



Citation for published version:

Fletcher, L, Pichler, S & Chandrasekaran, L 2024, 'Songs of the Self: The Importance of Authentic Leadership and Core Self Evaluations for LGBT Managers', *Journal of Managerial Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-06-2023-0310>

DOI:

[10.1108/JMP-06-2023-0310](https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-06-2023-0310)

Publication date:

2024

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication](#)

Publisher Rights

CC BY-NC

University of Bath

Alternative formats

If you require this document in an alternative format, please contact:
openaccess@bath.ac.uk

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



**Songs of the Self: The Importance of Authentic Leadership
and Core Self Evaluations for LGBT Managers**

Journal:	<i>Journal of Managerial Psychology</i>
Manuscript ID	JMP-06-2023-0310.R2
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	authentic leadership, Gender issues, Leadership development, Diversity, Discrimination, Authenticity

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Songs of the Self:

The Importance of Authentic Leadership and Core Self Evaluations for LGBT Managers

Abstract

Purpose – Based on authentic leadership (AL) theory and research on lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) workplace experiences, we propose that AL explains variance beyond transformational leadership (TL) in attitudinal outcomes for LGBT managers compared to non-LGBT managers. We further predict that core self-evaluations (CSEs) bound relationships between AL, LGBT status, and outcomes.

Design/methodology/approach – We conducted a time-lagged survey of 193 LGBT and 218 non-LGBT (i.e., heterosexual, cisgender) managers. The first survey assessed respondents' evaluations of their leadership behavior and CSEs whereas the second survey, conducted one month later, assessed role engagement and career satisfaction.

Findings – Regression and moderation analyses revealed support for our hypotheses. AL seems especially relevant for LGBT leaders, particularly at low levels of CSEs.

Practical Implications – Leadership development programmes emphasizing AL could be particularly beneficial for LGBT managers, especially those low in CSEs. Harnessing a leader's sense of identity could help those who have been marginalized.

Originality/Value – We propose, explain, and demonstrate that relationships between AL and leader outcomes will likely be different between managers with and without stigmatized identities, in this case those who are (not) LGBT.

Keywords: LGBT; sexuality; transgender; authentic leadership; engagement; careers.

Introduction

There has been a growing interest in authentic leadership (AL) since the initial model of the construct by Luthans and Avolio (2003), including special issues, reviews, and debate pieces (e.g., Gardner *et al.*, 2011; Gardner *et al.*, 2021). Because the theoretical development of AL was based principally on positive organizational behavior and transformational leadership (TL; Gardner *et al.*, 2011), the distinctions between, and discriminant validity of, these constructs has been a perennial concern (Banks *et al.*, 2016). There are inconsistent findings as to whether AL predicts leader outcomes such as job attitudes over and above TL (Cooper *et al.*, 2005). There is also a significant gap in research on leadership among lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender individuals (Fine, 2017; Pichler and Ruggs, 2018).

We present a novel theoretical proposition to bridge the gap between the literature on leadership and LGBT workers, suggesting that some of the key concerns and inconsistent findings in the AL literature may be related to leaders having a stigmatized identity. We propose, more specifically, that AL is more likely to predict leader outcomes over and above TL among LGBT leaders vs. non-LGBT leaders. We study role engagement and career satisfaction as relevant leader outcomes because the literature on LGBT workers indicates there is extensive variability in these outcomes for this population (e.g., Fletcher and Marvell, 2023) and because these outcomes are important indicators of personal success, satisfaction, and well-being (e.g., Shuck *et al.*, 2021). Furthermore, we suggest that the relationship between AL and these outcomes for LGBT and non-LGBT leaders is contingent on core self-evaluations (CSEs).

Our propositions are based on literature about stigmatized invisible identities, including LGBT workers and managers. LGBT workers desire to be authentic and express that authenticity in their roles and their careers, particularly LGBT leaders, to fulfil their potential and to

1
2
3 experience positive wellbeing (e.g., Chang and Bowring, 2017; Fine, 2017; Fletcher and Everly,
4 2021). Challenges associated with managing a stigmatized invisible identity as well as with
5 confronting stereotypes should make AL more complex for LGBT leaders (Ayaz *et al.*, 2023;
6 Fine, 2017). The process of leading authentically might also present unique opportunities for
7 LGBT leaders, e.g., to develop an enhanced sense of self-realization, which may contribute to
8 their engagement at work and their broader sense of satisfaction with their career (Ilies *et al.*,
9 2005). This could be especially true at low levels of CSEs, i.e., when LGBT managers have low
10 self-esteem and/or self-efficacy. This raises two research questions, which frame and guide our
11 study: 1. When controlling for TL, is AL more predictive of attitudinal outcomes for LGBT
12 managers vis-à-vis for non-LGBT managers? and 2. When controlling for TL, are relationships
13 between AL, LGBT status, and attitudinal outcomes bound by CSEs? We test these ideas via a
14 quantitative analysis comparing 193 LGBT managers and 218 non-LGBT managers to ascertain
15 whether the added value of AL above and beyond TL is unique to LGBT individuals, particularly
16 those who are low in CSEs.

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36 By addressing these questions, we develop important contributions to theory and
37 research. Our contribution to theory is to develop propositions about the conditions under which
38 authentic leadership should be more or less likely to predict attitudinal outcomes based on LGBT
39 status and CSEs. An additional and related theoretical contribution is to develop a typology to
40 explain how LGBT status and CSEs interact with authentic leadership to predict attitudinal
41 outcomes. In terms of contributions to research, we integrate the literatures on authentic
42 leadership and LGBT workers. We do so by examining the extent to which authentic leadership
43 adds value as a leadership concept for LGBT managers, and how this added value may be unique
44 to LGBT managers when compared with non-LGBT managers. This is important not only
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 because it addresses the perennial debate about the discriminant validity of transformational
4 leadership and authentic leadership—but also because authentic leadership might be even more
5 relevant to attitudinal outcomes for LGBT leaders. We provide an explanation as to why there
6 are inconsistent findings in the authentic leadership literature and suggest that this may be due to
7 identity-based differences between managers. We also demonstrate that relationships between
8 LGBT status, authentic leadership, and attitudinal outcomes are contingent upon CSEs. This
9 presents a substantive opportunity for future research and theory development about authentic
10 leadership: A need to consider how authentic leadership relates to job attitudes differently for
11 managers with stigmatized identities based on sexual orientation and gender identity vs. those
12 without—and how these differences are conditional on CSEs. Our findings offer an important
13 practical contribution: LGBT leaders should be aware of and trained in authentic leadership.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 **Theoretical background**

