
IMPACT OF AGE, TENURE, SENIORITY, FAITH, AND GENDER ON AUTHENTIC AND CREDIBLE LEADERSHIP

Christine Namenya Egessa

PhD Student, Graduate School, Pan Africa Christian University

Email: cegessa@gmail.com

Publication Date: May 2026

ABSTRACT

Purpose of the Study: The purpose of this study was to determine the impact of age, tenure, seniority, faith, and gender on authentic and credible leadership in a fintech company in Nairobi, Kenya.

Methodology: The study employed a quantitative methodology and survey design. A simple random sample was used to select participants from a Kenya-based fintech company in Nairobi. Using a self-administered questionnaire, the Authentic Leadership Questionnaire (ALQ) developed by Walumbwa et al. (2008) data were collected from 58 respondents and analyzed using SPSS. Descriptive statistics as well as inferential statistics including chi-square tests were carried out.

Findings: The analysed results revealed a statistically significant association between faith and authenticity ($X^2 = 34.644$, $p = 0.000$), between tenure and authenticity ($X^2 = 28.175$, $p = 0.016$), and between seniority and authenticity ($X^2 = 23.195$, $p = 0.026$). No significant association was found between age and authenticity ($X^2 = 8.32$, $p = 0.081$), or between gender and authenticity ($X^2 = 3.559$, $p = 0.169$). Among the four components of authentic leadership, participants ranked the internalized moral perspective as the most important, recording the highest aggregate mean ($M = 4.29$, $SD = 0.54$).

Conclusion: The study concludes that faith, tenure, and seniority are significantly associated with authentic and credible leadership, while age and gender are not. Internalized moral perspective emerged as the highest-rated dimension of authentic leadership, indicating that leaders' alignment of personal values with action is the most critically perceived component of authenticity in the Kenyan fintech organizational context.

Recommendation: Organizations in the fintech industry and similar sectors in Kenya should invest in leadership development programs that strengthen internalized moral perspective, particularly for leaders across varying tenure and seniority levels, given the demonstrated relationship between these variables and authentic leadership.

Keywords: *Authenticity, Credibility, Authentic Leadership, Credible Leadership, Leadership.*

INTRODUCTION

In the twenty-first century, extraordinary leadership challenges persist to the extent that scholars and practitioners agree that conventional leadership styles are ineffective in modern businesses (Armstrong & Armstrong, 2021; Burnes, 2017; Dessler, 2015; Kouzes & Posner, 2011; Northouse, 2019). As time progresses, the current organization faces more challenges, such as a multigenerational workforce, an increase in human capital competitiveness accompanied by a heightened level of awareness, as well as the volatility and uncertainty caused by unanticipated events and ever-changing consumer demands (Armstrong & Armstrong, 2021). Kouzes and Posner (2011) argue that leaders should always be willing to adopt a mindset of a learner because extraordinary events necessitate equally extraordinary shifts in approach across the board, including leadership. It is more important than ever for businesses to provide a psychological sanctuary where employees can retreat whenever the need arises (Yukl, 2013). This new leadership reality necessitates leaders who are defined not by their job titles or a single approach to problem solving, but by the qualities they bring to their work, such as emotional intelligence, putting others ahead of oneself, appreciating the value of life, ethics, and a concern for the common good (Drucker, 2015; Goleman et al., 2013). Such leaders, according to George (2003), are those who go beyond the bottom line these are the leaders who can be said to be applying the tenets of authenticity and credibility (Walumbwa et al., 2008; Kouzes & Posner, 2011).

Examining leadership in the context of diversity is crucial for understanding what constitutes authentic and credible leadership. According to Jones (2000), as cited in Burnes (2017), diversity is defined as distinctions among people based on demographics, economic status, and abilities. Current leadership research has often been skewed to focus on western organizations, and adding diversity to the research would help practitioners contextualize leadership more effectively (Burnes, 2017). Demographic data has been used to investigate the concept of leadership on occasion. According to Mullins (2015), gender differences in leadership have continued to pique research interest, particularly when it comes to preferred leadership styles, with men favoring more agentic transactional leadership styles and women favouring more accommodative transformational styles.

