



CHRISTIAN FAITH PERSPECTIVES IN  
LEADERSHIP AND BUSINESS

# True Leadership

*Leadership Styles and the Kenotic Relationship*



*Edited by*

DAVID P. PELTZ  
JOHN H. WILSON



palgrave  
macmillan

# Christian Faith Perspectives in Leadership and Business

## **Series Editors**

Doris Gomez  
Regent University  
Virginia Beach, VA, USA

Kathleen Patterson  
School of Global Leadership and Entrepreneurship  
Regent University  
Virginia Beach, VA, USA

Bruce E. Winston  
Regent University  
Virginia Beach, VA, USA

Gary Oster  
Regent University  
Virginia Beach, VA, USA

This book series is designed to integrate Christian faith-based perspectives into the field of leadership and business, widening its influence by taking a deeper look at its foundational roots. It is led by a team of experts from Regent University, recognized by the Coalition of Christian Colleges and Universities as the leader in servant leadership research and the first Christian University to integrate innovation, design thinking, and entrepreneurship courses in its Masters and Doctoral programs. Stemming from Regent's hallmark values of innovation and Christian faith-based perspectives, the series aims to put forth top-notch scholarship from current faculty, students, and alumni of Regent's School of Business & Leadership, allowing for both scholarly and practical aspects to be addressed while providing robust content and relevant material to readers. Each volume in the series will contribute to filling the void of a scholarly Christian-faith perspective on key aspects of organizational leadership and business such as Business and Innovation, Biblical Perspectives in Business and Leadership, and Servant Leadership. The series takes a unique approach to such broad-based and well-trodden disciplines as leadership, business, innovation, and entrepreneurship, positioning itself as a much-needed resource for students, academics, and leaders rooted in Christian-faith traditions.

More information about this series at  
<http://www.palgrave.com/gp/series/15425>

David P. Peltz • John H. Wilson  
Editors

# True Leadership

Leadership Styles and the Kenotic  
Relationship

Foreword by Kathleen Patterson

palgrave  
macmillan

### *Editors*

David P. Peltz  
Peltz Consulting Services LLC  
Sahuarita, AZ, USA

John H. Wilson  
Strategic Collisions International LLC  
Glenmoore, PA, USA

Foreword by

Kathleen Patterson  
School of Global Leadership and Entrepreneurship  
Regent University  
Virginia Beach, VA, USA

Scripture quotations marked (NRSV) are taken from the New Revised Standard Version Bible: Catholic Edition, copyright © 1989, 1993 National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America. Used by permission. All rights reserved worldwide. Scripture quotations marked (NKJV) are taken from the New King James Version®. Copyright © 1982 by Thomas Nelson. Used by permission. All rights reserved. Scripture quotations marked (RSV) are taken from the Revised Standard Version of the Bible, copyright © 1946, 1952, and 1971 the Division of Christian Education of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America. Used by permission. All rights reserved. Scripture quotations marked (NIV) are taken from the Holy Bible, New International Version®, NIV®. Copyright © 1973, 1978, 1984, 2011 by Biblica, Inc.™ Used by permission of Zondervan. All rights reserved worldwide. [www.zondervan.com](http://www.zondervan.com) The “NIV” and “New International Version” are trademarks registered in the United States Patent and Trademark Office by Biblica, Inc.™

Christian Faith Perspectives in Leadership and Business

ISBN 978-3-030-46659-6

ISBN 978-3-030-46660-2 (eBook)

<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-46660-2>

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2020

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, expressed or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Cover illustration: © shaifulzamri / Moment / Getty

This Palgrave Macmillan imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Switzerland AG. The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

*To all those in pursuit of learning and contributing to research in the many facets of leadership.*

# Foreword

We might think that noble leaders are needed now more than ever; the interesting thing is this—the world has always been looking for such leaders. This age is nothing new in its pursuit of great, noble, humble, moral leaders—the world has been looking for these leaders since the beginning of time. Why? Because unfortunately the world has seen, experienced, lived with leaders are anything but—since the beginning of time.

A quick cursory look at history tells us that damaging, cruel, corrupt, evil, manipulating, downright mean leaders have plagued history with how they lead, how they engage and how they perpetuate their unique leadership. If you have ever been in a leadership or followership role, you have likely experienced the harsher side of leadership. Most people I talk with have, but much fewer have seen the nobler side of leadership. One might ask how we can be the leaders we idealize if we have not even seen or experienced them ourselves; this void is partly why I am willing to write this foreword—in hopes that all of us seek a better way of leadership, it can be done. But history shows us that great leaders are hard to find, the rare breed, the needle in the haystack—but why—why are we not more prone to leadership that is honest, kind, moral and truthful? Reality is we tend to fall back on our own laurels that are broken and bruised—when we need to forge new paths and find the hidden trails and seek out the good in this world. I know I am not asking of you an easy thing—but I am favoring this book that can guide you, guide us all, on this journey.

We must begin by asking why the kenotic—why the emptying of self in our leadership. The world has many messages—and one of the most prevalent in leadership circles is to get to the top by looking out for self. This message is not only prevalent but widely believed and practiced! And yet we know these are the very leaders we do not enjoy working for as they are people users.

The kenotic leader—the selfless leader—may not be well known—in fact, they are likely the quiet one who is not trumpeting their own leadership but trumpeting others! And yet this is the leader who is making a difference in the world, in the organization and in the lives of their followers. This is the leader who will abandon their own interests and seek the good of the follower. Not the typical hero, but maybe we need to define the word hero, just as Robert K. Greenleaf (who coined the terminology servant leader) encouraged us to redefine the words servant and leader by breaking their very definitions and rebuilding the words for today. Perhaps in rebuilding such words as leader and hero, we can rebuild what is terribly broken in our expectations of what leaders need to be. Instead of looking out for self, we can be looking out for the interests of others, and in doing so build better human beings, livelier organizations and a more healed world. It can happen!

An interesting thing I have seen happens when we empty ourselves of ourselves—we are often filled right back up. I realize this does not make sense unless you have experienced it, but trust me you cannot give out enough of yourself without this strange phenomena happening of being filled again and again; it is as if we cannot give out enough of who we are as people and leaders—it becomes a bottomless vessel of giving.

The crux of history teaches us these things, but it is in the scholarship where we shine a light to seek understanding. David P. Peltz and John H. Wilson bring us the possibility to know and understand a new path to leadership, an opportunity to know and do better, with their apt compilation of authors, research and perspectives that are both wide-ranging and yet narrow enough to give us a deep dive. And though scholarship shines this light on understanding, it is up to each of us, you, to live this out. While this is a scholarly book deeply embedded with content that is backed by research and supported by the scholarly community, I invite each of you as readers to engage the content beyond the scope of the



scholastic endeavor—and urge you to engage the content with a leadership mind and heart. If you can do this, you will invite a new chapter into your own life of leadership—perhaps one that can open new doors, fill new needs and impact others beyond the expected.

What is it that makes us be a selfless leader, a leader who empties themselves of themselves? Perhaps, it is a combination of things, from our experiences in leadership and from other leaders; perhaps, it is our value system, some combination of how we were raised in our faith perspectives, but maybe, just maybe it is our choice—how we choose to engage others in this world, and how we choose to be as leaders. Ultimately, in my personal opinion, I think it is a lot about personal choice. We can choose to be kind and loving and moral and authentic and open with ourselves as leaders or choose to be self-ingratiating, self-protective or even self-aggrandizing, notice the emphasis on self. As master of ourselves, we can choose differently. If we can choose to be kind, loving and just different, we are choosing to not only change ourselves but change the world, and this is the choice I would urge you to make upon reading this book.

Virginia Beach, VA, USA

Kathleen Patterson

# Preface

It is the age of transparency, age of divergent perspectives, and age of immediacy. Like no other time in human history, leaders can be seen for who they are by their actions, unfiltered by a veil of protection or secrecy. The question of character of a leader when no one is looking is no longer relevant since the matter of private action is dispensed by the ubiquitous technology that reveals all through direct record or inference via data analysis. Authentic leadership may no longer be a question of outcomes, but rather a matter of unavoidable necessity. If leaders' actions are clear for all to see, then inauthentic leaders will find their efficacy diminished and their tenure of positional authority quite brief. It is for such a time as this that this book is needed. With leader authenticity no longer an option, then the question turns to morality and self-sacrifice as differentiating characteristics of leaders who inspire others to follow them, to take action, and to make a better world.

To this end, this text addresses several forms of moral leadership within the context of kenosis that could be described as self-sacrificial action for the sake of followers and the success of the leader's cause. This volume brings in both secular and biblical perspectives on the role of morality and self-sacrifice toward effective leadership theory and practice. This approach will appeal to leaders from scholarly institutions, the public sector, and commercial enterprises, whether ecumenical or secular. What these leaders have in common are the desire to lead confidently based on

their values and social ideals in addition to the financial success and traditional performance metrics produced by their efforts. Additionally, this text can act as an extension to current research and perspectives in adult learning and leadership studies to include servant leadership, transformational leadership, authentic leadership, and kenotic leadership.

A key lens applied to this writing is that of kenosis, a view of leaders who empty themselves in humility, setting aside their power, authority, recognition, and trappings of a high position, except as needed to influence others to achieve the vision and mission they have articulated (Bekker, 2011; Ditewig, 2006). To this end, leaders operating from a kenotic frame do not focus on fortifying and expanding their power, but rather transferring their power to followers in a way that empowers rather than directs. In this way, the kenotic leader pursues the ideal of leadership, rather than an increasingly elevated position of leadership.

In the chapters that follow, the authors apply the extant literature associated with each of these moral leadership theories in the analysis of the sacred texts with the goal of taking small steps out of the shadows of leadership into the light, to gain some new perspective on that which is revealed about the Form of True Leadership. This idea is highlighted by Dr. John H. Wilson in the first chapter as *True Leadership*, examining a Christocentric model for leadership that can serve as an ideal form, particularly for those who view Christ as far more than a mere mortal human. Rather, that Jesus was God in human form, such that His leadership is an observable, ideal form for leadership, unpolluted by the human condition.

In the second chapter, Dr. David P. Peltz compares and contrasts two important forms of moral leadership, authentic leadership and servant leadership, offering an important role for both forms of moral leadership. Distinguishing how a leader's authenticity does not necessarily result in the behaviors associated with servant leadership, a servant leader must embody the characteristics of authentic leadership, else their humility and concern for others be called in question, ultimately undermining the basis for inspiring others to action.

In Chap. 3, Dr. Wilbur A. Reid examines the mind of a transformational leader as a framework for interpreting Jesus' examples of

transforming His followers to endeavor toward humility and service. In this way, transformational leaders represent moral leadership in the way that they relate to their followers, achieving the ideal of True Leadership by developing others to reach their highest potential in their work as well as becoming leaders themselves.

In Chap. 4, Dr. Rev. David A. Oginde examines the character of leaders, framing authenticity as a moral distinction. Hence, character reveals the willingness of a leader to allow others to see their true nature and vulnerabilities. This serves as proof of personal moral conviction, foreshadowing the kenotic aspects of *True Leadership*.

Dr. Christopher L. Boyd, in Chap. 5, analyzes the transformational effect of authentic leadership, explaining how leaders are transformed to authenticity, using a powerful metaphor of building a puzzle. Gathering, sorting, and connecting those elements of True Leadership revealed by scripture in a manner that can be applied and emulated.

In Chap. 6, Dr. Heidi R. Ventura illustrates the praxis of authentic leadership from the shadows of fallen humanity by analyzing the successes and failures described in the Old Testament accounts of Moses and Jethro, with key learnings for those who strive to mentor effective leaders who are authentic and moral in the way they lead others.

In Chap. 7, Dr. Laurel B. Emory and Dr. David P. Peltz build on Dr. Ventura's lessons of individual mentorship toward a model for programmatic development of leaders who are committed to pursue the ideals of authentic, servant, and kenotic leadership in regular practice by applying the principles of moral leadership.

Finally, in Chap. 8, Dr. Andrea R. Ramirez examines the self-emptying attributes of kenotic leaders, who set themselves aside for the sake of their followers (Bekker, 2011)—making the connection between acts of leader self-sacrifice and the reconciliation that occurs between leaders and followers. In this way, kenosis on the part of a leader begins to reveal some of the ideals of *True Leadership* in ways that can be applied, inspired, and acculturated into modern organizations.

These unique insights of biblical truth about leadership, through the lens of these contemporary theories of moral leadership, connect the moral foundations of authenticity, service, transformation, and

self-sacrifice to produce effective results through a moral mindset. This will help aspiring moral leaders who seek to better understand the limitations of the shadows of leadership to catch a glimpse of True Leadership.

Glenmoore, PA, USA

John H. Wilson

## References

- Bekker, C. J. (2011). Kenotic leadership. In F. Gandolfi (Ed.), *Fundamentals of leadership* (Vol. 1). Saarbrücken, Germany: Lambert Academic Publishing.
- Ditewig, W. T. (2006). Epilogue: The kenotic leadership of deacons. In J. Keating (Ed.), *The deacon reader*. New York: Paulist Press.

# Acknowledgments

The authors of this text would like to thank their families, friends, peers, fellow scholars, professors, and God for helping them achieve this milestone in their lives and careers.

A special acknowledgment goes out to the professors of Regent University in the School of Business and Leadership for their guidance with this work.

A distinguished acknowledgment recognizes Dr. Cornelius Bekker for his mentorship, counsel, contributions, and wisdom—without him none of this would be possible.

## Praise for *True Leadership*

“A valuable compendium of perspectives related to leadership styles and the relationships associated with true leadership. This edited volume illustrates some of the decisional processes, behaviors and contexts associated with leaders and leadership, which may foster the structured inculcation of leadership in varying contexts. I am enthusiastic about this book; and I am exceedingly proud to be your colleague.”

—Paul B. Carr, *Regent University, USA*

“In *True Leadership*, Dave Peltz and John Wilson break important new ground in our understanding of leadership. Each of the contributing authors provides powerful insights into the nature of caring leadership. It is a most helpful guide for the development of leaders who truly seek to serve ‘the least privileged in society,’ as Robert Greenleaf encouraged us to do.”

—Larry C. Spears, *Gonzaga University, USA*; President,  
*The Spears Center for Servant Leadership*

“The words, ‘He must increase, but I must decrease’, shared in the Scriptures, are a genuine sign of a great leader! John Wilson and his colleagues have put together an incredible guide in their new book to help all of us move towards genuine leadership by focusing on how we can increase all of those around us. Buy it today! And then read it, apply it, read it again and apply it again and again!”

—Bob Tiede, Blogger @ [LeadingWithQuestions.com](http://LeadingWithQuestions.com)

# Contents

<b>1 True Leadership: Beyond the Shadows</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>John H. Wilson</i>	
<b>2 Distinguishing Between Servant Leadership and Authentic Leadership</b>	<b>15</b>
<i>David P. Peltz</i>	
<b>3 The Mind of the Transformational Leader</b>	<b>49</b>
<i>Wilbur A. Reid</i>	
<b>4 The Character of a Leader: Authenticity as a Moral Distinction</b>	<b>65</b>
<i>David A. Oginde</i>	
<b>5 Transformed to Authenticity: Where a Leader's History Meets Destiny</b>	<b>75</b>
<i>Christopher L. Boyd</i>	
<b>6 Authentic Leadership Development in the Life of Moses</b>	<b>91</b>
<i>Heidi R. Ventura</i>	



<b>7 Leadership Development: The Role of Learning in the Authentic, Transformational, Servant, and Kenotic Leader</b>	109
<i>Laurel B. Emory and David P. Peltz</i>	
<b>8 The Impact of Kenosis on the Transformational Authentic Leader</b>	119
<i>Andrea R. Ramirez</i>	
<b>Final Thoughts</b>	137
<b>Index</b>	139

## Notes on Contributors

**Christopher L. Boyd** and his twin brother was born in the small country town of Woodlawn, Virginia. After a devastating fire left the family homeless, Boyd and his family moved to Roanoke, Virginia. Following graduation from Patrick Henry High School in 1993, he attended Lynchburg College in Lynchburg, Virginia, from which he graduated in 1997 with a degree in Communication Studies. In 2005, he earned a Master of Business Administration degree from Shorter University. He holds a PhD in Organizational Leadership from Regent University in the School of Global Leadership and Entrepreneurship (2014). For nearly 10 years, he worked as an executive in the corporate sector for Vertis Communications. He is serving as Executive Pastor of Word of Faith Family Worship Cathedral in Austell, Georgia. The ministry serves more than 21,000 members in the greater Atlanta community. He has a passion for leadership and helping others achieve a life of significance.

**Laurel B. Emory** is Senior Vice President for Human Resources at Logisticare, the nation's largest medical transportation firm. Emory's career spans over 20 years of experience in strategy, administration, and operations, primarily in healthcare and education, in both the for-profit and non-profit sectors. In addition to her formal roles, she serves as a mentor to women who are seeking to learn more about themselves and how they can pursue purpose and intentionality professionally and personally. She is

passionate about supporting organizations that are making a difference in peoples' lives. She is serving as Vice President for an international women's organization that raises money for college and graduate school scholarships and low-interest loans for women. She holds a PhD in Organizational Leadership along with a Master's in Business Administration from George Fox University, and a Bachelor of Science degree in Theology from San Jose Christian College. She lives in San Luis Obispo, California, with her husband. In addition to reading, writing, fly fishing, and traveling, she loves sinking her toes into the cool sandy beaches of the Pacific while watching the sun set.

**David A. Oginde** is the Presiding Bishop of Christ in the Answer Ministries (CITAM) and also serves as the Chancellor for the Pan Africa Christian (PAC) University. CITAM is focused on reaching urban communities in Kenya and the world, and has presence in several countries including Africa, the USA, Asia, and Europe. Apart from its congregations, the church also provides education services through CITAM Schools and PAC University. CITAM provides media ministry through Hope FM and Hope TV. The organization also runs a rehabilitation center for street children and special community outreach stations among the underprivileged communities in Kenya. He holds a PhD in Organizational Leadership from the School of Business and Leadership, Regent University, USA, having graduated with a Master's in Leadership degree from the PAC University, Nairobi. Prior to this, he had graduated with a Bachelor of Architecture degree from the University of Nairobi. He had previously attended Trinity Evangelical Divinity School (Trinity International University) in Illinois, USA, where he undertook his biblical studies. Apart from his pastoral duties, he is actively involved in speaking into and influencing national policies and issues related to governance and leadership in Kenya.

**David P. Peltz** is the founder of Peltz Consulting Services LLC. He is an employee development subject-matter expert who specializes in leadership, career positioning, and adult learning. He provides employee development coaching services for civilians, military members, and veterans. He also teaches undergraduate and graduate studies in the areas of business, leadership, research, and statistics. He attributes his knowledge, experience, and

business acumen to three career phases: military and civilian law enforcement; corporate defense manufacturing; and leadership/business consulting. These three distinct and very different phases have provided him with broad insights on change and adapting to extreme or opposing environments. These experiences have enabled him to efficiently comprehend challenging situations and develop effective solutions through innovation and foresight. He has received numerous team and individual awards and recognitions throughout his career. He has also given numerous presentations, nationally and internationally, on topics such as servant leadership, human resource development, and adult learning. He has several published works including *The Career Positioning Challenge: Essential Career Perspectives and Insights*, *The Military Transition Challenge: Perspectives for Civilian Career Positioning*, and *Multicultural Andragogy for Transformative Learning*. He holds a Doctorate of Philosophy in Organizational Leadership with a major in Human Resource Development from Regent University, a Master's in Business Administration with a specialization in Global Management from the University of Phoenix, and a Bachelor of Science degree with a major in Business Management from the University of Phoenix. He also has several industry-specific certifications.

**Andrea R. Ramirez** serves as the executive director of the Faith and Education Coalition for the National Hispanic Christian Leadership Coalition (NHCLC), America's Largest Hispanic Christian Evangelical Organization. She oversees key education initiatives for the NHCLC throughout the USA and leads an advisory board of Evangelical leaders within the Faith and Education Coalition ([www.faithandeducation.com](http://www.faithandeducation.com)). She has been featured on *Christian Post*, *Christianity Today*, CT Hoy, and CBN. In addition, she hosts the "Raising the Standards" TBN Salsa weekly television program focused on the nexus of faith and education. She holds a PhD from Regent University (Virginia) and was named the 2014 Outstanding PhD graduate award recipient for her cohort. She completed a degree in Business Administration and an MBA at Dallas Baptist University (Texas). Ramirez has been deeply involved in curriculum development since 2011. She lives in Texas, where she has been engaged in community ministry and education initiatives across the state.

**Wilbur A. Reid** enjoyed 27 years of experience in corporate management at Kimberly-Clark Corporation, Genuine Parts Company, and Home Federal Bank. He holds a PhD in Organizational Leadership from Regent University (2013). He has served as an adjunct faculty member at Milligan College, Johnson University, and Commonwealth International University. In 2015, he retired from the corporate world to join academia full time as Professor of Organizational Leadership and Director of the online MBA Program at Johnson University. His research interests are in servant leadership and level 5 leadership.

**Heidi R. Ventura** serves as Associate Vice-President and Dean for the School of Graduate and Continuing Studies at Trevecca Nazarene University in Nashville. In this role, she provides leadership for programs, faculty, curricula, and academic efforts for nontraditional adult learners at five locations and online. She holds a PhD in Organizational Leadership from Regent University as well as a MBA and B.Mus. from Palm Beach Atlantic University. She is Associate Professor of Leadership Studies and has taught and/or developed courses in business, leadership, management, and interdisciplinary studies. Her research interests include higher education, accreditation, adult learner experience, faculty engagement, accountability, authentic leadership, and biblical exegetical study of leadership theory and praxis. She has presented at various conferences, including the Conclave for Leadership Research and Analysis, the Annual Conference for the Center for Research in Adult Learning, the Annual Meeting for the Higher Learning Commission, and the Annual Meeting of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges. She has served on the Ohio Board of Regent's Prior Learning Assessment Working Group and the Association for Biblical Higher Education Standards for Accreditation Review Task Force. She was a 2010 Fellow in Indiana Wesleyan University's Advancing Women's Leadership program and was recognized as the 2010 Administrator of the Year at Ohio Christian University. She previously served at Ohio Christian University in Circleville, Ohio, first in institutional effectiveness and then as Assistant Vice President and Dean for the College of Adult and Graduate Studies. Prior to that, she served at Palm Beach Atlantic University.

**John H. Wilson** is a business leader and scholar with more than 23 years of experience in the software industry with focus on nonhierarchical organizational design, employee empowerment, intrapreneurship, and business strategy. He is the founder of Strategic Collisions International LLC, an organization that helps entrepreneurs to thrive through spontaneous engagement with other entrepreneurs. He lives and works in Eastern Pennsylvania with his wife and three children. He holds a Bachelor of Science in Marketing from Messiah College, a Master's in Business Administration from Pennsylvania State University, and a PhD in Organizational Leadership from Regent University. He has published numerous articles in academic and business journals on topics that relate to empowering employee excellence, self-leadership, adaptive change, intrapreneurship, and distributed organizational structures. He is also a frequent speaker at conferences, college/university guest lectures, and roundtable discussions with popular topics including "The Mailroom CEO", "The Guanxi Corporation", "The Embedded Scholar", and "The Powerless CEO".

# List of Tables

Table 2.1	Servant leadership scale assimilation—13 scales	26
Table 2.2	Servant leadership versus authentic leadership	37
Table 3.1	Differences between transactional and transformational leaderships	51
Table 3.2	Sub-types of leaderships	52
Table 5.1	Levels of expertise	82
Table 5.2	Continuous learning process	86
Table 6.1	Inquiry and response in Exodus 3:4 through 4:17 (NRSV)	99
Table 6.2	Jethro's and Moses's dialogue	103

# Operational Definitions

*Moral leadership:*

This is an inclusive reference throughout the text to True Leadership, transformational leadership, kenotic leadership, authentic leadership, and servant leadership.

*True Leadership:*

A proposed model for leadership based on the paradigm of a platonic form such that leadership can be viewed as an ideal that was demonstrated in Christ, revealed in the sacred scriptures, and not based on the experiences of humans, which represent more about the shadows of leadership as opposed to this ideal form.

*Transformational authentic leadership:*

A proposed leadership type where the leader is able to acknowledge the importance of the individual's values and help the follower to see either how those values might need to be shifted to support the importance of the mission or how transcending their self-interest to support the mission they actually are able to achieve a higher-order need.





# 1

## True Leadership: Beyond the Shadows

John H. Wilson

**Abstract** A shared conundrum for scholars in the field of leadership practice and theory seems to be whether there is in fact a True ideal Form of leadership or whether different behaviors and styles simply work better for some people or circumstances than others (Northouse, 2019; Takala, *Journal of Business Ethics* 17:785–798, 1998; Yukl, 2013). This chapter examines several scriptural texts about darkness and light alongside the metaphor of Plato’s Cave as a basis for distinguishing between that which is True compared with mere shadows of the True as it relates to the study of leadership. The notion of True Leadership is offered as an ideal Form for leadership, personified by Jesus and illuminated in small ways through exegetical study and through the lens of transformational, authentic, and kenotic leadership theories.

**Keywords** Leadership • Plato’s Cave • Light/darkness • True Form • Scripture

---

J. H. Wilson (✉)

Strategic Collisions International LLC, Glenmoore, PA, USA

© The Author(s) 2020

D. P. Peltz, J. H. Wilson (eds.), *True Leadership*, Christian Faith Perspectives in Leadership and Business, [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-46660-2\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-46660-2_1)

A shared conundrum for scholars in the field of leadership, both in terms of practice and theory, seems to be whether the ideals of leadership relate more to the leader as an individual or the way in which they lead (Northouse, 2019; Yukl, 2013). The more fundamental question is whether there is in fact a *True* ideal Form of leadership or whether different behaviors and styles simply work better than others for some people, or in some circumstances (Takala, 1998). Many authors on the subject have set forth the notion of a particular theory of leadership and then promote their approach with concepts, methods of practice, or structured taxonomies (Yukl, 2013, p. 2). While much can be learned from such theories that stem from the behavioral sciences, business literature, and political sciences, there is a dependency on the human experiences as it relates to leadership. Whether the study of such experiences is from the viewpoint of those who follow, or of those who lead, the human being is a common denominator. For Christ-followers who serve as leaders, who aspire to lead, or who wish to understand better those whom they follow, this human-centric paradigm for leadership has inherent flaws.

