passionate about and interested in doing.

**Theme 9: Authenticity at work contributes to overall happiness and a productive work environment**

Participants were requested to list reasons why they thought it was important to be authentic at work. There appeared to be no significant differences in the answers given by the participants and hence no answer was attributed to something characteristic of a certain temperament type. The participants highlighted various reasons why they deemed being authentic at work as important but at face value none of the answers provided could be attributed to something characteristic of a specific temperament type.

A number of participants identified overall happiness as a reason for why it was important to be authentic at work. This reason correlates to the work of Goldman and Kernis (2002) who highlighted that authenticity plays an important role within the healthy psychological
functioning and subjective wellbeing of an individual. As participant 4 (P4) noted: “Well if you are not going to be authentic then you are not going to be happy and if you’re not happy you can’t really be productive or contribute to anyone else’s happiness, you end up being miserable and the long face in the office, and just end up dragging everyone down”. For this participant authenticity tied in with happiness and furthermore had a considerable influence on overall productivity as well as general office mood or morale. The extent to which a person is authentic could have an influence on productivity, for the individual as well as the team.

Participant 1 (P1) acknowledged that authenticity at work also tied in with work/life balance. “The more authentic you are, the happier you would be; it will add to your balance in life, by being true to yourself”. Participant 1 (P1) went on to mention that a person should be focused on being the best that he/she can be and that this includes displaying authenticity at work. Authenticity then is something that should be lived 24/7, 365 days a year and work is one of these domains where it should be expressed.

In support of viewing authenticity as an all day activity Participant 7 (P7) made no distinction between work and other facets of his life. “I think work is just an extension of life. I don’t think there are lines. I think we live 24 hours a day and part of what we do in a day is a thing called work”. In this regard participant 7 (P7) noted that whoever an individual was at his/her core should flow from one moment to the next irrespective of what the activity is that the individual was engaged in. “There is no distinction for me. It doesn’t make a difference. You are who you are”.

A number of participants also acknowledge the benefits that authenticity at work has for the organisation and work relations as such. “I think when we are authentic; I think then we deal with reality, then when more people in a team or place of work are authentic, then stuff like agendas or politics decreases and we can work with how things actually are. We can work truthfully through issues, work together when we know each other and I think you can only really connect with someone on a deep level when they are authentic. So that has a multiple effect on team work, results and politics and all of that”.

Something of the social implication of authenticity at work was also shared by two participants. Participant 2 (P2) argued: “It’s a respect thing, if you are authentic and true to
yourself other people are going to be exactly the same towards you, in respect towards you shown and received. If I am not genuine people are not going to take me seriously or respect me, it goes both ways”. In this regard participant 1 (P1) noted “I think the importance there is if you’re not authentic and you are not who you say you are and you are wearing masks, at some point that mask is going to come off. When the circumstances becomes harsh and you get pushed to your limits somewhere you are going to crack and let slip and if you’re not the person that other people believe you are, then that will be a pretty bad place to end up in, cause you’ll disappoint a lot of people and that’s how disappointments happen when we are being false and we get found out”.

Finally participant 6 (P6) indicated that the importance of authenticity at work related to self-knowledge. In this regard participant 6 (P6) presented the following reasons for the importance of authenticity at work: “I would say that the most important thing is knowing yourself, knowing your weaknesses and not trying to compensate for them but also to leverage your strengths where possible, and to work on your weaknesses… Knowing yourself”. Participant 6 (P6) highlighted that by gaining self-knowledge a person would be able to grasp what he or she would be able to offer the organisation as such.

Theme 10: Internal and external variables contribute to authenticity at work
Participants were requested to highlight how they ensured that they remain authentic within their work context. On face value it was believed that there could be significant differences among the various temperament types and hence was treated as such.

Guardians
The Guardians seemed to use different means of ensuring that they remain authentic within the work context. Participant 1 (P1) acknowledged the importance of being honest with self as well as with others and sharing opinions and concerns with the team as such, making everything as clear as possible. Participant 2 (P2) placed considerable emphasis on sticking to specific tasks or work responsibilities: “I think I stick to what I need to do, I don’t get to a point where you get side-tracked, so basically this is the job I have to do and do the job”.
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Artisans
There appeared to be no real commonality between how the two participants representing the Artisan temperament type ensured that they remained authentic at work. The difference could also be due to the nature of each participants work and the responsibilities associated with it. Participant 3 (P3) noted “I think the most important thing for me is to build the relationship, so that people actually know you. People know who you are, they know how you operate, they know what to expect from you on a consistent basis and that allows you to be authentic”.

Participant 4 (P4), in referral to emotions, exclaimed that it was important to distinguish between what is real and fake in the work environment, and hence preferred to detach from the environment when what was going on wasn’t perceived by the participant as being authentic. For this purposes participant 4 (P4) preferred to block out the noise: “So I will put in my ear phones and listen to some music and just sit back and block out the noise a bit”.

Idealists
Participant 5 (P5) viewed the influence of the work environment as a determining variable in his ability to be authentic “I do feel that I am fortunate in that my context, my place of work do place high value on a person’s strengths and who they are. So that makes it easier for me to be myself at my place of work…” It became clear that Participant 5 (P5) placed great emphasis on individual authenticity and furthermore put support structures in place to empower employees to be more authentic. Participant 5 (P5) furthermore highlighted that his level of self-awareness was a key determining factor in his ability to be authentic at work, as the nature of the work required of him to be authentic with himself as well as with others.