Concepts such as age have also proven to be intriguing, for example, presented arguments on crystallized cognitive ability, which is believed to be acquired over time and is linked to age

(Northouse, 2019). Experience closely related to tenure has also been studied, revealing a significant relationship between the type of leadership that can be applied whether directive leadership for less experienced employees or supportive leadership for more experienced employees as they require less structure (Boatwright, 2002, as cited in Northouse, 2019). Finally, faith, also known as religion or spirituality, can influence a leader's personal philosophy (Yukl, 2013). This study aims to use demographic data, including age, gender, seniority, tenure, and faith, to determine how these variables affect authenticity.

GENERAL RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The study sought to understand the values and characteristics that are perceived to represent authentic and credible leadership, as well as to determine the impact of different demographics on authenticity. The following specific objectives guided the study:

- i. Evaluate the impact of age, gender, tenure, seniority, and faith on authentic leadership in a specific organization.
- ii. Examine existing literature on credibility and authentic leadership as it relates to the ALQ.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This study undertook to answer the following questions:

- i. What effects do age, faith, gender, tenure, and seniority have on authenticity?
- ii. How do authenticity and credibility influence current leadership practice improvement?

LITERATURE REVIEW

History of Authentic and Credible Leadership

The concept of leadership has evolved over time to encompass methods that seek to promote positive behaviors such as compassion, mutual respect, and employee engagement (Northouse, 2019). These behavioral approaches to leadership, under which authentic and credible leadership fall, have been linked to positive psychological approaches that seek to view employees as more than just a means to a competitive advantage and instead focus on building mutually beneficial relationships (Gardner, 2009; Northouse, 2019; Walumbwa et al., 2008; Yukl, 2013). Scholars

appear to have found an inextricable link between credibility and authenticity, as certain dimensions such as moral perspective to leadership, relational engagement, understanding oneself through self-discovery and self-awareness, as well as appreciation of diversity seem to cut across the two constructs (Kouzes & Posner, 2011; Walumbwa et al., 2008). Notably, it is now becoming apparent that leadership potential can be innate, but it must be nurtured and developed (George, 2003). Both authentic and credible leadership support the idea of continuous learning and adaptability to accommodate the extremely fluid nature of the organization (Kouzes & Posner, 2011; Yukl, 2013).

Credibility

According to Kouzes and Posner (2011), credible leaders are praised for their honesty, foresight, inspiration, and competence, as well as their ability to align their words and actions. While Kouzes and Posner (2011) argue that followers place leaders on a pedestal and constantly test them to see if they keep their promises, Yukl (2013) argues that leaders lose legitimacy when their lies or grossly exaggerated claims are discovered. According to both Baldoni (2008) and Kouzes and Posner (2011), a leader's credibility is critical for gaining and maintaining subordinate support as well as influencing them. The six pillars of credible leadership are "discovering oneself," "appreciating one's constituents," "affirming shared values," "developing one's abilities," "serving a higher purpose," and "sustaining hope" (Kouzes & Posner, 2011, p. 262).

Authenticity

Authenticity is "the ownership of an individual's personal experiences in the form of emotions, processes, thoughts, preferences, beliefs, and needs that are guided by self-awareness and being one's true self" (Linley et al., 2012). Avolio et al. (2004) aver that authentic leaders are self-aware in the sense that they know their own values and strengths as well as those of the people around them. To be authentic, one must take charge of one's life and act in ways that are consistent with one's most held ideals. According to Avolio and Luthans (2006) and George (2003), becoming authentic is a lifelong journey. Although still evolving conceptually, the concept of authenticity incorporates philosophy substantially (Harter, 2002) and psychological research (Rogers, 1963). According to Kernis and Goldman (2006), modern psychological theory interpretations of authenticity have a lot in common with philosophical writings, in which authenticity is firmly

rooted in movements such as humanism or phenomenology as well as topics such as metaphysics and ontology. The concept encompasses a number of cognitive and behavioral mechanisms.

Authentic Leadership

Over the years, researchers and practitioners have proposed a variety of definitions of authentic leadership, drawing from a vast array of philosophical traditions to provide contrasting but complementary perspectives on what authentic leadership entails (Bass, 2009; Northouse, 2019; Yukl, 2013). Early attempts to properly describe and operationalize the concepts of authentic leadership identified three components as constituting it: (1) the acceptance of both personal and organizational responsibility for actions, outcomes, and errors; (2) the non-manipulation of subordinates; and (3) the primacy of the self over role requirements (Henderson & Hoy, 2003). The importance of self stands out among the three dimensions because it appears to have a significant relationship with the theory-based concept of authenticity, which describes a propensity to behave in a genuine, largely unrestricted manner with regard to traditional roles.