There is clear evidence in the sacred texts that all things of this world are but faint shadows of the glory of God's kingdom that is yet hidden from our human view. An example can be found in the writings of the Apostle Paul, "Ever since the creation of the world His eternal power and divine nature, invisible though they are, have been understood and seen through the things he has made" (Rom. 1:20, New Revised Standard Version). This is much like what C. S. Lewis described in writings such as *The Great Divorce* or *The Chronicles of Narnia*. The notion that this world is in darkness and that only faint rays from God's eminence reach here, "There are many who say, 'O that we might see some good! Let the light of your face shine on us, O Lord!'" (Psa. 4:6). Likewise, in Psalm 18, "It is you who light my lamp; the Lord, my God, lights up my darkness" (Psa. 18:28). Lawson (2009) presented a similar basis for viewing the Sermon on the Mount in the gospel according to Matthew, as a glimpse at the ideal of moral living that human beings should aspire to, but cannot achieve this side of Heaven.

This metaphor of our world in shadows has clear roots in the notion of *Forms* that Plato described in Book IV of *The Republic*. A perfect and True Form is something that humans can only experience through pale

shadows of such Forms that are hidden from direct view (Morris, 2009; Stefanini & Di Lascia, 1952):

Behold! Human beings living in an underground den, which has a mouth open towards the light and reaching all along the den; here they have been from their childhood, and have their legs and necks chained so that they cannot move . . . . above and behind them a fire is blazing at a distance, and between the fire and the prisoners there is a raised way; and you will see, if you look, a low wall built along the way, like a screen which marionette players have in front of them, over which they show puppets . . . .they see only their own shadows, or the shadows of another, which the fire throws on the opposite wall of the cave. (Plato, trans. 1989)

This seems to be a useful metaphor to apply to the exegetical study of leadership using revelation about Jesus Christ as a leader as the divine Form modeling leadership in its True state.

Takala (1998) made the case that Plato presented relevant principles that relate to leadership including the way that meaning is created in organizational settings; the way to create new meanings through rituals/symbols, and the importance of charisma in leadership (p. 797). Likewise, the same kind of distinction between that which is True compared with that which is mere shadows (Henderson, Oakes, & Smith, 2009) seems to correlate with truth revealed through scripture. “By the tender mercy of our God, the dawn from on high will break upon us, to give light to those who sit in darkness and in the shadow of death, to guide our feet into the way of peace” (Luke 1:78–79). A model for leadership produced by humans about the experiences of other humans will represent more about the shadows of leadership as opposed to the ideal Form, henceforth described as *True Leadership*.

Human views of leadership may likely be informed more by shadowed darkness than eminent light. This is particularly troublesome when proponents of a particular leadership model or style project the core characteristics of their favored construct onto sacred writings about Jesus, as if to suggest that Jesus employed their particular leadership style. In so doing, such authors seem to suggest that Jesus solely fits into this one particular human model of leadership as opposed to competing

alternative theories. If Christ-followers believe Jesus was more than a prominent human, but rather God incarnate, then Jesus should inform leadership theory much more so than leadership theory informing us about His leadership. This is not to dispense with contemporary leadership theory, but rather to instead begin with Christ, using scripture to illuminate True Leadership from among the shadows of human leadership conventions. In so doing, Christian leaders and theorists have the unique opportunity to move beyond the shadows of leadership and glimpse leadership as a Form with vivid detail, texture, and color. Such a Christological model of leadership offers us the potential to *lead* in His steps as we also *follow* in His steps.

To this end, the purpose of this book will not be to defend or promote a particular contemporary leadership model as aligning more closely with the sacred texts than other theories. Rather, the following volume applies thematic analysis to certain contemporary leadership theories as a lens through which to understand what features of the Form that is True Leadership are revealed in the sacred texts:

He was in the beginning with God. All things that came into being through him, and without him not one thing came into being. What has come into being in him was life, and the life was the light of all people. The light that shines in the darkness, and the darkness did not overcome it. (John 1:2–5)

With rhythmic, poetic cadence, this Johannine text identified Jesus with God as the source of all life, characterized as light (Witherington, 1995, p. 49). Further, the text contrasted the light as that which is perfect, from the darkness that is the complete opposite, flawed, and imperfect. In much the same way, Plato's Cave metaphor presented the light as actual Truth. The shadows, a function of darkness, represent the flawed and imperfect copy because they are polluted by darkness.

While the field of leadership studies has produced literally hundreds of leadership theories, each of which could provide a meaningful contribution to the discussion of True Leadership, four constructs seem to warrant particular attention. These are transformational leadership, authentic leadership, servant leadership, and kenotic leadership. Such leadership models deal with the ends that a leader pursues, with the character of a

leader, with the humility of the leader, and with the commitment level of the leader, respectively. Therefore, these four contemporary leadership theories are used as a framework to more accurately interpret just a few attributes of Jesus' True Leadership.

## Leading in the Cave: Plato and Scriptural Revelation

The first 14 verses in the gospel according to John are often characterized as a Christological hymn and likely reflect the Roman tradition of offering such a hymn praising an emperor prior to a narrative of a drama in which they have a prominent role (Witherington, 1995, p. 47). Such Christological hymns in sacred texts often stem from personified or hypostasized Wisdom, teachings about Jesus' life, or the use of Old Testament Psalms (p. 51). Of particular relevance to the discussion about the state of human leadership as faint shadows of True Leadership are verses 6–9, the second *strophe* or stanza of the hymn:

There was a man sent from God, whose name was John. He came as a witness to testify to the light, so that all might believe through him. He himself was not the light, but he came to testify to the light. The true light, which enlightens everyone, was coming into the world. (John 1:6–9)

This pericope contrasted John the Baptist, a foreshadowing of the light, with Jesus as the *True* light. In this, Jesus is set apart as divine, not merely a creation of the divine (p. 54). In much the same way that Plato distinguished between True Forms in comparison to the flickering shadows on the cave wall in the view of the prisoners such that Forms were more real than the shadows that they cast (Morris, 2009; Williamson, 2008).

In the John 1 hymn, the light and darkness metaphor alludes to both lack of knowledge and also moral corruption. The darkness the author talks about is not just physical darkness, but a spiritual darkness that involves not only ignorance of the truth but also moral darkness and fallenness, which lead one to reject the light and life even when they are offered (Witherington, 1995, p. 55). Hence, the darkness represents

distance between the visible shadow and the invisible Form, while simultaneously causing such distance to exist.

What does this mean for the theory and praxis of leadership? It seems reasonable to suggest that a Christological view of leadership involves viewing Jesus not as a mere exemplar of good and effective leadership as many writings suggest. Takala's (1998) comment was one example, "Some leaders, like Jesus or Ghandi are good examples of ethically good leaders" (p. 797). Rather, a Christological view of leadership requires assent to the paradigmatic view that Jesus, as the divine, represents the Form that is True Leadership:

This is the message we have heard from him and proclaim to you, that God is light and in him there is no darkness at all. If we say that we have fellowship with him while we are walking in darkness, we lie and do not do what is true; but if we walk in the light as he himself is in the light, we have fellowship with one another, and the blood of Jesus his Son cleanses us from all sin. If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. If we confess our sins, he who is faithful and just will forgive us our sins and cleanse us from all unrighteousness. If we say that we have not sinned, we make him a liar, and his word is not in us. (1 John 1:5–10)

The light represents what is True—the light of Christ that is completely absent of the darkness of sin and unrighteousness. Hence, the darkness represents the absence and antithesis of the light and truth. From this, the reader can infer there is the light that has no darkness whatever, and there is everything else, including the shadows, which have at least some darkness. To associate True Leadership with the light of Christ as described in this sacred text is to offer a Form for leadership, separate from the flawed shadows of temporal, human leadership, however well intended.

The notion of True Leadership could be an unsettling approach for many leadership scholars because it involves surrendering to the idea that as humans, we are confined by shadows when it comes to fully grasping or practicing leadership. Yet, Paul directed in his letter to the Romans, "Do not be conformed to this world, but be transformed by the good and acceptable and perfect" (Rom. 12:2). Witherington (2004) posited that in this passage, Paul was promoting inward transformation on the part of

the Roman church in the sense of de-enculturation and reorientation towards a Christ-centered worldview in contrast to a human-centered worldview (p. 286). Therefore, the pursuit of True Leadership perhaps involves the application of leadership theory, research, and experience to better understand what the sacred texts have revealed about Jesus as the divine Form of True Leadership. In this, we are not conforming to the worldly paradigm, but rather seeking transformation that can only come from Christ, manifest in transformational, authentic, self-emptying leaders who resemble Him.

## In Between: Nearness to the True

One of the tensions facing the group of scholars who came together to author this book was whether a leader could be authentic without being moral or if a leader can have a transformative affect if they are consistent in their espousal and pursuit of corrupt ends. Some extreme examples, such as Stalin or Hitler, often enter the discussion as individuals who were morally corrupt, but seemed to have a higher degree of congruence than others between their espoused theory and theory-in-use (Henderson et al., 2009; Lawson, 2009; Williamson, 2008). Does this mean that they were authentic and/or transformational as leaders? Can they even be called leaders? In apparent opposition to the notion of authenticity on the part of a leader, Machiavelli (1513) seemed to encourage heads of state deliberately that they should focus on follower perceptions independent of the reality of their actions in *The Prince*:

Everyone will admit that it would be better to be very praiseworthy if a prince had all those ... qualities that are deemed good; but since they cannot have them, nor devotedly adhere to them, because human conditions will not permit, he must be sufficiently prudent to avoid a reputation for those vices which would deprive him of his state and, if possible, also avoid those that would not deprive him of it. (p. 62)

This paradigm only supports consistency between word and deed when it is useful for producing a leader's desired reputation for purposes of

accomplishing their goals or preserving their position. Along these same lines, Cronin (2008) associated political leadership to stage acting, such that a leader can only survive if they consistently project the image that their constituency demands (p. 468).

Incongruity between the espoused principles of a leader and their actions would seem to cast shadows on the perceived authenticity as a leader. Novicevic, Harvey, Buckley, Brown, and Evans (2006) suggested that authenticity has different meanings when viewed from a philosophical perspective in comparison to a psychological perspective. These authors reported that the philosophical Form of authenticity focuses on “individual virtues and ethical choices ... while psychological meanings of authenticity have been historically articulated in terms of individual traits/states and identities” (p. 66). Therefore, the philosophical perspective of leadership seems to focus on what a leader does, while the psychological view seems to place greater emphasis on who the leader genuinely is. The former seems related to theory-in-practice, but the latter seems to produce a new category, “*who*” the leader actually is inherently.

In an effort to clarify this distinction, Burns (1978) and Bass and Riggio (2006) constructed the notion of pseudo-transformational leadership. This relates to an individual who employs characteristics of transformational leadership but does so for self-serving or destructive ends (p. 14). Likewise, Padilla, Hogan, and Kaiser (2007) presented a category of leadership called destructive leadership for those who engage in negative or harmful tactics to attain follower compliance (p. 179). The implication is there are moral boundaries that disqualify some individuals from the designation of leader or at least from certain kinds of theoretically defined leadership. The daunting challenge is determining where in the spectrum between totally pure and totally evil for a leader as the acceptance point for leadership when all fall short of True Leadership. Of course, the description of Jesus as True light seems to preclude a spectrum view as it stated, “God is light and in him there is no darkness at all” (1 John 1:5).

It seems reasonable to suggest that this argument has some roots in opposing views held by Plato and Aristotle about the nature of reality, or the *True*. In Plato’s view, there are perfect Forms of the True that are unattainable but worthy of pursuit, as opposed to Aristotle’s view that the



True is understood through experience existing only within the temporal constraints of this world (Zucker & Borg, 2005, p. 144). The question is not whether or not a leader should be moral. Both Plato and Aristotle identified character as an important quality of leaders. Rather, Plato framed reality more in a metaphorical sense, while Aristotle seemingly viewed reality in more tangible terms that are often referred to as the *eudemonistic* view (Takala, 1997; Williamson, 2008). The question is more whether if there is a human context of leadership definable as moral or if human Forms of leadership are limited to the shadows and the True Leadership of Jesus is illuminated through the sacred texts.

By no means will the authors of this book attempt to resolve this argument fully in the pages that follow, but rather will examine how such views influence perceptions of leaders. What the argumentation surrounding this subject reveals is whether the emphasis is on the variance of a leader's behaviors from a perfect Form or on whether a leader qualifies as moral within the restraints of a temporal context, leadership seemingly relates to what is in between the Form and the shadows.

## Leading in His Steps: Imitating the *True* Leader

It is humbling to accept the idea of True Leadership as a Form because it involves the surrender of having an achievable target for greatness. This is to concede what Issitt (2007) described about Plato's view of humans as prisoners to the shadows, restrained from the light of the Form. Likewise, Romans 3:23 declares all (sinful humans) have sinned and fall short of God's glory, effectively disqualifying humans in their fallenness from achieving any likeness to Jesus' perfection, as if imprisoned in the shadows of darkness. While the primary allusion is to righteousness, there is a logical inference to the futility of any other Form of *imitatio Christo*, imitation of Jesus (Robbins, 1996), in which we might endeavor to accomplish through our own efforts. Accepting such futility would seem to violate the notion that through study, practice, and mastery experiences, a leader should be able to overcome the shadows and attain the Form that is True Leadership. To set this goal of achievement aside represents an emptying self of ambition, pride, or aggrandizement that seems

abstract to the contemporary understanding of leadership. Would this not in itself be a Form of *imitatio Christo*? “Just as the Son of Man came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many” (Matt. 20:28). Jesus, as the Form of the True leader, emptied himself by stepping down from a rightful position of grandeur to accept humility and frailty (Phil. 2:5-7). Therefore, relinquishing the pursuit of definable greatness as an end for participating in leadership has value in itself as a shadow of True Leadership.

From a Christological view of leadership, the end state of self-emptying, which is represented with the term *kenosis* (Bekker, 2011) in Chap. 8, would seem to serve a critical function in looking beyond the shadows to glimpse that which is True. Paul reminded the church in Ephesus, “For once you were in darkness, but now in the Lord you are light. Live as children of the light – for the fruit of the light is found in all that is good and right and true” (Eph. 5:8–9). Witherington (2007) commented on this passage as follows:

Here Christ or God in Christ is the pattern that the audience is called to emulate and imitate, and Christ is the one to whom implicit praise is given ... Believers are to be light, as Christ is light, and so to act no longer as though they are or they dwell in darkness where no one notices their conduct. (p. 303)

Hence, this seems to support the notion of Jesus as the perfect Form of light as a metaphor for righteousness. Further, the Pauline text implored Christ-followers to emulate His example as a means to move away from darkness, out of the shadows, and to become light. Finally, the passage established that moving out of darkness exposes conduct in a way that an individual’s authenticity, or the lack thereof, is discernible by others.

How then should we lead? The passage in Ephesians 5, and others throughout scripture, offered much about how we should follow in His steps. Consider an Old Testament example from Job:

Does he not see my ways, and number my steps? If I have walked in falsehood, and my foot is hurried to deceit – let me be weighed in a just balance, and let God know my integrity! – if my step has turned aside from

the way, and my heart has followed my eyes, and if any spot has clung to my hands; then let me sow, and another eat: and let what grows for me be rooted out. (Job 31:4–8)

Therefore, in order to *lead* in His steps, we must first be *following* in His steps. What can get lost in this is we must continue to follow in His steps still while we are leading, or we are no longer leading in His steps. Rather, we blaze our own trail back into darkness, pursuing increasingly fainter shadows of leadership rather than True Leadership.

## Conclusion: The Journey Out of the Shadows Towards True Leadership

In an effort to commence a journey out of the shadows of leadership and towards illuminating the Form that is True Leadership, the four contemporary leadership theories of transformational leadership, authentic leadership, servant leadership, and self-emptying (kenotic) leadership will be the focal point of the chapters that follow.

Transformational leadership involves the act of influencing followers in a way that produces intrinsic motivation, not merely to behave in a certain way but to complete the work that the leader desires (Burns, 1978; Joo & Nimon 2012; Northouse, 2019; Sosik & Jung, 2010). Rather, transformational leadership relates to changing what followers value personally, such that their actions naturally contribute to the leader's vision (Yukl, 2013). This is particularly useful for analyzing scripture in a way that would reveal more about the transformational nature of True Leadership such that a leader influences transformation of followers' hearts and minds more so than just their behaviors.

Authentic leadership is helpful in this analysis as well because this leadership construct deals with a leader's self-awareness, behaviors that reflect personal values, and the degree which their theories-in-use resemble their theories-in-practice (Avolio, Gardner, Walumbwa, Luthans, & May, 2004; Shek, Chung, & Leung, 2015; Sosik & Jung, 2010). Within this, there is opportunity to consider the character of a leader, their beliefs, their views related to ethics and morality, and the degree that their actions

are consistent with their espoused beliefs. Finally, the notion of authentic leadership offers an additional dimension as allegory for the gap between the Form of True Leadership and the shadows of leadership that human beings experience. For example, differences between a leader's behaviors and their espoused ideals are likely to draw their authenticity into question. Recognizing that human leaders are incapable of acting in full accord with their espoused principles, it seems reasonable to suggest that humans are also incapable of achieving True Leadership on their own merits for the same reasons.

At first glance, the two concepts of servant leadership and authentic leadership may seem very similar, closely related (Avolio & Gardner, 2005), or that one may be considered subordinate to the other. Upon closer examination, the two appear to be quite distinguishable from one another when the operational definitions of authentic leadership, transformational leadership, and servant leadership are compared in order to provide discernable working distinctions between each construct. However, these two leadership behaviors are distinct in that the servant leader assumes the role of a servant with followers, while authentic leaders act in a way that presents and reflects their personal values (Shek et al., 2015, p. 220).

Finally, kenotic leadership is the notion of an individual emptying themselves in the Form of humility and altruism for the sake of their mission, their followers, or both (Bekker, 2011). This relates to our understanding of True Leadership in the context of Christ's ultimate relinquishment of His rightful position as divine ruler to become a sacrifice so that sinners trapped in the shadows could step into a relationship with the Father God (Philippians 2: 5–11). Thus, unworthy sinners can experience the light and achieving purity through the sanctification of Christ. Because such sacrifice served as the only bridge between darkness and light, Jesus' kenotic acts of reconciliation represent the genesis of any aspiration to reveal even a mere shadow of True Leadership that would otherwise be totally hidden from our view.

## References

- Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Walumbwa, F. O., Luthans, F., & May, D. R. (2004). Unlocking the mask: A look at the process by which authentic leaders impact follower attitudes and behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *15*(6), 801–823.
- Avolio, B. J., & Gardner, W. L. (2005). Authentic leadership development: getting to the root of positive forms of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *16*, 315–338.
- Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bekker, C. J. (2011). Kenotic leadership. In F. Gandolfi (Ed.), *Fundamentals of leadership* (Vol. 1). Saarbrücken, Germany: Lambert Academic Publishing.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harpers & Row.
- Cronin, T. E. (2008). “All the world’s a stage...” acting and the art of political leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *19*, 459–468.
- Henderson, M., Oakes, M., & Smith, M. (2009). What Plato knew about Enron. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *86*(4), 463–471.
- Issitt, J. (2007). Evidence and metacognition in the new regime of truth: Figures of the autonomous learner on the walls of Plato’s cave. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, *41*(3), 381–393.
- Joo, B. K., & Nimon, K. (2012). Two of a kind? A canonical correlational study of transformational leadership and authentic leadership. *European Journal of Training and Development*, *38*(6), 570–587.
- Lawson, D. (2009). Transforming initiatives: Leadership ethics from the Sermon on the Mount. *The Journal of Applied Christian Leadership*, *3*(1), 29.
- Machiavelli, N. (1513/1966). *The prince*. New York: Bantam.
- Morris, T. (2009). Plato’s cave. *South African Journal of Philosophy*, *28*(4), 415–432.
- Northouse, P. G. (2019). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (8th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Novicevic, M. M., Harvey, M. G., Buckley, M. R., Brown, J. A., & Evans, R. (2006). Authentic leadership: A historical perspective. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, *13*(1), 64.
- Padilla, A., Hogan, B., & Kaiser, R. B. (2007). Recent abuses of authority in business, politics, and religion have revived interest in destructive leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *18*, 176–194.
- Robbins, V. K. (1996). *The tapestry of early Christian discourse: Rhetoric, society and ideology*. New York: Routledge.

- Shek, D. T. L., Chung, P. P. Y., & Leung, H. (2015). How unique is the service leadership model? A comparison with contemporary leadership approaches. *International Journal on Disability and Human Development*, 14(3), 217–231.
- Sosik, J. J., & Jung, D. I. (2010). *Full range leadership development: Pathways for people, profit, and planet*. New York: Routledge.
- Stefanini, L., & Di Lascia, A. (1952). The mystery that is Plato. *Cross Currents*, 2(4), 43–68.
- Takala, T. (1997). Charismatic leadership: A key factor in organizational communication. *Corporate Communications*, 2(1), 8.
- Takala, T. (1998). Plato on leadership. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 17(7), 785–798.
- Williamson, T. (2008). The good society and the good soul: Plato's Republic on leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19, 397–408.
- Witherington, B. (1995). *John's wisdom: A commentary on the fourth gospel*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Witherington, B. (2004). *Paul's letter to the Romans: A socio-rhetorical commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Witherington, B. (2007). *The letters to Philemon, the Colossians, and the Ephesians: A socio-rhetorical commentary on the captivity epistles*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing.
- Yukl, G. A. (2013). *Leadership in organizations* (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Zucker, D. M., & Borg, D. (2005). Plato's cave and Aristotle's collections: Dialog across disciplines. *Nursing Philosophy*, 6, 144–147.



# 2

## Distinguishing Between Servant Leadership and Authentic Leadership

David P. Peltz

**Abstract** Some scholars have stated there is a distinct difference between authentic versus inauthentic leadership (Shamir and Eilam, *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 395–417, 2005). Still other scholars have indicated servant leadership involves aspects of authenticity or a state of being authentic (Hotep, *Journal of Pan African Studies*, 3, 11–26, 2010; Malphurs, *Being leaders: The nature of authentic Christian leadership*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2003). At first glance, the two concepts of authentic leadership and servant leadership may seem very similar, closely related (Avolio and Gardner, *Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 315, 2005), or almost interrelated, or that one may be considered subordinate to the other. Upon closer examination, the two appear to be quite distinguishable from one another. The purpose of this chapter is to provide a cross-sectional conspectus of the servant leadership construct in comparison to authentic leadership. Included are operational definitions of authentic leadership, transformational leadership, and servant leadership to provide discernable working distinctions between each construct based upon content discussed in

---

D. P. Peltz (✉)

Peltz Consulting Services LLC, Sahuarita, AZ, USA

© The Author(s) 2020

D. P. Peltz, J. H. Wilson (eds.), *True Leadership*, Christian Faith Perspectives in Leadership and Business, [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-46660-2\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-46660-2_2)

previous chapters. Further, this chapter classifies fundamental details regarding the origin and progression of servant leadership as a distinct construct from authentic leadership. Then this chapter will discuss prevailing servant leadership themes found in academia, in theological/scripture, and among a sampling of worldviews. Finally, this chapter closes with a summarized comparison between servant leadership along with implications for research and praxis.

**Keywords** Servant • Authentic • Leadership • Qualitative • Quantitative • Scripture • Worldviews

As far as leadership models and philosophies go, servant leadership is one of the most, perhaps the most, contemporary view on leadership to date. Though facets and examples of servant leadership have been traced back several millennia, it was not formally developed or recognized until the latter part of the twentieth century. Astroth, Goodwin, and Hodnett (2011) noted fundamental aspects of servant leadership can be traced to the Eastern philosophy Taoism, Lao-tsu (Barnabas, Joseph, & Clifford, 2010), and admittedly were loosely founded/influenced from Eastern philosophy (Greenleaf, 1977; Meixner, 2010). Murray and Evers (2011) suggested there should be an “intentional partnering of leadership and spirituality” (p. 5). This spiritual and scriptural connection can be observed in several articles and texts to include those of Howell Jr. (2003) and Malphurs (2003), just to name a couple.

Perhaps one of the more accepted views of servant leadership personified, from a religious perspective, is the belief Christ was the quintessential servant leader (Black, 2010; Sendjaya & Sarros, 2002). This view has propagated a plethora of articles that have emphasized Christ as a servant leader, as well as the relevancy of servant leadership to the theological realm. A potential challenge with many of the articles may reside in incorporation of an anecdotal evidence-based approach rather than a more formalized, empirical qualitative, and/or quantitative methodology.

Conceptually and experientially, servant leadership theory, application, and practice has ranged from corporate entities (Barnabas et al., 2010) to educational institutions, from secular to religious, from western



to non-western/international. During the first ten years of the twenty-first century, hundreds of peer-reviewed articles and texts have been written as increasingly more qualitative and quantitative research has been conducted in order to fully understand the implications and outcomes of this leadership model. A good portion of this research has been dedicated to understanding and distinguishing the differences between servant leadership and other leadership models available and utilized.

This discourse explores the origin and progression of servant leadership and provides distinguishing characteristics between servant leadership and authentic leadership. To accomplish this, a fundamental understanding of servant leadership must be conveyed. This chapter also provides working distinctions between authentic leadership, transformational leadership, and servant leadership. To further construe and facilitate the applications and implications of servant leadership, three applied themes of servant leadership are presented: academic, theological/scriptural, and non-western worldviews.