30 *Authentic leadership (AL) and its connection with transformational leadership (TL)*

31
32
33 AL is defined as “a process that draws from both positive psychological capacities and a highly
34 developed organizational context, which results in both greater self-awareness and self-regulated
35 positive behaviors on the part of leaders and associates, fostering positive self-development”
36 (Luthans and Avolio, 2003, p. 243). At its heart is the idea of authenticity coupled with a strong
37 set of moral and ethical principles that can help the leader navigate organizational pressures and
38 role related tensions (Gardner *et al.*, 2011). Whilst there are a few ways to operationalize AL, the
39 most common and well-established is that of Walumbwa *et al.*'s (2008) measure which includes
40 four dimensions—self-awareness, an internalized moral perspective, balanced processing of
41 information, and relational transparency (p. 94). Recent research has indicated that leader self-
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 perceptions are also relevant to understanding the potential benefits of AL on job attitudes (e.g.,
4 Černe *et al.*, 2014), and there is a small emergent stream exploring the effectiveness of AL
5
6 training interventions for leaders self-development (e.g., Baron, 2016). Thus, it is crucial to focus
7
8 on AL from the perspective of the managers who may be enacting and experiencing AL in their
9
10 day-to-day roles, and what impact such perceptions have on their own attitudes at work.
11
12
13

14
15 AL emerged from the concern that the dominant existing leadership theories and models,
16
17 such as transformational leadership (TL), were not adequately helping to develop ethically
18
19 driven, personally responsible, and socially conscious leaders, as evidenced by “chilling
20
21 examples of corporate and government malfeasance” (Gardner *et al.*, 2011, p. 1120). AL is
22
23 argued to be conceptually distinct from TL (Gardner *et al.*, 2021), yet empirically there are still
24
25 ongoing concerns that AL is not as differentiated nor as powerful at explaining follower
26
27 outcomes as TL (Banks *et al.*, 2016). TL focuses on how to meet the higher order needs of
28
29 followers and is a more established leadership construct than AL that has previously indicated
30
31 strong associations with attitudinal and performance outcomes of followers (e.g., Wang *et al.*,
32
33 2011). TL is typically captured by a number of dimensions, the most focused upon tend to be: i)
34
35 "Idealized Influence" - a leader's ability to encourage strong identification between themselves
36
37 and their followers, ii) "Inspirational Motivation" - the leader's capacity to inspire and motivate
38
39 followers through a compelling vision, iii) "Intellectual Stimulation" - the leader's role in
40
41 promoting innovative thinking and a culture of risk-taking, and iv) "Individual Consideration" -
42
43 the leader's dedication to addressing the unique needs of each follower (Banks *et al.*, 2016). This
44
45 ‘value added’ of AL is an ongoing and perennial issue at the heart of the literature on AL, and
46
47 merits further attention (Banks *et al.*, 2016). There is little theoretical explanation as to when AL
48
49 might predict these over and above TL (Cooper *et al.*, 2005). Therefore, our overarching central
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 proposition in this paper is that we theorize that AL should predict more variance in role
4 engagement and career satisfaction over and above TL for LGBT leaders compared to non-
5 LGBT leaders—and that this set of relationships is bounded by CSEs.
6
7

8 *LGBT leaders and authentic leadership (AL)*

9
10 Throughout the literature on AL is a focus and emphasis on the true self (Gardner *et al.*, 2005),
11 indicating authenticity is embedded within the concept of AL. Walumbwa *et al.* (2008) note that
12 while “there may be much more to authentic leadership than just being true to oneself” (p. 34),
13 authenticity is core to the construct of AL. Indeed, prevailing models of AL such as those
14 advanced by Gardner *et al.*, (2005) and Ilies *et al.* (2005) are “influenced heavily” by the concept
15 of authenticity (Walumbwa *et al.*, 2008, p.92) and include authentic behavior as a component.
16 Authenticity and authentic behavior are of interest to our study given the relatively greater
17 complexities that LGBT individuals might experience with each; how this operates for LGBT
18 leaders might be different than non-LGBT leaders (Ayaz *et al.*, 2023; Fine, 2017).
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 Our suggestion ties to our first research question, i.e., is AL more predictive of attitudinal
35 outcomes for LGBT managers. The small, but growing, literature on LGBT leaders suggests that
36 the answer is ‘yes’. For instance, Chang and Bowring (2017) found that while many LGBT
37 leaders they interviewed experienced some negative consequences for disclosure, the leaders also
38 felt they were well-equipped to identify injustices, advocate and speak up for followers, and
39 build relationships with followers by recognizing differences. This suggests that the experience
40 of being a sexual and/or gender identity minority might allow for advantages when it comes to
41 leading authentically—that LGBT leaders might benefit even more from AL than non-LGBT
42 leaders when it comes to role engagement and career satisfaction, above and beyond TL. We
43 theorize two interrelated reasons as to why LGBT leaders might benefit even more from AL:
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 identity management and authenticity. We consider how identity management for LGBT leaders
4
5 is related to authenticity and, hence, why AL might be more beneficial for LGBT leaders.
6
7

8 Identity management is an ongoing process that occurs every time someone with a
9
10 stigmatized identity interacts with someone, particularly those to whom they have not disclosed
11
12 their identity to (Croteau *et al.*, 2008). LGBT managers must determine on an ongoing basis
13
14 whom to disclose their hidden stigmatized identity to, when, and under what conditions (Fine,
15
16 2017). This necessarily means that authenticity, can vary across time and situations for LGBT
17
18 leaders. AL is theorized to affect role engagement and job attitudes through authenticity
19
20 (Gardner *et al.*, 2021), yet authenticity is also adaptive in that identity is evolving and the nature
21
22 of one's true self varies across time and situations based on challenges presented (Ibarra, 2015).
23
24 Since LGBT leaders must constantly adapt the self via disclosure and identity management
25
26 strategies, at least as it concerns their stigmatized identity, they may become more proficient in
27
28 understanding their self and environment, and in turn their sense of authenticity (Fine, 2017).
29
30 The literature on LGBT individuals has conceptualized authenticity as the extent to which they
31
32 are comfortable with their LGBT identity and expressing this identity in interactions with others
33
34 (Riggle *et al.*, 2014). There is evidence that being authentic to one's self, and enacting this,
35
36 within one's work role and work environment is beneficial and important for LGBT people
37
38 (Fletcher and Everly, 2021; Fletcher and Marvell, 2023).
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 Leading authentically could give LGBT leaders a sense of identity integration across life
47
48 domains, which is related to positive affective outcomes (Lindsey *et al.*, 2020). It could also
49
50 provide LGBT leaders with opportunities to develop the types of relationships with followers
51
52 that allow for higher levels of trust and disclosure (Ilies *et al.*, 2005) and thus more effective
53
54 relationships with followers (Chang and Bowring, 2017), which should relate to higher levels of
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 engagement and career satisfaction. Based on the integrating the literature on workplace
4 experiences of LGBT individuals and leaders with that of authenticity and AL, our overarching
5 proposition, which is new to the literature on AL is: AL could be particularly useful when it
6 comes to role engagement and career satisfaction for LGBT leaders above and beyond TL.
7
8
9
10
11