Additional attempts to define authentic leadership emerged from the works of Bhindi and Duignan (2017), using "sensibility, spirituality, intentionality, and authenticity." Begley (2010) introduced a new concept, equating ethical and effective leadership with authenticity, contending that it entails being truthful in terms of visionary, open-ended, hopeful, and creative responses to situations. A subsequent definition was developed that acknowledges the critical need for self-awareness, a characteristic widely acknowledged as fundamental to most conceptions of authentic leadership and credible leadership (Gardner et al., 2009; Kouzes & Posner, 2011). From the preceding definitions, convergence is found in George's (2003; 2007) contributions to the origins of authentic leadership as: (1) building long-lasting relationships; (2) leading from the heart; (3) upholding strong values; (4) exhibiting self-discipline; and (5) pursuing a mission with undying zeal.

ELEMENTS OF AUTHENTIC LEADERSHIP THEORY AND APPLICATION IN CURRENT LEADERSHIP PRACTICE

This section of the research uncovers correlated perspectives to the understanding of authentic leadership theory as seen by key scholars of authentic leadership. Significantly identical components appear on the ALQ questionnaire.

Self-awareness

Many scholars, including Shamir and Eilam (2005), believe that a leader's authenticity requires them to be self-aware. Ilies et al. (2005) posit that self-awareness is demonstrated when an individual is aware of their own reality and the consequences in the environment in which they function. As a result, self-awareness is a dynamic course of discovering and cultivating skills, potencies, mission, and fundamental values, rather than a destination. It is closely related to Kouzes and Posner's (2011) concept of self-discovery, which aims to introduce an individual to their highest self. Kernis (2003) defines self-aware leaders as those who "demonstrate deep knowledge of how they develop and make sense of the world, and how this process influences their view of themselves over time." Self-awareness is cognizant of one's own limits as well as the many facets that make up one's personality, including learning about oneself through interactions and being aware of one's influence on others (Gardner et al., 2009).

Relational Transparency

Gardner et al. (2009) opine that relational transparency is characterized by two scopes: (1) openness to information and ideas; and (2) self-disclosure based on self-awareness. Relational transparency is the expression of every or any of the four components of self-disclosure: goals/motives, identity, values, and emotions (GIVE). GIVE is activated by events external to a person's self-awareness.

Balanced Processing

According to scholars such as Yukl (2013), effective leaders engage in balanced processing, which entails a thorough examination of all relevant data without bias. As a result, they are shielded from outside influences while maintaining a healthy internal processing system. Gardner et al. (2005) assert that "balanced processing involves objectively analyzing external and self-referential facts and data." Leaders who exhibit higher amounts of balance processing, transparency, and ethical behavior are likely to inspire followers' loyalty while providing followers with a psychological and ethical environment (Northouse, 2019).

Internalized Moral Perspective

Scholars such as Ryan and Deci (2013) opine that internalized moral perspective refers to "an internalized and unified form of self-regulation." In accordance with this, Prasojo et al. (2020)

assert that internalized moral perspective refers to leaders who demonstrate consistency between their core principles and the judgments they express, as well as justice and a high level of professional practice. This type of self-regulation is based on one's own moral standards and values as opposed to external influences like those found in a group, an organization, or the larger society, and it produces outcomes that are in line with those values. In conclusion, these perspectives and dimensions of authentic leadership encourage genuine leaders to show their followers that they are making an honest effort to know and understand themselves.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The objective of the study was to determine the impact of age, tenure, seniority, faith, and gender on authentic leadership. The study employed a quantitative methodology and survey design. A simple random sample was used to select participants from a Kenya-based fintech company in Nairobi. Using a self-administered questionnaire, the Authentic Leadership Questionnaire (ALQ) developed by Walumbwa et al. (2008) data were collected from a variety of participants and SPSS was used for analysis. According to Creswell (2014), a survey research design is not only suitable for extensive research, but it is also cost-effective and can be used to gain an understanding of a population. The influence of the principles of authentic leadership relational transparency (RT), balanced processing (BP), internalized moral perspective (IMP), and self-awareness (SA) was investigated. The authentic leadership score was then compared to age, faith, gender, tenure, and seniority to determine whether there was a correlation between the variables and the score.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents and discusses the findings of the study based on the data collected from the respondents. It begins with the demographic characteristics of the respondents, including gender, faith, age, tenure, and seniority, to provide a clear profile of the study participants. The section further presents descriptive statistics on the four dimensions of authentic leadership, namely self-awareness, relational transparency, internalized moral perspective, and balanced processing. It also examines the relationship between demographic characteristics and authentic leadership scores before discussing the findings in relation to the study objectives and existing literature.