## **Authentic, Transformational, and Servant Leadership Defined**

This section not only describes/defines authentic, transformational, and servant leadership theories, but also takes into consideration inauthentic and pseudo-transformational leadership theories to establish discernable distinctions between the primary and counter associated leadership theories to facilitate and further differentiate their potential relationships. Scholars have indicated and attempted to differentiate between the theories, citing they are closely related (Avolio & Gardner, 2005; Parolini, Patterson, & Winston, 2009). It has been noted authentic, transformational, and servant leaderships are often compared (Savage-Austin & Honeycutt, 2011). Savage-Austin and Honeycutt (2011) stated,

Characteristics noted between the authentic and transformational leadership models and the servant leadership philosophy are as follows: integrity, trust, respect, and authenticity. Interestingly, the transformational approach emphasizes the ethical responsibility of the leader and calls attention to the

need for leaders to communicate vision morally and ethically. The authentic leader is noted as having the ability to provide an unbiased comprehension of multiple points of view (or sides) of an issue while behaving in accordance with one's true self (Avolio & Gardner). Research also indicates the common theme of the servant leader revolves more around the well-being of others. (p. 50)

## Authentic Leadership

Northouse (2019) noted three common viewpoints/perspectives of authentic leadership: intrapersonal, interpersonal, and developmental. Northouse indicated Shamir and Eilam (2005) addressed the intrapersonal; Eagly (2005) addressed the interpersonal; and Avolio, Gardner, Walumbwa, Wernsing, and Peterson (Avolio & Gardner, 2005; Gardner, Avolio, Luthans, May, & Walumbwa, 2005; Walumbwa, Avolio, Gardner, Wernsing, & Peterson, 2008) addressed the developmental perspective. Each of these approaches, though similar, contains subtle nuances distinguishing them from the others.

### Intrapersonal Perspective

Shamir and Eilam (2005) stated, "Authentic leaders are portrayed as possessing self-knowledge and a personal point of view, which reflects clarity about their values and convictions" (p. 396) and "They are also portrayed as identifying strongly with their leadership role, expressing themselves by enacting that role, and acting on the basis of their values and convictions" (p. 396). Shamir and Eilam continued, "Leaders are authentic to the extent they act and justify their actions on the basis of the meaning system provided by their life-stories" (p. 396). Shamir and Eilam (2005) suggested this was a shift from the traditional focus on developing skills and behaviors, and emphasized self-development of the leader through their life experiences and reflection, which were not associated with their leadership style (p. 396). They ultimately defined authentic leadership as follows:

1. The degree of person-role merger i.e. the salience of the leadership role in their self-concept
  2. The level of self-concept clarity and the extent to which this clarity centers around strongly held values and convictions
  3. The extent to which their goals are self-concordant
  4. The degree to which their behavior is consistent with their self-concept.
- (p. 399)

### **Interpersonal Perspective**

Eagly (2005) introduced a relational element to defining authentic leadership. She proposed it was derived from two components: “Leaders endorse values that promote the interests of the larger community and transparently convey these values to followers” (p. 461) and “Followers personally identify with these values and accept them as appropriate for the community in which they are joined to the leader—be that a nation, an organization, or a group” (p. 461). Eagly stated these two components, referred to as relational authenticity, are interdependent whereby both need to occur to produce the positive effects of authentic leadership.

### **Developmental Perspective**

Walumbwa, Avolio, Gardner, Wernsing, and Peterson (2008) indicated the basis of their position was behavioral in nature, which can be developed as opposed to an inherent trait. Their research resulted in a further refined model and quantitative scale. The developmental model included four factors: self-awareness, relational transparency, internalized moral perspective, and balanced processing (p. 121).

### **Inauthentic Leadership**

Shamir and Eilam (2005) distinguished inauthentic leadership from authentic leadership and used transformational leadership as an example. Shamir and Eilam noted authentic leadership was not synonymous with

transformational leadership, whereby transformational leaders could be either authentic or inauthentic (p. 396). This may imply other leadership models may also be categorized as either authentic or inauthentic depending on attributed characteristics.

## Transformational Leadership

Just as it has been stated, authentic leadership has a negative counter model, so it has been indicated transformational leadership does too. Both are briefly discussed here. Yukl (2013) summarized Bass' definition of transformational leadership as follows:

The leader transforms and motivates followers by (1) making them more aware of the importance of task outcomes, (2) inducting them to transcend their own self-interest for the sake of the organization or team, and (3) activating their higher-order needs. (p. 322)

Bass (1990) included within his definition of transformational leadership that followers “consider their longer-term needs to develop themselves, rather than their needs of the moment” (p. 53). Indicative of this summarization, the leader develops their followers albeit ultimately for the benefit of the organization (Bass, 1990).

## Pseudo-transformational Leadership

Bass and Steidlmeier (1999) stated, “The opposite [of transformational leadership] is inauthentic or pseudo-transformational leadership, that of leaders who consciously or unconsciously act in bad faith (Sartre, 1992)” (p. 184). Bass and Steidlmeier added, “It is the presence or absence of such a moral foundation of the leader as a moral agent that grounds the distinction between authentic versus pseudo-transformational leadership” (p. 186). Kalshoven, Den Hartog, and De Hoogh (2011) stated,

Pseudo-transformational leaders have motives or intentions that are not legitimate and they aim for undesirable goals, whereas authentic transformational leaders have a strong moral compass and serve the organization. (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999, p. 350)

Bass and Steidlmeier (1999) also stated, “Followers should not be mere means to self-satisfying ends for the leader but should be treated as ends in themselves” (p. 186). Bass and Steidlmeier noted pseudo-transformational leaders are deceptive and manipulative (Ethical Issues in Transformational Leadership), and made a clear distinction that “authentic transformational leaders may have to be manipulative at times for what they judge to be the common good, but manipulation is a frequent practice of pseudo-transformational leaders and an infrequent practice of authentic transformational leaders” (p. 186).

To summarize, pseudo-transformational leadership, by all accounts, is the moral antithesis of transformational leadership. Of the leadership models discussed thus far, it is perhaps the most intentionally destructive form of leadership exhibited due to the calculated nature of the actions and decisions of the leader. It appears that the only essential goal of pseudo-transformational leadership is the success and progression of the leader themselves whereby the followers become somewhat expendable.

## Servant Leadership

Perhaps one of the singular most defining qualities that distinguish servant leadership from other forms of leadership is “servant leaders transcend self-interest” (Ebener & O’Connell, 2010, p. 315). Greenleaf (1977) described servant leadership as putting the needs of the followers first. This approach to leadership still leaves many philosophers and scholars of traditional leadership models questioning the rationality and practicality of such a paradigm. Within Greenleaf’s concept of servant leadership, the servant leader develops followers based upon the follower’s needs with the inherent understanding the organization/entity will benefit from the growth and development of the follower. To clarify, the development and growth that occurs may not directly correlate to the

follower's *current* position, task, or place of employment. The question may be asked, if it does not directly benefit the company, how does the company benefit? Simply stated, the organizational benefit may actually be that the employee finds a more gratifying means of work outside the company, whereby the company may then have the opportunity to find a candidate more well suited for the needed/desired tasks/job.

### **Servant Leadership Implied as Authentic?**

Hotep (2010) and Malphurs (2003) both indicated servant leadership contains an implied facet/characteristic of being authentic. Sipe and Frick (2009) stated it was in fact one of the key components of serving with integrity, one of the factors within the “seven pillars of servant leadership” (pp. 4–5). Spears and Lawrence (2002) stated servant leaders must be authentic.

It appears servant leadership contains characteristics, factors, facets, and perhaps even an inherent requirement to be authentic. Does this mean servant leadership is a form of authentic leadership? Is servant leadership authentic simply by nature of inherent design and its fundamental principles? Could authentic leadership be the common denominator within leadership models that focus on the development of the employee/follower? If it is the common denominator, is it really a separate type of leadership or only a shared characteristic?

## **Origin and Progression of Servant Leadership**

### **Origin of Servant Leadership**

Robert K. Greenleaf published the concept of servant leadership in 1977. It was the manifestation of an article he had written in 1969, which was based upon his personal interest in and influenced by *Journey to the East*, written by Hermann Hesse. It was also due in part to the culmination of over 40 years of professional and corporate experience. His book *Servant Leadership: A Journey into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness*

became the catalyst for a new approach and alternative perspective for viewing the role of leadership, that of being a servant first. This counter-cultural view of leadership did not take off immediately but rather took over a decade to gain any substantial momentum. Most of what has been written about servant leadership, aside from the works of Greenleaf himself, has been predominantly constructed and composed in the mid- to late-1990s through the present. To note, much of this work has been conducted after Greenleaf's death in 1990 (Frick, 2004).

## Progression of Servant Leadership

Robert Greenleaf retired from corporate work in September 1964 to begin consulting and founded the Center for Applied Ethics (Frick, 2004; Greenleaf Center, 2011). This center changed its name to the Center for Applied Studies in January 1968 (Frick, 2004). In 1985, Greenleaf's health began to decline, and the name of the center was changed a third time to the Robert K. Greenleaf Center (Greenleaf Center, 2011). Larry C. Spears served as president and CEO of the Robert K. Greenleaf Center from 1990 to 2007 (Ferch & Spears, 2011; Greenleaf Center, 2011). In 2008, Larry Spears became the president and CEO for the Larry C. Spears Center for Servant Leadership Inc. (Ferch & Spears, 2011). Both centers are still operational and offer widespread support, lectures, teachings, and resources to facilitate the propagation of servant leadership knowledge.

Larry Spears, as well as many others, have contributed significantly to the progression of servant leadership. He has served as editor and author to many of Greenleaf's works and the advancement of the field. In 1992, Spears identified ten prevailing characteristics of servant leadership, which have provided the foundation for many future works in the advancement of servant leadership research (The Spears Center, 2011).

## Servant Leadership Research

The advancement of the field of servant leadership has not stopped at lectures, symposiums, roundtable, coursework, and mere sources of support. It has branched into the realm of academia, whereby qualitative and

quantitative research has been conducted in an effort to better understand the theory and to introduce academic support and legitimacy to the leadership model. This has led to an abundance of qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods research and models to review and consider.

## Qualitative Research

Patterson (2003) identified seven constructs that support the servant leadership model. The seven constructs Patterson identified were leader agapao love, humility, altruism, vision, trust, service, and empowerment. Winston (2003) extended Patterson's (2003) model. Initially, Patterson's model was only one way by virtue of the leader. Winston (2003) extended this model to include additional follower constructs, which included follower agapao love, commitment, self-efficacy, intrinsic motivation, altruism, and service. Winston (2004) conducted a two-year case study involving servant leadership that involved the utilization of both Patterson's (2003) and Winston's (2003) models. Results of the two-year study supported the two sets (leader and follower) of variables.

Savage-Austin and Honeycutt (2011) conducted a phenomenological study of business leaders. The study focused on leaders' experiences that practice servant leadership. The study concluded as follows:

(1) The ultimate test of a leader's effectiveness is based upon how a leader is allowed to demonstrate his or her traits and character.

(2) The most common barriers to servant leadership practices are the organization's culture, the fear of change due to lack of presence of other servant leaders within the organization, and the lack of knowledge regarding the philosophy of servant leadership practices.

(3a) Servant leaders who work in environments that do not support servant leadership practices miss the opportunity to fully develop and teach their followers.

(3b) Organizational elements (barriers) make it difficult for servant leaders to interact with others outside of their inner circle, and perpetuate the development of silos; the impact of silos within an organization can be devastating. (pp. 52–53)



Additionally, a mixed methods research project was conducted by Sendjaya, Sarros, and Santora (2008). The quantitative scale is displayed in the Quantitative Research section, and the qualitative portion is mentioned in the Mixed Methods Research section below.

## Quantitative Research

At least 13 quantitative studies have been conducted that have been specifically focused on servant leadership. To summarize at a high level, and without going into great detail on each study, the chart below has been assimilated. The chart displays the description of the scales utilized, the number of dimensions contained within each scale, and the dimensions each scale measured. Each scale utilized a Likert type scale ranging from 4 to 7 points. In some cases, the author has provided an informal descriptor to distinguish them from the other formally named scales; this is noted by “(I/D)” after the title. Each of the below quantitative scales has a variety of outcomes, and validity and reliability values (Table 2.1).

## Mixed Methods Research

Sendjaya, Sarros, and Santora (2008) conducted a mixed research study that examined servant leadership behavior in organizations. Through interviews and reviewed literature, six servant leadership dimensions were established: “(1) Voluntary Subordination; (2) Authentic Self; (3) Covenantal Relationship; (4) Responsible Morality; (5) Transcendental Spirituality; and (6) Transforming Influence” (p. 412). The quantitative study utilized the Servant Leadership Behaviour Scale. Results from the quantitative study were tested against the results from the qualitative study and confirmed the six dimensions identified (p. 412). The quantitative scale was included in the above chart.

**Table 2.1** Servant leadership scale assimilation—13 scales

Scale description	Dimensions	Dimensions measured
Organizational Leadership Assessment © 1998 (Laub, 2003)	6	Values people, develops people, builds community, displays authenticity, provides leadership, and shares leadership
Revised Servant Leadership Profile © (Wong & Page, 2003)	10	Leading, servanthood, visioning, developing others, team-building, empowering others, shared decision making, and integrity
Revised Servant Leadership Profile ©—Factor Analysis (Dennis & Winston, 2003)	3	Empowerment, service, vision
Organizational Citizenship Behavior Servant Leadership Measure (I/D) (Ehrhart, 2004)	7	Servant leadership: forming relationships with subordinates, empowering subordinates, helping subordinates grow and succeed, behaving ethically, having conceptual skills, putting subordinates first, and creating value for those outside of the organization
Servant Leadership and Organizational Trust Inventory (Reinke, 2004)	4	Servant leadership: openness, vision, and stewardship; trust
Servant Leadership Assessment Instrument © 2004 (Dennis & Bocarnea, 2005)	5	Empowerment, love, humility, trust, vision
Servant Leadership Questionnaire (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006)	5	Altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping, organizational stewardship
Servant Shepherd Leadership Scale (Rardin, 2000; Whittington, Frank, May, Murray, & Goodwin, 2006)	4	Other-centered, facilitative environment, self-sacrifice, follower affirmation
Multidimensional Servant Leadership Measure (I/D) (Liden, Wayne, Zhao, & Henderson, 2008)	7	Conceptual skills, empowerment, helping subordinates grow and succeed, putting subordinates first, behaving ethically, emotional healing, and creating value for the community

*(continued)*

Table 2.1 (continued)

Scale description	Dimensions	Dimensions measured
Servant Leadership Behaviour Scale (Sendjaya, Sarros, & Santora, 2008)	6	Voluntary subordination, authentic self, covenantal relationship, responsible morality, transcendental spirituality, transforming influence
Servant-Leadership Styles Inventory (Fridell, Newcom Belcher, & Messner, 2009)	4	Daily reflection, consensus building, healing relationships, drive sense of self-worth
Parsimonious Servant Leadership Measure (I/D) (Fields & Winston, 2010—unpublished)	1	Parsimonious servant leadership measures
Executive Servant Leadership (Reed, Vidaver-Cohen, & Colwell, 2011)	6	Interpersonal support, building community, altruism, egalitarianism, moral integrity, executive servant leadership

Note: The author has provided *informal descriptors* for three of the scales that did not have a formal name assigned; this was to distinguish them from the other scales discussed and will be noted by "(I/D)" after the title

## Servant Leadership Themes

One of the interesting facets of several of the servant leadership articles is they are not necessarily homogenous to any one singular theme. That is to say, articles involving academia may cross over into scriptural or worldview themes, or similarly, a worldview article may cross over into a theme of academia. This crossing of themes displays the variety and the breadth of servant leadership study and application.

## Servant Leadership in Academia

The use/incorporation of servant leadership characteristics (SLC) has been documented both through formal quantitative and qualitative research, and through less formal experiential approaches. Taylor, Martin, Hutchinson, and Jinks (2007) noted,

DuFour (2001) recommended that principals who embrace their role as servant leader will focus on creating school settings in which people are working towards a shared vision and are honoring collective commitments to self and others. (p. 402)

Black (2010) conducted research organization climate and servant leadership. Within the research project, Black administered Laub's Organizational Leadership Assessment to full-time 231 teaching staff and 15 principals from an Ontario, Canada, Catholic school board as part of a mixed methods research study. The article maintained references to scriptural acts as one of the fundamental justifications for servant leadership in the academic environment. The study concluded that there was "a significant positive relationship between the perceptions of servant leadership practices and perceptions of school climate" (p. 460).

Meixner (2010) described how while she was teaching an undergraduate level leadership course became disheartened over the pedagogical teaching methodology around the course. Meixner took it upon herself to read *The Journey to the East*, the same text inspired Robert Greenleaf. Meixner indicated that it renewed her spirit toward teaching leadership and she was able to sympathize with Greenleaf's inspiration with the text.

Boroski and Greif (2009) conducted a qualitative servant leadership study involving 20 community college presidents, identified as servant leaders by their peers. The phenomenological study delved into experiences, values, and beliefs deemed critical to their approaches to leadership. The study concluded the results from the interviews coincided and suggested strong alignment with the ten servant leadership characteristics identified by Spears. The ten characteristics identified by Spears are addressed in the Characteristics of Servant Leadership and Authentic Leadership section below.

Hays (2008) applied the ten servant leadership characteristics identified by Spears to a teaching environment. In this project, the instructor attempted to incorporate one or more of the servant leadership characteristics into their "instructional strategy or approach" (p. 123). Hays stated, "Narratives are [were] extracted from student reflective learning journals, interviews, and unsolicited comments from students" (p. 123) to provide the data for the research project. Hays concluded that incorporating

servant leadership into the instructor's teaching style "produces outcomes that transcend more conventional forms of instruction" (p. 131).

Taylor, Martin, Hutchinson, and Jinks (2007) conducted a quantitative study that involved principals from elementary through high school. The study utilized two assessments, the "Self-assessment of servant leadership profile" by Wong and Page, and a second leadership survey from Kouzes and Posner. Taylor, Martin, Hutchinson, and Jinks indicated 50% of the principals who responded rated themselves as servant leaders.

## Servant Leadership in Theology/Scripture

Many scholars and Christian communities believe Christ was the ultimate servant leader, and he embodied and exemplified what it meant to be a servant leader (Kretzschmar, 2002; Sendjaya & Sarros, 2002). Many of those within these communities believe, too, there are several teachings by scriptural authors that display servant leadership characteristics themselves, thereby also becoming examples of servant leaders. Challenges and questions exist as to whether the evidential characteristics may be anecdotally derived or are based upon repeatable qualitative and/or quantitative research.

It has been noted that there is a potential lack of *leadership* in the theological realm and more should be done to merge leadership and administration in pastoral/religious realms (Frank, 2006). Frank (2006) noted, "Pastors find the call of leadership appealing but generally think of it first in terms of preaching, teaching, and pastoral care" (p. 114) and "Few pastors would identify administration as essential to their vocation" (pp. 113–114). Frank pointed out that the United Methodist Church replaced its "understanding of ordained ministry ... with an appeal for 'servant leadership' ... [and] asserted that all leaders (in fact, all Christians) are called to servant leadership" (pp. 124–125). Frank recognized this noble attempt caused consternation within the church's membership due to the ambiguity and unfamiliarity of the term within the church. The church did identify the need for the incorporation of servant leadership within its congregation; perhaps, the issue was not so much with the term/concept of servant leadership, but rather more so with the execution of its integration within the community.

Flaniken (2006) showed how Greenleaf's servant leadership principles could be directly related to scriptural passages. In the article Flaniken provided specific examples of being a servant first from Mark 9:35, Philippians 2:3, Philippians 2:7, and Galatians 5:13; each of which is provided below from the New Revised Standard Version.

Mark 9:35 states, "He sat down, called the twelve, and said to them, 'Whoever wants to be first must be last of all and servant of all.'"

Philippians 2:3 states, "Do nothing from selfish ambition or conceit, but in humility regard others as better than yourselves."

Philippians 2:7 states, "but emptied himself, taking the form of a slave, being born in human likeness. And being found in human form,"

Galatians 5:13 states, "For you were called to freedom, brothers and sisters; only do not use your freedom as an opportunity for self-indulgence, but through love become slaves to one another."

Other books mentioned regarding being a servant first included Leviticus, Matthew, II Corinthians, and Romans. Flaniken also provided biblical examples for each of the SLC identified in the article (listed below). To note, not all characteristics mentioned below have an exact correlation to the characteristics identified by Spears (see section titled Characteristics of Servant Leadership and Authentic Leadership).

The Leader Guides.

The Leader is Goal-Oriented and Qualified.

The Leader Listens and Reflects.

The Leader is Fair and Flexible.

The Leader is Intuitive and Aware.

The Leader Uses Persuasion.

The Leader Takes One Step at a Time. (p. 34)

Biblical examples of a leader as a guide were from the book of Matthew; being goal-oriented was from the story of Moses; leaders listen and reflect and use persuasion were from the book of proverbs; being fair and flexible were from the books of John and Luke; being intuitive was from the story of David; and taking things "one step at a time" (p. 34) was from the story of Noah.

## Servant Leadership Non-western Worldviews

Hannay (2009) provided an article that discussed the cross-cultural application of servant leadership. Hannay utilized the five cultural dimensions identified by Hofstede (1993, 2001): power distance, individualism versus collectivism, masculinity versus femininity, uncertainty avoidance, and long-term versus short-term orientation. Hofstede (1993) provided a table with ten countries which included the USA, Germany, Japan, France, the Netherlands, Hong Kong, Indonesia, West Africa, Russia, and China (p. 91). Hannay stated that power distance and uncertainty avoidance stood out as being more critical to the success of servant leadership than the other cultural dimensions (p. 9), and out of the ten countries listed by Hofstede, the Netherlands appeared to be the best suited for successful use of servant leadership.

### Africa

What is potentially interesting about the African worldview, according to Kretzschmar (2002), is servant leadership may be considered a confusing concept. This, Kretzschmar indicated, may be in part due to the perceptions around the usage of the word *servant*, whereby “the word ‘servant’ reminds too many of us of slavery and servitude” (p. 47). According to Kretzschmar, this alternative non-western perception of the concept was addressed by Robert Dale who provided the following summary pertaining to servant leadership:

Servants lead out of relationship, not by coercion;  
Servants lead by support, not by control;  
Servants lead by developing others, not by doing all the ministry themselves;  
Servants guide people, not drive them;  
Servants lead from love, not domination;  
Servants seek growth, not position. (p. 47)

Kretzschmar continued,

Such leaders can empower groups towards healing and transformation. They can assist believers to pursue common goals and to be future oriented. They are able to develop and enhance the power of individuals within the group through managing and nurturing members within the group. (pp. 47–48)

## **Australia and Indonesia**

Pekerti and Sendjaya (2010) conducted a quantitative servant leadership study in Australia and Indonesia, which was intended to expand the GLOBE study. The study first sought to determine if servant leadership was used/practiced in Australia and Indonesia; and secondly, “if it is practised, then to what degree does culture influence SL [servant leadership] in Australia and Indonesia” (p. 755). The study was applied to six servant leadership dimensions: voluntary subordination, authentic self, conventional relationship, transcendental spirituality, responsible morality, and transforming influence” (p. 770). The 5-point Likert-scale-based survey was administered to two educational institutions in Indonesia, and four organizations—two for-profit and two not-for-profit—in Australia. Pekerti and Sendjaya concluded, “Servant leadership is universally practised and accepted in Australia and Indonesia” (p. 776).

## **China**

Han, Kakabadse, and Kakabadse (2010) conducted a qualitative study on servant leadership in China. The research study involved a pilot study first, followed by a main study from the quasi-governmental sector. The survey consisted of open-ended questions “to describe one or more concrete events they viewed as servant leadership in their work experience” (p. 273). Six servant leadership dimensions surfaced as similar within China: putting people first, ethical behavior, moral (agapao) love, leadership (conceptual skills), humility, and building relationships (p. 274). Han, Kakabadse, and Kakabadse concluded, “Using an inductive approach” (p. 277), “that the concept of servant leadership holds comparable meaning in China” (p. 277).



## Turkey

Cerit (2010) conducted a research study on servant leadership in Turkish elementary schools. The first part of the study was a series of six qualitative questions administered to teachers; the second part of the study was quantitative, was administered to school principals, and utilized the “servant organizational leadership assessment (SOLA) scale developed by Laub (1999)” (p. 308). Cerit concluded, “The results of this study reveal that three strongest servant leadership predictors of teachers’ organization commitment are valuing people, developing people and displaying authenticity” (p. 312).

## Characteristics of Servant Leadership and Authentic Leadership

Spears (1998, 2004), Sipe and Frick (2009), Shamir and Eilam (2005), and Bissessar (2010) have added to the breadth and detailed understanding within their respective leadership communities. Listed below are the terse characteristics of servant and authentic leadership. For the sake of brevity, and because the terms and statements are relatively rudimentary, definitions of each are not provided.

### Characteristics and Pillars of Servant Leadership

The characteristics of servant leadership were developed by Spears (1998, 2004). The pillars of servant leadership were constructed by Sipe and Frick (2009).

### Characteristics

After several years of in-depth research based upon the many manuscripts by Greenleaf, Spears (1998, 2004) identified ten characteristics of servant leadership:

1. Listening
2. Empathy
3. Healing
4. Awareness
5. Persuasion
6. Conceptualization
7. Foresight
8. Stewardship
9. Commitment to growth of people
10. Building community

### **Pillars**

Sipe and Frick (2009) also conducted research based upon Greenleaf's writings and developed the seven pillars of servant leadership:

1. Person of character
2. Puts people first
3. Skilled communicator
4. Compassionate collaborator
5. Has foresight
6. Systems thinker
7. Leads with moral authority

### **Characteristics, Attributes, and Seeds of Authentic Leadership**

The characteristics and attributes of authentic leadership were provided by Shamir and Eilam (2005), while the seeds of authentic leadership were provided by Bissessar (2010). There appears to be a definite progression and expansion of content within authentic leadership.