Participant 6 (P6) acknowledged that he struggled with authenticity. When probed about whether the he felt that he was indeed being authentic at work participant 6 (P6) replied by noting: “I don’t think I do… I think it’s more of a reactive thing than pro-active, which is maybe wrong”. The reactive behaviour was explained as follows: “If I move into a bad space, I’ll find myself at some point in time realising that I am in a bad space. I’ll either be unhappy, or very angry, or frustrated, or whatever the negative emotion might be. Then I’ll try and correct it”.
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Rationals
Participant 7 (P7) placed considerable emphasis on that which he was engaged in and furthermore on ensuring that he remain authentic at work: “...make sure you are doing something that is authentic for you to do.” Participant 7 (P7) didn’t seem to have any significant challenges with being authentic at work and deemed the role of Trainer and Change Manager within which he was occupied as fitting to who he was and hence contributed to his ability to be authentic.

Theme 11: Self-awareness and being true to self are key elements of the process of managing authenticity
In exploring how participants from these temperament types managed their authenticity the focus turned to find commonalities between the answers provided by the participants as well as the literature per se.

Guardians
In addressing this question participant 1 (P1) underscored the importance of honesty. Within that context participant 1 (P1) emphasised being aware of strengths and weaknesses and being open to share this with fellow team members. In this way when tasks are delegated to a team they can ensure that the person who is more equipped for the task will perform the function. “I think where my tactics changed quite a bit was accepting my lower points and verbalising it instead of taking on the task I gave it to someone else so that they can complete it which helped the cause at the end of the day”.

“Even if I was doubtful or if I knew that it wasn’t specifically entitled for me to do and I’m maybe not the best person for the job, I still would have taken on the responsibility and uhm... to accomplish the task for self growth in a certain sense and in another sense also to impress and to work myself up the ladder but what I did realise was and I think where my tactics changed quite a bit was accepting my lower points and verbalising it instead of taking on the task I gave it to someone else so that they can complete it which helped the cause at the end of the day”.

Participant 2 (P2) described a situation whereby the person was under immense stress and that this influenced the quality of work relations. It was not until the
person was involved in an argument with a superior that the seriousness of the situation came to light. In that situation Participant 2 (P2) realised the following: “First of all I am not being true to myself, I am not improving myself nor am I improving our team situation, and currently up until this point in time I am still working on improving that but it has considerably improved, better relational skills, better management of the emotional against the logical side, being a better leader in my time therefore improving the team dynamics.”

Artisans
With the focus on managing authenticity participant 3 (P3) felt that by giving reassurance to immediate team members that the person was being authentic with upper management that the individual was indeed managing individual authenticity. In this context participant 3 (P3) gave team members the assurance that complaints and concerns are being shared with upper management. “Give them the reassurance that I can be authentic with upper management”.

Participant 4 (P4) expressed the feeling that by openly standing up and expressing thoughts and feelings in important meetings the person in a sense managed authenticity. In this context participant 4 (P4) felt that by being true to self in those moments she was paving the way for others to follow the example and also openly share thoughts and feelings. As participant 4 (P4) pointed out: “I think whenever you are authentic and you are being true to yourself then it’s easier for other people to stand up and say: You know what I didn’t want to say that cause I was afraid of what people may think...”.

Idealists
Participant 5 (P5) viewed managing authenticity from the perspective of having the freedom to express in a team situation how the person felt about something being discussed: “In that planning meeting I could then just stick up my hand and say I do feel this is an area that I am stronger in, that’s closer to who I am.” Participant 5 (P5) furthermore also felt that managing authenticity entailed the freedom to openly state when the person is not comfortable with taking on a specific task: “I have been in planning meetings where I had to manage my authenticity where things have
been expected of me where I could say I am not strong in this department or it’s not really in my skill set or my talents”.

Participant 6 (P6) had an interesting view on authenticity as well as the management thereof. Participant 6 (P6) described authenticity as doing what he wanted to do while this also did not go against what the company expected or required of him. “So I think authenticity at work is, if I use my two (prompt) definitions, is doing what I believe is right and doing what the company, or the boss thinks is right.” From this perspective participant 6 (P6) felt that he was most authentic when the perception of authenticity between his superior and himself were aligned: “When I was adding most value to the team was when I was authentic but it didn’t go against what he thought was wrong or right. When I was inauthentic was when I believed I was authentic, but it went against the grain”.

In being more specific participant 6 (P6) felt that authenticity was related to the opportunity to be creative and work with ideas: “So at work, when I’ve added most value to a team, was when I believe I was authentic and how I was authentic was when I let my creative nature take over.” For participant 6 (P6) managing authenticity thus related to finding that balance between doing what he felt what was right and doing what the organisation expected of him.

Rationals
Because of Participant 7 (P7) inherent nature he felt that managing individual authenticity entailed monitoring those things to which the he seemed to have a natural inclination to. One of these was the fact that he enjoyed confrontation: “So, at home and at work, I’ve had to manage that. I’ve had to go, I’ve had to be aware of my facial expressions and my tone of voice and my body language, so that I don’t seem confrontational all the time.” Participant 7 (P7) expanded by noting that whenever fear or insecurity was detected in others the participant would adjust to be more welcoming to others: “I think wherever I see fear in other people, and insecurity, and low self-esteem in other people, I adjust myself”.