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics of the respondents' bio-demographic information.

Table 1: Demographic Data

Demographic	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	25	43.1%
	Female	33	56.9%
Faith	Catholic	21	36.2%
	Christian-Evangelical	6	10.3%
	Christian-Other	6	10.3%
	Christian-Protestant	21	36.2%
	Muslim	3	5.2%
	No Faith	1	1.7%
Age	20–30 years	6	10.3%
	31–40 years	22	37.9%
	41–50 years	30	51.7%
Tenure	Less than a year	1	1.7%
	1–5 years	7	12.1%
	6–10 years	21	36.2%
	11–15 years	14	24.1%
	16–20 years	10	17.2%
	21–25 years	5	8.6%
Seniority	Entry-level	4	6.9%
	Executive or Superior	6	10.3%
	First-level management	13	22.4%
	Intermediate or Experienced	18	31.0%
	Middle management	17	29.3%

From the findings, 56.9% (n = 33) were female while 43.1% (n = 25) were male. Under age, 51.7% (n = 30) were in the age bracket of between 41–50 years, 37.9% (n = 22) were between 31–40 years, and 10.3% (n = 6) were between 21–30 years. Under faith, 36.2% (n = 21) were Catholics, 10.3% (n = 6) were evangelical Christians, 36.2% (n = 21) were Protestants, 10.3% (n = 6) were from other Christian denominations, 5.2% (n = 3) were Muslim, while only 1.7% (n = 1) had no faith. On tenure, 8.6% (n = 5) had worked for 21–25 years, 24.1% (n = 14) for 11–15 years, 12.1% (n = 7) for 1–5 years, and only one respondent (1.7%) had worked for less than a year. On seniority, entry-level respondents were 4 (6.9%), 10.3% (n = 6) were in executive positions, 22.4% (n = 13) were in first-level management, the majority, 31.0% (n = 18), were intermediate or experienced staff, while 29.3% (n = 17) were in middle-level management.

Table 2: Self-Awareness

Statements	n	Min	Max	Mean	SD
"I can list my three greatest weaknesses"	58	1	5	3.91	1.06
"I can list my three greatest strengths"	58	1	5	4.21	1.04
"I seek feedback as a way of understanding who I am as a person"	58	1	5	3.76	1.20
"I accept the feelings I have about myself"	58	2	5	4.29	0.77
Aggregate Mean	58	2	5	4.04	0.77

Findings show that self-awareness had a strong mean (SD) of 4.04 ± 0.77 . Two parameters under self-awareness had a strong mean of over 4, while the other parameters had a mean close to 4. This is proof that respondents were aware of their strengths, limitations, how others see them, and how they impact others.

Table 3: Relational Transparency

Statements	n	Min	Max	Mean	SD
"I openly share my feelings with others"	58	1	5	3.48	1.19
"I let others know who I truly am as a person"	58	1	5	3.84	1.04
"I rarely present a false front to others"	58	1	5	4.02	1.10
"I admit my mistakes to others"	58	1	5	4.07	1.02
Aggregate Mean	58	1.75	5	3.85	0.83

Findings show that relational transparency had a mean (SD) of 3.85 ± 0.83 . Two parameters under relational transparency had a mean of above 4 while other parameters had a mean above 3.5. This demonstrates that respondents are able to foster an atmosphere of openness with others and gives them the chance to be forthright about their thoughts, difficulties, and beliefs.