## Characteristics

Shamir and Eilam (2005) suggested “that the main defining characteristics of authentic leaders” (p. 396) were as follows:

1. Authentic leaders do not fake their leadership.
2. Relatedly, authentic leaders do not take on a leadership role or engage in leadership activities for status, honor or other personal rewards.
3. Authentic leaders are originals, not copies.
4. Authentic leaders are leaders whose actions are based on their values and convictions. (pp. 396–398)

## Attributes

Shamir and Eilam (2005) identified attributes of authentic leadership:

1. The role of the leader is a central component of their self-concept.
2. They have achieved a high level of self-resolution (Turner, 1976) or self-concept clarity.
3. Their goals are self-concordant.
4. Their behavior is self-expressive. (pp. 398–399)

## Seeds

Bissessar (2010) stated that there were six seeds within authentic leadership:

1. The need for leaders to manifest what is in their hearts,
2. Ability to embrace both the good and the bad and learn from them,
3. The leader serves the parts and the whole through value creation,
4. The leader masters the ego and moves beyond the ego,
5. The leader displays social intelligence through his or her ability to connect with others, and
6. The leader is able to find the potential in others. (p. 1)

## Comparison Between Servant Leadership and Authentic Leadership

Avolio and Gardner (2005) provided the following comparison between servant leadership and authentic leadership:

Like authentic leadership, both servant and spiritual leadership include either explicit or implicit recognition of the role of leader self-awareness/regulation. For example, prevailing theories of servant leadership (e.g., Greenleaf, 1977; Smith, Montagno, & Kuzmenko, 2004; Spears, 1995, 1998; Spears, Lawrence, & Blanchard, 2001) include discussions of leader awareness, empathy, conceptualization, and foresight (vision). However, in contrast to our authentic leadership development perspective which draws from the clinical, positive and social psychology literatures for our discussion of self-awareness/regulation (Bandura, 1986, 1997, 2000; Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000; Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998), the discussion of these constructs within servant leadership theory has been largely atheoretical and not grounded or supported by empirical research. Also largely missing from servant leadership theory is explicit recognition of the mediating role of follower self-awareness and regulation, as well as positive psychological capital, and a positive organizational context. Finally, contributions of servant leadership to sustainable and veritable performance are not currently articulated. (p. 331)

Table 2.2 was assimilated from the content from Spears (1998, 2004), Sipe and Frick (2009), Shamir and Eilam (2005), and Bissessar (2010). The table displays each of the characteristics (ten) and pillars (seven) of servant leadership from Spears, and Sipe and Frick (respectively) next to the characteristics (four) and attributes (four), and seeds (six) of authentic leadership from Shamir and Eilam, and Bissessar (respectively) from the paragraphs above. What becomes evident is six of the SLC from Spears and two of the servant leadership pillars (SLP) from Sipe and Frick can be observed in two of the authentic leadership characteristics (ALC) from Shamir and Eilam, and four of the authentic leadership seeds (ALS) from Bissessar.

**Table 2.2** Servant leadership versus authentic leadership

Servant leadership		Authentic leadership	
Characteristics <sup>a</sup>	Pillars <sup>b</sup>	Characteristics <sup>c</sup>	Attributes <sup>d</sup>
Listening	Person of character	Do not fake their leadership	Central component of their self-concept
Empathy	Puts people first	Do not take on a leadership role for personal reward	Achieved a high level of self-resolution
Healing	Skilled communicator	Are originals	Goals are self-concordant
Awareness	Compassionate collaborator	Actions are based on their values and convictions	Behavior is self-expressive
Persuasion	Has foresight		
Conceptualization	Systems thinker		
Foresight	Leads with moral authority		

Seeds<sup>e</sup>

Manifest what is in their hearts  
 Embrace both the good and the bad and learn from them  
 Serves the parts and the whole through value creation  
 Masters the ego and moves beyond the ego  
 Displays social intelligence through his or her ability to connect with others  
 Find the potential in others

(continued)

Table 2.2 (continued)

Servant leadership	Authentic leadership			
Characteristics <sup>a</sup>	Pillars <sup>b</sup>	Characteristics <sup>c</sup>	Attributes <sup>d</sup>	Seeds <sup>e</sup>
Stewardship Commitment to growth of people Building community				

Note: This table was adapted from the following four sources:

<sup>a</sup>Spears, L. C. (Ed.). (1998). *Insights on Leadership: Service Stewardship, Spirit, and Servant Leadership*. New York, NY: Wiley & Sons Inc.; and Spears, L. C. (2004). *Practicing Servant-Leadership. Leader to Leader*, (34), 7–11. Retrieved from EBSCOhost

<sup>b</sup>Sipe, J. W., & Frick, D. M. (2009). *Seven Pillars of Servant Leadership: Practicing the Wisdom of Leading by Serving*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press

<sup>c</sup>Shamir, B., & Eilam, G. (2005). What's your story: A life-stories approach to authentic leadership development [Electronic version]. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 395–417

<sup>d</sup>Shamir, B., & Eilam, G. (2005). What's your story: A life-stories approach to authentic leadership development [Electronic version]. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 395–417

<sup>e</sup>Bissessar, C. (2010). *Authentic Leadership: As Exemplified by Kamla Persad Bissessar- Implications for Current and Potential Leaders. Advancing Women in Leadership*, 30(23), 1–9. Retrieved from EBSCOhost

To further elucidate, the following relational groupings between servant leadership characteristics and pillars, and authentic leadership characteristics and seeds were provided:

1. Healing (SLC) → Embrace both the good and the bad and learn from them (ALS)
2. Awareness (SLC) → Serves the parts and the whole through value creation (ALS)
3. Persuasion (SLC), Leads with moral authority (SLP) → Actions are based on their values and convictions (ALC)
4. Stewardship (SLC), Puts people first (SLP) → Do not take on a leadership role for personal reward (ALC)
5. Commitment to growth of people (SLC) → Find the potential in others (ALS)
6. Building community (SLC) → Displays social intelligence through his or her ability to connect with others (ALS)

What these groupings display is there does appear to be some intersection between the two types of leaderships. What this also displays is the two leadership styles are not synonymous. The fundamental question extracted from this data was, what then, if any, is the actual relationship or dynamic between the two leadership styles?

## Discussion

Taylor, Martin, Hutchinson, and Jinks (2007) noted, “He [Senge, 1995] suggested servant leadership opened up a new caring paradigm of leadership because it builds on relationships and focuses on service to others” (p. 402). Vinod and Sudhakar (2011) discussed servant leadership in organizations. Vinod and Sudhakar stated, “According to Vinod and Sudhakar (2011), six criteria identify these companies [who practice servant leadership]: openness and fairness, camaraderie/friendliness, opportunities, pride in work and company, pay/benefits, and security” (p. 461). These statements would appear to indicate that servant leadership

embodies a deliberateness that focuses on the relationship quality of individuals and the organization.

Avolio and Gardner (2005) stated, “Authentic leadership can incorporate transformational, charismatic, servant, spiritual or other forms of positive leadership” (p. 329), yet Taylor, Martin, Hutchinson, and Jinks stated, “A number of noted leadership authors, including Spears (1998, 2001), have claimed servant leadership is a concept compatible with and enhances other leadership models” (p. 405). McCuddy and Cavin (2008) stated, “Servant leadership, in its practical application, requires a community of trust, authenticity, and shared reliance” (p. 108). These statements may indicate the positional complexities surrounding the positional relationship between authentic leadership and servant leadership.

## Central Message

Perhaps the central message herein is additional research and investigation should be conducted to further and fully understand the relationship between servant leadership and authentic leadership. Fundamentally, both may be considered acceptable forms of leadership for both managers/leaders/supervisors and organizations. It may be asserted though some similarities appear to exist between the two leadership types. It could also be asserted one leadership style (either servant leadership or authentic leadership) may actually encompass the other.

## Impact to Leadership and the Global Community

Bissessar (2010) stated, “Potential and current leaders should master the ego and lead from a position of servant” (p. 6). Still another view, though agreeable with the concept of servant leadership, shared concern with the facet regarding its implementation. Irving and McIntosh (2009) concluded, “While the vision of servant-oriented leadership is attractive to many in the Latin American context, the obstacles to its practice and effective implementation and development are substantial” (p. 10). Still, Herman (2010) concluded that her “study found a positive correlation



between employee perceptions of organizational servant leadership and workplace spirituality” (p. 98).

During the discourse of conducting servant leadership literary research, it quickly becomes apparent a community of leadership exists that strongly supports the inclusion, incorporation, and application of servant leadership in the secular, theological, academic, and global communities. Several projects and practical applications of servant leadership have been applied throughout the USA and countries throughout the world. Additionally, servant leadership is not a style that is facilely applied nor limited to theological application.

## Future Implications and Research

Avolio and Gardner (2005) stated, “Authentic leadership can incorporate transformational, charismatic, servant, spiritual or other forms of positive leadership” (p. 329). This statement may become a catalyst for future research based upon this discourse. The statement by Avolio and Gardner, and the content throughout this discourse, may premise several potential questions to emerge:

1. What, if any, is the true relationship between servant leadership and authentic leadership? Is one subordinate to the other? Is servant leadership encompassed under the theoretical umbrella of authentic leadership? Is authentic leadership (authenticity, being authentic) more of a shared characteristic among several leadership models/theories rather than an individual construct?
2. Based upon the distinctions of authentic versus inauthentic leadership and transformational versus pseudo-transformational leadership, does the potential that two types of servant leadership exist: authentic servant leadership and inauthentic/pseudo-servant leadership? If the concept of inauthentic/pseudo-servant leadership (that is to say developing followers based upon the followers’ needs for the conscious benefit of the leader, not the organization) is in reality a fallacy by the very definition of servant leadership, then how would that leadership type (inauthentic/pseudo-servant leadership) be classified?

3. What are the potential global implications if servant leadership becomes more widely accepted and utilized? What are the educational implications if servant leadership becomes a formal academic pillar/keystone in higher education? What would be the implications of servant leadership as a pillar to twenty-first-century leadership throughout the fabric of industry, government, and/or for/not for/non-profit?

## Final Thoughts

Servant leadership is perhaps one of the newest and most potentially pervasive leadership theories to have emerged in the past 40 years. Its implications and applications are virtually innumerable. To think of a world that utilized a singular form of leadership captured by the incorporation of servant leadership would be auspicious, albeit utopian as well. Additionally, it would make for a very boring and impractical world wrought with more problems than solutions. Singular utilization of a leadership style is impractical at best. Perhaps, one of the best scenarios that can be envisioned would be of a world that understands leadership differences and effectively engages the appropriate positive leadership methodologies within the correct frame of references. Potentially, servant leadership (and admittedly authentic leadership) may be two of those leadership constructs. However, to become more effective leaders we must continue to strive for a clearer understanding and familiarity between existing leadership constructs and their respective similarities and differences. Servant leadership and authentic leadership are two such examples of leadership that appear virtually indistinguishable upon overview, yet become increasingly disparate upon closer examination.

A last and final point to further fuel the inquisition would be: servant leadership is ultimately based upon the element of conscious choice to serve (Greenleaf, 1977), and authentic leadership is hinged on self-awareness (Walumbwa et al., 2008). Therefore, it could be asserted one must possess self-awareness as an antecedent to conscious choice. This would indicate that authentic leadership precedes servant leadership on a progressive leadership continuum. Is it possible these two leadership

constructs are more dissimilar than similar? Is there in fact a distinguishable point of separation? Or, have we achieved a perfect coupling whereby they enhance and quantify the effects of the other if properly paired?

## References

- Astroth, K. A., Goodwin, J., & Hodnett, F. (2011). Servant leadership: Guiding extension programs in the 21st century. *Journal of Extension, 49*(3), 1–9. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Avolio, B. J., & Gardner, W. L. (2005). Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership. *Leadership Quarterly, 16*(3), 315. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Barbuto Jr., J. E., & Wheeler, D. W. (2006). Scale development and construct clarification of servant leadership. *Group & Organization Management, 31*(3), 300–326. Retrieved May 23, 2010, from ABI/INFORM Global. (Document ID: 1039929731).
- Barnabas, A., Joseph, A. D., & Clifford, P. (2010). The need for awareness of servant leadership in business schools. *Academic Leadership (15337812), 8*(2), 1–6. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications*. New York: The Free Press.
- Bass, B. M., & Steidlmeier, P. (1999). Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership behavior. *Leadership Quarterly, 10*(2), 181. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Bissessar, C. (2010). Authentic leadership: As exemplified by Kamla Persad Bissessar- implications for current and potential leaders. *Advancing Women in Leadership, 30*(23), 1–9. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Black, G. (2010). Correlational analysis of servant leadership and school climate. *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry and Practice, 13*(4), 437–466. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Boroski, E., & Greif, T. (2009). Servant-leaders in community colleges: Their values, beliefs, and implications. *Review of Business Research, 9*(4), 113–120. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Cerit, Y. (2010). The effects of servant leadership on teachers' organizational commitment in primary schools in Turkey. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 13*(3), 301–317. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2010.496933>

- Dennis, R., & Winston, B. E. (2003). A factor analysis of Page and Wong's servant leadership instrument. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 24(7/8), 455–459. Retrieved July 4, 2010, from ABI/INFORM Global. (Document ID: 521138211).
- Dennis, R. S., & Bocarnea, M. (2005). Development of the servant leadership assessment instrument. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 26(7/8), 600–615. Retrieved June 6, 2010, from ABI/INFORM Global. (Document ID: 966513091).
- Eagly, A. H. (2005). Achieving relational authenticity in leadership: Does gender matter? *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(3), 459–474. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.03.007>
- Ebener, D. R., & O'Connell, D. J. (2010). How might servant leadership work? *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, 20(3), 315–335. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Ehrhart, M. G. (2004). Leadership and procedural justice climate as antecedents of unit-level organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 57(1), 61–94. Retrieved August 19, 2010, from ABI/INFORM Global. (Document ID: 597781281).
- Ferch, S. R., & Spears, L. C. (Eds.). (2011). *The spirit of servant leadership*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.
- Fields, D. L., & Winston, B. E. (2010). *Development and evaluation of a new parsimonious measure of servant leadership*. Unpublished manuscript, Regent University School of Leadership and Entrepreneurship, Virginia Beach, Virginia.
- Flaniken, F. (2006). Is the Bible relevant to servant-leadership? *Journal of Applied Christian Leadership*, 1(1), 32–39. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Frank, T. E. (2006). Leadership and administration: An emerging field in practical theology. *International Journal of Practical Theology*, 10(1), 113–136. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/205158212?accountid=13479>
- Frick, D. M. (2004). *Robert K. Greenleaf: A life of servant leadership*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Fridell, M., Newcom Belcher, R., & Messner, P. E. (2009). Discriminate analysis gender public school principal servant leadership differences. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 30(8), 722–736. Retrieved July 4, 2010, from ABI/INFORM Global. (Document ID: 1919928651).
- Gardner, W., Avolio, B., Luthans, F., May, D., & Walumbwa, F. (2005). “Can you see the real me?” A self-based model of authentic leader and follower development. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 343–372.
- Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership: History. (2011). *Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership*. <http://www.greenleaf.org/aboutus/history.html>

- Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Han, Y., Kakabadse, N. K., & Kakabadse, A. (2010). Servant leadership in the People's Republic of China: A case study of the public sector. *The Journal of Management Development*, 29(3), 265–281. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02621711011025786>
- Hannay, M. (2009). The cross-cultural leader: The application of servant leadership theory in the international context. *Journal of International Business & Cultural Studies*, 1, 1–12. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Hays, J. (2008). Teacher as servant applications of Greenleaf's servant leadership in higher education. *Journal of Global Business Issues*, 2(1), 113–134. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Herman, R. L. (2010). The promise of servant leadership for workplace spirituality. *International Journal of Business Research*, 10(6), 83–102. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Hofstede, G. (1993). Cultural constraints in management theories. *Executive* (19389779), 7(1), 81–94. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AME.1993.9409142061>
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hotep, U. (2010). African centered leadership-followership: Foundational principles, precepts, and essential practices. *Journal of Pan African Studies*, 3(6), 11–26. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Howell Jr., D. N. (2003). *Servants of the servant: A biblical theology of leadership*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock Publishers.
- Irving, J., & McIntosh, T. (2009). Investigating the value of and hindrances to servant leadership in the Latin American context: Initial findings from Peruvian leaders. *Journal of International Business & Cultural Studies*, 2, 1–16. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Kalshoven, K., Den Hartog, D. N., & De Hoogh, A. H. B. (2011). Ethical leader behavior and big five factors of personality. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 100(2), 349–366. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-010-0685-9>
- Kretschmar, L. (2002). Authentic Christian leadership and spiritual formation in Africa. *Journal of Theology for Southern Africa*, 113, 41–60. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/213383903?accountid=13479>
- Laub, J. (2003). *From paternalism to the servant organization*. Virginia Beach, VA: Servant Leadership Research Roundtable.
- Liden, R., Wayne, S., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. (2008). Servant leadership: Development of a multidimensional measure and multi-level assessment.

- Leadership Quarterly*, 19(2), 161. Retrieved July 4, 2010, from ABI/INFORM Global. (Document ID: 1470091931).
- Malphurs, A. (2003). *Being leaders: The nature of authentic Christian leadership*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books.
- McCuddy, M. K., & Cavin, M. C. (2008). Fundamental moral orientations, servant leadership, and leadership effectiveness: An empirical test. *Review of Business Research*, 8(4), 107–117. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Meixner, C. (2010). Reconciling self, servant leadership, and learning: The journey to the east as locus for reflection and transformation. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 3(4), 81–85. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jls.20142>
- Murray, M., & Evers, F. T. (2011). Reweaving the fabric: Leadership and spirituality in the 21st century. *Interbeing*, 5(1), 5–15. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/872062665?accountid=13479>
- Northouse, P. G. (2019). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (8th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Parolini, J., Patterson, K., & Winston, B. (2009). Distinguishing between transformational and servant leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 30(3), 274–291. Retrieved May 29, 2010, from ABI/INFORM Global. (Document ID: 1867609461).
- Patterson, K. A. (2003). *Servant leadership: A theoretical model*. Paper presented at the Servant leadership research roundtable, Regent University, Virginia Beach, VA. Available at [http://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/sl\\_proceedings/2003/patterson\\_servant\\_leadership.pdf](http://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/sl_proceedings/2003/patterson_servant_leadership.pdf)
- Pekerti, A. A., & Sendjaya, S. S. (2010). Exploring servant leadership across cultures: Comparative study in Australia and Indonesia. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 21(5), 754–780. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585191003658920>
- Rardin, R. (2000). *Servant-shepherd leadership scale*. <http://www.servant-shepherd.com>
- Reed, L., Vidaver-Cohen, D., & Colwell, S. (2011). A new scale to measure executive servant leadership: Development, analysis, and implications for research. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 101(3), 415–434. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-010-0729-1>
- Reinke, S. J. (2004). Service before self: Towards a theory of servant-leadership. *Global Virtue Ethics Review*, 5(3), 30–57. Retrieved July 5, 2010, from ABI/INFORM Global. (Document ID: 1011232761).
- Savage-Austin, A. R., & Honeycutt, A. (2011). Servant leadership: A phenomenological study of practices, experiences, organizational effectiveness, and

- barriers. *Journal of Business & Economics Research*, 9(1), 49–54. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Sendjaya, S., & Sarros, J. C. (2002). Servant leadership: It's origin, development, and application in organizations. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 9(2), 57–64. Retrieved May 31, 2010, from ABI/INFORM Global. (Document ID: 275645021).
- Sendjaya, S., Sarros, J., & Santora, J. (2008). Defining and measuring servant leadership behaviour in organizations. *Journal of Management Studies*, 45(2), 402–424. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2007.00761.x>
- Shamir, B., & Eilam, G. (2005). What's your story: A life-stories approach to authentic leadership development [electronic version]. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 395–417.
- Sipe, J. W., & Frick, D. M. (2009). *Seven pillars of servant leadership: Practicing the wisdom of leading by serving*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.
- Spears Center for Servant Leadership: Larry C. Spears and Robert K. Greenleaf. (2011). *The Spears Center for servant leadership*. <http://spearscenter.org/about-larry/larry-a-robert-greenleaf>
- Spears, L. C. (Ed.). (1998). *Insights on leadership: Service stewardship, spirit, and servant leadership*. New York: Wiley & Sons.
- Spears, L. C. (2004). Practicing servant-leadership. *Leader to Leader*, 34, 7–11. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Spears, L. C., & Lawrence, M. (Eds.). (2002). *Focus on leadership: Servant-leadership for the 21st century*. New York: Wiley & Sons.
- Taylor, T., Martin, B. N., Hutchinson, S., & Jinks, M. (2007). Examination of leadership practices of principals identified as servant leaders. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 10(4), 401–419. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Vinod, S., & Sudhakar, B. B. (2011). Servant leadership: A unique art of leadership! *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 2(11), 456–467. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- 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(1), 89–126. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206307308913>
- Whittington, J. L., Frank, B. A., May, R. C., Murray, B., & Goodwin, V. L. (2006). *Servant leadership in organizations: Scale development and validation*. Atlanta, GA: Academy of Management Meeting.

- Winston, B. E. (2003). *Extending Patterson's servant leadership model: Explaining how leaders and followers interact in a circular model*. Paper presented at the servant leadership research roundtable, Regent University, Virginia Beach, VA. Available at [http://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/sl\\_proceedings/2003/winston\\_extending\\_patterson.pdf](http://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/sl_proceedings/2003/winston_extending_patterson.pdf)
- Winston, B. E. (2004). Servant leadership at Heritage Bible College: A single-case study. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 25(7/8), 600–617. Retrieved May 23, 2010, from ABI/INFORM Global. (Document ID: 769715841).
- Wong, P. T., & Page, D. (2003). *Servant leadership: An opponent-process model and the revised servant leadership profile*. Paper presented at the servant leadership research roundtable, Regent University, Virginia Beach, VA. Available at [http://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/sl\\_proceedings/2003/wong\\_servant\\_leadership.pdf](http://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/sl_proceedings/2003/wong_servant_leadership.pdf)
- Yukl, G. (2013). *Leadership in organizations* (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.





# 3

## The Mind of the Transformational Leader

Wilbur A. Reid

**Abstract** The strong relationship between authentic and transformational leadership presents an opportunity to examine authentic leadership through the mind of the transformational leader. Understanding the mind of the transformational leader can be accomplished by examining great transformational leaders in the Bible and in church history. Transformational leaders are able to relate to their followers personally and motivate their followers to strive for a mission or purpose that is greater than them. They must be authentic, turn followers into leaders, and rally their followers to a cause that is greater than them. Christian leaders have a common cause as they point their followers to Christ.

**Keywords** Transformational • Transactional • Leader • Full range • Scripture • Moses • History

---

W. A. Reid (✉)  
Johnson University, Sevierville, TN, USA

© The Author(s) 2020  
D. P. Peltz, J. H. Wilson (eds.), *True Leadership*, Christian Faith Perspectives in Leadership and Business, [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-46660-2\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-46660-2_3)

Although research into authentic leadership has grown dramatically in the scholarly community over the past ten years, modern leadership research has been dominated by transformational leadership (Banks, McCauley, Gardner, & Guler, 2016). Meta-analysis shows there is a strong relationship between authentic and transformational relationship and that neither construct adds incremental validity beyond the other (Banks et al., 2016).

Authentic leadership theory focuses on the attributes of the leader. All transformational leaders are authentic, but not all authentic leaders are transformational (Avolio & Gardner, 2005). For example, an authentic leader may have a positive impact on their followers as a result of their example, but they may not be doing anything that actively develops their followers into leaders. Transformational leadership theory helps to collect the pieces of the puzzle that compose leadership in an effort to advance toward the picture that appears on the puzzle box. The examples of biblical leaders and historical church leaders show successful Christian leaders transform lives and transform the world will be authentic, will relate well with followers, will nurture leaders, and will point followers to Christ.

Transformational, transactional, and passive-avoidant/laissez-faire leaderships remain popular topics of study (Arrington, 2010; Bass & Bass, 2008; Yammarino, Spangler, & Bass, 1993). Most relationships between leaders and followers, especially between supervisors and employers, are transactional in nature (Bass, 1990). For example, an employee agrees to perform a certain task within the prescribed guidelines and their employer agrees to compensate them for the work. An alternate approach to transactional leadership is transformational leadership, which seeks to raise the consciousness of people above their own self-interests by appealing to higher ideals (Burns, 1978). Bass (1990) stated,

Superior leadership performance—transformational leadership—occurs when leaders broaden and elevate the interests of their employees, when they generate awareness and acceptance of the purposes and mission of the group, and when they stir their employees to look beyond their own self-interest for the good of the group. (p. 21)

Great leaders strive for this more effective transformational leadership.

Avolio and Bass (2007) developed the *full range leadership model* to address perceived shortcomings of previous leadership models that do not account for all of the leadership characteristics that should be accounted for. This model begins with identifying three broad types of leadership: (a) transformational, (b) transactional, and (c) passive-avoidant (*laissez-faire*). Passive individuals avoid engaging in leadership behaviors and are the least effective leaders. Transactional leaders focus on errors and exceptions, exchanging rewards for effort and results, and can be effective leaders. The most effective leadership type of the three is transformational leadership because followers are inspired, challenged, and stimulated to pursue a vision (Avolio & Bass, 2007). Table 3.1 summarizes the difference between transactional and transformational leaderships.

These three broad types of leadership contain sub-types of leaderships that are called *full range leadership model factors* and are summarized in Table 3.2 (Avolio & Bass, 2004; Bass & Avolio, 1995).