However Participant 7 (P7) highlighted that all adjustments to be more welcoming to others ultimately had to be from something authentic: “Even in that adjustment I’ll
have to feel authentic in it. You know. Even in that adjustment I have to feel honest. So, I might change my tone of voice, or my behavioural style, but I may not change my words, I’ll say them a softer way”.

4.4. CONCLUSION

The focus of chapter 3 was on highlighting specific themes that were derived from the semi-structured interviews through a process of qualitative data analysis. These themes were substantiated by quoting directly from relevant sections of those interviews. Through the use of thematic analysis as well as coding it was ensured that important was not overlooked during the analysis of the data. From the discussion it was evident that there were some differences between the answers given by leaders from the various temperament types while for others there were none. Overall the research participants described authenticity as being true to self and acknowledged the importance of being self-aware as a key element in being more authentic. The following chapter will highlight how the various research questions have been addressed and end off with recommendations for future studies.
CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY, FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1. INTRODUCTION - PURPOSE OF THE CHAPTER

The intent of this study was to explore how leaders could manage their authenticity to add more value to themselves as well as to their teams. This was done by exploring whether there was a possible link between temperament and authenticity and furthermore how leaders from different temperament types experienced and managed individual authenticity.

This chapter presents a summary of the key findings as well as limitations and recommendations of the study. Key insights drawn from the literature review as well as from the qualitative interviews are highlighted. Limitations applicable to the study are mentioned while recommendations for further studies are discussed.

5.2. SUMMARY AND FINDINGS

The main intent of the research study was to explore how authenticity, as manifested within temperament, can be managed by leaders to the extent that it adds value. This aim was achieved by answering the following research questions as initially asked in 1.4.2.

5.2.1 How can leaders enhance their authenticity?
5.2.2 How do leaders within different temperament types define and experience authenticity within their work environments?
5.2.3 How can authenticity be managed?
5.2.4 How can leaders create value within relationships as a management function?

5.2.1. How can leaders enhance their authenticity?

In this study it was argued that in order for a person to enhance individual authenticity he/she first of all has to develop some sense of self-awareness. This doesn’t merely
pertain to becoming aware of strengths or good and favourable character traits, but also to becoming aware of whom the person is in a holistic sense of the word, weaknesses included. Follow on this the individual subsequently has to learn to remain true to those deeply held values and goals and thus encompasses the notion of remaining true to self. It was furthermore argued that authenticity isn’t something that an individual can attribute to self but must be attributed to the individual by others. In this regard the individual has to act with integrity and find common ground with those with whom the person is working in a team context.

5.2.2. How do leaders within different temperament types define and experience authenticity within their work environments?

There weren’t notable differences in how leaders from different temperament types defined authenticity. The majority of the research participants highlighted that authenticity in some way or the other entailed being true to self. Being true to self seemed to refer to a combination of certain characteristics associated with the individuals’ temperament as well as personal life story and experience, work interest, values and goals. True to self thus encompassed being true to that which the person enjoyed doing within his or her particular work environment. What was evident was the notable importance with which research participants regarded self-awareness. In this sense it was highlighted that this self-awareness did not merely refer to an awareness of good traits or strengths but also becoming aware of negative traits or the shadow per se. The participants thus acknowledged the importance of having a holistic awareness of who the individual was at the core of him or herself.

According to Keirsey (1998), temperament, character and personality are configured, and hence as humans we are automatically inclined to develop certain attitudes and behaviours at the expense of others. The development of the traits within a specific temperament type precludes the development of a self-image based on the traits of another temperament type (Keirsey, 1998). That said, Artisans will base their self-image on “graceful action, bold spirit, and adaptability to circumstance”; Idealist on “empathy, benevolence, and authenticity”; Guardians on “reliability, service, and respectability”; and Rationals on “ingenuity, autonomy, and willpower” (Keirsey, ). Based on Keirsey’s view of temperament it could be expected that individuals would link authenticity, being true to
self, to that which is found to be true of their temperament. Within the compounds of authenticity, being true to self could thus entail the extent to which individuals are able to live in accord with that which is characteristic, attitudes and behaviour, of their temperament, as well as all the other elements that make up the real self.

5.2.3. How can individual authenticity be managed?

From the perspective of managing individual authenticity it was argued that the responsibilities of leaders are such that they cannot give an uncontrolled expression of their individual authenticity. Leaders have to remain cognisant of the expectations associated with their roles, the context within which they operate as well as the expectations of their followers. It was furthermore highlighted that managing or controlling individual authenticity is not impression management, as it is merely concerned with pleasing others and not giving expression from the core of the individual. In order to ensure that leaders come across as authentic while managing their individual authenticity they should ensure that they know themselves as well as others well, use their unique stories to connect with others and conform to norms and social/cultural practices to some extent. Apart from that leaders should also take care not to use a persona or mask to connect with others, but ensure that the “faces” they show of themselves to others are all true to who they are at the core.