Table 4: Internalized Moral Perspective

Statements	n	Min	Max	Mean	SD
"My actions reflect my core values"	58	2	5	4.45	0.73
"I do not allow group pressure to control me"	58	2	5	4.31	0.80
"Other people know where I stand on controversial issues"	58	1	5	3.91	0.88
"My morals guide what I do as a leader"	58	2	5	4.50	0.76
Aggregate Mean	58	3	5	4.29	0.54

Findings show that internalized moral perspective had a strong mean (SD) of 4.29 ± 0.54 . All parameters, but one, under internalized moral perspective had a strong mean of above 4. This shows that respondents are able to set a high standard for moral and ethical conduct.

Table 5: Balanced Processing

Statements	n	Min	Max	Mean	SD
"I seek other people's opinions before making up my mind"	58	1	5	3.57	1.09
"I listen closely to the ideas of those who disagree with me"	58	2	5	3.91	0.78
"I do not emphasize my own point of view at the expense of others"	58	1	5	3.50	1.22
"I listen very carefully to the ideas of others before making decisions"	58	2	5	4.07	0.84
Aggregate Mean	58	2.25	5	3.76	0.65

Findings show that balanced processing had a mean (SD) of 3.76 ± 0.65 . Only one parameter under balanced processing had a strong mean of above 4, while three parameters had a mean of above 3.5. This shows that respondents solicit sufficient opinions and viewpoints prior to making important decisions.

Table 6: Score Rating

Rank	Frequency	Percentage
Low	2	3.4%
High	30	51.7%
Very High	26	44.8%
Total	58	100%

The self-assessment questionnaire was developed to assist people in determining how authentically they lead by measuring self-awareness, internalized moral perspective, balanced processing, and relational transparency. When their scores were compared, 44.8% (n = 26) fell into the Very High category, 51.7% (n = 30) fell into the High category, 3.4% (n = 2) fell into the Low category, and none fell into the Very Low category. Scores in the upper ranges indicate stronger authentic leadership, whereas scores in the lower ranges indicate weaker authentic leadership.

Relationship between Demographic Characteristics and Authentic Leadership

Table 7: Demographics against ALQ

Demographic	Self-Awareness X ² (p-value)	Relational Transparency X ² (p-value)	Internalized Moral Perspective X ² (p-value)	Balanced Processing X ² (p-value)
Age	38.25 (0.33)	34.87 (0.70)	25.71 (0.12)	20.58 (0.42)
Gender	10.35 (0.59)	8.16 (0.77)	11.59 (0.17)	11.65 (0.31)
Faith	84.31 (0.21)	58.16 (0.54)	29.22 (0.896)	48.15 (0.548)
Tenure	31.02 (0.013)*	107.57 (0.000)*	56.27 (0.045)*	27.68 (0.012)*
Seniority	49.46 (0.035)*	45.99 (0.055)	52.32 (0.043)*	61.21 (0.017)*

The p-value significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$ was chosen. Under age and gender, there was no statistical significance against the four perspectives; the p-values were greater than 0.05. There was a statistical significance between tenure and all of the perspectives, with p-values less than

0.05. Under seniority, there also was statistical significance with three of the four perspectives, as proven by p-values of less than 0.05.

Table 8: Score Classification against Age

Age Group	Very Low	Low	High	Very High	X ² (p-value)
20–30 Years	0 (0.0%)	1 (16.7%)	5 (83.3%)	0 (0.0%)	8.32 (0.081)
31–40 Years	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	10 (45.5%)	12 (54.5%)	
41–50 Years	0 (0.0%)	1 (3.3%)	15 (50.0%)	14 (46.7%)	

The score classifications were as shown in the table above. Five respondents between the ages of 21–30 years ranked high. Ten respondents in the age group of 31–40 years were ranked high and twelve ranked very high. Respondents in the age group of 41–50 years were ranked as follows: one (1) Low, fifteen (15) High, and fourteen (14) Very High. The p-value (0.081) is greater than the significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$. We therefore do not reject the null hypothesis, concluding that there is insufficient evidence to show a relationship between age group and score classification.