A transformational leader is proactive and seeks to optimize performance by leading individuals to achieve higher results. The five factors within transformational leadership that describes how that happens are all labeled with words beginning with the letter “I”, so they are called the *five I’s of transformational leadership*. Questions related to idealized

**Table 3.1** Differences between transactional and transformational leaderships

Transactional leadership	Transformational leadership
Recognize what their associates want to get from their work, and try to see that they get it, if their performance so warrants	Raise associates’ level of awareness of the importance of achieving valued outcomes and strategies for reaching them
Exchange rewards and promises of reward for appropriate level of support	Encourage associates to transcend their self-interest for the sake of the team, organization, or larger policy
Respond to the needs and desires of associates as long as they are getting the job done	Develop associates’ needs to higher levels in such areas as achievement, autonomy, and affiliation, which can be both work related and not work related

Note: Adapted from *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations*, by B. Bass, 1985, New York: The Free Press

**Table 3.2** Sub-types of leaderships

Leadership type	Full range leadership model factor labels	Abbreviation
Transformational leadership The five I's of transformational leadership	Idealized Attributes	IA
	Idealized Behaviors	IB
	Inspirational Motivation	IM
	Intellectual Stimulation	IS
	Individualized Consideration	IC
Transactional leadership	Contingent Reward	CR
	Management-by-Exception: Active	MBEA
Passive-avoidant leadership behaviors	Management-by-Exception: Passive	MBEP
	Laissez-Faire	LF

Note: Adapted from *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire: Manual and Sampler Set* by Avolio and Bass (2004)

attributes seek to determine if the leader is able to instill a certain way of thinking within the followers, such as a sense of pride, respect, and interest in others. Idealized behavior is more action oriented and searches for behaviors such as talking about the values of the group, considering moral implications of decisions, and having a collective sense of mission. Inspirational motivation captures enthusiasm, optimism, and confidence that goals will be achieved. Intellectual stimulation is about seeking different perspectives to solve problems and suggesting new ways of doing things. Individual consideration is about spending time with others in teaching and coaching, and valuing the input of others in the group (Avolio & Bass, 2007).

Conversely, transactional leaders utilize rewards and punishment to lead followers to a desired outcome. Transactional leadership may take the form of contingent reward or management-by-exception: active. Contingent reward utilizes specific goals and objectives, and provides incentives to reward followers for obtaining those objectives. Management-by-exception: active focuses on exceptions and mistakes, and directs attention toward failures so that standards can be met (Avolio & Bass, 2007). Passive-avoidant behavior is reactive and ineffective, and can be divided into two types. Management-by-exception: passive waits until

there is a problem and then responds to it. Laissez-faire represents a vacuum of leadership and is not responsive at all (Avolio & Bass, 2007).

Howell and Avolio (1993) noted that previous research showed transactional leadership provided mixed results in predicting performance, but “substantial evidence now exists” (p. 893) to show that transformational leadership will positively predict performance. A literature review by Sivanathan and Fekken (2002) concluded that “transformational leadership has consistently shown advantageous effects on a range of individual and organizational outcomes” (p. 198). Bennett (2009) noted transformational leadership motivates and inspires employees more than other leadership type. Muller and Turner (2007) proved that leadership type was significant to project success and that different types of leadership types may be appropriate for different project types. The transactional leadership type appeals to subordinates’ personal desires, with rewards based on performance (Burns, 1978).

Understanding the mind of the transformational leader can be accomplished by examining some of the great transformational leaders in the Bible and in church history. These transformational leaders were able to relate to their followers personally. Additionally, they motivated their followers to strive for a mission or purpose that was greater than them.

## Leaders in the Bible

Burns (1978) described transactional leaders as those that appeal to followers’ self-interests, while transformational leaders appeal to their moral values. The Bible (New International Version (NIV)) contains stories of both transactional and transformational leaders. Moses has been recognized as one of the greatest leaders of history (van Rensburg & Nicolaidis, 2015), but his leadership tended to be transactional. The Israelites did not accept him as a leader (Exod. 5:21, 6:9) until after nine plagues when they realized he might be able to emancipate them from slavery. As long as things were going well, they followed Moses. However, they rejected his leadership when he was not giving them what they wanted. This rebellion was seen when Moses was receiving the Ten Commandments (Exod. 32:1), when the people were hungry (Exod. 16:2–12), thirsty

(Exod. 17:1–6), and threatened (Exod. 14:11), or did not want to fight (Num 14:1–4). God, through Moses, responded to the people in a transactional manner when he provided manna, quail, water, or whatever appealed to their self-interest.

Joshua followed Moses, but appealed to the Israelites moral values. At the end of his life, Joshua told the people to choose who they would serve and had them swear that they would follow Yahweh forever (Josh. 24:14–24).

Joshua gathered all the tribes of Israel to Shechem and summoned the elders, the heads, the judges, and the officers of Israel. And they presented themselves before God ... “Now therefore fear the LORD and serve him in sincerity and in faithfulness. Put away the gods that your fathers served beyond the River and in Egypt, and serve the LORD. And if it is evil in your eyes to serve the LORD, choose this day whom you will serve, whether the gods your fathers served in the region beyond the River, or the gods of the Amorites in whose land you dwell. But as for me and my house, we will serve the LORD.” (Josh 24:1, 14–15)

Joshua’s goal was to change the lives of their descendants in the Promised Land.

Perhaps the most remarkable difference between Moses and Joshua was their relationships with God and with their followers. Moses had a remarkable personal relationship with God, but constantly struggled in a combative relationship with his followers. Joshua did not seem to have the personal relationship with God that Moses did, but had a much more positive relationship with the children of Israel such that they followed him and followed God more than they did under Moses. The Talmud says Moses was like the sun and Joshua was like the moon (Angel, 2009).

Moses was like the sun because he was close to God and his radiance was sometimes so bright that the people could not even look at his face (Exod. 34:29–35). God spoke to him face to face (Num. 12:8), but his followers had difficulty speaking to him. Angel (2009) noted:

Moses’ unparalleled awe of God was so great that that he simply could not fathom why his people did not also trust God. Ironically then, Moses’

incomparable faith may have been precisely at the root of his struggles in leading the Israelites. (p. 150)

Moses' struggle in the leadership of people began while they were still in Egypt. The elders required miraculous signs before they believed God had sent him (Exod. 4:29–31). Then the people complained against Moses and Aaron throughout their lifetime (Exod. 5:20, 21; 15:24; 16:2,3; 17:2,3; Num. 14:2–4; 16:41; 20:2–5; 21:4–6; Deut. 1:12, 26–28). For example, in the wilderness,

the whole congregation of the people of Israel grumbled against Moses and Aaron in the wilderness, and the people of Israel said to them, would that we had died by the hand of the LORD in the land of Egypt, when we sat by the meat pots and ate bread to the full, for you have brought us out into this wilderness to kill this whole assembly with hunger. (Exod. 16:2, 3)

Each change in the attitude of the people was the result of a transaction.

Since the Hebrew people were so rebellious against Moses, it is interesting to note they remained loyal to God and to Joshua throughout his time of leadership. In fact, there was only one sin recorded, Achan's plunder from Jericho, throughout Joshua's tenure (Angel, 2009, p. 144). While Moses was aloof and separate from the people, Joshua was appealing because he allowed people to see his weakness as he did with the disaster at Ai when he tore his clothes and fell prostrate in front of the altar (Josh 7:6). Joshua was a man of prayer and sought God, but he was also a man of the people that commanded their respect (Wiersbe, 1989, p. 90).

He was serving the Lord and the Lord's people, and they followed him because they knew they could trust him. His motives were pure, his life was godly, and his character was above reproach. (Wiersbe, 1989, p. 90)

Joshua was "a trustworthy servant of Yahweh" (Kissling, 1996, p. 70). The absence of complaints against Joshua by the people, as they had done to Moses, may be the result of his impressive battlefield record (Exod. 17:8–14) or his "ability to stand up against popular opinion and show

himself to be a person with vision and faith” (Fountain, 2004, p. 191). Therefore, even though Moses and Joshua were both great leaders, Joshua provided the transformational leadership that prepared the people for life in the Promised Land.

Moving to the New Testament, there is a striking difference between the transformational leadership of Jesus in contrast with the transactional leadership of the Pharisees. Transformational leaders instill “trust, admiration, loyalty, and respect toward the leader, and they are motivated to do more than they originally expected to do” (Yukl, 2013, p. 322). The leadership of Jesus transformed the world by transforming the people he led. This was evident in both his teaching and his actions, often by teaching and modeling the transformational concept of servant leadership.

A central theme in the teachings of Jesus was humility and service. Early in his ministry, he began the Sermon on the Mount by turning conventional wisdom upside down and stated the people that are poor in spirit, merciful, and meek are the ones that are blessed (Matt. 5:3–10). He then contrasted the Old Testament law to a revolutionary way of thinking:

You have heard that it was said to the people long ago, ‘You shall not murder, and anyone who murders will be subject to judgment.’ But I tell you that anyone who is angry with a brother or sister will be subject to judgment ... You have heard that it was said, ‘You shall not commit adultery.’ But I tell you that anyone who looks at a woman lustfully has already committed adultery with her in his heart. (Matt. 5:21–22, 27–28)

Jesus told a parable about picking seats of honor at a banquet, and then concluded “For everyone who exalts himself will be humbled, and he who humbles himself will be exalted” (Luke 14:11, NIV). When the apostles were arguing about who would be the greatest in the kingdom,

Jesus called them together and said, ‘You know that the rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them, and their high officials exercise authority over them. Not so with you. Instead, whoever wants to become great among you must be your servant, and whoever wants to be first must be your



slave—just as the Son of Man did not come to be served, but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many.’ (Matt 20:25-28)

Jesus exhibited transformational leadership by challenging his followers to pursue the vision of a pure heart that will naturally result in holy living.

Toward the end of a ministry spent serving the common man with teaching and healing, John recorded two occasions Jesus was with his disciples and modeled servant leadership. The first was in the upper room at the last supper when Jesus demonstrated servant leadership by washing his disciples’ feet, and then instructed them to do likewise (John 13:14). After his resurrection, Jesus invited the disciples to breakfast on the shore and once again demonstrated servant leadership by preparing breakfast and serving it to them (John 21:12–13). The life of Jesus exemplified the nature of being a servant. Servant leaders establish trust “by being completely honest and open, keeping actions consistent with values, and showing trust in followers” (Yukl, 2013, p. 349). The leadership Jesus modeled for the disciples was revolutionary for his time (Agosto, 2005). His disciples learned from him, and in turn, this small group of men changed the world by implementing servant leadership in the churches they planted (1 Peter 5:1–6).

When Peter denied he knew Jesus three times, his relationship with Jesus may have been irreparably damaged, just as Judas’ relationship with Jesus was destroyed (Matt 27:3–5). However, John 21 revealed Peter’s desire to restore the relationship, and the way Jesus used the opportunity on the lake shore after the resurrection to transform Peter’s life (Wilson, 2010). Peter’s loyalty to Jesus changed the world. The transformation in Peter’s life can be seen in other New Testament texts. For instance, in Acts 2, Peter was the one that led the preaching on the first day of the church on the day of Pentecost, which resulted in three thousand baptisms. He healed the sick (Acts 3:1–10), provided leadership for the church (Acts 15, 1 Peter, 2 Peter), and boldly spoke about Jesus wherever he went (Acts 3:11–26, 4:1–22, 8:14–25, 10).

Jesus related to his followers, had compassion for them, and served them. He appealed to them to not only act appropriately but also look to the inside to transform their way of thinking. Paul summarized this philosophy as follows:

Do not conform to the pattern of this world, but be transformed by the renewing of your mind. Then you will be able to test and approve what God's will is—his good, pleasing and perfect will. (Rom. 12:2)

In contrast, the Pharisees focused on external actions, were out of touch with their followers, and generally practiced transactional leadership (Robinson, 1999).

## Transformational Leaders in Church History

Throughout history, Christian leaders have followed the examples of scripture and forefathers to transform lives and transform the world. Christian transformational leaders “experienced cognitive dissonance because of their spiritual formation and conditions that they perceived in the environment, and they formed a higher purpose aimed at reducing the dissonance” (Jacobs & Longbotham, 2011, p. 69). Martin Luther could no longer accept the corruption and teaching of the Catholic Church. This led him to post the Ninety-Five Theses to the Castle Church in Wittenberg and began a reformation of the church that transformed lives. This led to the emergence of other great church leaders such as Calvin, Zwingli, Wycliffe, and Knox (Booth, 2008). Alexander Campbell decried Christian sectarianism on the American frontier as *the offspring of hell* and transformed the frontier in the early nineteenth century with the Restoration Movement (Foster, Blowers, Dunnavant, & Williams, 2004). As a school teacher in Calcutta, Mother Teresa became disturbed by the plight of the poor of that city and started a ministry that included 610 missions in 123 countries at the time of her death (Kolodiejchuk, 2007; Muggerridge, 1971). Martin Luther King, Jr., was a young Baptist pastor when he decided to take action against racial injustice and became the leader of a movement that transformed the attitude of the American culture (Jackson, 2007). Billy Graham became *America's Pastor*. He led 3 million people to Christ, by understanding that “ministry rests on the notion that if individuals are brought to God and their lives transformed, they in turn will go out and transform society” (Gibbs & Ostling, 1993,

para. 30). These men and women were transformational leaders that had a significant impact on their world.

David Livingstone became internationally known for his exploration and missionary work in Africa in the nineteenth century. Booth (2008) indicated the mind of this transformational Christian leader can be understood by the comment he made to H. M. Stanley, the *New York Herald* reporter that found Livingstone in Africa:

I feel sometimes as if I am only the first evangelist to attack central Africa, crying in the wilderness, and that other evangelists will shortly follow. And after those, there will come a thousand evangelists. (p. 187)

Livingstone travelled throughout central Africa. He covered an astounding 40,000 miles (Booth, 2008) and introduced the gospel to countless people that had never heard it before. When he died, the English government demanded his body be returned to England. The local tribe finally relented, and two men carried his body for eight months and over 1000 miles to the port, but not until after they removed his heart and internal organs and buried them near their town. Of the 125 million non-whites who lived in 1990 in the ten modern African countries located where Livingstone worked, 75 million (60%) claimed to be Christians (Booth, 2008).

A single statement transformed the life of young Dwight L. (D. L.) Moody, and he used the motivation to transform Chicago and Great Britain. “The world has yet to see what God will do with a man fully consecrated to Him” (Booth, 2008, p. 237). Moody became determined to become that man and wholly committed his entire life to God. He was not highly educated and not a polished public speaker, so he began by personal evangelism and worked with children one-on-one. When he heard the great Charles Spurgeon preach, he realized the strength of his preaching came from the Holy Spirit, not from Spurgeon. Based on the confidence the Holy Spirit would speak through him also, he began to preach. By the end of his life in 1899, before the days of radio and TV, it was estimated he had proclaimed the gospel in front of 100,000,000 people (Whitesell, 1956). Perhaps even more impressively, he had worked

personally with 750,000 people, many of whom were youth (Whitesell, 1956).

As the great transformational leaders in Christian history are considered, it is interesting to note individuals that are appointed to formal positions of power are not seen to be transformational leaders as a result of their positions. For example, denominational leaders and popes are seldom mentioned in literature as examples of transformational leadership. One possible explanation may be they seem distant from their followers, just as Moses was.

## Conclusion: Implications for Today's Leaders

There are several implications for transformational leadership where today's leaders can learn from the mind of historical Christian and biblical leaders. First, transformational leaders must be authentic (Avolio & Gardner, 2005). Simply being authentic does not make a leader effective and transformational, but a truly transformational leader must be authentic with their followers. Second, relational authenticity is an important component of transformational leadership (Spitzmuller, 2010). In other words, transformational leaders develop relationships with their followers so that they seem to be approachable and genuine. Third, transformational leaders turn followers into leaders (Burns, 1978). When great transformational leaders pass away, their work continues because their followers become the leaders. Finally, transformational leaders rally their followers to a cause that is greater than themselves (Stone, Russell, & Patterson, 2003). The Christian leaders discussed above had a common cause as they pointed their followers to Christ.

Today's Christian leaders can learn from these examples. The common thread that permeates all the aforementioned stories is the mind of the transformational leader. The successful leader that will transform lives and transform the world will be authentic, will relate well with followers, will nurture leaders, and will point followers to Christ.

## References

- Agosto, E. (2005). *Servant leadership: Jesus and Paul*. St. Louis, MO: Chalice Press.
- Angel, H. (2009). Moonlit leadership: A Midrashic reading of Joshua's success. *Jewish Bible Quarterly*, 37(3), 144–152.
- Arrington, A. (2010). Lead with a human focus; for Christ's sake! *Leadership Advance Online*, 1(XIX), 1–6.
- Avolio, B., & Bass, B. (2004). *Multifactor leadership questionnaire: Manual and sampler set*. Menlo Park, CA: Mind Garden.
- Avolio, B., & Bass, B. (2007). *MLQ: Self evaluation report*. Menlo Park, CA: Mind Garden.
- Avolio, B., & Gardner, W. (2005). Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 315–338.
- Banks, G., McCauley, K., Gardner, W., & Guler, G. (2016). A meta-analytic review of authentic and transformational leadership: A test for redundancy. *The Leadership Quarterly*. Retrieved 3 May 2016, from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1048984316000163>
- Bass, B. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, 18, 19–31.
- Bass, B., & Avolio, B. (1995). *MLQ multifactor leadership questionnaire for research: Permission set*. Palo Alto, CA: Mind Garden.
- Bass, B. M., & Bass, R. (2008). *The Bass handbook of leadership* (4th ed.). New York: Free Press.
- Bennett, T. (2009). A study of the management leadership style preferred by IT subordinates. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications and Conflict*, 13(2), 1–25.
- Booth, E. P. (2008). *Inspiring men of the faith*. Uhrichsville, OH: Barbour Publishing.
- Burns, J. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Foster, D., Blowers, P., Dunnivant, A., & Williams, D. (Eds.). (2004). *The encyclopedia of the Stone-Campbell movement*. Cambridge, UK: William B. Eerdmans Publishing.
- Fountain, A. K. (2004). An investigation into successful leadership transitions in the Old Testament. *Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies*, 7(2), 187–204.
- Gibbs, N., & Ostling, R. (1993, November 15). God's Billy Pulpit. *Time*.

- Howell, J., & Avolio, B. (1993). Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, locus of control, and support for innovation: Key predictors of consolidated-business-unit performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*(6), 891–902.
- Jackson, T. (2007). *From civil rights to human rights. Martin Luther King Jr. and the struggle for economic justice*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Jacobs, G., & Longbotham, G. (2011). The impact of spirituality on the formation of a leader's purpose. *Journal of Management, Spirituality, & Religion, 8*(1), 69–91.
- Kissling, P. J. (1996). *Reliable characters in the primary history: Profiles of Moses, Joshua, Elijah, and Elisha*. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Kolodiejchuk, B. (2007). *Mother Teresa: Come be my light*. New York: Doubleday Religion.
- Muggeridge, M. (1971). *Something beautiful for god. The classic account of Mother Teresa's journey into compassion*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Muller, R., & Turner, J. (2007). Matching the project manager's leadership style to project type. *International Journal of Project Management, 25*, 21–32.
- Robinson, A. (1999). Leadership that matters. *Christian Century*.
- Sivanathan, N., & Fekken, G. (2002). Emotional intelligence, moral reasoning, and transformational leadership. *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal, 23*(4), 198–204.
- Spitzmuller, M. (2010). Do they (all) see my true self? Leader's relational authenticity. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 19*(3), 304–332.
- Stone, A., Russell, R., & Patterson, K. (2003). Transformational versus servant leadership: A difference in leader focus. In *Servant leadership research roundtable* (pp. 1–10). Virginia Beach, VA: School of Leadership Studies. Regent University.
- van Rensburg, M. J., & Nicolaidis, A. (2015). An analysis of theological and strategic management perspectives of Moses as a leader. *Pharos Journal of Theology, 96*(1). Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/contentproxy.phoenix.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsdoj&AN=edsdoj.35aac865cfc4e04be78183e358ae1e7&site=eds-live>
- Whitesell, F. (1956). *Great Personal Workers*. Chicago, IL: Moody Press.
- Wiersbe, W. (1989). *Bible exposition commentary: Old Testament wisdom and poetry*. New York: Victor.
- Wilson, J. H. (2010). Jesus as agent of change: Leadership in John 21. *Emerging Leadership Journeys, 3*(1), 10–22.

- Yammarino, F., Spangler, W., & Bass, B. (1993). Transformational leadership and performance: A longitudinal investigation. *Leadership Quarterly*, 4(1), 81–102.
- Yukl, G. (2013). *Leadership in organizations* (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.



# 4

## The Character of a Leader: Authenticity as a Moral Distinction

David A. Oginde

**Abstract** There is much debate about whether the morality of a leader influences their authenticity or transformational efficacy. Drawing on the writings of Aristotle, sacred texts, and contemporary leadership literature, this analysis examines the importance of a leader's character, positing the necessity for universal acceptance, consistency, and moral distinction for a leader to be viewed as authentic or transformational. Hence, to be an authentic leader, character and conduct must be consistently apparent publicly and privately. Likewise, to be a transformational leader, ethical conduct and commitment to the leader's espoused vision should be modeled and reinforced systemically. Therefore, the shared moral components of both authentic and transformational leadership styles represent moral forms of leadership because they both call for integrity and consistency of espoused beliefs and measurable action.

**Keywords** Authentic • Transformational • Leadership • Authenticity • Character • Moral • Scripture

---

D. A. Oginde (✉)

Christ is the Answer Ministries (CITAM), Nairobi, Kenya

© The Author(s) 2020

D. P. Peltz, J. H. Wilson (eds.), *True Leadership*, Christian Faith Perspectives in Leadership and Business, [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-46660-2\\_4](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-46660-2_4)



Bass and Steidlmeier (1999) proffered that for many moral analysts, leadership is a many-headed hydra that alternately shows the faces of Saddam Hussein and Pol Pot alongside leaders like Nelson Mandela and Mother Theresa. This raises questions concerning the place of moral character in leadership and how it affects the legitimacy of the programs and accomplishments of leaders. Does a leader's morality contribute to the authenticity of their leadership?

In international politics, there are examples of leaders who have made the argument that it is not necessary to view morality in absolute terms, but rather be informed by prudence, flexibility, and the common good over the long term (Walker, 2006). From this perspective, the only universalities are the interests that exist, fulfilled with the broadest view of the common good possible. In fact, according to Walker, realists believe that human nature is selfish and that people will behave according to the rational pursuit of self-interest over the short term. This certainly reinforces the question of whether *character provides a moral distinction for authentic leadership*. This chapter explores this question from both philosophical and biblical perspectives.

## Character and Morality

According to Lanctot and Irving (2010), it was Aristotle, drawing on Plato, who first articulated the nature of character and virtue by considering the *telos* (*end*) of humanity. Thus, Aristotle spoke of virtues as character traits that are the means of bringing a person from what they happen to be to what they could be by realizing essential nature. Furthermore, Aristotle emphasized that right action can only flow from right character. Similarly, Jesus disagreed with the thought of a dichotomous lifestyle, especially in leadership, using prophets as an example:

You will know them by their fruits. Are grapes gathered from thorns, or figs from thistles? So, every sound tree bears good fruit, but the bad tree bears evil fruit. A sound tree cannot bear evil fruit, nor can a bad tree bear good fruit. (Matt 7:16–18, RSV)

Keener (1993) reported that prophets were viewed as false if they led people away from the true God (Deut 13) or if their words did not come to pass (Deut 18:21–22). Although the rabbis allowed prophets to temporarily suspend a teaching of the law in the same way rabbis themselves did. However, if a prophet denied the law itself or advocated idolatry, they were false prophets. But Jesus raised the bar and took it beyond the veracity of the prophets' words—if the prophets do not live right, they are false (Matt 7:21–23). In Jesus' view, it was quite clear:

No good tree bears bad fruit, nor does a bad tree bear good fruit. Each tree is recognized by its own fruit. People do not pick figs from thorn bushes, or grapes from briars. The good man brings good things out of the good stored up in his heart, and the evil man brings evil things out of the evil stored up in his heart. (Luke 6:43–45, NIV)

Consequently, for both Aristotle and Jesus, character was the very fountain of a virtuous life. For, right action can only flow from right character (Aristotle), and the good person brings good things out of the good stored up in their heart, while the evil person brings evil things out of the evil stored up in their heart (Jesus). No wonder then, Lanctot and Irving (2010) defined virtue as a set of related personal attributes or dispositions that (a) is universal and not contextual, (b) has moral implications that extend beyond the individual, (c) recognized that possessing it without excess is considered good while lacking it is harmful, and (d) can be attained through practice. It follows, therefore, a person of virtue and character, should be one possessed of these qualities in a universally acceptable, morally distinct, and measurably consistent.

## Character and Authentic Leadership

Quite in line with Lanctot and Irving's (2010) argument, several studies found that moral character augments followers' perceptions of a leader's authenticity. For example, Fields (2007) predicted that authentic leaders whose actions were consistent with their own beliefs will likely have more influence on followers, in part because such followers interpret

authenticity as evidence of a leader's reliability. Thus, an authentic leader is more likely to be emulated by followers because they are a credible role model. This may be because authentic leaders are characterized as having (a) heightened capacity to effectively process self-information, which includes values, beliefs, goals, and emotions; (b) ability to use their self-system to regulate behaviors while acting as a leader; (c) high levels of clarity of self; and (d) ability to manage tension between self and social demands (Chan, Hannah, & Gardner, 2005). Hence, even for a new leader, if there is a perception of credibility, the uncertainty among followers is greatly reduced. This produces confidence in both the leader and the team. It is no wonder then the Bible sets out clear standards for biblical leadership based on an individual's moral character traits.