12
13 *H1. Authentic leadership (AL) will explain additional variance in a) role engagement and*
14 *b) career satisfaction for LGBT leaders but not for non-LGBT leaders, after controlling*
15 *for transformational leadership (TL) and core self-evaluations (CSEs).*
16
17
18

19
20 *H2. LGBT status will moderate the relationship between authentic leadership (AL) and a)*
21 *role engagement and b) career satisfaction such that the relationship is stronger for*
22 *LGBT managers than for non-LGBT managers, after controlling for transformational*
23 *leadership (TL) and core self-evaluations (CSEs) ¹.*
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 *The role of core self-evaluations (CSEs) as a boundary condition*

34
35 Our study also addresses the question - are the relationships between AL, LGBT status, and
36 attitudinal outcomes bound by CSEs? CSEs are ultimately “fundamental, bottom-line evaluations
37 that people make of themselves” (Judge, 2009, pg. 58), as such that when assessed collectively it
38 connotes a “broad, integrative trait indicated by self-esteem, locus of control, generalized self-
39 efficacy, and (low) neuroticism (high emotional stability)” (Judge, 2009, pg. 58). Research
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 ¹ This second hypothesis is in response to review team comments which suggest we should also test our H1 within a
51 combined dataset where we treat LGBT status as a binary moderator variable. We believe this is a slightly different
52 hypothesis to H1 and requires a different analytical process to how we test H1, yet has the same theoretical logic
53 underpinning it as H1. Therefore, we develop H2 as an extension to H1. We thank the review team for their
54 suggestion.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 shows that CSEs are related to a range of attitudes, such as job and life satisfaction (Chang *et al.*,
4 2012), as well as higher levels of performance in leadership roles (Hu *et al.*, 2012). We propose
5 that CSEs are especially relevant to the interaction between LGBT status and AL.
6
7

8
9
10 CSEs are an issue for LGBT individuals because of the discrimination that they face
11 across the life course including in the workplace (Pichler and Ruggs, 2018), and as leaders (Fine,
12 2017); all of which can lead to threats to self-esteem and self-concept (Bourguignon *et al.*, 2006).
13 Engaging in identity management of an LGBT identity can also be related to challenges with
14 one's self-concept (Alparsaln and Akdoğan, 2023). Research has shown that, in general, LGBT
15 individuals have lower CSEs than non-LGBT individuals (Munn and James, 2022), perhaps due
16 to minority stress (McConnell *et al.*, 2018). We accordingly propose that leading authentically,
17 is particularly valuable for LGBT leaders low in CSE; that high levels of AL are critical to
18 positive attitudinal LGBT leaders low in CSEs. This implies a three-way interaction between
19 CSEs, LGBT status, and AL as related to attitudinal outcomes. To flesh-out this proposition, we
20 develop a typology of CSEs as boundary conditions of the interaction between LGBT status and
21 AL (Figure 1).
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 -----
40
41 Insert Figure I Here
42
43 -----
44

45 Let us first consider the condition of low CSEs. We expect that the effects of AL are
46 likely to be significantly different between LGBT and non-LGBT managers at low levels of
47 CSE. This is because we predict that the relationship between AL and attitudinal outcomes to be
48 strong (and positive) for LGBT leaders low in CSEs, yet much weaker for non-LGBT leaders
49 low in CSEs. High levels of AL play a 'pivotal' role in enabling the career satisfaction and role
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 engagement for LGBT managers low in CSEs (and a more detrimental ‘triple jeopardy’ effect
4 when AL is low for these managers due to the tripartite synthesis of a stigmatized identity, low
5 AL which we argue is critically important to LGBT leaders, and low CSEs). In contrast, AL is
6 less likely to be as ‘pivotal’ at high levels and less detrimental at low levels for non-stigmatized
7 (i.e. non-LGBT) leaders low in CSEs because AL is less salient to their sense of (adaptive)
8 authenticity in their leadership role. Thus, the relative effects of low versus high AL when CSEs
9 are low are more muted for non-LGBT leaders.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 Let us next consider the condition of high CSEs. We expect that the effects of AL are
21 likely to be similar between LGBT and non-LGBT managers, yet slightly stronger for non-
22 LGBT managers, at this level of CSEs. This is because AL may have a modest positive effect for
23 both LGBT and non-LGBT managers for slightly different reasons. For LGBT managers, CSEs
24 are not a substitute for AL and as such low levels of AL will have some detrimental impact,
25 however high CSEs have a ‘synthesis’ effect for LGBT managers who enact AL as there is
26 alignment between their leadership behavior and their sense of self-esteem and confidence, thus
27 promoting generally positive effects. In contrast, for non-LGBT managers, high CSEs will have
28 a ‘resilience’ compensatory effect when AL is not enacted, thus protecting them from detriment,
29 and a boosting effect when AL is enacted due to the ‘privilege’ of having a non-stigmatized
30 identity, high levels of CSEs, and strong AL that provide an enriched source of power, social
31 capital, and resource acquisition.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 *H3. Core self-evaluations (CSEs), LGBT status, and authentic leadership (AL) will*
49 *interact together to influence a) role engagement and b) career satisfaction, after controlling for*
50 *transformational leadership (TL). To be more precise, we predict that (after controlling for TL)*
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *AL will be the most strongly associated with a) role engagement and b) life satisfaction for*
4
5 *LGBT managers who are low in CSEs.*
6
7
8
9
10