Table 9: Score Classification against Faith

Faith	Very Low	Low	High	Very High	X ² (p-value)
Catholic	0 (0.0%)	1 (4.8%)	10 (47.6%)	10 (47.6%)	34.644 (0.000)*
Christian-Evangelical	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (50.0%)	3 (50.0%)	
Christian-Others	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (50.0%)	3 (50.0%)	
Christian-Protestant	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	14 (66.7%)	7 (33.3%)	
Muslim	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (100.0%)	
No Faith	0 (0.0%)	1 (100.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	

As shown in Table 9, ten respondents who were Catholic were ranked very high and ten ranked high. Evangelical respondents ranked as follows: three (3) very high, three (3) high. Three respondents from other Christian denominations ranked very high and three ranked high. Fourteen Protestant respondents ranked high while seven ranked very high. All three Muslim respondents ranked very high. The only respondent with no religion ranked low. Since the p-value (0.000) is

lower than the chosen significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$, the null hypothesis is rejected. There is statistical significance between faith and score classification ($X^2 = 34.644$, $p = 0.000$).

Table 10: Score Classification against Gender

Gender	Very Low	Low	High	Very High	X ² (p-value)
Male	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	16 (48.5%)	17 (51.5%)	3.559 (0.169)
Female	0 (0.0%)	2 (8.0%)	14 (56.0%)	9 (36.0%)	

Male respondents scored as follows: seventeen (17) very high, sixteen (16) high, and none scored low or very low. Female respondents: nine (9) scored very high, fourteen (14) high, and two (2) low. Since the p-value (0.169) is greater than the chosen significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$, the null hypothesis is not rejected. There is insufficient evidence to suggest an association between gender and score classification.

Table 11: Score Classification against Tenure

Tenure	Very Low	Low	High	Very High	X ² (p-value)
Less than 1 Year	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (100.0%)	0 (0.0%)	28.175 (0.016)*
1–5 Years	0 (0.0%)	1 (14.3%)	6 (85.7%)	0 (0.0%)	
6–10 Years	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	9 (42.9%)	12 (57.1%)	
11–15 Years	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	9 (64.3%)	5 (35.7%)	
16–20 Years	0 (0.0%)	1 (10.0%)	3 (30.0%)	6 (60.0%)	
21–25 Years	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (40.0%)	3 (60.0%)	

As shown in Table 11, the respondent below 1 year ranked high. Respondents between 1–5 years had six (6) ranked high. Among those in the 6–10 years category, twelve (12) were ranked very high and nine (9) high. For the 11–15 years group, nine (9) were ranked high and five (5) very high. Respondents between 16–20 years ranked six (6) very high, three (3) high, and one (1) low. Since the p-value (0.016) is lower than the chosen significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$, there is sufficient evidence to suggest a statistically significant association between tenure and score classification ($X^2 = 28.175$, $p = 0.016$).

Table 12: Score Classification against Seniority

Seniority	Very Low	Low	High	Very High	X ² (p-value)
Entry-level	0 (0.0%)	1 (25.0%)	1 (25.0%)	2 (50.0%)	23.195 (0.026)*
Executive or Senior Management	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (66.7%)	2 (33.3%)	
First-level Management	0 (0.0%)	1 (7.7%)	4 (30.8%)	8 (61.5%)	
Intermediate or Experienced Staff	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	12 (66.7%)	6 (33.3%)	
Middle Management	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	9 (52.9%)	8 (47.1%)	

Entry-level respondents were ranked as follows: two (2) very high, one (1) high, and one (1) low. Executive level management: two (2) very high and four (4) high. Intermediate or experienced staff: six (6) very high and twelve (12) high. Middle management respondents: eight (8) very high and nine (9) high. Since the p-value (0.026) is lower than the chosen significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$, there is sufficient evidence to conclude that a statistically significant association exists between seniority and score classification ($X^2 = 23.195$, $p = 0.026$).

Table 13: Mean Scores per Perspective against Demographics

Category		Self-Awareness (Mean)	Internalized Moral Perspective (Mean)	Balanced Processing (Mean)	Relational Transparency (Mean)	
Age	20–30 Years	3.13	3.58	3.42	3.54	
		31–40 Years	4.14	4.45	3.88	4.06
		41–50 Years	4.16	4.32	3.75	3.77
Gender	Female	4.08	4.40	3.78	3.92	
	Male	4.00	4.00	4.15	3.74	3.76
Faith	Catholic	3.90	4.21	3.88	3.90	
		Christian-Evangelical	4.21	4.54	3.71	4.38
		Christian-Other	4.42	4.29	3.58	3.79
		Christian-Protestant	4.02	4.27	3.70	3.69
		Muslim	4.58	4.58	4.25	4.17
Tenure	1–5 Years	No Faith	2.50	4.00	2.50	2.50
		3.32	3.46	3.46	3.36	
		6–10 Years	4.12	4.48	3.93	4.11
		11–15 Years	4.16	4.21	3.68	3.82
		16–20 Years	4.03	4.43	3.68	3.73
		21–25 Years	4.55	4.60	3.95	4.25
Seniority	Entry-level	<1 Year	3.50	4.50	3.50	1.75
		3.69	4.19	3.44	2.94	
		Executive/Senior Mgmt	4.00	4.00	3.71	3.83
		First-level Mgmt	3.79	4.40	3.88	3.88
		Intermediate/Experienced	4.04	4.29	3.90	4.01
	Middle Management	4.34	4.34	3.62	3.88	

