

Beyond Authentic Leadership:

From Authenticity to Dynamic Congruence

Abstract

This paper explores the origins and rise of *Authentic Leadership* as a leading model of personal leadership. Then it reviews the five major types of critique of this leadership approach, before putting forward an alternative model of *Dynamic Congruence*, which while building on some of the key elements of *Authentic Leadership* addresses the criticisms and weaknesses of the earlier approach.

“The louder he talked of his honor the faster we counted our spoons.” Ralph Waldo Emerson, 1844.

“The wise fool Nasrudin, was travelling in a foreign country. He went to a bank to acquire some cash from his account. They asked him if he had any means of identifying himself. He reached down into the pocket of his long cloak and brought out a very ornate mirror. He looked into the mirror and said: “Yes that is me, all right!”

When they refused to give him any money, he went to another bank, who with their new security measures, said he needed two means of identification. This time he reached into his deep pockets with both hands, brought out two mirrors and looking from one to the other said: “Now I am sure one of those is me, but I am not sure which one!”” (Hawkins, 2005)

Introduction

Authentic Leadership has been a fast-growing brand in the field of leadership development and leadership studies in the last 15 years. It has many advocates in both the academic leadership papers and among those working in leadership development. In this paper I will first elucidate the common features of this approach, then discuss some of its inherent problematics and paradoxes before exploring a number of critiques of this leadership genre. There is a danger that we follow the trend of so many new ideas in leadership – first they become a popular new idea and many “jump on the bandwagon” with evangelical enthusiasm. The concept then becomes popularised and over-simplified. Then it is criticised and labelled as a “latest fad”. Finally, the approach declines and is replaced by a new popular concept. The danger is we fail to explore more deeply the benefits of the original thinking as well as the weaknesses of the concept, address the criticisms and further mature the thinking that underlies and surrounds the concept.

Following my review of the literature and practice of authenticity, I offer a distinctive model that attempts to build on the need for authenticity but addresses the paradoxes contained in the advocacy of the early proponents. This is a model of *dynamic congruence* in personal leadership practice, which I believe overcomes many of the current limitations in the authentic leadership discourses.

What is Authentic Leadership?

The development of *Authentic Leadership* has grown out of studies in transformational leadership (Burns, 1978; Bass & Riggio, 2008) and addresses what is required to lead organisations through periods of change and transformation. Many writers have argued that effective transformation requires leaders, not only to create but to clearly communicate a clear vision, strategy and plan. However they must also be able to engage people at all levels, both within their organisation as well as external stakeholders in the collective endeavour of the transformation (George, 2003; Goffee and Jones, 2005; Bass & Riggio, 2008). This requires not only the ability to inspire others but also to elicit high levels of trust from them. From both old and new studies, (Lencioni, 2002; Hope-Hailey, 2012; Edelman, 2012), we know that trust increases when a person:

- a) does what they say and keeps to their commitments,
- b) demonstrates a congruence between what they say and how they say it, (i.e. they show congruence between their words, the tonality in which they deliver these words, and their non-verbal communication – their overall melody and harmony),
- c) acts as a role model and does what they are asking others to do: i.e. they ‘walk the talk’,
- d) actively listen to others’ concerns with openness and empathy, and
- e) shares their own humanity and frailty.

Bill George, one of the key American writers in the field wrote ‘due to the current crisis, complexities and challenges facing our society and organizations nowadays we need a new type of leadership – the authentic leader.’ (George, 2003)

In the U.K. Goffee and Jones wrote: ‘Leadership demands the expression of an authentic self.’ (Goffee and Jones, 2005). By 2015 Ibarra could write: ‘Authenticity has become the gold standard for leaders.’ (Ibarra, 2015).

So, what is meant by authenticity? Harter (2002) offers a simple definition: ‘Authenticity is defined as knowing oneself and acting accordingly.’ This is usefully expanded by Aviola et al. (2004, p.4). when they define authentic leaders as those who are:

‘deeply aware of how they think and behave and are perceived by others as being aware of their own and others’ values/moral perspectives, knowledge and strengths, aware of the context in which they operate; and who are confident, hopeful, optimistic, resilient and of high moral character.’ Aviola et al. (2004, p.4)

Although in this paper I am focussing on the modern incarnation of authentic leadership, writing in this area has long historical roots. Aristotle taught the importance of *Phronesis* – or knowledge translated into appropriate action, and this included self-knowledge. Plato wrote in the *Republic*, the importance of the *philosopher king* who is a role-model acting in the public good, and Plato’s own teacher Socrates constantly echoed the importance of the Delphic Oracle’s words ‘know-thyself’.