11 **Methodology**

12 *Participants and procedure*

13
14
15 A total of 485 managers (247 non-LGBT, 238 LGBT) were recruited via the Prolific platform to
16
17 complete two surveys; of which 418 (220 non-LGBT, 198 LGBT) completed both surveys; a
18
19 completion rate of 86%. Seven individuals' data were removed as they represented outliers or
20
21 inattentive responders, thus giving a final dataset of 411 individuals (218 non-LGBT and 193
22
23 LGBT managers). A total of 31% were team leaders/shift supervisors, 50% were junior or
24
25 middle managers, and 19% were senior/executive level managers. Respondents had, on average,
26
27 7 to 8 years of managerial experience ($SD = 7$ years) and managed around 10 direct reports ($SD =$
28
29 20 individuals). The majority (69%) worked in the private sector, with around half of these
30
31 working in large sized firms, i.e., more than 250 employees. The majority were white (88%) and
32
33 the average age was 37 years ($SD = 10$ years). Around 40% were cisgender males, although the
34
35 LGBT sample also had some representation of transgender identities (9% of LGBT sample, 0%
36
37 in non-LGBT sample). All of the non-LGBT managers were heterosexual, whereas the LGBT
38
39 sample represented a range of other non-heterosexual identities: 39% homosexual (i.e., gay or
40
41 lesbian), 52% bisexual, and 9% other sexualities, such as pansexual and asexual.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 There were no statistically significant differences between non-LGBT and LGBT
51
52 managers in terms of proportions across managerial levels, years of managerial experience,
53
54 number of direct reports, proportions across different sectors/sizes of firms, and proportions of
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 white/non-white racial identities. The main differences were in terms of sexual orientation (i.e.,
4 100% heterosexual for non-LGBT sample versus 0% heterosexual for LGBT sample),
5 representation of gender identities (i.e., 39% cisgender male, 61% cisgender female, 0%
6 transgender for non-LGBT versus 40% cisgender male, 51% cisgender female, 9% transgender
7 for LGBT sample), and age – where non-LGBT respondents were slightly older than LGBT
8 respondents on average, although the difference is not particularly meaningful ($M = 38$ years, SD
9 = 11 years versus $M = 36$ years, $SD = 10$ years).

10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 *Measures*

22 The first survey, at time 1 ($t1$), assessed self-reported leadership behavior and personal,
23 employment and demographic information: the second, one month later at time 2 ($t2$), captured
24 role engagement and career satisfaction.

25
26
27
28
29
30 *CSEs (t1)*. We used the six positive valence items from Judge *et al.*'s (2003) CSEs
31 measure, e.g., 'When I try, I generally succeed'. Inter-item reliability was good ($\alpha = .82$ non-
32 LGBT; $\alpha = .82$ LGBT).

33
34
35
36
37
38 *TL (t1)*. The seven-item short measure by Carless *et al.* (2000) was used, e.g. 'I
39 communicate a clear and positive vision of the future'. Inter-item reliability was good ($\alpha = .85$
40 non-LGBT; $\alpha = .81$ LGBT).

41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
AL (t1). The 14-item measure by Levesque-Côté *et al.* (2018) was used to capture its four
dimensions: balanced processing (e.g., 'I carefully listen to alternative perspectives before
reaching a conclusion'), moral perspective (e.g. 'I make decisions based on a rigorous ethical
code'), relational transparency (e.g., 'I express my ideas and thoughts clearly to others'), and
self-awareness (e.g., 'I describe precisely how others view my abilities'). Inter-item reliability

1
2
3 was good ($\alpha = .80$ non-LGBT; $\alpha = .81$ LGBT). Given AL as a higher-order latent construct
4 comprising of four subdimensions, we tested a higher order factor structure (i.e., where
5 dimensions are separated but load onto a common latent factor) and found the configural model
6 was an adequate fit and a slightly better fit than the first order version (i.e., where dimensions are
7 separated, yet correlated): $\Delta\chi^2(4) = 24.36$, $p < .001$; $\chi^2(146) = 248.42$, $p < .001$; $\chi^2 / df = 1.70$,
8 CFI = .90; RMSEA = .06; SRMR = .06. The metric model was not significantly different, thus
9 confirming the higher order factor structure was similar across LGBT and non-LGBT managers:
10 $\Delta\chi^2(13) = 7.27$, $p = .888$. Therefore, we calculated the score for AL as the mean score of the four
11 dimensions, which was found to be reliable ($\alpha = .74$ non-LGBT; $\alpha = .74$ LGBT).
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 *Role engagement (t2)*. Six items were used to assess emotional, cognitive, and physical
25 engagement with one's managerial role. Items were adapted from Rich *et al.*'s (2010) job
26 engagement scale, e.g., 'I am enthusiastic when carrying out my management role'. Inter-item
27 reliability was strong ($\alpha = .92$ non-LGBT; $\alpha = .91$ LGBT).
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 *Career satisfaction (t2)*. The five-item scale by Greenhaus *et al.* (1990) was used, e.g., 'I
35 am satisfied with the progress I have made toward meeting my goals for the development of new
36 skills'. Inter-item reliability was strong ($\alpha = .93$ non-LGBT; $\alpha = .95$ LGBT).
37
38
39
40
41

42 *Measurement models*

43
44 To verify that the study constructs were distinct and equivalent across non-LGBT and LGBT
45 managers, we ran a multigroup confirmatory factor analysis delineating the five constructs
46 (CSEs, TL, AL, role engagement, career satisfaction). To maintain parsimony and power, we
47 represented AL as its four constituent dimensions. The configural model was an acceptable fit of
48 the data: $\chi^2(680) = 1263.18$, $p < .001$; $\chi^2 / df = 1.86$, CFI = .91; RMSEA = .06; SRMR = .06. The
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

metric model was not significantly different than the configural model, thus confirming the factor structure was similar across LGBT and non-LGBT managers: $\Delta\chi^2(23) = 30.39, p = .138$.

We compared the five factor configural model with two alternatives; both showed poorer fitting solutions: i) where AL and TL were combined (four factors): $\Delta\chi^2(8) = 53.51, p < .001; \chi^2(688) = 1316.69, p < .001; \chi^2 / df = 1.91, CFI = .90; RMSEA = .07; SRMR = .06$; and ii) where role engagement and career satisfaction were combined (four factors): $\Delta\chi^2(8) = 1304.31, p < .001; \chi^2(688) = 2567.49, p < .001; \chi^2 / df = 3.73, CFI = .71; RMSEA = .12; SRMR = .13$.