For example, there were qualifying standards presented in I Tim 3:1–7. This pericope declared that any person who aspires to a leadership position must possess certain character traits and qualities to qualify for a role leading others. Advising Timothy on the appointment of leaders within the nascent church, Paul emphasized the need for definite character qualities evident in the lives of those who sought top leadership positions. The Apostle Paul acknowledged leadership was open to all who met the stated qualifications and the desire to be a leader was a noble pursuit (1 Tim. 3:1), and certain qualities were to be the hallmark of authentic Christian leadership (1 Tim. 3:2–3). These qualifications needed to be observable in the perspective prospective leader, especially given the heresy that had spread in Ephesus (Keener, 1993). Such authenticity was therefore predicated upon a proven track record of a consistent good conduct. It is noteworthy that between verse 2 and verse 7, the word *must* was repeated four times and was found at the opening of each verse, except for verse 3. In other words, the possession of these character traits was imperative and a prerequisite to ascending to any leadership position. Hence, according to Paul, the first imperative for leadership was for the aspirant to be above reproach: “Now a bishop must be above reproach, the husband of one wife, temperate, sensible, dignified, hospitable, an apt teacher, no drunkard, not violent but gentle, not quarrelsome, and no lover of money” (1 Tim 3:2–3, RSV). This appeared to be a list of character qualities that demonstrate self-discipline. Clarke (2006) posited that the Greek word *anepiblepton*, translated as *above reproach*, was used for a person against

whom no evil could be proved. Clarke further asserted, the word was a metaphor, taken from the case of an expert and skillful warrior, who so effectively defended every part of his body such that it was impossible for his antagonist to give one hit. Likewise, an authentic leader must be one who has so disciplined themselves in an irreprehensible manner. Paul, therefore, directed leaders to refuse to follow the path of polygamy, a common practice in Palestine (Keener, 1993). Rather, leaders have sufficient discipline to be a husband of only one wife. Such a leader had to equally take charge of emotions and appetites, and be willing to take in trustworthy travelers as guests, a practice that was a universal virtue at the time. Thus, according to Paul, the qualifying candidates for leadership had to be masters of their lives, showing self-control and mastery of passions. They likewise had to have restraint where money, wine, or violent temper was concerned (DeSilva, 2004). This must have been fundamentally critical, especially for the church, because such leaders were not only to be role models but also to serve as transformational leaders promoting humility in a decadent society. Hence, the authenticity of leaders was judged by their character and conduct, both in society and at home.

## Character and Transformational Leadership

According to Burns (1995), transformational leadership occurs when an individual *engages* with others in such a way that both the leader and their followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality. This level of engagement challenges the follower to “transcend their own self-interest” (Yukl, 2013, p. 322) and results in the follower doing more than was originally expected. Thus, transformational leadership, though also goal-oriented, incorporates the preeminent role of morality at its core, with the leader playing a critical role in shaping the values and ethics of the follower.

Transformational leadership is comprised of four dimensions: charisma or idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration (Yukl, 2013). It seems likely the most critical component for impacting the character and behavior of the follower is *idealized influence*. This is the degree to which the leader

behaves in admirable ways that, in turn, cause followers to identify with the leader. Such leaders display conviction, they take stands, and they appeal to followers on an emotional level. Accordingly, Bass and Steidlmeier (1999) argued that effective leaders not only influence the attitudes and actions of followers but also do so from an established code of ethical and moral values.

In scripture, there are many examples of these values and moral codes that represent foundational teachings. One such example was God's charge to Joshua when commissioning him to lead the nation of Israel into the Promised Land:

This book of the law shall not depart out of your mouth, but you shall meditate on it day and night, that you may be careful to do according to all that is written in it; for then you shall make your way prosperous, and then you shall have good success. (Joshua 1:8)

Thus, the book of the law was intended to be Joshua's leadership guide if he was to be prosperous and experience good success. It was this book that shaped Joshua's character and defined his morality. Understandably therefore, Fields (2007) suggested that to be effective, leaders must not only behave reliably in ways consistent with their personal values but also adhere to values that are consistent with objective moral codes. In this regard, Bass (1985) originally argued that transformational leaders could wear the black hats of villains or the white hats of heroes, depending on their values. Bass and Steidlmeier (1999) later considered this to be mistaken. "Only those who wear white hats are seen as truly transformational. Those in black hats are now seen as pseudo-transformational" (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999, p. 187). In other words, those leaders whose lives and actions are incongruent with moral principles, while they may be transformational, are inauthentic as transformational leaders. Bass and Steidlmeier referred to these false messiahs and tyrants of history as pseudo-transformational leaders. They fit Jesus' categorization of false prophets whose trees and fruits are irreconcilable.

To further refine this concept of morality as evidence of authentic transformational leadership, Walker (2006) made it clear it is not only the ends of the process that must be moral but also the means. In Walker's

view, this was a crucial distinction from alternative views of leadership such as Machiavellianism. For example, in Machiavelli's view, true virtue was accomplishing one's goals or ends on behalf of one's constituents irrespective of the means (Mansfield, 1996). In fact, Machiavelli's writings could be interpreted to mean leaders could not actually be that good, but rather goodness and virtue are only defined and established in a social, political context. Thus, for Machiavelli, virtue ethics were focused upon what makes a good person as opposed to a good action, implying that morality and leadership are distinct constructs that do not have to exist concurrently in the person of a leader. Many contemporary scholars challenged this divergent view of morality and leadership. For instance, Palanski and Yammarino (2007) reported that empirical research has linked various aspects of morality and integrity with transformational leadership. For example, Peterson (2004) noted that a leader's integrity (defined as the absence of unethical behavior) was positively correlated with the moral intentions of his or her followers. Likewise, in a qualitative research about employees' psychological expectations about their managers, Baccili (2001) found that integrity was often cited by participants as a key expectation. She determined that employees expect integrity from their immediate supervisors, even if the overall organization was not perceived to encourage integrity. Likewise, in a study on follower expectations of a leader, Oginde (2011) found that personal character and integrity was a common theme among those interviewed. The respondents described the good leader and admired leaders with phrases like transparent, honest, accountable, has character, has integrity, means what they say, and says what they mean.

In Trevion, Brown, and Hartman's (2003) definition, *integrity* was equated with *consistency*—doing what you say, following up, and following through. It is a pattern that when you say something, people believe it because historically when you have said it, you have follow through. Therefore, it is reasonable to expect that the perception of a leader as a person of integrity will produce an idealized influence with followers. Furthermore, according to Trevion, Brown, and Hartman (2003), such leaders hold followers accountable to standards by creating a system that reinforces ethical behavior and admonishes ethical violations. In this way, transformational leaders convey to followers how individuals win and

lose within the organization. To this point, Fairholm (1998) asserted that a leader's task is to integrate behavior and values. Likewise, Heifetz (1994) encouraged "adaptive work ... to diminish the gap between the values people stand for and the reality they face" (p. 22). These findings all point to the crucial link between morality and effective transformational leadership.

## Conclusion

Considering the above arguments, Avolio, Luthans, and Walumbwa's (2004) definition of authentic leaders seems to be well supported. These authors viewed authentic leaders as those who are deeply aware of how they think and behave. Such leaders are consistently perceived by others as "aware of their own and others' values/moral perspectives, knowledge, and strengths; aware of the context in which they operate; and [those] who are confident, hopeful, optimistic, resilient, and of high moral character" (p. 4).

Furthermore, Bass and Steidlmeier (1999) had strong criticism for those who merely present the impression of authenticity:

Pseudo-transformational idealized leaders may see themselves as honest and straightforward and supportive of their organization's mission but their behavior is inconsistent and unreliable. They have an outer shell of authenticity but an inner self that is false to the organization's purposes. They profess strong attachment to their organization and its people but privately are ready to sacrifice them. Inauthentic CEOs downsize their organization, increase their own compensation, and weep crocodile tears for the employees who have lost their jobs. (p. 188)

Jesus likewise spoke firmly to the inauthentic leaders he encountered:

You hypocrites! You are like whitewashed tombs, which look beautiful on the outside but on the inside are full of dead men's bones and everything unclean. In the same way, on the outside you appear to people as righteous but on the inside you are full of hypocrisy and wickedness. (Matt 23:27-28)

It is clear, then, that authentic transformational leadership (Arenas, Tucker, & Connelly, 2017; Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999; Zhu, Avolio, Riggio, & Sosik, 2011) carries with it a component of high moral character as an indispensable leadership trait. It embraces the congruence between the leader's beliefs and their practice. It displays an integral lifestyle that is both moral and transformative. Consequently, it rejects anything that is to the contrary. It is truly authentic in every sense of the word.

## References

- Arenas, F. J., Tucker, J., & Connelly, D. A. (2017). Transforming future air force leaders of tomorrow: A path to authentic transformational leadership. *Air & Space Power Journal*, 31(3), 18–33.
- Avolio, B. J., Luthans, F., & Walumbwa, F. O. (2004). Authentic leadership: Theory building for veritable sustained performance. *Gallup Leadership Institute, University of Nebraska-Lincoln*, 4.
- Baccili, P. A. (2001). *Organization and manager obligations in a framework of psychological contract development and violation*. Unpublished dissertation, Claremont Graduate University.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M., & Steidlmeier, P. (1999). Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership behavior. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2), 181–217.
- Burns, J. M. (1995). Transactional and transforming leadership. In T. J. Wren (Ed.), *The leader's companion: Insights in leadership through the ages*. New York: Free Press.
- Chan, A., Hannah, S., & Gardner, W. (2005). Veritable authentic leadership: Emergence, functioning, and impacts. In W. Gardner, B. Avolio, & F. Walumbwa (Eds.), *Authentic leadership theory and practice: Origins, effects, and development*. Oxford, UK: Elsevier.
- Clarke, A. (2006). Adam Clarke's commentary. Electronic Database, PC Study Bible (Version 5.0) [Computer Software]. BibleSoft, Inc.
- DeSilva, D. A. (2004). *An introduction to the New Testament: Contexts, methods, and ministry formation*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Fairholm, G. W. (1998). *Perspectives on leadership: From the science of management to its spiritual heart*. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.



- Fields, D. L. (2007). Determinants of follower perceptions of a leader's authenticity and integrity. *European Management Journal*, 25(3), 195–206.
- Heifetz, R. A. (1994). *Leadership without easy answers*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Keener, C. S. (1993). *IVP Bible background commentary: New Testament*. Downers Grove, IL: Inter Varsity Press.
- Lanctot, J. D., & Irving, J. A. (2010). Character and leadership: Situating servant leadership in a proposed virtues framework. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, 6(1), 28–50.
- Mansfield, H. C. (1996). *Machiavelli's virtue*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Oginde, D. A. (2011). Follower expectations of a leader: Most admired leader behaviors. *International Leadership Journal*, 3(2), 87–108.
- Palanski, M. E., & Yammarino, F. J. (2007). Integrity and leadership: Clearing the conceptual confusion. *European Management Journal*, 25(3), 171–184.
- Peterson, D. (2004). Perceived leader integrity and ethical intentions of subordinates. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 25, 7–23.
- Treviño, L. K., Brown, M., & Hartman, L. P. (2003). A qualitative investigation of perceived executive ethical leadership: Perceptions from inside and outside the executive suite. *Human Relations*, 56(1), 5–37.
- Walker, M. C. (2006). Morality, self-interest, and leaders in international affairs. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17, 138–145.
- Yukl, G. (2013). *Leadership in organizations* (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Zhu, W., Avolio, B. J., Riggio, R. E., & Sosik, J. J. (2011). The effect of authentic transformational leadership on follower and group ethics. *Leadership Quarterly*, 22(5), 801.



# 5

## Transformed to Authenticity: Where a Leader's History Meets Destiny

Christopher L. Boyd

**Abstract** Authentic leadership has become a buzzword among leadership scholars, as organizations and followers seek new ways to identify what is missing in many leaders today. One's history can be an indicator of one's destiny. Many leaders, however, do not take the time to gather, sort, and connect the pieces of their life to understand the unique direction life is taking them. As a result, life is lived more by default rather than by design. Authentic leaders, however, understand that their life story is like a puzzle that guides their current action toward an evolving, significant, and purpose-filled end. This describes the process of gathering, sorting, and connecting the pieces of life so that leaders can live intentionally and authentically as true leaders in service to others.

**Keywords** Authentic • Leadership • Authenticity • Puzzle • Scripture

---

C. L. Boyd (✉)

Word of Faith Family Worship Cathedral, Austell, GA, USA

© The Author(s) 2020

D. P. Peltz, J. H. Wilson (eds.), *True Leadership*, Christian Faith Perspectives in Leadership and Business, [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-46660-2\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-46660-2_5)

Many scholars (Avolio, 2005; Gardner, 1993; George, Sims, McLean, & Mayer, 2007) have addressed the age-old leadership question, *are leaders born or made?* To that question, Avolio (2005) supported the notion leaders are made because “If you believe that leaders are born, you will probably not develop your full leadership capacity” (p. xiii). Gardner (1993) described the topic this way: “Most of what leaders have that enables them to lead is learned. Leadership is not a mysterious activity ... And the capacity to perform those tasks is widely distributed in the population” (p. xv). George et al. (2007) offered a somewhat different perspective and stated leaders were born with certain gifts, but those gifts must be developed every day. The very fact leadership development programs exist acknowledges the reality that leaders can be groomed toward greater levels of effectiveness, no matter their starting point (George et al., 2007; Yukl, 2013).

George (2007) posited that as leaders develop, those who come to the realization their leadership is meant to meet a need beyond their own will initiate the journey toward authenticity. For a leader with such awareness, who acknowledges that the leadership journey is less about pleasing stockholders and rising up the corporate ladder, it is more about living a life of significance. This perspective recognizes personally held gifts, talents, abilities, wisdom, passion, and other positive and personally held attributes are used to make a difference in the life of someone else (Avolio, 2005; George et al., 2007; Michie & Gooty, 2005; Shamir & Eilam, 2005).

How does a leader come to the realization for the need for authenticity in their leadership? This chapter discusses that phenomenon and suggests the leader’s history, comprised of their experiences (positive and negative), education (formal and tacit knowledge), skills, relationships, personally held values, and other developmental influences collectively create a hunger for significance. This hunger for significance has the potential to transform a self-serving, self-promoting, and approval-seeking narcissistic leader into a purpose-driven, legacy-leaving, destiny-minded, God-pleasing authentic leader. These elements of one’s history are, in essence, the life puzzle pieces God gives to every individual. Therefore, authentic leadership development is much like a puzzle—every piece is different, but they all fit together to form a beautiful picture (Avolio & Gardner, 2005; George et al., 2007).

## How to Put Together a Hard Puzzle

wikiHow ([n.d.](#)) identified a five-step process for “How to Put Together a Hard Puzzle”. Metaphorically speaking, most would consider the process of discovering one’s authentic leadership to be similar to putting together a hard puzzle. Therefore, these wikiHow steps are used to describe the authentic leadership discovery process. The steps include the following:

1. Do the border of the puzzle. This is the easiest because the edge pieces will tend to have a straight edge. Therefore, this should always be first. (Gathering)
2. Separate all the pieces into groups according to their texture or color. (Gathering/Sorting)
3. Start putting pieces of the same group together. It should form an image. Look on the box to see where that image goes and put it there. (Sorting)
4. Make all the other images shown on the box. (Connecting)
5. Connect the images using the colored pieces of whatever the background is. (Connecting)

The following sections use the puzzle metaphor and suggest a leader’s discovery of their authentic self is similar to the process of assembling a puzzle—gathering, sorting, and connecting. As the pieces are assembled, the shape of the puzzle and the image the puzzle is forming emerge revealing its unique and destined beauty. To the degree leaders rightly fit together their life puzzle pieces, they demonstrate True Leadership and begin purposefully behaving in accord with the authentic image of the destined “good” that God is “working together” in their lives (Romans 8:28, NKJV).

## Authentic Leadership Definition

Before moving forward, it may be helpful to clearly define authentic leadership, the key construct that will be used in this chapter. According to Shamir and Eilam ([2005](#)), a literature review of authentic leadership

literature showed that the term has been defined differently by many scholars (Bennis, 2003; Bennis & Thomas, 2002; George, 2003; Luthans & Avolio, 2003; Terry, 1993). Shamir and Eilam (2005) reduced the construct to certain core elements shared by many scholars. These included (a) possessing self-knowledge and a personal point of view, which reflects clarity about their values and convictions, and (b) identifying strongly with their leadership role, expressing themselves by enacting that role, and acting on the basis of their values and convictions (Shamir & Eilam, 2005, p. 396). “Any discussion of authentic leader development has to focus on how these characteristics are developed” (Shamir & Eilam, 2005, p. 396). Although these characteristics are essential, there is more to the authentic leadership concept (Avolio & Gardner, 2005; George et al., 2007). While authentic leadership is a distinct construct from transformational leadership, Joo and Nimon (2012) found these two forms of moral leadership to be correlated and complimentary. Likewise, Riggio, Zhu, Reina, and Maroosis (2010) found a positive correlation between authentic and transformational leadership. George et al. (2007) described the construct this way:

Authentic leaders demonstrate a passion for their purpose, practice their values consistently, and lead with their hearts as well as their heads. They establish long-term, meaningful relationships and have the self-discipline to get results. They know who they are. (p. 130)

The two elements George et al. (2007) included, which were absent from Shamir and Eilam (2005), were the idea that authentic leaders establish lasting relationships and that they possess self-discipline that yields, seemingly positive, results. In the defined construct for this chapter, this relationship aspect and the results aspect were included to emphasize the positive influence of people and accomplishment on an authentic leader’s history and subsequent destiny.

Another missing component in Shamir and Eilam’s (2005) summation of authentic leadership definitions was the element of morality and integrity. Avolio and Gardner (2005) and George et al. (2007) indicated integrity is a must for authentic leaders. Avolio and Gardner (2005) posited authentic leadership is “the root construct underlying all positive forms

of leadership and its development” (p. 316). B. George (2007) said further, “Integrity is the one value required of every authentic leader” (p. 48).

Shamir and Eilam (2005) defined the authentic leadership construct based upon a review of literature that did not consistently include integrity and morality as components of authentic leadership. This chapter intentionally included them, parting from Shamir and Eilam, for two reasons:

1. Trust is required to be an authentic leader, and trust in a leader is not possible apart from leader morality/integrity (B. George, 2007; Yukl, 2013); and
2. A concern for others is essential to authentic leadership for, according to Avolio and Gardner (2005), “Positive other-directed emotions (e.g., gratitude, goodwill, appreciation and concern for others) play a fundamental role in the emergence and development of authentic leadership” (p. 318). According to Yukl (2013), “Integrity is a primary determinant of interpersonal trust. Unless one is perceived to be trustworthy, it is difficult to retain the loyalty of followers or to obtain cooperation and support from peers and superiors” (p. 143). Leaders who lack integrity/morality have an adverse impact on the people and the organizations that they serve (Yukl, 2013).

Therefore, the operational definition for authentic leadership in this chapter has been defined to include self-knowledge—clarity about personally held values and convictions, and effective action in accord with self-knowledge such that one’s history positively influences one’s destiny leading to a life of significance, where success is less about personal gain and more about helping others achieve significance in their own lives.

## **An Authentic Leader’s History: Gathering the Puzzle Pieces of Life**

According to Coleman (1999), history was defined as “a recorded narrative that aims to tell the truth about a past sequence of events” (p. 134). Coleman further said, at its root meaning, the word story was the same

word as history. Shamir and Eilam (2005) and George et al. (2007) suggested that life stories provided the framework for authentic living. Shamir and Eilam (2005) and George et al. (2007) further indicated within self-reflection on the core elements of a leader's story lie the building blocks, or rather, the key influencers that shape the leader's life. Busselle, Ryabovolova, and Wilson (2004) stated that according to Gerbner:

Stories socialize us into roles of gender, age, class, vocation, and lifestyle, and offer models of conformity or targets for rebellion. [Stories] weave the seamless web of the cultural environment that cultivates most of what we think, what we do, and how we conduct our affairs. (p. 366)

McCabe and Peterson (1984) identified three different ways to analyze a story's structure. The ways identified were (a) episodic or story grammar—approaches stories as problem-solving episodes, emphasizing goals and activities to achieve them; (b) high point structure—emphasizes affective information and sees stories as organized around emotional high points or crisis events; and (c) dependency analysis—emphasizes linguistic complexity and, in particular, the way propositions are related to each other through a relationship of either coordination or subordination (p. 457). Each offers a unique analytical approach.

The analysis of a leader's story follows the high point structure, where one looks within the story to analyze the emotional high points, crisis events, and what was developed in the leader along the way (George 2007; George et al., 2007; Shamir & Eilam, 2005). Coleman (1999) further suggested, "Coherence, assimilation, structure, and truth are important dimensions of a life story" (p. 133). These dimensions "involve owning important life themes, working through traumatic events, solving unsatisfactory beginnings and disappointing endings, and finding genuine and lasting commitments" (Coleman, 1999, p. 133).

Stories identify the people, places, and things that create one's world (Coleman, 1999; Gray, 2007; Fazey, Fazey, & Fazey, 2005; Shamir & Eilam, 2005). Stories describe experiences that shape tacit knowledge and skills within individuals (Fazey et al., 2005, p. 9). Stories identify personally held expertise, defined as "extensive knowledge that affects

what they [individuals] notice [about themselves], and how they organize, represent, and interpret information” (Fazey et al., 2005, p. 5). According to Fazey et al. (2005), “In general, it takes around 10 years to develop expertise in something in the way that is typically discussed in the educational literature” (p. 5). Relationships, education (formal and tacit knowledge), skills, wisdom, and so on are the puzzle pieces that develop the expertise of authentic leaders.

George et al. (2007) interviewed 125 leaders between the ages of 23 and 93, who were recognized based upon their reputation for authenticity and effectiveness, to determine how they developed their leadership abilities. The men and women came from various racial, religious, socio-economic backgrounds, and nationalities. Half were CEOs and the remaining half were leaders from profit and not-for-profit organizations (George et al., 2007). From their qualitative interviews, 3000 pages of transcripts were produced. The researchers were “startled” because the results lacked the expected set of “universal characteristics, traits, skills, or styles that led to their success. Rather, their leadership emerged from their life stories” (George et al., 2007, p. 130). George et al. (2007) said further the leaders constantly tested themselves through “real-world experiences” (p. 130), leading to an understanding of who they innately were. George et al. (2007) continued, “In doing so, they discovered the purpose of their leadership and learned that being authentic made them more effective” (p. 130). The “real-world experiences” of these leaders, or rather the leader’s story/history, identified the unique puzzle pieces (knowledge, skills, values, etc.) that contributed to other’s perception of them as effective and authentic (George et al., 2007). Authentic leaders at this stage gather these pieces and begin the process of sorting the pieces as they best fit into their life puzzle.



## An Authentic Leader's Expertise: Sorting the Puzzle Pieces of Life

“Recognized strengths” is another phrase that describes the puzzle pieces of life. Strengths are acquired through experience, recognized through self-reflection, and intentionally developed through consistent application (Avolio, 2005; Avolio & Gardner, 2005; George, 2007; George et al., 2007; Shamir & Eilam, 2005). George et al. (2007) stated, according to Fudge, the challenge for leaders “is to understand ourselves well enough to discover where we can use our leadership gifts to serve others” (p. 130). According to Avolio (2005), “Certain events, their timing, number, and accumulation can influence the course of leadership development” (p. 17). Therefore, the authentic leader’s story is one of trial and error, where experience, self-reflection, and consistent application of strengths develop into a recognized expertise (Clark, 2008; Fazey et al. 2005). Clarke (2008) defined an expert as “Someone widely recognized as a reliable source of technique or skill whose faculty for judging or deciding rightly, justly, or wisely is accorded authority and status by the public or their peers” (pp. 7–8). Expertise, therefore, is the process of becoming an expert (Clark, 2008). Clark (2008) suggested expertise was developed in stages. The stages are described in Table 5.1.

**Table 5.1** Levels of expertise

Level	An individual who
Novice	Has minimal exposure to a field
Apprentice	Has completed a period of study beyond introductory level and is usually working in a domain under supervision
Journeyman	Can perform routine work unsupervised
Expert	Is highly regarded by peers; whose judgments are uncommonly accurate and reliable; whose performance shows both skill and economy of effort; and who can deal with unusual or tough cases
Master	Can teach others; a member of an elite group of experts whose judgments set regulations, standards, or ideals

Note: Adapted from “Building Expertise: Cognitive Methods for Training and Performance Improvement,” by R. C. Clark, 2008, p. 8

Expertise is of central focus because it is a key component of authentic leadership. It is the conscious and subconscious reframing of one's life story by "constantly testing themselves through real-world experiences ... to understand who they [are] at their core" (George et al., 2007, p. 130). "In doing so, they discovered the purpose of their leadership and learned that being authentic made them more effective" (George et al., 2007, p. 130). Effectiveness is an attribute of authentic leaders. Therefore, in accord with Clarke's (2008) levels of expertise, an authentic leader, because of their journey through the framing and reframing stages that shape a leader's effectiveness, would be considered an expert, if not a master, in their areas of strength (Clark, 2008; George et al., 2007).

Clark (2008) offered seven lessons that have been learned about experts in the areas of sports, medicine, programming, music, and chess. The following lessons help to uncover how experts and leaders differ from less-skilled individuals:

1. Expertise requires extensive practice: High levels of expertise demand years of practice.
2. Expertise is domain specific: Expertise relies on a large body of specific knowledge accumulated over time in memory. Each job domain will require a unique knowledge base and a specialized educational and developmental program to build it.
3. Expertise requires deliberate practice: Deliberate practice requires good performers to concentrate on specific skills that are just beyond their current proficiency levels.
4. Experts see with different eyes: Part of building expertise is to train the brain to see problems through the eyes of an expert; in other words, to build the ability to represent problems in ways that lead to effective solutions.
5. Experts can get stuck: Seeking ways to build flexible expertise that is the source of innovation is an increasingly important goal for experts.
6. Expertise grows from two intelligences: Routine expertise (those adept at seeing and efficiently solving problems based on their domain-specific mental models) and adaptive expertise (those who evolve their core competencies by venturing into new areas that require them to function as "intelligent novices"). An emphasis on innovative or

creative thinking as a source of competitive edge suggests the need to encourage adaptive types of expertise or fluid intelligence.

7. Challenging problems require diverse expertise: Valuable expertise in an organization can be deployed with knowledge management techniques that use participative techniques. (pp. 9–15)

Because a leader's authentic leadership is, in part, the result of consistent application of one's developed expertise, as understood through reflection on experience, an understanding of Clark's lessons about experts may be helpful in sorting the puzzle pieces of one's life.

## The Process of Sorting

wikiHow ([n.d.](#)) suggested the puzzle piece sorting process involves separating the pieces according to their texture and color. Through self-reflection, authentic leaders identify the personally held areas of expertise and they discern their limitations (Clarke, 2008; Fazey et al., 2005). Once those areas of expertise have been identified, the authentic leader realizes each area of expertise has purpose and is a necessary part of the leader's puzzle (George et al., 2007). The key is being able to arrange the expertise areas in a way that causes the leader to connect in a purposeful way that maximizes the good when placed into the puzzle of life.