Shakespeare wrote the lines for Polonius in Hamlet:

‘This above all, to thine own self be true,
And it must follow, as the night the day,
Thou canst not then be false to any man.’ (Shakespeare, [year], Act no.Scene no.Line no)

The Growing Critique of Authentic Leadership

There has been a growing number of critiques of both the theory and practice of *Authentic Leadership*. A number of writers have commented on the difficulty of combining 'be true to oneself' with other views of what a leader should be.

Ladkin and Taylor (2010) wrote that having positive psychological capacities such as confidence, hope and optimism may be authentic for some leaders but not for others. This was echoed by Wilson (2013) who said that all leaders may be confident, hopeful, optimistic and resilient on some occasions but may be the opposite at other times. Shamir and Eilam (2005) pointed out that it is possible to be authentic to immoral values that are self-serving and negative for the wider society.

In my own writings I have argued that Authentic Leadership can be seen as part of the out-dated notion that leadership resides in individual heroic leaders (Hawkins, 2011, 2014, 2017), who not only have to be courageous and decisive, engaging, empowering and many other things but now have to be authentic as well!

Adarves-Yorno (in Bolden et al., 2016) very usefully identifies four key paradoxes in the literature of Authentic Leadership: 1) Conceptual paradox, 2) Contextual paradox, 3) Identity as singular/multiple Paradox, and finally 4) Paradox of depth.

1. Conceptual paradox

This builds on the writings of Ladkin and Taylor (2010) and Wilson (2013) quoted above who maintain that combining authenticity with a definite range of desired leadership qualities creates a conflict. Above I quoted Aviola et al. (2004): suggesting that leaders need to be both "*authentic*" as well as "*confident, hopeful, optimistic, resilient and of high moral character.*" At times when a leader is not feeling confident, hopeful or optimistic, they have the choice of either inauthentically demonstrating those advocated leadership traits or being true to their current inner state. At such times a leader can do one or the other, but not both. Boston (2011) addresses this issue by looking at the integration of authenticity with responsibility and courage.

2. Contextual paradox

A number of writers have argued that being authentic is not just something that is always appropriate but that is context dependent. Nyberg and Sveningsson (2014) suggest leaders need to know when and when not to be authentic and transparent about their thoughts and feelings. Ibarra (2015) argues that in some circumstances showing your vulnerability in an authentic way may be counter-productive and undermine one's leadership. This is illustrated by a personal narrative of being in such a situation. Adarves-Yorno also offers an example quoting Jean Tomlin (former HR manager of Marks and Spencer):

I want to be me, but I am channelling parts of me to context. What you get is a segment of me. It is not a fabrication or a façade – just the bits that are relevant for the situation.
Adarves-Yorno (in Bolden et al., 2016, p.122).

I would argue that there is no such thing as an "I am" – we are ALWAYS expressing only parts of ourselves. Inherent contradictions and complexities within the self makes the whole concept of unitary authenticity questionable and there is a need to use different aspects of oneself in different situations. This links to the next paradox.

3. Identity paradox

Wilson (2013) questions the assumption that there is one true and unified self. He argues that the self is multi-faceted and sometimes these different aspects of self can be contradictory. The spiritual

teacher Gurdjieff (in Ouspensky, 1950) described how the “I” that goes to bed committed to getting up early is not the same “I” that wakes up in the morning. He also wrote:

Man has no individual I. But there are, instead, hundreds and thousands of separate small "i"s, very often entirely unknown to one another, never coming into contact, or, on the contrary, hostile to each other, mutually exclusive and incompatible. Each minute, each moment, man is saying or thinking, "i". And each time his i is different. Just now it was a thought, now it is a desire, now a sensation, now another thought, and so on, endlessly. Man is a plurality. Man's name is legion. (quoted in Ouspensky, 1950, p.59)