Results

Table I shows the means, standard deviations, mean difference tests, and correlations of the study variables for LGBT and non-LGBT managers.

[INSERT TABLE I HERE]

Table II shows the multiple regression analyses for each of the *t2* dependent variables and for each sample. Since all results are reported in tables and for sake of parsimony, we only describe results relevant to our hypotheses, i.e., after controlling for CSEs in step 1 and additionally TL in step 2. In the final step (step 3), AL explains significant additional variance (to step 2) and is positively related to role engagement ($B = .33, p = .010; \Delta r^2 = .03$) and career satisfaction ($B = .56, p = .008; \Delta r^2 = .03$) for LGBT managers. In contrast, no significant change in explained variance (compared to step 2), nor any significant effect of AL, is found for these outcomes within the non-LGBT sample: role engagement ($B = .12, p = .345; \Delta r^2 = .00$), career satisfaction ($B = .03, p = .849; \Delta r^2 = .00$). Overall, hypothesis *H1* was supported, i.e., AL explains more variability in role engagement and career satisfaction for LGBT leaders as compared to non-LGBT leaders (after controlling for CSEs in step 1 and TL in step 2).

[INSERT TABLE II HERE]

Table III shows the combined multiple regression analyses for the full dataset ($n = 411$) when predicting role engagement and career satisfaction. Again, we focus on the results pertaining to our hypotheses, i.e., after controlling for TL, LGBT status, CSEs, and AL in step 1. As hypothesized by *H2* the interaction between LGBT status and AL (as detailed in step 2 results) is positive and significant for career satisfaction ($B = .29, p = .013$), yet it is not significant for role engagement ($B = .14, p = .083$), thus providing partial support for *H2*. We probe the significant interaction between LGBT status and AL on career satisfaction using simple slope analyses (Dawson, 2014). These reveal that the positive relationship between AL and career satisfaction is significant for LGBT managers ($z = .31, p < .001$) but not for non-LGBT managers ($z = .02, p > .05$), as predicted by *H2*.

The three-way interaction between AL, LGBT status, and core-self evaluations (as detailed in step 3 results) is negative and significant, and explains one percent additional variance, for both role engagement ($B = -.13, p = .047$) and career satisfaction ($B = -.19, p = .047$), thus providing support for hypothesis *H3*. To better understand these interactions we again conducted simple slope tests. The relationship between AL and role engagement is significant (and positive) for LGBT managers low in CSEs ($z = .21, p = .002$) but not for non-LGBT managers low in CSEs ($z = -.04, p > .05$). The difference between LGBT and non-LGBT managers low in CSEs is significant (slope difference = $.25, p < .006$). In contrast, the relationship between AL and role engagement is not significant (despite being positive) for LGBT managers high in CSEs ($z = .14, p > .05$) nor for non-LGBT managers high in CSEs ($z = .16, p > .05$), and the difference between these slopes is not significant (slope difference = $-.02, p > .05$). Similarly, the relationship between AL and career satisfaction is significant (and

1
2
3 positive) for LGBT managers low in CSEs ($z = .35, p < .001$) but not for non-LGBT managers
4 low in CSEs ($z = -.10, p > .05$), and this difference is significant (slope difference = $.45, p =$
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

.001). In contrast, the relationship between AL and career satisfaction is not significant (despite being positive) for LGBT managers high in CSEs ($z = .19, p > .05$) nor for non-LGBT managers high in CSEs ($z = .13, p > .05$), and the difference between these slopes is not significant (slope difference = $.06, p > .05$). Overall, these findings provide support for the ‘pivotal’ role of high AL for LGBT managers low in CSEs (after controlling for TL).

[INSERT TABLE III HERE]

Discussion

Theory suggests that AL should be related to leader’s role engagement and job attitudes (Gardner *et al.*, 2005). Empirical findings, however, tend to neglect how AL may impact the leader themselves and there are inconsistencies as to whether AL is discriminant from or adds unique validity over and above TL (Banks *et al.*, 2016). AL theory and research on LGBT workers suggests that LGBT leaders might be especially likely to benefit from leading in an authentic way (Fletcher and Everly, 2021). Based on a synthesis of the literatures on AL and LGBT workers, we developed a novel theoretical proposition: That one reason for inconsistent findings in the AL literature might have to do with leaders having a stigmatized identity. We fleshed-out this proposition by developing a new typology of relationships between AL, core-self evaluations, LGBT status as they relate to differences in attitudinal outcomes between LGBT and non-LGBT leaders (see Figure I). We addressed our proposition and the relationships implied by our typology by developing three hypotheses.

1
2
3 To test these hypotheses, we carried out a time-lagged survey of 193 LGBT and 218 non-
4
5 LGBT managers. We find that self-reported AL is positively related to one's career satisfaction
6
7 and the engagement with one's managerial role, and adds incremental validity beyond TL, for
8
9 LGBT managers but not for non-LGBT managers. In total, we address the discriminant validity
10
11 of AL and offer a better understanding of the extent to which leading authentically is related to
12
13 these outcomes for LGBT vs. non-LGBT managers. We also test LGBT status as a moderator of
14
15 the relationship between AL and attitudinal outcomes and find that LGBT status moderated the
16
17 relationship between AL and career satisfaction (but not role engagement). Finally, we tested
18
19 whether CSEs bound interactions between LGBT status and AL, significant three-way
20
21 interactions were found for both career satisfaction and role engagement that were in-line with
22
23 our typology, specifically the 'pivotal' role of AL for LGBT managers low in CSEs.
24
25
26
27
28

29 *Implications for theory and future research*

30
31 Our study presents a substantive opportunity for future research and theory development about
32
33 AL; a need to consider how AL relates to outcomes differently for managers with stigmatized
34
35 identities—and how these differences are conditional on individual differences such as CSEs.
36
37 Our foremost contribution is related to our first research question: Is AL more predictive of
38
39 attitudinal outcomes for LGBT managers? To provide an explanation as to why the relationship
40
41 between AL and job attitudes will be different between managers with and without stigmatized
42
43 identities based on sexual orientation and gender identity. The limited empirical research
44
45 suggests that authenticity is especially important for LGBT workers (e.g., Fletcher and Everly,
46
47 2021). We argued that since LGBT leaders must constantly adapt the self, as it concerns their
48
49 stigmatized identity, they may become more proficient in understanding their self and
50
51 environment, which can assist them in leading authentically and is psychologically beneficial
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 (Fine, 2017; Ibarra, 2015). Our exploratory study is the first to propose and test distinctions
4 between LGBT and non-LGBT leaders in AL outcomes. It is important for future research to
5 probe some of the reasons as to why LGBT leaders might benefit more from AL.
6
7