5.2.4. How can leaders create value within relationships as a management function?

From the literature it was evident that the expectations of and responsibilities on leaders are such that they cannot freely express their individual authenticity as they see fit. They have to manage the expression of their individual authenticity and hence display the necessary sensitivity to the environment within which they operate. Through such practice they will ensure that they add more value to themselves as well as to their teams. Other important components involved in creating more value included: being self-aware, attentively listening to others, serving and sharing stories among leaders and followers. It is through harbouring authentic relationships with others that leaders are able to create more value. It is thus essential for leaders to be team players and inspire others to serve authentically.
5.3. MANIFESTATION OF AUTHENTICITY WITHIN TEMPERAMENT

The focus of the research study was to explore how authenticity, as manifested within temperament, can be managed by leaders to the extent that it adds value. Keirsey’s (1998) view of temperament along with his description of the traits and characteristics of each of the four temperament types provided some insight into understanding the possible link between authentic and temperament. Based on Keirsey’s view it was expected that participants would link their understanding and experience of authenticity to that which was found to be characteristic of their temperament types. Considering the view that authenticity entails being true to self (Harkness, 2005; George, 2003; Chan, Hannah & Gardner, 2005), or in other words true to type, it could be inferred that authenticity would in some way tie in with that which constitutes being true to all the traits and characteristics of an individual’s set temperament.

5.3.1. Guardian

According to Keirsey (2011b), Guardians will base their self-image on “reliability, service, and respectability”. Along with participants from all the other temperament types, Guardians described authenticity as being true to self (see George, 2003). Guardian participants identified different activities that they felt enabled them to feel more authentic. In accordance with Keirsey’s (1998) view of the Guardian temperament, one participant felt more authentic when he worked in service of the musicians, thus correlating with a trait characteristic of the Guardian temperament type. The only prominent activity shared by both participants was that they enjoyed working with people.

Regarding inauthenticity, Guardians felt inauthentic when they had to do something that didn’t bode well with who they were inherently (see Leider and Shapiro, 2001). One participant attributed feeling inauthentic to performing tasks that required creativity as well those tasks that were stressful. Considered in light of Keirsey’s (1998) temperament descriptions, Guardians’ longing for stability, safety and security may explain why the participant felt inauthentic when forced to perform new tasks. Guardian participants highlighted that they relied on honesty as well as an awareness of strengths and weaknesses as important variables in the process of managing their authenticity (see George, 2003). Remaining true to self is also cited as an important component for managing authenticity (Maineiro and Sullivan, 2006).
5.3.2. Artisan

Keirsey (2011b) indicated that Artisans will base their self-image on “graceful action, bold spirit and adaptability to circumstance”. The Artisans described authenticity in terms of being true to self. They furthermore acknowledged the freedom they had within their work environments to express themselves authentically. One participant identified strategic thinking, interacting with people and leading by example as activities that contributed to feeling authentic. The other participant worked with stock broking and felt that the nature of her work gave her the freedom to be herself in the work environment.

One of the participants cited detailed planning, daily reporting, reprimanding team members and instructing others as examples of activities that made her feel less authentic. The second of the Artisan participants identified the norms, rules and regulations of organisations as examples of factors that made her feel less authentic. This appeared to relate to Keirsey’s (1998) view of the Artisan temperament; namely that they enjoy freedom. To utilise strengths in service of the team and to compensate for weaknesses, both participants advocated the importance of being self-aware (George, 2003). For them this entailed being aware of their strengths. The Artisans acknowledged that they preferred to be authentic and that the good fit with the work environment meant that they had the freedom to give full expression of who they were at their core (see Chan, Hannah, & Gardner, 2005).

One of the Artisan participants noted the importance of building relationships with people so that others may come to know her true self (Goldman & Kernis, 2002). Through such actions others will become familiar with her style of work and know what to expect of her. This appeared to be in accord with the view that authenticity is something that others must ascribe to you (Goffee & Jones, 2005). With regards to the management of authenticity the Artisans underscored the importance of building relations with others (Goldman & Kernis, 2002) as a prerequisite for effectively managing authenticity. Overall it appeared that the participants were drawn to authenticity as much as the Idealists, however with a stronger focus on freedom with the work environment to give expression from the core of who they are. The emphasis on freedom show some correlation with the Artisan temperament description offered by Keirsey (2008)
5.3.3. Idealist
It was expected that participants within the Idealists temperament type would base their self-image on “empathy, benevolence, and authenticity” according to Keirsey’s (2011b) description of their temperament type. Both of the participants described authenticity as being true to self. From the discussions it was clear that both participants acknowledge the importance of authenticity (Keirsey, 1998), however one appeared to have grown more accustomed to authenticity as part of a process of personal development (see Chan, Hannah, & Gardner, 2005) while the other participant appeared to struggle with authenticity. One of the participants demonstrated considerably empathy (Keirsey, 1998) for others, with his occupation as a fulltime minister providing him with opportunities to give full expression of that empathy. The other participant enjoyed the world of ideas which appeared to relate to Keirsey’s (1998) description of the Idealist temperament.

One of the participants related detailed planning to inauthenticity while the other related performing administrative and mundane work-related tasks. Regarding compensating for weaknesses and utilising strengths the Idealists advocated employing strengths in service of the team while relying on team members to fill in for weaknesses. One participant ensured that he remained authentic at work by relying on self-awareness as well as by being honest with himself and with others (see, Goldman and Kernis, 2002).

For the purpose of managing authenticity, Idealists advocated the importance of being able to authentically express oneself in any given situation (Lerner, 1993). This relates to Keirsey’s (1998) view that authenticity is a characteristic trait of the Idealist temperament type. The participants furthermore underscored the importance that was required with oneself and with others in terms of turning certain tasks down and accepting others. Overall it appears that there were considerable similarities between that which the participants related to authenticity and that which is characteristic of the Idealist temperament type.