Roberto Assagioli (1965, 1973), founder of psycho-synthesis, a transpersonal form of humanistic psychotherapy, wrote extensively about our *Sub-personalities* and our relationship to them. Turner et al. (1987) developed *self-categorisation theory* (SCT) that argues that we have a personal identity and many social identities. Roccas and Brewer (2002) developed this further with their concept of *social identity complexity* where different identities conflict with one another. Daniel Goleman sums up this paradox when he writes ‘no one has just one fully integrated self-image, a single harmonious version of the self. Various points and stages in life accrue overlapping selves, some congruent, others not.’ (Goleman, 1998, p. 102)

Some theorists and psychotherapists including Jungians, psychosynthesis and object relations writers such as Winnicott (1965), would argue that maturity comes with having an integration of one’s different identities and sub-personalities, through the developing of a core inner self that can act as a witness and/or a stage director to the various self-identities.

The American psychologist and psychoanalyst, Robert Jay Lifton (1993), argues that our times require the development of a *protean self* which has high flexibility and adaptability to the flux of our times.

We are becoming fluid and many-sided. Without quite realizing it, we have been evolving a sense of self appropriate to the restlessness and flux of our time. This mode of being differs radically from that of the past and enables us to engage in continuous exploration and personal experiment. I have named it the ‘protean self’, after Proteus, the Greek sea god of many forms. (Lifton, 1993, p.1)

4. Depth paradox

An individual being consistent and unchanging can be an indication of a fixity of belief which can be a negative trait for leaders. The Roman philosopher Cicero wrote “unchanging consistency of standpoint has never been considered a virtue in great statesmen.” (quoted in Genovese, 2016, p. 68). Cicero goes on to use the analogy of a sailing ship. If the winds change you do not stick to your course or rigging but adapt. Recent examples of leaders negatively holding to a fixity of their own beliefs and positions include the British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, who famously said: “You turn if you like, the lady is not for turning.”. This attitude led to her adopting an unhealthy inflexibility to such issues as the Falkland’s War and the Poll Tax. In America, George W. Bush’s conviction that Saddam Hussein was evil and that Iraq posed a threat, led him and many other leaders to convince themselves that they had fool-proof evidence of “weapons of mass destruction” in Iraq. His belief that “we will be greeted as liberators” was misplaced, and led to the failure to develop a solid plan for reconstruction after the war, a failure that has cost much suffering and hundreds of lives.

Genovese, 2016, argues:

In a hyper-change world, a leader must be able to style-flex.
High flex in a high-flux world.
Rigidity is the enemy of good leadership; flexibility is its ally.
(Genovese, 2016, pp.85-86)

Boyatzis and McKee suggest we should move from focusing on *Authentic Leadership* to focussing on *resonant leadership* and develop the capacity of mindfulness:

the capacity to be fully aware of all that one experiences inside the self – body, mind, heart and spirit - and to pay full attention to what is happening around us – people, the natural world, our surroundings and events. (Boyatzis and McKee, 2005, p. 112).

Adarves-Yorno showed in a small research study that those less trained in mindfulness were more focussed on authenticity across time, whereas those more fully trained in Mindfulness were more concerned with being congruent with what was happening moment by moment, including moments of incongruence itself. (Adarves-Yorno 2013)

I would add a fifth paradox to those suggested by Adarves-Yorno: the Socio-Political paradox.

5. Socio-Political paradox

The more we have talked about authenticity the faster the trust in leaders in the west has diminished. We have seen public trust in large companies and their boards fall lower than ever following the economic crisis of 2008-9, and although in some countries it has recovered a little, in Western Europe and North America in 2012, less than half of respondents trusted business leaders to tell the truth with scores in the UK 42% and in the USA 38% (Edelman, 2012). Veronica Hope Hailey's extensive research on "Trust in Leadership" in companies has shown that trust has fallen in leaders since the financial crisis of 2008-9 across all business sectors (Hope-Hailey, 2012).

Percentages of people who do not trust their national government to tell the truth are shockingly even higher and declining faster (Edelman, 2012). In 1960 70% of Americans said they had confidence in federal government, by 1990 this had fallen to 30%, and by 2013 it was as low as 17% (*The Wall Street Journal/NBC poll*, July 2013, quoted in Genovese, 2016, p.105).