In scripture, 1 Corinthians 12:14–19 (NKJV) offers a summary of the sorting process that authentic leaders experience:

For in fact the body is not one member but many. If the foot should say, "Because I am not a hand, I am not of the body," is it therefore not of the body? And if the ear should say, "Because I am not an eye, I am not of the body," is it therefore not of the body? If the whole body were an eye, where would be the hearing? If the whole were hearing, where would be the smelling? But now God has set the members, each one of them, in the body just as He pleased. And if they were all one member, where would the body be?

Likewise, authentic leaders understand all expertise is given for the united purpose of effective and efficient service to others (George et al., 2007;

Shamir & Eilam, 2005). A distinguishing characteristic of authentic leaders is not only do they understand this, but they also act in accord with their true selves and use what they have been given to achieve positive results (Avolio, 2005; Avolio & Gardner, 2005; George et al., 2007). According to George et al. (2007), "Leadership principles are values translated into action. Having a solid base of values and testing them under fire enables you to develop the principles you will use in leading" (p. 135).

## **An Authentic Leader's Clarity: Connecting the Puzzle Pieces of Life**

Once the puzzle pieces have been gathered and sorted, the only thing that remains is connecting the pieces so they fit and form the known image. Because the colors and contour on each puzzle piece require a different orientation, attention must be given to vertical and/or horizontal placement to ensure proper connection. In the process of assembly, it may not be readily apparent where pieces align. The pieces may have to be positioned and repositioned between vertical and horizontal orientation to ensure best fit. A comparison to authentic leadership can be seen in the adaptive expertise of authentic leaders as discussed by Clark (2008) and Fazey et al. (2005). Clark (2008) and Fazey et al. (2005) described this orient/reorient process to involve three components: (a) practice, (b) variation, and (c) reflection. Although these concepts have been discussed previously, the point with relationship to authentic leaders is that, even after expertise has been gathered and sorted, there is still further refining that occurs in the application of authentic leadership (Fazey et al., 2005; George et al., 2007). This continuous learning process is necessary for a lifetime of authentic leading (see Table 5.2) (George et al., 2007).

### **Connecting the Unseen Image**

Just as the puzzle assembly becomes easier as pieces are added, the same is true of authentic leaders. As the journey of life introduces new tacit

**Table 5.2** Continuous learning process

Factor	Summary
Practice	<p>With practice, the application of learned skill or ability can eventually become automatic in a flexible and adaptive way</p> <p>Actual practice can be complemented and sometimes replaced by detailed mental rehearsal or review</p> <p>Practice making judgments improves performance, as long as there is a clear objective and set of criteria for judging performance</p>
Variation	<p>Variation breaks our tendency to assume that what we experience is reality, not reality experienced in a particular way</p> <p>Variable practice leads to better retention and develops adaptive expertise</p> <p>To develop adaptability, it is possible to vary (1) the intended outcome, (2) the criteria or precision by which an outcome is judged, (3) the way a task is done or experienced, (4) the reason for doing a task, (5) the perspective a person can take</p>
Reflection	<p>For effective learning, continuous monitoring of discrepancies between intended and actual outcomes is required</p> <p>A number of explicit methods can be used to promote learning. However, having the right attitude by taking a mindfulness approach to learning is the most</p>

Note: From "Learning More Effectively from Experience," by I. Fazey, J. A. Fazey, and D. M. A. Fazey, 2005, *Ecology and Society*, 10(2), p. 12

knowledge and skills, and as values, purpose, and vision are refined, leaders see more clearly the path their leadership journey is taking them. As this path is revealed, authentic leaders become more intentional about leading their life in that perceived direction.

## An Authentic Leader's Destiny: Seeing the Completed Puzzle

One benefit to puzzle assembly is the ability to refer to a known image on the puzzle box top. The box top image illustrates the completed puzzle with all the pieces in tact—nothing missing, nothing broken. What happens, however, when the completed image is unknown? How does one go about assembling the pieces? Also, if the pieces are assembled, how is one assured they are oriented properly? Authentic leaders develop in this way (George et al., 2007; Shamir & Eilam, 2005). Authentic leaders do not

have a physical picture to which they can refer to since each person has a unique story and, therefore, a unique form of their authentic selves (Avolio & Gardner, 2005; George et al., 2007; Shamir & Eilam, 2005). There are no roadmaps or global positioning systems that can provide guidance. There is also no single person who can give directions. Rather, the path to discovery of one's authentic leadership is gathered through self-reflection and the path to living as one's authentic self is sorted and connected expertise.

What remains is the looming question, "Where are these connected pieces taking me?" In scripture, Jeremiah 1:4–5 stated, "Then the word of the Lord came to me [Jeremiah] saying: 'Before I formed you in the womb I knew you; Before you were born I sanctified you; I ordained you a prophet to the nations'". Romans 9:20b–21 stated further:

Will the thing formed say to him who formed it, 'Why have you made me like this?' Does not the potter have power over the clay, from the same lump to make one vessel for honor and another for dishonor?

Consider the following:

1. God knew the Prophet Jeremiah before Jeremiah was conceived in his mother's womb (Jer. 1:5a).
2. God gave Jeremiah a purpose (reason for living) before Jeremiah was born (Jer. 1:5c—"...prophet to the nations").
3. God prepared Jeremiah for his purpose before Jeremiah was sent to fulfill it (Jer. 1:5b—"I sanctified you; I ordained you").
4. God told Jeremiah these things only after He had done them all (Jer. 1:4—Then the word of the Lord came to me).

Could the process be the same for authentic leaders? Could it be that one's life story is a masterpiece revealing how the preparation of God (gathering) leads one's life to the purpose of God (sorting) such that self-reflection helps one see the relationship (connecting) between the leader's history and the leader's destiny?

Therefore, to address the question "Where are these connected pieces taking me", perhaps the answer can be found by seeking God for

guidance. Jeremiah did not shy away from asking God about his puzzle, his expertise, or how the pieces would connect. “Ah, Lord God Behold, I cannot speak, for I am a youth” (Jer. 1:6). When Jeremiah asked, God answered and reassured Jeremiah:

Do not say, “I am a youth”, for you shall go to all to whom I send you. And whatever I command you, you shall speak. Do not be afraid of their faces, for I am with you to deliver you ... Behold I have put My words in your mouth. See, I have this day set you over the nations and over the kingdoms, to root out and to pull down, to destroy and to throw down, to build and to plant (Jer. 1:7–10). Therefore, prepare yourself and arise and speak to them all that I command you. Do not be dismayed before their faces, lest I dismay you before them. For behold, I have made you this day a fortified city and an iron pillar, and bronze walls against the whole land – against the princes, against its priests, and against the people of the land. They will fight against you, but they shall not prevail against you. For I am with you to deliver you. (Jer. 1:17–19)

When authentic leaders ask God for guidance in seeing the invisible image of their future and connecting the pieces of their life puzzle, He will answer them too. Jeremiah demonstrated that he sensed this clarity from God: “His word was in my heart like a burning fire shut up in my bones; I was weary of holding it back, and I could not” (Jer. 20:9). God can give that same passion to authentic leaders that seek Him today (George et al., 2007).

## Conclusion

The seven lessons described by Clark (2008) are akin to the seven pieces of the puzzle that God gives every human being who finds themselves in a leadership role. Authentic leaders do not have all the answers, they simply chose to ask themselves and others questions that lead to discovery of these seven pieces. As those pieces are gathered, sorted, and connected, they reveal the purpose and True Leadership that is to be pursued, guiding the leader to their destiny. A path to authenticity has been presented.

The key, however, is to live authentically so that actions speak for themselves. The following quote from Don Meyer summarized this point nicely: “Be what you is. Because if you be what you ain’t, you ain’t what you is” (Meyer, 2014).

## References

- Avolio, B. J. (2005). *Leadership development in balance: Madelborn*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.
- Avolio, B. J., & Gardner, W. L. (2005). Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership [Electronic version]. *Leadership Quarterly*, 16(3), 315–338.
- Bennis, W. G. (2003). The crucibles of authentic leadership. In J. Antonakis, A. T. Gianciolo, & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *The nature of leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bennis, W. G., & Thomas, R. J. (2002). *Geeks and geezers*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Busselle, R., Ryabovolova, A., & Wilson, B. (2004). Ruining a good story: Cultivation, perceived realism and narrative. *Communications: The European Journal of Communication Research*, 29, 365–378.
- Clark, R. C. (2008). *Building expertise: Cognitive methods for training and performance improvement*. Retrieved from [http://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=8IPI9HZQAm4C&oi=fnd&pg=PR9&dq=types+of+expertise&ots=g8r-h\\_hncL&sig=3ktTh30R9zsko\\_F7qkflxMC-esk#v=onepage&q&f=false](http://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=8IPI9HZQAm4C&oi=fnd&pg=PR9&dq=types+of+expertise&ots=g8r-h_hncL&sig=3ktTh30R9zsko_F7qkflxMC-esk#v=onepage&q&f=false)
- Coleman, P. G. (1999). Creating a life story: The task of reconciliation [Electronic version]. *The Gerontologist*, 39(2), 133–139.
- Fazey, I., Fazey, J. A., & Fazey, D. M. A. (2005). Learning more effectively from experience. *Ecology and Society*, 10(2), 4–26.
- Gardner, J. W. (1993). *On leadership*. New York: The Free Press.
- George, B. (2007). True north [Electronic version]. *Georgia Tech Alumni Magazine*, 4, 46–51.
- George, B., Sims, P., McLean, A. N., & Mayer, D. (2007). Discovering your authentic leadership [Electronic version]. *Harvard Business Review*, 85(2), 129–138.
- George, W. (2003). *Authentic leadership: Rediscovering the secrets to creating lasting value*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.



- Gray, D. E. (2007). Facilitating management learning: Developing critical reflection through reflective tools [Electronic version]. *Management Learning*, 38(5), 495–517.
- Joo, B. K., & Nimon, K. (2012). Two of a kind? A canonical correlational study of transformational leadership and authentic leadership. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 38(6), 570–587.
- 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). San Francisco: Barrett-Koehler.
- McCabe, A., & Peterson, C. (1984). What makes a good story [Electronic version]. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 13(6), 457–480.
- Meyer, D. (2014). *The key component*. Northern State University. <http://coach-meyertribute.com/be-you/>
- Michie, S., & Gooty, J. (2005). Values, emotions, and authenticity: Will the real leader please stand up? *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(3), 441–457. <https://doi-org.contentproxy.phoenix.edu/10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.03.006>
- Riggio, R. E., Zhu, W., Reina, C., & Maroosis, J. D. (2010). Virtue-based measurement of ethical leadership: The leadership virtues questionnaire. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 62(4), 235–250.
- Shamir, B., & Eilam, G. (2005). What's your story: A life-stories approach to authentic leadership development [Electronic version]. *Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 395–417.
- Terry, R. W. (1993). *Authentic leadership: Courage in action*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- wikiHow. (n.d.). *How to put together a hard puzzle*. Retrieved from <http://www.wikihow.com/Put-Together-a-Hard-Puzzle>
- Yukl, G. (2013). *Leadership in organizations* (8th ed.). Upper Saddle Creek, NJ: Prentice-Hall.



# 6

## Authentic Leadership Development in the Life of Moses

Heidi R. Ventura

**Abstract** Moses experienced several trigger moments (Avolio, 2005) that developed him as an authentic leader. Through an examination of key events in Moses's life, we can observe God's emphasis on development of authentic leadership values. The selected passages provide the scholar with detailed conversations that occurred as God called Moses to lead the Hebrews out of Egyptian slavery and as Jethro mentored Moses in leadership skills. Through these intimate exchanges, Moses is motivated to shift his perspective, a necessary step to his development to lead the Hebrew children out of Egyptian slavery and prepare them for the Promised Land.

**Keywords** Authentic • Leadership • Moses • Dimensions • Trigger • Scripture

---

H. R. Ventura (✉)

Trevecca Nazarene University, Nashville, TN, USA

© The Author(s) 2020

D. P. Peltz, J. H. Wilson (eds.), *True Leadership*, Christian Faith Perspectives in Leadership and Business, [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-46660-2\\_6](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-46660-2_6)

Leadership is more than manipulative tricks or self-discipline practices. It is a significant God-given trust for which the leader will give an account. Authentic leadership is deeper than behaviors; it is the consistency of behaviors “in accordance with deep personal values and convictions” (Avolio, Gardner, Walumbwa, Luthans, & May, 2004, p. 806). DuPree (2004) said leadership is defining reality. This simple phrase has scriptural foundation: “Where there is no vision, the people perish” (Prov. 29:18, King James Version). In order to define reality, leaders must see reality and be transparent: something that can be described as authenticity.

This chapter explores the characteristics of authentic leadership theory by examining dialogues at important trigger points (Avolio, 2005) which developed authentic leadership in the life of Moses. The very basis of authentic leadership theory is the network of relationships within the social sphere (Avolio & Gardner, 2005), and consequently, authentic leadership is best examined in the context of relationships (Avolio, 2007). Thus, the selected passages provide a detailed description of two conversations: (a) God and Moses at the burning bush and (b) Jethro and Moses in a coaching situation. Narrational texture technique (Robbins, 1996) was employed to analyze the passages. The purpose was to understand the conversations as pivotal moments for developing Moses into an authentic leader as applied to the task that was before him. The selected passages provided a detailed conversation that occurred as God called Moses to lead the Hebrews out of Egyptian slavery, and also as Jethro mentored Moses in leadership skills.

## Trigger Moments Through the Lens of the Four Authentic Leadership Dimensions

The question is continually asked: are leaders are born or made? Authentic leaders experience significant trigger moments (Gardner, Avolio, Luthans, May, & Walumbwa, 2005) that influence the life stream. Avolio (2005) described this concept, “The life stream represents events you accumulate from birth to the present that shape how you choose to influence others and yourself” (p. 12). Each of moments—negative or positive—causes

the person “to reconsider who he is, what he stands for and the model that guides his thoughts, behaviors, and actions” (p. 12). These events challenge one’s view of reality and the implicit theories as to why things are the way they are (Avolio & Luthans, 2006).

Avolio (2005) described an example of this shift as occurring when “you provide for the needs of others first versus your own needs” (p. 77). The perspective shift is in the context of the situation (Luthans & Avolio, 2003). “Leaders are tenants of context ... within which leaders and followers interact and determine the demands and constraints placed on them as they contextualize their actions, attitudes, emotions, and moral choices” (Klenke, 2005, pp. 156–157). Napoleon said, “Leaders are dealers in hope.” From research and theory, Klenke posited, “Authentic leaders and followers are more likely to generate hope than their less authentic counterparts and in doing so reinforce each other’s future orientation” (p. 166).

Within authentic leadership theory, researchers have developed four dimensions. The four dimensions are as follows:

1. Self-awareness, the degree to which the leader knows personal strengths, weaknesses, others’ perceptions, and his or her own impact on followers;
2. Internalized moral perspective, the degree to which the leader expects conduct in line with standards;
3. Balanced processing, the degree to which the leader seeks others’ opinions and ideas for decision-making; and
4. Relational transparency, the degree to which the leader demonstrates openness by encouraging others’ opinions and feedback; (Avolio & Luthans, 2006; Walumbwa, Avolio, Gardner, Wernsing, & Peterson, 2008).

Each of the four dimensions has been further explored below.

## Self-awareness

Self-awareness is a dimension of authentic leadership development related to personal ideas of the past, present, and future. Reflecting on and processing past events are important aspects of development (Avolio, 2005). This discernment is more than a situational analysis; it requires divine direction, a willingness to develop and learn, and viewing self and situation in reality. According to Kretzschmar (2007), this view of reality and perspective on life requires an evaluation that brings leaders “[t]o the end of their insights and strengths. This compels them to seek to learn from God and to value the insights and contributions of others, thereby deepening their own spiritual and moral discernment and formation” (p. 36).

Leaders undergo the development portion of the process through innumerable struggles and encounters. Equally important, they have exercised the self-discipline “to reflect on experience and assess its consequences” (Korac-Kakabadse, Korac-Kakabadse, & Kouzmin, 2001, p. 212) and to change for the future. Self-knowledge and self-consistency create the foundation for authentic leadership (Peus, Wesche, Streicher, Braun, & Frey, 2011), making adaptation possible for the leader. Heifetz (2009) advocated adaptive change as identifying what is precious and essential to conserve, what small items must be discarded, and what new thing needs to be created. This linkage of past to the present will strengthen the leader’s effectiveness and further development the formation of wisdom.

Intentional reflection and adjustment requires a strong self-leadership foundation and commitment in balancing emotions and considering others (Korac-Kakabadse et al., 2001). The first concept, balancing emotions, is an intrapersonal intelligence process of self-awareness (Korac-Kakabadse et al.). Hill and Stephens (2003) promoted this aspect of *selves management* as a method to acknowledge priorities and live by them. As a form of self-discipline, it should cause one to be more Christ-like in thinking of others, focusing on what is important, and adhering to a true life calling. People want to be “all things to all people” (I Cor. 9:22); however, it may be that one has to choose to let one or more *selves* go and then strategically *self manage* what remains (Hill & Stephens, 2003). This

level of “self-awareness enables the individual to stand apart and examine even how one sees oneself, one’s attitudes and behaviour [*sic*]” (Korac-Kakabadse et al., 2001, p. 216). Leaders must acknowledge their personal worldview and how it affects their perception of reality, while also simultaneously influencing their perception of others (Kretzschmar, 2007).

## Internalized Moral Perspective

The internalized moral perspective dimension relates to a high standard of conduct. Demonstrating consistency between espoused and enacted values is imperative for an authentic leader (Avolio & Gardner, 2005; Avolio & Luthans, 2006). Shamir and Eilam (2005) described it as intra-personal wherein a leader leads from original convictions, basing actions on values. For example, if an organization claims to hold a certain identity but actually puts forth a strategy that does not fully align with that foundation, employees can experience emotional issue with dissonance (He, 2008). Bouchikhi and Kimberly (2003) conducted field-based research which led to a layered model of organizations in which concentric layers of identity (the core), strategy, and operations. Change initiatives in any of the layers, therefore, must be synced with the inner layers.

In addition to seeking to influence the organization, a Christian leader seeks to influence the level of ethical behaviors, even the moral beliefs, of a group. A Christian leader must pursue prudence of intellectual and moral virtues (Kretzschmar, 2007). Along the way, leaders must develop their consciences to ask, “What is the wise and holy thing to do?” (Grisez & Shaw, 2004, p. 41). Moral leaders must also demonstrate and advocate wisdom (Kretzschmar, 2007).

## Balanced Processing

The balanced processing dimension relates to the leader’s ability to solicit multiple viewpoints for decision-making. Klenke (2005) described aspects of spirituality within authentic leadership development as transcendence, a recognition of “the limitedness of their perspective, which is

anchored in a specific time and place, to consider encompassing visions of life that are more holistic and interconnected” (p. 168). Each leader and each follower is placed in the sphere of the organization with a specific purpose to impact the whole (I Cor. 12:18).

These interactions create culture through shared meaning of what it is to be in relationships, what provides stability in life, and what brings true joy (Stebbins, 2010). Until leaders grasp this level of reality, they will be unable to adapt to a global perspective (Robinson & Harvey, 2008). According to Bartholomew (2006), “the relationship between leader and followers is presumed to be dependent upon characteristics of the situation as well as the interaction between the participants” (p. 11).

As various organizations, such as churches, businesses, and governments, increase in globalization, Christian leaders must be able to facilitate the dialogue of a diverse individuals and groups to consider issues from multiple perspectives. Through collaboration, teams are able to accomplish together more than they could do individually. Leaders must develop their ability to communicate across cultures thereby encouraging dialogue and demonstrating teachability through collaboration. This type of “empathic communication requires that the listener get inside another person’s frame of reference, understands his/her philosophy and understands how s/he feels” (Korac-Kakabadse et al., 2001, p. 217).

## Relational Transparency

Relational transparency was originally conceived in authentic leadership development as self-regulation (Avolio & Luthans, 2006). It relates to reinforcing openness with others to increasingly build trust (Avolio & Luthans, 2006). “Self-regulation means being in control of yourself and the way you behave with others” (Avolio & Luthans, 2006, p. 127), so individuals have predictability in various circumstances. This self-regulation will demonstrate that the leader has consistency. An element of moral conversion is the will or volition in which the leader gives up willfulness of self and rebellion against God, replacing it with a willingness to love God and humankind (Kretzschmar, 2007).

Christians should be especially practiced in prioritizing the value of relationship. Cosgrove (2006) wrote, “Faith is a directing picture that moves human mind and life pieces together into holistic, thinking and behaving person” (p. 35). A leader must strive to move beyond the natural tendency of acting on assumptions and first impressions. Through a process of spiritual awareness and honest personal evaluation, a leader can “become more tolerant of others and begin to accept them rather than living in sterile bubbles” (Grant, 2008, p. 81).

## God and Moses: Development at the Burning Bush

Moses was born as an unusual child under unusual circumstances (Exodus 2), and he experienced significant trigger moments (Gardner et al., 2005) that influenced his life stream. Moses was adopted into Pharaoh’s family, and in his early formative years, he received a royal education, began identifying with the Hebrews, killed an Egyptian, and fled into Midian. Each of these was a dramatic event that caused Moses “to reconsider who he [was], what he [stood] for and the model that guide[d] his thoughts, behaviors, and actions” (Avolio, 2005, p. 12). These moments challenged his ideas of reality and the implicit theories he held as to why things were the way they were (Avolio & Luthans, 2006).

The passage of Exodus 3:4 through 4:17 described one trigger moment (Avolio & Luthans, 2006) in Moses’s development of authentic leadership. At the burning bush, Moses was forced to shift his perspective (Avolio, 2005) from himself and his personal limitations to God’s plan for the Hebrew people. In this situation, Moses was drawn to consider a perspective shift whereby with God certain things may be desperate but not hopeless. The first perspective shift related to the plight of the Hebrew people. The second related to Moses’s own limitations. In both of these situations, God offered hope and divine help to accomplish the task ahead.

The framework of their calling was God had chosen them—both the Hebrew people and Moses himself. God repeated multiple times who He is in relationship to them: (a) “The God of your father, the God of



Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob” (Ex. 3:6), (b) “I am who I am” (Ex. 3:14), (c) “The Lord, the God of your ancestors, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob” (Ex. 3:15), (d) “The Lord, the God of your ancestors, the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob” (Ex. 3:16), (e) “The Lord, the God of the Hebrews” (Ex. 3:18), and (f) “The Lord, the God of their ancestors, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob” (Ex. 4:5). The context was that God’s presence did not exist just in the Hebrew history, but His presence continued in the Hebrew present. God guided Moses in this perspective shift from hopelessness to hope so Moses could lead the same change for the Hebrew people. This conversation at the burning bush was a necessary step in Moses’s leadership development so he could offer hope.

Narrational texture analysis was used to examine the passage of Exodus 3:4 through 4:17 and provided insight into the development of the conversation. The questions from Moses and responses from God demonstrate a particular progression of the conversation (Table 6.1).

In the first discourse, Moses asked, “Who am I?” Although it seems this is a statement of humility, it may have been more than that (Beegle, 1972; Meyer, 1996). “There was a tone of self-depreciation that was inconsistent with a true faith in God’s selection and appointment” (Meyer, 1996, p. 34). Moses used this reason as a cover for fear (Beegle, 1972). God responded, “I will be with you” (Ex. 3:12). This was a first demonstration that this situation was not about who Moses was.

In the second discourse, Moses hypothesized (Janzen, 1979), “If I come to the Israelites ... and they ask me, ‘What is his name?’” (Ex. 3:13). In the cultural context, the names of gods were significant as a representation of character (Beegle, 1972). God responded, “I AM” (Ex. 3:14). He described the hope that Moses would proclaim, “In Hebrew tradition ... a prophet was a man called by God and authorized to speak for him ... Whereas most of the classical prophets are messengers of judgment and doom, Moses is given Yahweh’s message of hope” (Beegle, 1972, pp. 76, 77). Again, the purpose of this interaction was this calling was not about Moses.

In the third dialogue, Moses asked, “What if they do not believe me or listen to me” (Ex. 4:1). God responded by giving Moses several miracles to perform, saying, “This is so that they may believe that the LORD” (Ex.

**Table 6.1** Inquiry and response in Exodus 3:4 through 4:17 (NRSV)

Verse(s)	Moses's inquiry	God's response
3:11–12	"Who am I that I should go to Pharaoh, and bring the Israelites out of Egypt?"	"I will be with you; and this shall be the sign for you that it is I who sent you: when you have brought the people out of Egypt, you shall worship God on this mountain."
3:13–14	"If I come to the Israelites and say to them, 'The God of your ancestors has sent me to you,' and they ask me, 'What is his name?' what shall I say to them?"	"'I am who I am.' Thus you shall say to the Israelites, 'I am has sent me to you.'..."
4:1–9	"But suppose they do not believe me or listen to me, but say, 'The Lord did not appear to you.'"	Gives miracles "...so that they may believe that the Lord, the God of their ancestors, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, has appeared to you..."
4:10–12	"O my Lord, I have never been eloquent, neither in the past nor even now that you have spoken to your servant; but I am slow of speech and slow of tongue."	"Who gives speech to mortals? Who makes them mute or deaf, seeing or blind? Is it not I, the Lord? Now go, and I will be with your mouth and teach you what you are to speak."
4:13–17	"O my Lord, please send someone else."	"...You shall speak to [Aaron] and put the words in his mouth; and I will be with your mouth and with his mouth, and will teach you what you shall do ..."

4:5). For the third time, there was a reminder the situation was not about Moses, his capabilities, or his skills.

In the fourth interaction, Moses inquired, "I am slow of speech and tongue" (Ex. 4:10). The acknowledgment of personal weaknesses demonstrated transparency and self-awareness. God responded, "Who gave man his mouth? ... Is it not I, the LORD?" (Ex. 4:11). Beegle (1972) described, "Yahweh knows that he has made Moses a stammerer, but he is going to use him anyway" (p. 79). Avolio (2005) described, "Getting people to be willing to experience mistakes is something that you must do if you are

going to create an innovative, adaptive, and resilient culture” (p. 114). For the fourth time, this calling was not centered on Moses.