5.3.4. Rational
According to the description provided by Kerisey (2011b), Rationals will base their self-image on “ingenuity, autonomy, and willpower”. Similar to the temperament types discussed thus far, the Rational participant also described authenticity as being true to self. This participant referred to his occupation as a Change and Training manager when
he was asked to identify activities with which he associated authenticity. The participant felt that by virtue of his work he was involved in activities that were in line with whom he was at his core that he could authentically express himself through his work (Robinson & Aronica, 2007).

There were considerable similarities between that which came natural to this participant and the description of the temperament type as provided by Keirsey (1998). The participant often felt that he had to restrain himself from taking control or being too direct, which ties in with the notion that Rationals lack a sense of diplomacy. In line with the trait of willpower the participant is a strong willed individual who from his point of view sometimes believes that he doesn't have weaknesses. In accordance with traits that make up the Rational temperament, the participant demonstrated an affinity for intelligence and reasoning. The participant found it relatively easy to be authentic, which relates to the autonomy and strong will of the Rational temperament (Keirsey, 1998). It is possible that as a result of the fact that autonomy is one of the defining traits of Rationals, individuals within the temperament may not be so overtly concerned with being accepted by others or with impression management (see Maddi, 2001).

The participant furthermore found it easy to be authentic irrespective of whether he was at home or at work. He furthermore regarded finding an occupation through which one can find fulfilment as imperative for being authentic (Robinson & Aronica, 2007). Regarding managing authenticity the participant pointed out that for him it entailed restraining himself when his natural inclination would be to lead or take control. This correlates with the willpower and autonomy which are characteristic of the temperament type. Through the discussion with the participant it was derived that the participant indirectly equated being authentic to being true to certain defining traits of the Rational temperament type. However, it was also evident that personal interests and passion played a significant role.

5.4. SUMMARY

By addressing the research sub-questions, the research aims as stated in paragraph 1.3 have been addressed. Through a combination of answering the research sub-questions the main research question formulated as, ‘How can authenticity as reflected within temperament be managed by leaders to the extent that it adds value?’ has also sufficiently
been addressed. Through a combination of the literature review as well as themes derived from semi-structured interviews it became evident that for leaders to manage their individual authenticity as to add more value to themselves and others they have to become self-aware while remaining true to who they are at their core. Self-awareness within this context relates to being aware of individual temperament and its influence on behaviour. With regards to their leadership positions they have to be cognisant of their role as leaders as well as the expectations of their followers.

5.4.1. Ensuring the quality of the study
According to Lincoln and Guba (1985) credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability are the essential criteria for ensuring the quality of a qualitative study.

5.4.2. Credibility
Patton (2001) points out that within qualitative research the researcher is the instrument and thus the credibility of the study depends on the overall effort, competency and thoroughness of the researcher. In other words it relates to the “adequate representation of the constructions of the social world under study” (Bradley, 1993, p. 436). Lincoln and Guba’s (1985) recommendations of activities that contribute to the credibility of the results, peer debriefing, member checking as well as checking of interpretations against raw data were carried out.

5.4.3. Transferability
Transferability replaces the notion of external validity, and is close to the idea of theory based generalisability. Many qualitative studies involve very small samples or single case studies and it is your role to help the reader transfer the specific knowledge gained from the research findings of one study to other settings...(Daymon & Holloway, 2002, p. 93).

Transferability relates to whether the findings of the study are applicable to others in similar situations. It thus explores the probability that the working hypothesis of the researcher can be applied to another context (Zhang & Wildemuth, 2009). According to Babbie and Mouton (2001) as well as Merriam (1988) transferability can be enhanced by providing thick descriptions of data. Babbie and Mouton (2001) furthermore point out that purposeful sampling could contribute to the transferability of the study. In this regard the literature review served as a basis for developing the questions of the semi-structured
interviews while the specific theoretical framework from which the study worked was clearly articulated. Sampling was also done purposefully by selecting leaders with more than one direct report.

5.4.4. Dependability
Lincoln and Guba (1985), Clont (1992) and Seale (1999) identify dependability as a criterion which promotes the overall consistency or reliability of the qualitative study. In this regard Lincoln and Guba (1985, p. 317) specifically point out that an “inquiry audit” could promote the dependability of a qualitative research approach. The researcher should thus be able present a clear audit trail which would enable the readers to evaluate the analysis by following the decision-making process (Daymon & Holloway, 2002). In this regard a personal diary with field notes was kept for the duration of the study while the study was furthermore carried out according to the guidelines and parameters associated with a qualitative research design.

5.4.5. Confirmability
According to (Bradley, 1993, p. 437) confirmability relates to “the extent to which the characteristics of the data, as posited by the researcher, can be confirmed by others who read or review the research results”. In this regard the confirmability is established by means of conducting audits of the research processes that was followed as well as the findings reported by the study (Zhang & Wildemuth, 2009). In line with ensuring confirmability field notes and memo style notes were taken while the semi-structured interviews were recorded and transcribed. This will allow for an audit to assess whether the researcher has in any specific way influenced the analysis of the data.

5.5. CONSTRAINTS AND LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

5.5.1. Sample Size
The sample size was limited to seven participants with two representatives from each of the temperament types interviewed except for Rationals for which only one representative was interviewed. The study was perhaps constraint by the limited number of participants that were asked to participate. By increasing the number of research participants per temperament type it may for example have assisted in making the link between temperament and the specific experience and conceptualisation of authenticity clearer.
5.5.2. Diversity
As a result of the convenience sampling all the research participants were white with only two being female. Individuals from different cultures and ethnic origins could possibly have defined authenticity differently while they potentially may also have offered different insights with regards to the management of their individual authenticity.