What is needed now?

The authentic leadership discourse can lead us to focussing on "being true and authentic to ourselves". If we examine what that actually means it is often about being true to our self-created self-narrative, which can partly be built on *wilful blindness* (Heffernan, 2011), *blind spots* (see *The Johari Window*, Luft and Ingham, 1955) and fixity of self-belief and action-logic (Torbert, 2004). The self is ever changing in an ever-changing world and we need to develop a fluid authenticity. This then poses the question of how to have high-flexibility, as Genovese (2016) argues is essential in a high-flux world, with a degree of congruence that makes us trustworthy. In a VUCA world (Steihm, 2010) – that is 'volatile, uncertain, complex and ambiguous', we need to develop a leadership self that is constantly co-evolving, along with the rapid and complex changes in the systemic context.

What is needed in leadership in the 21st century is not the brilliant virtuoso soloist, who always wants to impress by playing the same tune, but a protean actor, who fluidly adjusts their being in response to the needs of the situation. A leader who engages people, not just with a simple narrative, but who helps others to see the eco-systemic nature of a situation by telling a story and by empathically stepping into all the different and sometimes conflicting stakeholder roles and perspectives.

Stephen Spielberg (2016), the film director, described the brilliance of the great actor Mark Rylance, as his fluid ability to let himself fully flow into many different roles and situations which directors offered him.

We also need leaders who can move from being virtuoso soloists to leaders of their part of the orchestra, helping the team be "more than the sum of its parts" (Hawkins, 2017, chapter 12), and then to being conductors and orchestrators, who can integrate and harmonise many aspects of the larger symphonic system. The orchestrating leader is not only able to listen carefully to each soloist,

but also to the connections and disconnections between the various parts of the orchestra (Hawkins, 2017, chapter 12).

This fluidity of self that I am arguing for is similar to that proposed by the psychological researcher Robert Lifton (1993) mentioned above, who argued for the development of a "Protean Self". He suggested that this has three elements. The first is '**sequential**', which involves the ability to re-invent oneself, as one enters different roles, cultures, periods of history. This leadership ability has been highlighted by many of the CEOs that have recently been interviewed for the Henley Business School global survey (Hawkins, 2017B) on *Tomorrow's Leadership and the Necessary Revolution in Today's Leadership Development*. One Global CEO talked about the need to radically reinvent oneself, as one progressed from leading a small team, to leading a function, to leading a country operation to leading a global listed business. Each new challenge required a new version of oneself. Another CEO went further and talked about having "to eat one's own children", by which he meant the ability to let go of and unlearn one's past successes and ways of leading, in order to develop a new leadership self, appropriate for the new context and level of operating.

The second manifestation of the protean self that Lifton argues for is '**simultaneous**', rather than sequential. It resides in "the multiplicity of varied, even antithetical images and ideas held at any one time by the self." (Lifton, 1993p. 8). The mature leader needs to be able to embrace paradox and contradiction both within their business environment and within themselves. This suggests that a leader needs to be able to have many different aspects and images to their self-narrative, rather than trying to stay "true to who they think they are". This can be seen as a post-modern conceptualization, embracing contingency, multiplicity and multiple co-existing narratives.

The third manifestation is '**social**'. This is the ability to flex how one shows up in the great variety of situations a leader must engage with both in the organisation and the multiple and varied organisation's stakeholders, as well as in their social and personal lives. The wise leader is not someone who treats everyone in the same way but a person who has the life artistry to spontaneously respond to each person, situation and context with the difference required.

This requires, at the very least, for authenticity to be seen, not as residing inside the individual, but as relational, being co-evolved and co-created between the leader and their followers and stakeholders, the leader *and* the group, the leader *and* the context, the leader *and* what is required. This is explored in detail by Lines and Scholes-Rhodes (2013) in *Touchpoint Leadership*, where the encounter calls forth the leadership required, rather than it being a creation of the leader.

This development of a Protean Self must be balanced by the individual learning to develop internal coherence that can integrate and hold these multiple selves in some form of systemic inter-connection. Leadership maturity is the continual development of a highly-flexed self, with multiple ways of showing up, that is continually integrating new ways of being into a coherent but dynamic whole. Bill Torbert's (2004) post-conventional levels of leadership can be understood as different modes of such dynamic integration.