8
9
10 We also offer an explanation as to why empirical findings are inconsistent as to the
11 relationship between AL as related to job attitudes for managers. We propose that differences
12 between subpopulations in stigmatized identity based on sexual orientation and gender identity
13 are partly related to the inconsistency of findings in the empirical literature. This is important to
14 AL theory and research because the distinctions between and discriminant validity of
15 transformational and AL has been a perennial concern (Banks *et al.*, 2016). Contextualizing AL
16 within a social group in this way is important for advancing knowledge about AL (Liu *et al.*,
17 2015) and so future research should provide further comparisons with other hidden, stigmatized
18 identities that must be confronted in similar ways to LGBT leaders (Ayaz *et al.*, 2023).
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 Additionally, we developed a typology of relationships between AL, core-self
33 evaluations, LGBT status as they relate to differences in attitudinal outcomes between LGBT and
34 non-LGBT leaders (see Figure I). This was related to our second research question: Are the
35 relationships between AL, LGBT status, and attitudinal outcomes bound by CSEs? We proposed
36 that CSEs are especially relevant to the interaction between LGBT status and AL due to the
37 threats to CSEs that LGBT leaders face due to their stigmatized identity. Although we found
38 broad support for our typology, i.e., that the difference in the relationship between AL and
39 outcomes between LGBT and non-LGBT managers will much greater (and significant) at low
40 levels of CSEs than at high levels of CSEs, as well as the specific 'pivotal' role of AL for LGBT
41 managers low in CSEs, some of the other specific aspects of the typology were more equivocally
42 supported. Therefore, it is important that future research more fully test each of the propositions
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 embedded in the typology by measuring additional job attitudes, performance or leadership
4 effectiveness outcomes. Our typology can serve as a guide in exploring distinctions between
5
6 LGBT and non-LGBT leaders.
7
8

9 10 11 *Limitations* 12

13 One of the limitations of our study is that all data are self-reported by managers themselves. We
14 worked to minimize common method bias by collecting data over-time with measures of our
15 independent and dependent variables separated in time. Given our intention was to examine
16 relationships between leadership behaviors with role engagement and career satisfaction,
17 manager's own understanding of their leadership behaviors might be the best predictor of their
18 engagement and satisfaction. With that said, future research should consider using reports of
19 leader behaviors from subordinates to further validate the findings of our study. Given the
20 exploratory nature of our study, we did not hypothesize differences between minority identities.
21 It could be the case that AL relates to role engagement and career satisfaction differently for gay
22 men compared to transgender men, for instance. Upon an anonymous reviewer's request we
23 explored potential differences across sexual and gender identity subgroups in relation to our
24 study variables, using ANOVA and bonferroni corrected post-hc tests. Whilst we did find
25 significant variation for most of the study variables, it was only transgender and non-binary
26 individuals that were comparatively different from other subgroups in CSEs and career
27 satisfaction. Given they represent a very small number and proportion (4%) of the overall dataset
28 it would be inappropriate to make generalizable conclusions based on this analysis. Therefore
29 future research should try to tease apart potential differences among the experiences of LGBT
30 leaders, particularly focusing on transgender/non-binary versus cisgender counterparts.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 55 56 *Practical implications* 57 58 59 60

1
2
3 Our findings offer an important practical contribution: LGBT leaders should be aware of and
4 trained in AL. Leadership development programmes, particularly those oriented towards LGBT
5 individuals, could include activities that highlight and strengthen one's identity and the positive
6 aspects of diversity within the organization (Baron, 2016). These programmes could focus on AL
7 and how to balance the need for authenticity with the need to enact a role performance (Ibarra,
8 2015), which could be particularly important for LGBT individuals early on in their managerial
9 careers, who may struggle with managing their identity at work. Role plays, active self/group
10 reflection, and coaching could build key competencies needed for AL, such as self-awareness,
11 decision-making skills, and interpersonal communication. Moreover, creating awareness
12 amongst non-LGBT managers about specific challenges that their LGBT counterparts face and
13 the support they can offer to facilitate the AL of their LGBT peers may be useful. By
14 encouraging LGBT managers and others with stigmatized identities to fulfil their leadership
15 potential via AL, organizations can enhance both employee performance and employee health
16 (Hildenbrand *et al.*, 2021). However, it is critical that such strategies are designed to empower,
17 rather than exploit, managers from minoritized groups for AL to add value (Fine, 2017).
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 **References**

- 42
43
44 Alparslan, K. and Akdoğan, N. (2023), "The role of identification and identity management
45 strategies in protecting self-esteem", *Current Psychology*, Vol. 42 No. 33, pp.29337-29348.
46
47
48
49 Ayaz, O., Ozbilgin, M. F., Samdanis, M., and Torunoglu, D. (2023), "Authenticity and
50 atypicality in leadership: Can an atypical leader afford to be authentic?", *International*
51
52
53
54 *Journal of Management Reviews*, online first publication. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12355>
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Banks, G.C., McCauley, K.D., Gardner, W.L. and Guler, C.E. (2016), “A meta-analytic review
4 of authentic and transformational leadership: A test for redundancy”, *The Leadership*
5
6
7
8 *Quarterly*, Vol. 27 No. 4, pp.634-652.
9
- 10 Baron, L. (2016), “Authentic leadership and mindfulness development through action learning”,
11
12
13 *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, Vol. 31 No. 1, pp. 296-311.
14
- 15 Bourguignon, D., Seron, E., Yzerbyt, V., and Herman, G. (2006), “Perceived group and personal
16 discrimination: Differential effects on personal self-esteem”, *European Journal of Social*
17
18
19
20
21 *Psychology*, Vol. 36 No. 5, pp. 773-789.
22
- 23 Carless, S. A., Wearing, A. J. and Mann, L. (2000), “A short measure of transformational
24 leadership”, *Journal of Business and Psychology*, Vol. 14 No. 3, pp. 389-405.
25
26
27
- 28 Černe, M., Dimovski, V., Marič, M., Penger, S. and Škerlavaj, M. (2014), “Congruence of leader
29 self-perceptions and follower perceptions of authentic leadership: Understanding what
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Chang, J. and Bowring, M. A. (2017), “The perceived impact of sexual orientation on the ability
of queer leaders to relate to followers”, *Leadership*, Vol. 13 No. 3, pp. 285-300.
- Chang, C. H., Ferris, D. L., Johnson, R. E., Rosen, C. C. and Tan, J. A. (2012), “Core self-
evaluations: A review and evaluation of the literature”, *Journal of Management*, Vol. 38
No.1, pp. 81-128