5.5.3. Longitudinal Study
The study wasn’t purely longitudinal in nature and hence didn’t span across a number of years. A longitudinal study could have offered greater insight in terms of how a change of job impacted an individual’s approach to managing authenticity. The possibility also exists that a study which spans over a period of time could have offered greater insights in terms of any changes in temperament types of the research participants as well as their conceptualisation of authenticity.

5.6. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE STUDIES
With regards to future studies I believe there are a number of topics that merit further exploration. While this study explored the link between authenticity and the temperaments types of Keirsey I believe there to be sufficient merit to do an in-depth study of the linkage between the specific character types of Keirsey’s four temperament types and authenticity. It could furthermore prove beneficial to explore whether there are any significant cultural differences between how various cultural groups especially within a South African context go about managing their individual authenticity. There may be deep cultural norms and practices which would not support the notion of managing authenticity, which has vast implications for businesses alike. Currently the thoughts, recommendations and guidelines on managing individual authenticity are broad and general and hence has not be tailor made according to the unique qualities and character traits of that which is find among individuals within each of the temperament types. I therefore believe it may be beneficial to explore whether a model with specific guidelines for each of the temperament types could be developed. The benefit to business leaders is paramount as the model could contain suggestions, recommendations and guidelines for managing individual authenticity from the vantage point of their specific temperament. As such one would be offering leaders guidelines tailor-made according to their strengths, weaknesses, unique qualities and so forth.
5.7. RELEVANCE AND IMPORTANCE OF FINDINGS

According to the researchers knowledge this is the first study of its kind that attempted to explore the relationship between authenticity and temperament in greater detail. Through the literature review it was discovered that studies relating to authenticity have primarily focused on leaders’ experience of authenticity as well as on the development of authentic leaders. Local studies such as those conducted by Olivier (2008) and Vogel (2003), and internationally studies such as those conducted by Wheeler, Jessup and Martinez (2002) have focused on the behavioural, experiential and educational influence of temperament, with specific reference to Keirsey’s temperament theory. Struwig (2006) conducted a critical assessment of the Keirsey instrument and concluded that there was a need to translate the instrument into indigenous African languages to make it accessible to the larger South African population. In years to come the Keirsey Instrument Sorter II can continue to play an important role as an assessment tool for understanding the diverse South African workforce. This insight can assist organisations in aligning their leadership development programmes to the authentic natures of their employees. By creating awareness of temperament and authenticity organisations can empower their leaders to become authentic leaders that lead in accord with their values, purpose, beliefs, temperament and so forth.

5.8. FINAL WORD

Following the completion of this study it is the opinion of the writer of the researcher that it is indeed not authenticity that manifests in temperament but temperament that contributes to the experience of authenticity. It appears that authenticity does not stand in a linear relationship with temperament. Based on the meanings commonly associated with authenticity it is evident that temperament is a composite of all that which contributes to the person’s experience of authenticity. Thus temperament, while being an important component is still just one of the many elements that play an important role in forming the “self” to which the authentic individual decidedly remains true to. Information derived from qualitative interviewing revealed that temperament, individual history and experience, as well as work interests to name a few, play an important role to that state or moment which the person describes as being authentic.
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INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE IN A MINI-DISSERTATION IN PERSONAL, INTERPERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL LEADERSHIP (PIPL)

Thank you for this opportunity to contact you with regards to my research. I am currently studying towards an MPhil HRM Personal and Professional Leadership degree at the University of Johannesburg. The requirements for completion of the degree include the submission of a mini-dissertation. The topic of my research is: *Manifestation of Authenticity within Temperament Study*. The study will make a qualitative exploration of the nature in which leaders who represent each of the 4 temperament types manage their individual authenticity to add value to themselves as well as to others.

The study will be conducted from out of the qualitative research approach. By means of the purposeful sampling technique you have been identified as an individual who could potentially make a welcome contribution to the study. If you agree to participate your involvement in this study will include completing the Keirsey Temperament Sorter II as to identify your specific temperament type while you will also be requested to participate in a semi-structured interview. The interview questions will relate to your experiences of authenticity.

You will be required to identify 2 potential dates during which we can meet: 1. Initial meeting during which the study will be further explained, the consent form will be signed, and you will be required to complete the Keirsey Temperament Sorter; 2. Semi-structured interview will be conducted. No preparation on your part is required.

As researcher I will facilitate all sessions and conduct the interview with you. Please note that the interview will be recorded with all personal information treated with the highest confidentiality. This ensures that your contribution to the study is used optimally.

Thanking you in advance.

Kind regards

________________
Clarence Payne
Date:
INFORMED CONSENT AGREEMENT

This agreement serves to confirm that the research participant mentioned below gave his/her consent to participate in a qualitative study regarding the Manifestation of Authenticity within Temperament. The research participant agrees to share with the researcher his/her experiences and views to the best of his/her ability.

The undersigned participant understands the purpose and nature of this study and understands that his/her participation is voluntary and that he/she may withdraw from the study at any time. The participant further grants permission for the data collected to be used in fulfilment of the requirements for the Master's degree: MPhil HRM (PiPL), including an article, and any future publication(s).

The data collected will be used for research purposes only. The researcher undertakes neither to disclose the identity of any of the participants, nor the origin of any of the statements made by any of the participants. However, the undersigned participant understands that in terms of the ideals of the study's methodology that the researcher is obliged to make use of verbatim statements from the transcribed taped interviews and/or excerpts from solicited essays and/or any other visual (e.g. photographs) in order to illustrate the world of the research participants and their perspectives in the research report.