In the next section I will offer a model of dynamic congruence, which integrates coherence of self with dynamic adaptation of engagement.

From Authenticity to Dynamic Congruence

Another way of thinking about authenticity is the capacity to combine multiple levels of congruence, which, I propose, is a key quality enabling a leader to attract respect and trust from those around them.

Both the terms "authentic" and "congruent" are often under-defined and mean different things to different people. For some *authentic* means truthful or believable; for others it means "walking one's talk" or "practising what you preach". These are often the phrases that are also used to

illustrate congruence. *Congruent* is used to describe a person who demonstrates alignment between what they say and how they say it; or more fully, a person whose words, emotional tone, expression, non-verbal behaviour and subsequent actions are all aligned.

In working with leaders in many fields over the last 40 years, I have met many leaders in each of the following three categories: those who:

1. had high alignment in their personal presentation, but were poor at aligning their way of being in contact and relationship with others,
2. were good at achieving rapport with the individuals they met, but less effective at aligning to the different group or team dynamics,
3. could align with the group they were with, but lose focus on the collective purpose or task.

I have been privileged to meet and work with some very impressive leaders who achieved effective rapport and presence, and were congruent at the personal, interpersonal and group levels in a wide variety of different settings. Occasionally I have also met leaders who could combine this effective congruence with an ability to link effectively to the purpose of the meeting, the group's collective endeavour and the organisation's mission and purpose (Hawkins, 2017 and 2014B). From these experiences I constructed a model of four dimensions of congruence:

1. **Self-congruence:** alignment of different aspects of one-self – thinking, feeling and doing, words and actions, words and non-verbal communication; one's espoused values and one's values in action
2. **Inter-personal congruence:** alignment and rapport with another
3. **Collective congruence:** alignment with the group, organisational and cultural setting
4. **Purposive and collaborative congruence:** alignment to the purpose that we are collectively there to serve.

Full authenticity requires congruence on all four of these levels. And we will now explore these further and how they connect to each other.

The Gyroscope of Congruence

In my writing on overcoming dualistic thinking (Hawkins, 2001), I discovered that one of the most used and least understood words in the Bible was "righteousness", a word much used in the New Testament Gospels. According to Frank Bullock, it appears 78 times in the Epistles of Saint Paul alone (Bullock, 2000). It is a word that is common and yet we do not often explore what it means.

Righteousness originally meant to be in balance, not to hold one truth against another, but to see that all truths exist in relation to their opposite. Righteousness, comes from the Greek word DIKAIOSUNE.

Maurice Nicoll writes:

The Greek word for righteousness (δικη) has the original meaning of being upright and so, between the opposites. The just man or righteous man, both of the New Testament and the Socratic teaching four centuries earlier, and of the teaching of Pythagoras as early as the 6th century B.C. is the upright man, the man who stands balanced between the opposites and is neither of them....the idea of the just man was directly derived from the ancient teaching about the opposites. **A one sided man could not be just. Nor could a man who lived in a small part of himself be just.** To be righteous, to be just, is to be balanced. Do not misuse this word balanced, imagining that perhaps because you do not feel things so strongly as others, you are more balanced. To be balanced is not to be stupid but to be alive to every side of existence. (Nicoll, 1952, p.326.)Balance is not static but dynamic. Modern science has shown that the only organisms that are in a stable state are those that are dead, and

that evolution's creativity takes place in states far from equilibrium. We must avoid making a new either-or dualism between balance and dis-equilibrium. Righteousness is about the *dynamic balance*, of fully embracing both poles of the contraries, holding them in relationship and searching for a conjunction that marries the two together.

Frank Bullock in his sermons in 1936 at Chapel Lane Unitarian Chapel (Bullock, 2000) translated *DIKAIOSUNE* as *Harmony* or "living from the spirit", but again this should not be confused with a lovely, precious beautiful oasis of no conflict, but a dynamic harmony that flows between difference.

So, the righteous person does not stand rigid at a point of compromise between the opposites but embraces both poles and finds how the two can be truly married together on a higher level of integration. In this respect the righteous person is demonstrating Torbert's post-conventional levels of leadership development (Torbert, 2004), where the "strategist or integrator leader" is able to combine different world views and arguments and achieve a new synthesis.