Table 13 shows mean scores per perspective against demographics. Under all demographics, internalized moral perspective had a high mean compared to the other perspectives. A mean above 4.0 is considered high, while a mean below 3.0 is considered low as it falls on the lower side of the Likert scale.

DISCUSSIONS

The primary objective of this study was to evaluate the effect of age, faith, gender, tenure, and seniority on authenticity. Combining the scores of the four authenticity components yielded the ALQ score. The findings show that there is no association between age and authenticity score because the p-value was greater than the significance level set for the study ($\alpha = 0.05$). When it comes to faith, the p-value was lower than the significance level chosen ($\alpha = 0.05$); as a result, the null hypothesis is rejected, implying that there is statistical significance between faith and authenticity. This is well supported by existing literature, such as Gardner et al. (2009), who state that spirituality, faith, and religion all contribute to the formation of values, which are critical in both credible and authentic leadership.

Because the p-value was greater than the chosen significance level ($\alpha = 0.05$), the null hypothesis was not rejected for gender, but it can be concluded that there is insufficient evidence to suggest a link between gender and authenticity. This insufficiency is consistent with current scholarly data, such as the works of Eagly (2005), who introduces the concept of relational transparency through role congruency, demonstrating that females have a higher proclivity for accommodating others. However, more research is needed to delve deeper into authenticity and gender and not limit it to one specific component. Since the p-value is less than the chosen significance level ($\alpha = 0.05$), there is sufficient evidence to suggest an association between tenure and authenticity, as a statistically significant relationship was found between tenure and the ALQ score. Notably, tenure has been studied in the context of authenticity by scholars such as Yagil and Medler-Liraz (2014), who discovered that tenure affects the quality of the leader-follower relationship, particularly the follower's unbiased self-presentation followership and leaders are extremely critical in the formation and adoption of authentic and credible leadership. Since the p-value is less than the predetermined significance level ($\alpha = 0.05$), it can be concluded that there is sufficient evidence to suggest an association between seniority and the ALQ score, and subsequently authenticity.

CONCLUSIONS

The first hypothesis stated that there was no relationship between age and authenticity; the results suggest that the null hypothesis should not be rejected because there was insufficient evidence to establish a connection between age and authenticity. Age as a variable did not produce sufficient evidence to suggest a causative link with authenticity in the Nairobi fintech industry. The second hypothesis stated that faith had no effect on authenticity; however, the study results showed that the p-value was lower than the chosen significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$, so the hypothesis was rejected. Based on this, it is feasible to conclude that there is statistical significance between faith and authenticity in the Nairobi, Kenya fintech industry. The third hypothesis stated that gender does not affect authenticity; from the results, no association was found between gender and authenticity. The null hypotheses on tenure and seniority were rejected, as the results showed an association with the ALQ score. Faith, tenure, and seniority are therefore associated with leaders' authenticity within the Nairobi fintech industry, with statistical significance demonstrated for three variables against the ALQ score. Among the characteristics of authentic leaders, the internal moral perspective was rated the highest.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the study findings, the following recommendations are proposed:

Organizations in the fintech industry and similar sectors in Kenya should invest in leadership development programs that prioritize internalized moral perspective, given its emergence as the highest-rated dimension of authentic leadership across all demographic groups. Such programs should be embedded in onboarding and continuous professional development structures, with particular attention to employees at early tenure stages where authenticity scores tend to be lower.

Faith communities and organizational culture should be recognized as significant contextual factors in leadership development, given the demonstrated association between faith and authentic leadership. Organizations operating in religiously diverse environments should design leadership frameworks that are culturally and spiritually inclusive.