The participant undertakes to give a true representation of his/her perspectives and/or his/her experiences.

I, _______________________ the undersigned participant, agrees to meet at mutually agreeable times and duration(s) or by other means of communication, e.g. by e-mail, as is reasonably necessary to enable the researcher, Clarence Payne, to complete the study. I further acknowledge that I received a copy of this Informed Consent Agreement and that I may contact any of the undermentioned if I have any subsequent queries.

Signature of research participant: __________________ Researcher: ______________
Title, initials and surname: __________________ Employer: __________________
Tel: __________________________
Date: _______________ 2011 E-mail: __________________________
Place: ______________________ Fax: _______________________

Research supervisor: __________________

Dr R. Viljoen
C. INTERVIEW GUIDE

Interview Guide: First Interview
Study: Manifestation of Authenticity within Temperament

1. Welcoming:
   a. Welcome and thank the person for the opportunity to meet.
   b. Ensure that the person is comfortable, relaxed and ready to commence with the interview.

2. Formalities:
   a. Ask the person to tell you more about him/herself.
   b. Introduce yourself, provide a bit of background information.

3. Set the stage:
   a. Explain the nature and purpose of the research: relay that the study is focused on understanding how authenticity manifests in temperament and furthermore how leaders who represent the different temperament quadrants manage their authenticity to add value.

4. Give an overview of the research:
   a. Note that the Qualitative Research Approach will be followed:
      i. Qualitative: Involves participants participating in semi-structured interviews.

5. Explain how the study will commence:
   a. Number of expected interview sessions: minimum of two meetings.
   b. First contact session: initial meeting with participant to introduce them to the study, sign the consent forms and ask participants to complete the Keirsey Temperament Sorter.
   c. Second contact session: semi-structured interviews will be conducted. Be specific that no preparation on the part of the participants is required.
   d. Highlight that not all participants who attended the initial contact session will be participating in the rest of the contact sessions and that these will be done according to the discretion of the researcher and the needs of the study.

6. If the person is interested in participating in this study
   a. Go through the Consent Form together and fill it out in duplicate. Both the participant and the researcher will each keep an original.
   b. After the consent forms have been signed, exit options will be discussed.

   OR

7. If the person does not want to continue with the process thank him/her for his/her time and wish them everything of the best.
8. **Interview 1: Complete the Keirsey Temperament Sorter**
   a. Explain to the participant that the completion of the Keirsey Temperament Sorter will help to identify his/her particular temperament type.
   b. Ask the participant to complete the Keirsey Temperament Sorter II by making use of the test which is freely available at [www.keirsey.com](http://www.keirsey.com)

9. **Dates:** Verify the date and time for the next meeting.
10. Thank the participant for his/her involvement. Close the session.
### Interview Guide: Second Interview

**Study: Manifestation of Authenticity within Temperament**

| **Introduction and orientation** | **a. Welcome the person.**  
|                                | **b. Ensure that the person is comfortable, relaxed and ready to commence with the interview.**  
|                                | **c. Conduct a quick recap of the research process to be followed.** |
| **Question 1** | **Are you more authentic when you talk about concrete things, such as facts and figures, work and play, home and family, news, sports and weather, events of everyday life? (Concrete)**  
|                                | **Or**  
|                                | **Are you more authentic when you talk about abstract constructs, such as theories and ideals, dreams and philosophies, beliefs and fantasies, all the possibilities, all the “what ifs” of life? (Abstract)**  
|                                | **Are you more authentic when you get the job done, achieve what you set out to do, meet your objectives, targets and goals as effectively and efficiently as possible and only afterwards check whether you followed the right rules and procedures? (Utilitarian)**  
|                                | **Or**  
|                                | **Are you more authentic when you do the right thing, follow the correct protocol, social rules and norms, codes of conduct and only later check the effectiveness of your actions? (Cooperative)**  
<p>| <strong>Question 2</strong> | <strong>Explain your understanding of authenticity. What, in your opinion, does it mean to be authentic, and what does it mean for you?</strong> |
| <strong>Question 3</strong> | <strong>During which (behavioural) activities do you feel that you are being truer to yourself? (Authentic) List possible examples.</strong> |
| <strong>Question 4</strong> | <strong>During which (behavioural) activities do you feel that you are being less true to yourself? (Inauthentic) List possible examples.</strong> |
| <strong>Question 5</strong> | <strong>What prevents you from being authentic?</strong> |
| <strong>Question 6</strong> | <strong>How do you compensate for your weaker points and how do you utilise your strengths?</strong> |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 7</th>
<th>Can you describe how easy it is for you to be authentic? How much energy do you actively apply to being authentic?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 8</td>
<td>Did anything significant happen in your life that led you to become more authentic? Were there any trigger events?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 9</td>
<td>Do you think you are more authentic at home or at work? Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 10</td>
<td>Why do you think it is important to be authentic (true to yourself) in the work context?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 11</td>
<td>How do you ensure that you remain authentic (true to yourself) in the work context?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 12</td>
<td>How have you in the past managed your individual authenticity to add more value to yourself and the people you work with? List possible examples.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>Summarise: Do you agree that the main points we talked about today were...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is there anything else you would like to add before we end the interview?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### D. KEIRSY TEMPERAMENT SORTER II