Let me offer a simple but extremely difficult awareness exercise, that can be undertaken in a reflective space at work or at home, as well as in the midst of the conflicting demands of a busy life.

In this exercise I ask the question: How can I be true to the needs of this time in the four dimensions of congruence?1. **The vertical dimension of "Self congruence"**: where I align myself: my thoughts; my feelings; my breathing; my head, heart and guts. Internal congruence is being at home in myself, honest with myself and to be one with myself, owning my 'shadow' and connecting both my darkness and light. This also requires a degree of mindfulness (Chaskalson, 2011; Hall, 2013)

2. **The horizontal dimension of "Inter-personal congruence"**: where I focus on the connection between myself and another. I move my attention from awareness of myself, to awareness of the other, to awareness of the connecting flow between us and back again. The questions I then focus on are as follows:

- In relationship to another, am I attending to myself and the other?
- Am I listening to both of us?
- Am I being honest to both of us?
- Am I aligning myself to the needs of the flow between us?

3. **The circular dimension of "Collective congruence"**: I focus on the flow of communication in the group, what are the different needs being expressed? What is the need of the totality of the group? What is waiting to come into being in the group? How can I assist its birth?

4. **The overarching and under-arching dimension of "Purposive and Collaborative congruence"**: Here I move my focus between my own sense of higher purpose and the purpose of the group, community, or organisation of which I am part. How are we being congruent to what we are currently in service of and the work we are currently there to do? I can move my attention even further out and ask what are the needs of the time, what is the great work needed by our world? I cannot be congruent and a bystander to what is required by my context. This dimension also must include a consideration of how congruent our work is to the living biosphere of this earth which provides us with life, warmth and sustenance. As Gregory Bateson (1972) so succinctly put it: "We are learning by bitter experience that the organism that destroys its environment destroys itself."

Achieving congruence in all four of these dimensions simultaneously is no easy task and requires a lifetime of practice. As leaders we need constantly to move from ensuring we are self-aligned, to focusing on empathic listening to others, to tuning into the culture, mood and dynamic of the group or team we are currently working with, to calling ourselves and those we lead to the collective purpose that requires our collaboration.12

Insert Figure 1.jpg here

Figure One: A Balanced Gyroscope

As I align and co-create a generative conjunction in each of the four dimensions, I become like a gyroscope, staying upright by constantly turning and gyrating, maintaining its dance, its movement between the opposites. Dynamic congruence is forever turning, constantly realigning to the ever-changing moving present moment, dancing with the dance of co-creation and co-evolution.

Applying Dynamic Congruence: A case example

I was coaching a senior partner in one of the world's largest "professional services" firms, whom I shall call 'George'. He was tasked with leading his part of the global business through a period of transformation. George talked of his challenge in getting partners to not only understand the challenges the firm was facing, but to "buy-into the new strategy".

Step one focused on *Self-congruence*. I agreed to actively coach a rehearsal of his presentation and help him to increase his *Authority, Presence and Impact* (Hawkins and Smith, 2013). This involved my feedback focusing on how his message was matched and amplified, or mismatched, by the way he was standing, engaging and speaking. How the medium could be more congruent with the message.

Step two focused on *inter-personal congruence*. This involved attending one of the many presentations George made to groups of senior partners. His talk was excellent, and he had now shared more of himself in the talk and there was a good match between the medium and the message. However, when it came to question time, he would respond to those questions that were in fact only faintly disguised challenges by repeating what he had already said, only a little more slowly. I could see how the audience heard this as the leader being patronising and like a school teacher, who thought they were not able to understand what he was saying the first time round. After this talk and before the next one, we worked on how he could tune-in to what the other partners were needing him to hear when they asked questions, and to be genuinely interested in the need behind the questions that are asked, and difficulties others experienced in implementing the new direction.

At the next presentation, I watched carefully as he responded to questions, by asking the questioner to say more about their concern, or about what difficulty they fore saw in implementing the new strategy. Then he responded with genuine interest and exploration of how together they might address the issues. Then asking other partners how they thought these concerns could best be addressed.