Given the significant association between seniority and authentic leadership, organizations should establish structured mentorship and leadership coaching programs that target junior and mid-level

staff, deliberately building authentic leadership competencies before individuals ascend to senior positions.

REFERENCES

- Armstrong, M., & Armstrong, M. (2021). *Armstrong's handbook of strategic human resource management: Improve business performance through strategic people management* (7th ed.). Kogan Page.
- Avolio, B. J. (1999). *Full leadership development: Building the vital forces in organizations*. SAGE.
- Avolio, B. J., & Luthans, F. (2006). *The high-impact leader*. McGraw-Hill.
- Baldoni, J. (2008, November 19). Leader's credibility is golden. *Harvard Business Review*. <https://hbr.org/2008/11/leaders-credibility-is-golden>
- Bass, B. M., Bass, R., & Bass, R. R. (2009). *The bass handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications* (4th ed.). Free Press.
- Begley, P. T. (2006). Self-knowledge, capacity, and sensitivity: Prerequisites to authentic leadership by school principals. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 44, 570–589.
- Bhindi, N., & Duignan, P. (1997). Leadership for a new century: Authenticity, intentionality, spirituality, and sensibility. *Educational Management and Administration*, 25(2), 117–132.
- Burnes, B. (2017). *Managing change* (7th ed.). Pearson.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). What and why of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11, 227–268.
- Dessler, G. (2005). *Human resource management* (10th ed.). Pearson/Prentice Hall.
- Drucker, P. F. (2015). *Managing oneself*. Harvard Business Review Press.
- Eagly, A. H. (2005). Achieving relational authenticity in leadership: Does gender matter? *The Leadership Quarterly*.
- Gardner, W. L. (2009). *Authentic leadership theory and practice: Origins, effects and development*. JAI.
- Gardner, W. L., Avolio, B. J., Luthans, F., May, D. R., & Walumbwa, F. O. (2005). Can you see the real me? A self-based model of authentic leader and follower development. *The Leadership Quarterly*.
- George, B., Sims, P., & Gergen, D. (2013). *True north: Discover your authentic leadership*. Jossey-Bass.
- George, W. (2003). *Authentic leadership: Rediscovering the secrets to creating lasting value*. Jossey-Bass.

- Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R. E., & McKee, A. (2013). *Primal leadership: Unleashing the power of emotional intelligence* (10th anniversary ed.). Harvard Business Review Press.
- Harter, S. (2002). Authenticity. In C. R. Snyder & S. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of positive psychology* (pp. 382–394). Oxford University Press.
- Henderson, J. E., & Hoy, W. K. (1983). Leader authenticity: The development and test of an operational measure. *Educational and Psychological Research*, 3(2), 63–75.
- Ilies, R., Morgeson, F. P., & Nahrgang, J. D. (2005). Authentic leadership and eudaemonic well-being: Understanding leader–follower outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly*.
- Kernis, M. H. (2003). Toward a conceptualization of optimal self-esteem. *Psychological Inquiry*, 14, 1–26.
- Kernis, M. H., & Goldman, B. M. (2006). A multicomponent conceptualization of authenticity: Theory and research. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 38, pp. 283–357). Academic Press.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2011). *Credibility: How leaders gain and lose it, why people demand it* (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Linley, P. A., Joseph, S., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2012). *Positive psychology in practice*. Wiley.
- Luthans, F. (2002). The need for and meaning of positive organizational behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23, 695–706.
- Luthans, F., & Avolio, B. J. (2003). Authentic leadership: A positive developmental approach. In K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton, & R. E. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive organizational scholarship* (pp. 241–261). Barrett-Koehler.
- Northouse, P. G. (2019). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. SAGE Publications.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 68–78.
- Shamir, B., & Eilam, G. (2005). "What's your story?": A life-stories approach to authentic leadership development. *The Leadership Quarterly*.
- Walumbwa, F. O., Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Wernsing, T. S., & Peterson, S. J. (2008). Authentic leadership: Development and validation of a theory-based measure. *Journal of Management*, 34, 89–126.
- Yagil, D., & Medler-Liraz, H. (2014). Feel free, be yourself: Authentic leadership, emotional expression, and employee authenticity. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 21(1), 59–70. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051813483833>
- Yukl, G. A. (2013). *Leadership in organizations* (8th ed.). Pearson.