- 1
2
3 Cooper, C. D., Scandura, T. A. and Schriesheim, C. A. (2005), “Looking forward but learning
4 from our past: Potential challenges to developing authentic leadership theory and authentic
5 leaders”, *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 16 No. 3, pp. 475-493.
6
7
8
9
10
11 Croteau, J. M., Anderson, M. Z. and VanderWal, B. L. (2008), “Models of workplace sexual
12 identity disclosure and management: Reviewing and extending concepts”, *Group &*
13 *Organization Management*, Vol. 33 No. 5, pp. 532-565.
14
15
16
17
18 Dawson, J.F., (2014), “Moderation in management research: What, why, when, and how”,
19 *Journal of Business and Psychology*, Vol. 29 No. 1, pp.1-19.
20
21
22
23
24 Fine, L. E. (2017), “Gender and sexual minorities’ practice and embodiment of authentic
25 leadership: Challenges and opportunities”, *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, Vol.
26 19 No. 4, pp. 378-392.
27
28
29
30
31 Fletcher, L. and Everly, B. A. (2021), “Perceived lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT)
32 supportive practices and the life satisfaction of LGBT employees: The roles of disclosure,
33 authenticity at work, and identity centrality”, *Journal of Occupational and Organizational*
34 *Psychology*, Vol. 94 No. 3, pp. 485-508.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41 Fletcher, L. and Marvell, R. (2023), “Furthering transgender inclusion in the workplace:
42 advancing a new model of allyship intentions and perceptions”, *The International Journal of*
43 *Human Resource Management*, Vol. 34 No. 9, pp. 1726-1756.
44
45
46
47
48
49 Gardner, W. L., Avolio, B. J., Luthans, F., May, D. R. and Walumbwa, F. (2005), ““Can you see
50 the real me?” A self-based model of authentic leader and follower development”, *The*
51 *leadership quarterly*, Vol. 16 No. 3, pp. 343-372.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Gardner, W. L., Cogliser, C. C., Davis, K. M. and Dickens, M. P. (2011), “Authentic leadership:
4
5 A review of the literature and research agenda”, *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 22 No. 6,
6
7 pp. 1120-1145.
8
9
10
11 Gardner, W.L., Karam, E.P., Alvesson, M. and Einola, K. (2021), “Authentic leadership theory:
12
13 The case for and against”, *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 32 No. 6, p.101495.
14
15
16 Greenhaus, J. H., Parasuraman, S. and Wormley, W. M. (1990), “Effects of race on
17
18 organizational experiences, job performance evaluations, and career outcomes”, *Academy of*
19
20 *Management Journal*, Vol. 33 No. 1, pp. 64-86.
21
22
23 Hildenbrand, K., Daher, P. and Akaighe, G. (2021), “Authentic leadership and employee health:
24
25 a conditional process model”, *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, Vol. 36 No. 3, pp. 241-
26
27 257.
28
29
30
31 Hu, J., Wang, Z., Liden, R. C., and Sun, J. (2012), “The influence of leader core self-evaluation
32
33 on follower reports of transformational leadership”, *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 23 No.
34
35 5, pp. 860-868.
36
37
38
39 Ibarra, H. (2015), “The authenticity paradox”, *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 93 No. 1/2, pp.
40
41 53-59.
42
43
44 Ilies, R., Morgeson, F. P. and Nahrgang, J. D. (2005), “Authentic leadership and eudaemonic
45
46 well-being: Understanding leader–follower outcomes”, *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 16
47
48 No. 3, pp. 373-394.
49
50
51 Judge, T.A. (2009), “Core self-evaluations and work success”, *Current Directions in*
52
53 *Psychological Science*, Vol. 18 No. 1, pp.58-62.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Judge, T. A., Erez, A., Bono, J. E. and Thoresen, C. J. (2003), “The core self-evaluations scale:
4 Development of a measure”, *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 56 No. 2, pp. 303-331.
5
6
7
8 Levesque-Côté, J., Fernet, C., Austin, S. and Morin, A. J. (2018), “New wine in a new bottle:
9 Refining the assessment of authentic leadership using exploratory structural equation
10 modeling (ESEM)”, *Journal of Business and Psychology*, Vol. 33 No. 5, pp. 611-628.
11
12
13
14 Lindsey, A., King, E., Gilmer, D., Sabat, I. and Ahmad, A. (2020), “The benefits of identity
15 integration across life domains”, *Journal of Homosexuality*, Vol. 67 No.8, pp. 1164-1172.
16
17
18
19
20 Liu, H., Cutcher, L. and Grant, D. (2015), “Doing authenticity: The gendered construction of
21 authentic leadership”, *Gender, Work & Organization*, Vol. 22 No. 3, pp. 237-255.
22
23
24
25
26 Luthans, F. and Avolio, B. J. (2003), “Authentic leadership: A positive developmental
27 approach”, Cameron, K. S., Dutton, J. E. and Quinn, R. E. (Eds.), *Positive Organizational
28 Scholarship*, Barrett-Koehler, San Francisco, CA, pp. 241–261.
29
30
31
32
33 McConnell, E. A., Janulis, P., Phillips II, G., Truong, R., and Birkett, M. (2018), “Multiple
34 minority stress and LGBT community resilience among sexual minority men”, *Psychology
35 of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity*, Vol. 5 No. 1, pp. 1-12.
36
37
38
39
40
41 Munn, M. and James, D. (2022), “Internalized homophobia and suicide ideation among sexual
42 minority adults: the serial mediation of core self-evaluations and depression”, *Archives of
43 Sexual Behavior*, Vol. 51 No. 7, pp. 3417-3430.
44
45
46
47
48
49 Pichler, S. and Ruggs, E. N. (2018), “LGBT workers”, Colella, A. J. and King, E. B. (Eds.) *The
50 Oxford Handbook of Workplace Discrimination*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 177–
51
52
53
54 195.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Rich, B. L., Lepine, J. A. and Crawford, E. R. (2010), "Job engagement: Antecedents and effects
4 on job performance", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 53 No. 3, pp. 617-635.
5
6
7
8 Riggle, E. D., Mohr, J. J., Rostosky, S. S., Fingerhut, A. W. and Balsam, K. F. (2014), "A
9 multifactor lesbian, gay, and bisexual positive identity measure (LGB-PIM)", *Psychology of*
10
11 *Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity*, Vol. 1 No. 4, pp. 398-411.
12
13
14
15
16 Shuck, B., Kim, W. and Fletcher, L. (2021), "Engagement at 30: a retrospective and look
17 forward through an international cross-cultural context", *Human Resource Development*
18
19 *International*, Vol. 24 No. 5, pp.465-467.
20
21
22
23 Walumbwa, F. O., Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Wernsing, T. S. and Peterson, S. J. (2008),
24
25 "Authentic leadership: Development and validation of a theory-based measure", *Journal of*
26
27 *Management*, Vol. 34 No. 1, pp. 89-126.
28
29
30
31 Wang, G., Oh, I.S., Courtright, S.H. and Colbert, A.E. (2011), "Transformational leadership and
32 performance across criteria and levels: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of research",
33
34 *Group & Organization Management*, Vol. 36 No. 2, pp.223-270.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table I. Descriptive statistics for LGBT and non-LGBT managers