Step Three focused on *collective congruence* and how this senior partner could be better at attuning to what was happening in different parts of the business and in different countries. George arrived at his talk to the Italian practice and instead of launching straight into his pre-prepared presentation, talked about how he was aware that the practice had recently been through a very tough period and a whole group of partners had gone off to join a rival firm. He empathised on the difficult road they had been on and thanked them for the hard work they had put in to get the business back on track. He even spoke a few words of Italian.

Finally, the coaching focussed on the *Purposive and collaborative congruence* and when George appointed his new leadership team, drawn from many parts of the business, he began his first meeting with the words: "We together have a big challenge, and we have many thousands of stakeholders who we serve, that need us to succeed. That is our clients, our investors, our partners, our employees, the regions and communities where we operate. We have a large and exciting mountain to climb. For us to succeed with these challenges I need your help – that is help from

every one of you individually, and from all of us as a team. We will only get to succeed together, if we discover how to become more than the sum of our parts.”

Conclusion: congruence and future leadership

In this paper I have tried to show how we need to move beyond limiting notions of authenticity where we apparently stay true to a fixed unitary self. Instead we need to create a relational, purposive and dynamic notion of authenticity. I suggest that this relational-purposive-dynamic model of authenticity is one where the individual is present in each moment, attempting to align: within themselves; between themselves and individual others; with the wider group; and with the emerging collective purpose. The individual can only be in a state of full authenticity, similar to the Greek notion of *dikaiosune* and the biblical notion of *righteousness* when, in the moment, they achieve an adequate congruence in each of these four dimensions.

Increasingly in a world of hyper-change (Genovese, 2016) and a world that is *Volatile, Uncertain, Complex and Ambiguous* (Stiehm 2011), we need leadership and leaders who constantly practice the art of gyroscopic or dynamic congruence. This ability can be developed through a variety of trainings and practices including: emotional and social intelligence (Goleman, 1996 and 2009); coaching and mentoring (Hawkins and Smith, 2013); systemic team coaching (Hawkins, 2017 and 2018); dialogue (Bohm, 1996 and Issacs, 1999); mindfulness (Boyatzis and McKee, 2005; Chaskalson 2011); and compassion training (Jinpa, 2015).

The leader must be for turning! And, as is sung in an old Shaker hymn, popularised by the American composer Aaron Copeland, entitled *Simple Gifts*:

To turn, turn, will be our delight,

Till by turning, turning we come 'round right'. (Brackett, 1848)