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 1. Facts               |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2. In sizing up others, do you tend to be   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 3. Is clutter in the workplace something you tolerate pretty well   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 4. Are you more whimsical than routinized routinized than whimsical   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 5. Is it worse to have your head in the clouds be in a rut   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 6. In stories, do you prefer action and adventure fantasy and heroism   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 7. Do you value in yourself more that you are reasonable devoted   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 8. Do you usually want things just penciled in settled and decided   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 9. Are you the kind of person who is rather talkative doesn't miss much   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 10. Do you more often see what's right in front of you what can only be imagined   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 11. Which is more of a compliment “There's a sentimental person” “There's a logical person”   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 12. In most situations are you more spontaneous than deliberate deliberate than spontaneous   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 13. Waiting in line, do you often stick to business chat with others   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 14. Common sense is usually reliable frequently questionable   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 15. If you must disappoint someone are you usually frank and straightforward warm and considerate   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 16. Do you prefer contracts to be settled on a handshake signed, sealed, and delivered   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 17. At work, is it more natural for you to try to please others point out mistakes   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 18. Are you more interested in what is actual what is possible   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 19. With people are you usually more gentle than firm firm than gentle   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 20. Are you swayed more by a touching appeal convincing evidence   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 21. Do you feel better about keeping your options open coming to closure   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 22. Do you consider yourself a good conversationalist a good listener   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 23. Are you more inclined to feel somewhat removed down to earth   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 24. It is worse to be hard-nosed a softy   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 25. Do you prefer to work just whenever to deadlines   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 26. Does interacting with strangers tax your reserves energize you   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27. Are you more frequently</td>
<td>a practical sort of person</td>
<td>a fanciful sort of person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Is it better to be</td>
<td>merciful</td>
<td>just</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. On the job, do you want your activities</td>
<td>scheduled</td>
<td>unscheduled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Do you like writers who</td>
<td>say what they mean</td>
<td>use metaphors and symbolism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. In making up your mind are you more likely to go by</td>
<td>data</td>
<td>desires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Do you see yourself as basically</td>
<td>thick-skinned</td>
<td>thin-skinned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Do you tend to notice</td>
<td>opportunities for change</td>
<td>disorderliness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Are you more</td>
<td>introspective than observant</td>
<td>observant than introspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Are you drawn more to</td>
<td>overtones</td>
<td>fundamentals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Do you think of yourself as a</td>
<td>tender-hearted person</td>
<td>tough-minded person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Are you inclined to be more</td>
<td>hurried than leisurely</td>
<td>leisurely than hurried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Do you think of yourself as</td>
<td>an outgoing person</td>
<td>a private person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Are you inclined to take what is said</td>
<td>more literally</td>
<td>more figuratively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Are you more often</td>
<td>a warm-hearted person</td>
<td>a cool-headed person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Are you prone to</td>
<td>exploring the possibilities</td>
<td>nailing things down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. When the phone rings, do you</td>
<td>hope someone else will answer it</td>
<td>hurry to get to it first</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Do you find visionaries and theorists</td>
<td>rather fascinating</td>
<td>somewhat annoying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Which appeals to you more</td>
<td>consistency of thought</td>
<td>harmonious relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Is it your way to</td>
<td>pick and choose at some length</td>
<td>make up your mind quickly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Are you more comfortable</td>
<td>after a decision</td>
<td>before a decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Are you more</td>
<td>ideational than sensible</td>
<td>sensible than ideational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Is it easier for you to</td>
<td>identify with others</td>
<td>put others to good use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Which seems the greater fault</td>
<td>to be too dispassionate</td>
<td>to be too compassionate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Would you say you are more</td>
<td>serious and determined</td>
<td>easy going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. At work do you tend to</td>
<td>be sociable with your colleagues</td>
<td>keep more to yourself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Are you more likely to trust</td>
<td>your conceptions</td>
<td>your experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Which rules you more</td>
<td>your thoughts</td>
<td>your feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. When finishing a job, do you like to</td>
<td>move on to something else</td>
<td>tie up all loose ends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. At a party, do you</td>
<td>interact with a few friends</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Options</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Children often do not</td>
<td>□ interact with many, even strangers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ exercise their fantasy enough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ make themselves useful enough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. In a heated discussion do you</td>
<td>□ look for common ground</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ stick to your guns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Are you more satisfied having</td>
<td>□ work in progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ a finished product</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Do you tend to be more</td>
<td>□ factual than speculative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ speculative than factual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Are you more comfortable in making</td>
<td>□ value judgments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ critical judgments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Which do you wish more for yourself</td>
<td>□ strength of will</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ strength of emotion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. Is it preferable mostly to</td>
<td>□ just let things happen naturally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ make sure things are arranged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. Are you inclined to be</td>
<td>□ somewhat reserved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ easy to approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. Do you prize in yourself</td>
<td>□ a vivid imagination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ a strong hold on reality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. In hard circumstances, are you sometimes</td>
<td>□ too sympathetic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ too unsympathetic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. Do you tend to choose</td>
<td>□ somewhat impulsively</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ rather carefully</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. Do you tend to</td>
<td>□ keep your ears open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ say right out what’s on your mind</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. Do you speak more in</td>
<td>□ generalities than particulars</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ particulars than generalities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. When in charge of others do you tend to be</td>
<td>□ forgiving and lenient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ firm and unbending</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. Do you more often prefer</td>
<td>□ final unalterable statements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ tentative preliminary statements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. Your gender is:</td>
<td>□ Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>