Study Variable	LGBT managers	Non-LGBT managers	Mean Difference (2-tailed)	Correlations				
	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>t</i>	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
1. Core Self Evaluations (CSEs)	5.30 (0.88)	5.48 (0.75)	2.18*	-	.41***	.36***	.39***	.54***
2. Transformational Leadership (TL)	5.98 (0.56)	5.94 (0.60)	0.72	.30***	-	.65***	.36***	.12
3. Authentic Leadership (AL)	5.55 (0.54)	5.54 (0.53)	0.14	.23**	.64***	-	.30***	.14*
4. Role Engagement	5.67 (0.82)	5.70 (0.85)	0.41	.25***	.40***	.39***	-	.40***
5. Career Satisfaction	4.74 (1.37)	5.08 (1.22)	2.66**	.47***	.17*	.26***	.37***	-

Note: n = 193 LGBT managers, 218 non-LGBT managers. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$. Correlations below diagonal are for LGBT managers and above diagonal are for non-LGBT managers

Table II. The additional variance explained by authentic leadership (AL); testing hypothesis H1

Step in Regression	Predicting role engagement				Predicting career satisfaction			
	LGBT Managers (n = 193)		Non-LGBT Managers (n = 218)		LGBT Managers (n = 193)		Non-LGBT Managers (n = 218)	
	B (SE)	p value	B (SE)	p value	B (SE)	p value	B (SE)	p value
Step 1								
Core Self Evaluations (CSEs)	.24 (.07)	<.001	.44 (.07)	<.001	.73 (.10)	<.001	.88 (.09)	<.001
R ²	.06		.15		.22		.29	
ΔR ²	.06		.15		.22		.29	
Step 2								
Transformational Leadership (TL)	.53 (.10)	<.001	.33 (.10)	<.001	.09 (.16)	.566	-.25 (.13)	.054
R ²	.18		.20		.22		.31	
ΔR ²	.12		.05		.00		.01	
Step 3								
Authentic Leadership (AL)	.33 (.13)	.010	.12 (.13)	.345	.56 (.21)	.008	.03 (.18)	.849
R ²	.21		.20		.25		.31	
ΔR ²	.03		.00		.03		.00	

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Table III. Examining interactions between LGBT status, authentic leadership (AL), and core self evaluations (CSEs); testing hypotheses H2 and H3

Step in Regression	Predicting role engagement		Predicting career satisfaction	
	<i>B (SE)</i>	<i>p value</i>	<i>B (SE)</i>	<i>p value</i>
Step 1				
Transformational Leadership (TL)	.17 (.05)	<.001	-.15 (.07)	.049
LGBT status (0-non LGBT, 1-LGBT)	-.01 (.08)	.879	-.19 (.11)	.088
Core Self Evaluations (CSEs)	.17 (.04)	<.001	.66 (.06)	<.001
Authentic Leadership (AL)	.13 (.05)	.010	.16 (.07)	.025
R ²	.20		.28	
Δ R ²	.20		.28	
Step 2				
LGBT status x CSEs	-.16 (.08)	.050	-.21 (.12)	.077
LGBT status x AL	.14 (.08)	.083	.29 (.12)	.013
CSE x AL	.03 (.03)	.387	.01 (.05)	.843
R ²	.21		.29	
Δ R ²	.01		.01	
Step 3				
LGBT status x CSEs x AL	-.13 (.07)	.047	-.19 (.10)	.047
R ²	.22		.30	
Δ R ²	.01		.01	

Note: $n = 411$. All continuous variables are mean-centred due to including interactions.

Figure I. Typology – Core self-evaluations (CSEs) as boundary conditions of the interaction between LGBT status and authentic leadership (AL), controlling for transformational leadership (TL)

Predicting Attitudinal Outcomes for Leaders (Role Engagement and Career Satisfaction)		
<i>At Low Levels of CSEs</i>	<i>LGBT Leaders</i>	<i>Non-LGBT Leaders</i>
<i>Low Authentic Leadership</i>	Triple Jeopardy: Low reported levels of Attitudinal Outcomes	Resource Double Bind: Low to moderate reported levels of Attitudinal Outcomes
<i>High Authentic Leadership</i>	Pivotal: High reported levels of Attitudinal Outcomes	Replacement Effect: Moderate reported levels of Attitudinal Outcomes
<i>Strength of relationship between AL and outcomes</i>	Move from triple jeopardy (low) to pivotal (high)– strong positive relationship	Move from resource double bind (low to moderate) to replacement effect (moderate) – weak positive relationship
<hr/>		
<i>At High Levels of CSEs</i>	<i>LGBT Leaders</i>	<i>Non-LGBT Leaders</i>
<i>Low Authentic Leadership</i>	No Substitute: Low to moderate reported levels of Attitudinal Outcomes	Resilience: Moderate reported levels of Attitudinal Outcomes
<i>High Authentic Leadership</i>	Synthesis: Moderate reported levels of Attitudinal Outcomes	Privilege: High reported levels of Attitudinal Outcomes
<i>Strength of relationship between AL and outcomes</i>	Move from no substitute (low to moderate) to synthesis (moderate): Weak positive relationship	Move from resilience (moderate) to privilege (high): Moderate positive relationship