Bibliography

- 2012 *Edelman Trust Barometer* survey . Retrieved from <https://www.edelman.com/2012-edelman-trust-barometer>
- Adarves-Yorno, I. (2016). Leadership and the Paradoxes of Authenticity. In: Bolden, R.; Witzel, M & Linacre, N. (Eds.) *Leadership paradoxes: rethinking leadership for an uncertain world*. London: Routledge.
- Assagioli, Roberto. (1965). *Psychosynthesis: a manual of principles and techniques*. New York and Buenos Aires: Hobbs, Dorman & Company.
- Assagioli, R. (1973). *The act of will*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Aviola, B.J., Luthans, F. and Walumbwa, F.O. (2004). *Authentic Leadership: theory building for veritable sustained performance*. Working Paper, Gallup Leadership Institute, University of Nebraska-Lincoln.
- Bass, B. M. & Riggio, R. E. (2008). *Transformational Leadership*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Bateson, G. (1972). *Steps to an ecology of mind*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Bohm, D. (1996). *On dialogue*. New York: Routledge.
- Boston, R. (2011). *ARC leadership: from surviving to thriving in a complex world*. London: Leaderspace.
- Boyatzis, R. & McKee, A. (2005). *Resonant leadership: renewing yourself and connecting to others through mindfulness, hope and compassion*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Books.
- Brackett, J. (1848). *Simple gifts. A Shaker song*.
- Bullock, F. in Bullock, A. (2000). *Building Jerusalem: a portrait of my father*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper and Raw
- Chaskalson, M. (2011). *The mindful workplace*. Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Emerson, R.W. (1844). On suspicion. In *Essays: Second Series*. Boston: James Munroe, 1844; English edition, London: John Chapman, 1844.
- Genovese, M. (2016). *Building tomorrow's leaders today: On becoming a polymath leader*. New York: Routledge.
- George, B. (2003). *Authentic leadership: rediscovering the secrets to creating lasting value*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Goffee, R. & Jones, G. (2005). Managing authenticity: the paradox of great leaders. *Harvard Business Review* 83(12), 86-94.
- Goleman, D. (1996). *Emotional intelligence*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Goleman, D. (1998). *Vital lies, simple truths: the psychology of self-deception*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Goleman, D. (2009). *Ecological intelligence*. New York: Broadway Books
- Hall, L. (2013). *Mindful coaching: how mindfulness can transform coaching practice*. London: Kogan Page.
- Harter, S. (2002). Authenticity. In Snyder, C.R. & Lopez, S. (Eds) *Handbook of Positive Psychology*(pp. 382-394). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Hawkins, P. (2001). *Beyond opposites*. Five talks given at the Unitarian Summer School, Hucklow, Derbyshire.
- Hawkins, P. (2011, 2014, 2017 third edition). *Leadership team coaching: developing collective transformational leadership*. London: Kogan Page.
- Hawkins, P. (Ed.). (2018). *Leadership team coaching in practice*. (2nd ed.). London: Kogan Page
- Hawkins, P. (2017). *Tomorrow's leadership and the necessary revolution in today's leadership development*. Henley UK: Henley Business School
- Hawkins, P. & Smith, N. (2013). *Coaching, mentoring and organizational consultancy: supervision and development*. Maidenhead UK: Open University Press/ McGraw-Hill.
- Heffernan, M. (2011). *Wilful blindness: how we ignore the obvious at our peril*. London: Simon and Schuster
- Hope-Hailey, V. (2012). *Where has all the trust gone*. Wimbledon UK: CIPD. Retrieved from: <http://www.cipd.co.uk/hr-resources/research/where-trust-gone.aspx>
- Ibarra, H. (2015). The authenticity paradox: Why feeling like a fake can be a sign of growth. *Harvard Business Review* 93, 52-59.
- Isaacs, W. (1999). *Dialogue and the art of thinking together: a pioneering approach to communicating in business and in life*. New York: Bantam Doubleday Dell Publishing Group.
- Jinpa, T. (2015). *A fearless heart: why compassion is the key to greater well-being*. New York: Hudson Street Press.
- Ladkin, D. and Taylor, S. (2010). Enacting the 'true-self': towards a theory of embodied authentic leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21, 64-74.
- Lencioni, P. (2002). *The five dysfunctions of a team. a leadership fable*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lifton R.J. (1993). *The protean self: human resilience in an age of human fragmentation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Lines, H. and Scholes-Rhodes, J. (2013). *Touchpoint leadership: creating collaborative energy across teams and organizations*. London: Kogan Page
- Luft, J. & Ingham, H. (1955). *The Johari window, a graphic model of interpersonal awareness. Proceedings of the western training laboratory in group development*. Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles.
- Nicoll, M. (1952). *Psychological commentaries on the teachings of Gurdjieff and Ouspensky. Volume 1*. London: Robinson and Watkins.
- Nyberg, D. & Sveningsson, S. (2014). Paradoxes of authentic leadership: Leader Identity struggles. *Leadership*, 10(4), 437-455.
- Ouspensky, P. D. (1950). *In search of the miraculous: fragments of an unknown teaching*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Roccas, S. & Brewer, M. (2002). Social identity complexity. *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 6(2), 88-106.
- Shamir, B. and Eilam, G. (2005). What's your story? A life-stories approach to authentic leadership development. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(3), 395-417.
- Stephen Spielberg interview. (2016). *BBC News at Ten*. 17 July 2016. Retrieved at <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/av/entertainment-arts-36821776/steven-spielberg-and-mark-rylance-s-big-friendly-bromance>

Stiehm, J.H. (2010). *US army war college: military education in democracy*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press

Torbert, W.(2004). *Action inquiry: the secret of timely and transforming leadership*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Wilson, V. (2013). Viewpoint: the authentic leader reconsidered: integrating the marvellous, mundane and mendacious. In Ladkin, D. & Spiller, C. (Eds), *Authentic leadership: clashes, convergences and coalescences* (pp. 55-64). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar

Winnicott, D. (1965). *Maturation processes and the facilitating environment: studies in the theory of emotional development*. London: Hogarth Press.