The willingness to make mistakes is important in authentic leadership development (Avolio, 2005). Moses wanted God to fix his stammering but also to choose someone else altogether. Moses pled, “Please send someone else to do it” (Ex. 4:13). God responded, “I know Aaron can speak well ... I will help both of you speak and will teach you what to do” (Ex. 4:14, 15). At this point Aaron was authorized to take the typical prophet’s role of mouthpiece while Moses “play[ed] the role of God” (Beegle, 1972, p. 80). This final solution underscored the point that the situation did not depend on Moses himself.

## Dimensions of Authentic Leadership

Moses demonstrated self-awareness by acknowledging his own past, present, and future limitations. His past limitations included not growing up within the Hebrew culture and also the loss of credibility when he killed an Egyptian in front of some Hebrews. God’s responses to Moses related to the Hebrew history: Moses needed to reflect on God’s choice of them as His people and His faithfulness in their past circumstances. Moses also focused on his present limitations and became aware of his own lack of skill in speaking. Leaders must understand their present circumstances and exercise self-efficacy, believing that they have the capacity necessary to succeed (Avolio & Luthans, 2006). Then God returned the focus back to His calling for Moses and His empowering capacity to overcome all of Moses’s deficiencies. Moses also acknowledged his future limitations: he was concerned about how the Pharaoh and the Hebrews would accept his leadership role. Believing in the future (Avolio & Luthans, 2006) and acting with hope (Klenke, 2005) is necessary for visionary leadership. God made grand promises to Moses to relay to His people. Promises of “a good and broad land, a land flowing with milk and honey” (Ex. 3:8), and a time to worship when they have been released (Ex. 3:12).

Demonstrating an internalized moral perspective, Moses was concerned about proving the integrity of his actions when he arrived, a valid

concern for an authentic leader. God acknowledged the validity of that concern and provided Moses with multiple miracles to demonstrate his divine appointment. God demonstrated balanced processing and allowed Moses to provide his finite opinions. In his inquiries, Moses considered the viewpoints of Pharaoh and the Hebrew people. God completed the appointment and brought Aaron into the process. Further, God demonstrated relational transparency with Moses through openness and honest discourse. Moses was permitted to present challenges and arguments with God. Moses also acknowledged future expectation for open dialogue. He had expectations for two upcoming dialogues: the Hebrews' challenging his mission and credibility and Pharaoh's resisting the notion of releasing these slaves.

## Jethro and Moses: Development Through Mentoring

Like Moses, Jethro was also an unusual person under unusual circumstances. He was a priest called to serve God among a foreign people and the father of seven daughters, which would have been considered a curse in his culture. The two men met when Moses was a fugitive. Moses met Jethro's daughters and sought to marry one of them named Zipporah. They lived together as a family for 40 years until Moses was dramatically called to liberate God's people (Ex. 3 and 4), and Jethro wished him well in his quest (Ex. 4:18). God completed a mighty liberation through Moses's work, which led the Hebrews into the wilderness where Jethro met them with Zipporah and the family (Ex. 18).

It became evident both Jethro and Moses experienced significant trigger moments (Gardner et al., 2005) that influenced their life streams. The passage of Exodus 18 describes another trigger moment (Avolio & Luthans, 2006) in Moses's development. After Jethro arrived and the celebration was completed, Jethro began observing the normal routine of Moses' leadership. Jethro, the older man, had been a priest leader of Midian for decades. In contrast, Moses was a new leader who had recently assumed immediate leadership for up to 2.5 million people. In this

passage (Exodus 18), Moses's and Jethro's analysis of the situation and their plan for leadership was recorded.

At the time when Moses took over as Israel's leader, Moses was forced to shift his perspective (Avolio, 2005) from himself and his personal involvement to a bigger, more long-term plan for the Hebrew people. He again provided "for the needs of others first versus your own needs" (Avolio, 2005, p. 77). In this situation, Jethro led Moses to consider this perspective shift—that God's call to an individual leader does not mean all the work and decisions must be made by that particular leader. This perspective shift was in the context of the situation (Avolio, 2007). "Leaders are tenants of context ... within which leaders and followers interact and determine the demands and constraints placed on them as they contextualize their actions, attitudes, emotions, and moral choices" (Klenke, 2005, pp. 156–157). The context was God had chosen them—both Moses and Jethro—but God did not require they carry the burden of leadership alone. The perspective shift allowed Moses to empower other men within the community to help bear the leadership burden and to make wise judgments before God.

God used Jethro to guide Moses through a perspective shift. Together they moved from emphasis on the overwhelming burden of leading 600,000 fighting-age men and their families, to focus instead on the hope of mentoring other leaders so together this community could make their journey to the Promised Land. Klenke (2005) posited, "Authentic leaders and followers are more likely to generate hope than their less authentic counterparts and in doing so reinforce each other's future orientation" (p. 166). This shift was a necessary step at a crucial time in Moses's leadership development. The dialogue Jethro and Moses exchanged has been summarized in Table 6.2.

## Dimensions of Authentic Leadership

Jethro and Moses focused on past, present, and future limitations during this mentoring dialogue. They had spent the prior evening recounting and discussing the miracles God had performed and the guidance He had given (Ex. 18:8–9). They had rejoiced in their own limitations and how

**Table 6.2** Jethro's and Moses's dialogue

Jethro's question	"What is this that you are doing for the people? Why do you sit alone, while all the people stand around you from morning until evening?" (Ex. 18:14)
Moses's response	"Because the people come to me to inquire of God. When they have a dispute, they come to me and I decide between one person and another, and I make known to them the statutes and instructions of God." (Ex. 18:15–16)
Jethro's suggestion	"What you are doing is not good. You will surely wear yourself out, both you and these people with you. For the task is too heavy for you; you cannot do it alone. Now listen to me. I will give you counsel, and God be with you! You should represent the people before God, and you should bring their cases before God; teach them the statutes and instructions and make known to them the way they are to go and the things they are to do. You should also look for able men among all the people, men who fear God, are trustworthy, and hate dishonest gain; set such men over them as officers over thousands, hundreds, fifties and tens. Let them sit as judges for the people at all times; let them bring every important case to you, but decide every minor case themselves. So it will be easier for you, and they will bear the burden with you. If you do this, and God so commands you, then you will be able to endure, and all these people will go to their home in peace." (Ex. 18:17–23)

God had proven Himself before the Egyptians and the Pharaoh (Ex. 18:10–11), and they understood their personal limitations. Moses had lost credibility among his people when he killed the Egyptian. Jethro, in contrast, was a righteous Gentile, a follower of God, but not born among His chosen people. As an experienced leader, Jethro perceived and pointed out some of Moses's present limitations. He brought focus to God's bigger purpose for the mass of people to become a nation and Moses's focus on his current leadership role. Jethro also guided Moses to acknowledge his future limitations: Moses' high involvement approach to leadership was unsustainable for an extended period of time. Moses instead needed to focus on leading this fledgling nation across the desert and into the Promised Land.

Moses demonstrated an internalized moral perspective in his concern about guiding the people in God's ways and proving the integrity of his

actions, a significant issue for an authentic leader. Bass and Steidlmeier (1999) described the authentic leader as following “a sort of Socratic commitment to the process of searching out moral excellence” (p. 208). Jethro acknowledged the validity of leadership concern but provided Moses with an alternative way of viewing the situation: that wise men can make decisions for minor disputes and Moses can focus on guiding the whole nation in accord with God’s plan.

Moses demonstrated balanced processing and involved Jethro in his daily activities and discussed it afterward. Jethro demonstrated experience in balanced processing and suggested Moses involve others to help lead the people. An authentic leader seeks to develop followers to become leaders themselves (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999). Moses grew as an authentic leader, followed the advice, established a sustainable structure, and empowered able men to be heads of groups of tens, fifties, hundreds, and thousands.

This exchange demonstrated strong relational transparency. Frederick, Wood, West, and Winston (2016) found openness served as a significant predictor of an authentic leader. Both Jethro and Moses practiced this openness to honest discourse. Jethro opened the discussion tactfully with a simple question *Why?* Moses and Jethro then analyzed the situation openly and discussed alternatives for future leadership effectiveness.

## Application

This chapter has explored the four areas of authentic leadership and examined how these dimensions were exemplified in two significant dialogues, which served as trigger moments in the life of Moses. There are several poignant applications of authentic leadership that can be drawn from this pericope of scripture. For example, if an employee worked on a team project, but was inadvertently left out of public recognition for the project, would they be less dissatisfied if they believed their supervisor was an authentic leader? It is wise for leaders to develop authenticity for their own character but also for the followers entrusted to their leadership. In each of the conversations presented, at important trigger moments, Moses was pushed to think beyond himself to realize God’s

presence and purposes. Likewise, for an authentic leader, development is not about self but should center on becoming a more mature person and a better conveyor of reality.

The natural next question for a leader is: how can one recognize a trigger event in their present circumstances, thus preparing them for great character and service? Life cascades in irreversible and unpredictable ways. This complexity of life—multiple perspectives, interdisciplinary issues, alternative options—can be frightening to many people. Leaders must frame problems by embracing the excitement that comes with exploration and the trust that comes from a relationship with God. God often enforces a trigger moments of *learning* for future leaders. Noah and his family spent more than a year on the ark and became only survivors of a worldwide tragedy (Gen. 8). Joseph was thrown in the pit by his brothers (Gen. 37) and later languished in prison (Gen. 39). Moses (Ex. 3) and David (I Sam. 16) each watched flocks in the wilderness alone for long periods of time. Jesus was in the wilderness and tempted by Satan for 40 days (Matt. 4). The early Church leaders waited in the upper room for the promised Holy Spirit (Acts 2). Saul sat and prayed in blindness after his conversion (Acts 9). What are some trigger moments a leader can recognize with a bit of self-reflection?

## Conclusion

A leader may have discernment or “an objectively valid ‘natural morality’ that may be attained, even in the weakness of sin, through some sort of ‘acquired virtue’” (Werpehowski, 2007, p. 63). Wisdom can be described as “a process that brings together the rational and the transcendent, the prosaic and higher virtues, the short- and long-terms, the contingent and the absolute, and the self and the collective” (McKenna, Rooney, & Boal, 2009, p. 185). Likewise, wise decisions can be made by a non-Christian leader. A toddler observes adults walking and experiments using his own muscles without acknowledging the laws of gravity until he develops the ability to walk. Similarly, a person seeking to be *good* can observe good behaviors and develop them to an extent within him/herself, without



acknowledging that “every generous act of giving, with every perfect gift, is from above, coming down from the Father of lights” (Jas. 1:17).

As leaders consider *True* reality, they must acknowledge there is no greater reality than God. His plan for creation, for all humanity, and for each individual is true reality. As described in one of the letters, “For now we see through a glass darkly, but then we will see face to face” (1 Cor. 13:12). The role of a leader then is to draw closer and closer to God, to discern reality, and to also draw others to that sight through the development of authenticity. As Saint Clare of Assisi described, the gospels are a mirror in which I must see myself and become more like Him until I become His likeness (Mueller, 2010). Lastly, may this be the prayer for every authentic leader: “One thing I ask from the Lord; this only do I seek: that I may dwell in the house all the days of my life, to gaze of the beauty of the Lord and to seek him in his temple” (Ps. 27:4, NIV).

## References

- Avolio, B. J. (2005). *Leadership development in balance: Made/born*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Avolio, B. J. (2007). Promoting more integrative strategies for leadership theory building. *American Psychologist*, 62, 25–33.
- Avolio, B. J., & Gardner, W. L. (2005). Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 315–338. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.03.001>
- Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Walumbwa, F. O., Luthans, F., & May, D. (2004). Unlocking the mask: A look at the process by which authentic leaders' impact follower attitudes and behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, 15(6), 801–823. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2004.09.003>
- Avolio, B. J., & Luthans, F. (2006). *The high impact leader: Moments matter in accelerating authentic leadership development*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Bartholomew, S. C. (2006). The influence of gender, age, and locus of control on servant leader behavior among group leaders at the culinary institute of America (Order No. 3219700). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (304937277). Retrieved from <https://trevecca.idm.oclc.org/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.trevecca.idm.oclc.org/docview/304937277?accountid=29083>

- Bass, B. M., & Steidlmeier, P. (1999). Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership behavior. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2), 181–218.
- Beegle, D. M. (1972). *Moses, the servant of Yahweh*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Bouchikhi, H., & Kimberly, J. R. (2003). Escaping the identity trap. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 44(3), 20–26. Retrieved from <http://eres.regent.edu:2048/login?url=http://0-search.ebscohost.com.library.regent.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bth&AN=9547970&site=bsi-live>
- Cosgrove, M. (2006). *Foundations of Christian thought: Faith, learning, and the Christian worldview*. Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications.
- DuPree, M. (2004). *Leadership is an art*. New York: Doubleday.
- Frederick, H. R., Wood, J. A., West, G. R. B., & Winston, B. E. (2016). The effect of the accountability variables of responsibility, openness, and answerability on authentic leadership. *Journal of Research in Christian Education*, 25(3), 302–316.
- 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. *Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 434–372. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.03.003>
- Grant, K. (2008). Who are the lepers in our organizations?: A case for compassionate leadership. *Business Renaissance Quarterly*, 3(2), 75–91.
- He, H. (2008). Corporate identity/strategy interface: Implications for corporate level marketing. *European Journal of Marketing*, 42(1/2), 10–15. <https://doi.org/10.1108/03090560810840871>
- Grisez, G., & Shaw, R. (2004). Conscience: Knowledge of moral truth. In Curren, C. E. (Ed.). *Conscience* (pp. 39–50). Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.
- Heifetz, R. A. (2009, May). *Adaptive leadership*. Session presented at the doctoral residency of Regent University, Virginia Beach, VA.
- Hill, R. P., & Stephens, D. L. (2003). The compassionate organization in the 21st century. *Organizational Dynamics*, 32(4), 331–341. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2003.08.004>
- Janzen, J. G. (1979). What's in a name: Yahweh in Exodus 3 and the wider biblical context. *Interpretation*, 33(3), 227–239. Retrieved from <http://0-first-search.oclc.org.library.regent.edu/WebZ/FSFETCH?fetchtype=fullrecord:ssionid=fsapp7-40823-g9x4wf7f-jop0yu:entitypagenum=4:0:recno=4:results et=2:format=FI:next=html/record.html:bad=error/badfetch.html:entitytoprecno=4:entitycurrecno=4:numrecs=1>

- Klenke, K. (2005). The internal theatre of the authentic leader: Integrating cognitive, affective, conative and spiritual facets of authentic leadership. *Authentic Leadership Theory and Practice: Origins, Effects and Development Monographs in Leadership and Management*, 3, 155–182.
- Korac-Kakabadse, N., Korac-Kakabadse, A., & Kouzmin, A. (2001). Leadership renewal: Towards the philosophy of wisdom. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 67, 207–227.
- Kretzschmar, L. (2007). The formation of moral leaders in South Africa: A Christian-ethical analysis of some essential elements. *Journal of Theology for Southern Africa*, 128, 18–36.
- Luthans, F., & Avolio, B. J. (2003). Authentic leadership development. In K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton, & R. E. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive organizational scholarship* (pp. 241–258). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- McKenna, B., Rooney, R., & Boal, K. B. (2009). Wisdom principles as a meta-theoretical basis for evaluating leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20(2), 177–190.
- Meyer, F. B. (1996). *Moses: The servant of God*. Lynnwood, WA: Emerald Books.
- Mueller, J. (2010). *A companion to Clare of Assisi: Life, writings, and spirituality*. Leiden, The Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV.
- Peus, C., Wesche, J. S., Streicher, B., Braun, S., & Frey, D. (2011). Authentic leadership: An empirical test of its antecedents, consequences, and mediating mechanisms. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 107(3), 331–348. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-1042-3>
- Robbins, V. K. (1996). *The tapestry of early Christian discourse: Rhetoric, society and ideology*. New York: Routledge.
- Robinson, D. A., & Harvey, M. (2008). Global leadership in a culturally diverse world. *Management Decision*, 46(3), 466–480.
- Shamir, B., & Eilam, G. (2005). “What’s your story?”: A life-stories approach to authentic leadership development. *Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 395–417.
- Stebbins, L. H. (2010). Development of reality system theory. *Journal of Business & Economics Research*, 8(4), 1–22. Retrieved from <http://0-proquest.umi.com.library.regent.edu/pqdweb?did=2016986671&sid=2&Fmt=4&clientId=3927&RQT=309&VName=PQD>
- 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(1), 89–126. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206307308913>
- Werpehowski, W. (2007). Practical wisdom and the integrity of Christian life. *Journal of the Society of Christian Ethics*, 27(2), 55–72.



# 7

## Leadership Development: The Role of Learning in the Authentic, Transformational, Servant, and Kenotic Leader

Laurel B. Emory and David P. Peltz

**Abstract** Leadership is a learned behavior. There is an underlying intentionality within this learning that implies a deliberateness to transcend to a higher level of cognition, that of kenosis. It is within this transformative stage of leader development a person can evolve in their self-awareness to achieve a new normative state of increased authenticity through self-emptying.

**Keywords** Authentic • Transformational • Servant • Leadership • Development • Learning • Kenotic

---

L. B. Emory (✉)

Emory Consulting and Coaching, Cambria, CA, USA

D. P. Peltz

Peltz Consulting Services LLC, Sahuarita, AZ, USA

© The Author(s) 2020

D. P. Peltz, J. H. Wilson (eds.), *True Leadership*, Christian Faith Perspectives in Leadership and Business, [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-46660-2\\_7](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-46660-2_7)

Fundamentally, leadership is a behavior (Yukl, 2013) and is a process/behavior that can be learned (Jago, 1982; Northouse, 2019). As has been discussed in previous chapters, there are many varying definitions of leadership. Yukl (2013) summarized them, “Most definitions of leadership reflect the assumption that it involves a process whereby intentional influence is exerted over other people to guide, structure, and facilitate activities and relationships in a group or organization” (p. 2). Regarding kenotic leadership, Ditlewicz (2006) stated, “Kenosis moves beyond simply giving up power. It is an active emptying ...” (p. 257). These statements together imply not only is leadership a learned behavior but also the act of kenosis/kenotic leadership style may also be learned.

## Leadership Development

This chapter will focus on the role of learning specific to the authentic, transformational, servant, and kenotic leader. It is important to note the on-going debate of whether leaders are made or born is somewhat irrelevant to the discussion of the role that learning plays in certain types of leaders. The very fact leadership development programs exist concedes the idea that leaders can, at the very least, be developed (George, Sims, McLean, & Mayer, 2007; Yukl, 2013). Credence is given to the idea that regardless of the starting point of a leader (made or born), development can still take place.

## Development Requires Learning

Maples and Webster (1980) defined learning as “a process by which behavior changes as a result of experiences” (p. 1). There are several triggers of adult learning: (1) stimuli in external environment, (2) internal cognitive structuring, (3) affective and cognitive needs, (4) interaction between person, behavior, and environment, and (5) internal construction of reality (Merriam & Caffarella, 1999, p. 264). Ultimately, the desired outcomes of learning are centered around (1) skill development and training, (2) cognitive development, (3) learning how to learn, (4)

self-directed learning, (5) socialization, (6) social roles, (7) experiential learning, (8) perspective transformation, and (9) reflective practice (Merriam & Caffarella, 1999, p. 264). These outcomes help to focus on the role learning plays in authentic, transformational, servant, and kenotic leadership.

## Learning in Authentic Leadership

It is important to be reminded of the definition of authentic leadership, as it is most commonly accepted today. Essentially, authentic leadership is a leader knowing who they are and what they believe, and then grounding their words, actions, and behaviors in those beliefs (i.e., values and convictions) (Bass & Bass, 2008; Shamir & Eilam, 2005; Yukl, 2013).

Learning for the authentic leader comes through wisdom, a realization that significance in this life comes through sharing one's gifts, talents, and abilities with others as opposed to using it to benefit oneself (Avolio, 2005; George et al., 2007; Michie & Gooty, 2005; Shamir & Eilam, 2005). This wisdom comes through learned experiences, both formal and informal. For each leader, a story unfolds that shows where experience, created from upbringing, culture, relationships, as well as education, plays a role in the development of a leader. Heifetz (2009) reminded us development takes place when the leader recognizes the need to adapt to the new environment by using pieces of the past as well as newly acquired learning. For the authentic leader, learning comes through the continued congruence between their words, actions, and behaviors. The self-awareness or self-knowledge of an authentic leader enables them to essentially playback situations they have been involved in. Reflecting on each experience, learning from each situation, and assessing what they would do differently the next time assists the leader in increasing self-awareness. Further extending this process, a leader can consider how they may have incorporated a different word choice, how they would have engaged another person in the situation, how they would have encouraged someone more, and how this may have impacted the results. These deeply held values and convictions create an automatic conscience, which they use to create learning opportunities for themselves (Shamir & Eilam, 2005).

Ultimately, this self-awareness and self-knowledge leads to self-discipline, which leads to success, which draws the attention of others and turns into trusted relationships (George et al., 2007). It is in these trusted relationships additional learning takes place as followers allow themselves to be influenced by the leader. The authentic leader then reflects on this experience of having a follower actually follow them and comes to the realization there is great responsibility in being a leader. The leader then observes the obligation to lead with even greater authenticity and integrity, thus seeking out ways through more learning (George, 2007). This can then become a model for shared learning where greater authenticity in the leader leads to authenticity in the follower, with each helping others to achieve significance. Additionally, this shared learning experience allows for leaders to recognize that they should solicit feedback and ideas from others, regardless of whether such ideas differ from their own (Popper & Lipshitz, 2000). Authentic leaders know learning takes place through the investigation and adoption of varying ideas rather than just their own ideas (Avolio, Gardner, & Walumbwa, 2007).

Authentic leaders also foster a culture where it is acceptable to make mistakes. They create an environment where learning is gained by moving out of one's comfort zone to areas that may be new or even intimidating. It is the real-world learning experiences, through trial and error, and trial and success, that helps them to be the authentic leaders that they are, and will help them to model authenticity for others (Clark 2008; Fazey, Fazey, & Fazey, 2005). It is through this learning authentic leaders become experts, which matters to their followers as it provides justification and substantiation of the follower's actions and behaviors, thus creating authenticity in the follower (Avolio, 2005; Avolio & Gardner, 2005).

## Learning in Transformational Leadership

The main definitions of transformational leadership center on the idea a leader helps a follower to see beyond the task in front of them or their own self-interest to the bigger picture, the greater purpose, while considering the inclusive needs of others (Avolio & Bass, 2007; Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978). An overarching way a transformational leader learns is

through developing their followers into leaders. Transformational leaders lead with the purpose of looking beyond themselves. One of the five I's of transformational leadership is intellectual stimulation (Avolio & Bass, 2004). Intellectual stimulation focuses on seeking out different perspectives in order to solve problems and innovating new methods (Avolio & Bass, 2007), whereby the focus is on the intention to learn. Since transformational leadership is about the development of followers, it would naturally follow that intellectual stimulation is focused on the learning of the follower. However, it could be argued a leader must have an interest in learning for themselves, in order to promote it to their followers. One of the other five I's of transformational leadership is individual consideration. This focuses on the leader's initiative to teach and coach their followers based on their own individual needs (Avolio & Bass, 2004). For it to actually be "individual consideration", one could argue the leader must be learned enough to provide the coaching/mentoring needed for each follower.

The Old Testament leader, Joshua, clearly provided a transformational leadership experience for his followers as he worked to prepare them to live in the Promised Land. Joshua also modeled transformational leadership, which resulted in transformed people as evidenced through a modeled response of sinless behaviors with just one sin recorded amongst the Hebrew people while he was their leader. Jesus' individual consideration of Peter after Peter denied Jesus is another example of transformational leadership in action. Jesus chose to nurture Peter through a difficult time and help him to learn from the experience of the situation. The learning that took place ultimately led to the transformation of Peter's life to where Peter became the first leader of the first-century church.

## Learning in Servant Leadership

Greenleaf (1977) indicated there are 13 key attributes to being a servant leader. In his discussions, he stated the best test of a servant leader as follows:



Do those served grow as persons? Do they, *while being served*, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants? *And*, what is the effect on the least privileged in society; will they benefit, or, at least, not become further deprived? (pp. 13–14)

Greenleaf offered that as a result of leadership, persons must grow, become wiser, and become more autonomous. This appeared to suggest a facet of learning/development/teaching was deliberately integrated into the delineations of the model itself. He was not the only author of a servant leadership model that included facets of learning/development/teaching, albeit he was the first.

There are several servant leadership models that include one or more of the facets of learning, development, and/or teaching. Miller's (1995) model included one facet of learning: "Seeing yourself as a leader: learning the art of self-perception" (p. 19). Pollard's (1996) model included two facets of learning: "Listen and learn" (p. 245) and "Provide a learning/growing environment" (p. 246). Rinehart's (1998) model included one facet of development: "Equip and develop people" (p. 39). Laub's (1999) model included one facet of development: "Develops people" (p. 46). Page and Wong's (2000) model included one facet of development: "Developing others" (p. 16). McGee-Cooper and Trammell's (2002) model included two facets of learning: "Accountability is about making it safe to learn from mistakes" (p. 146) and "Uses humor to lift others up and make it safe to learn from mistakes" (p. 146); and one facet of development: "Develops trust across a network of constituencies; breaks down hierarchy" (p. 146). Russell and Stone's (2002) model included one facet of teaching: "Teaching" (p. 147). Keith's (2008) model included two facets of development/coaching: "Developing your colleagues" (p. 43) and "Coaching not controlling" (p. 46). McGee-Cooper and Trammell's (2011) model included: "Servant, helper, and teacher first, then leader" (p. 3). Finally, van Dierendonck's (2011) model includes one facet of development: "Empower and develop people" (p. 1228).

Several of the servant leadership models developed subsequent to Greenleaf's (1977) model incorporated the facets of learning, development/coaching, and teaching. A short scan of the models mentioned above revealed three models included facets of learning, six models

included facets of development/coaching, and two models included facets of teaching. This may suggest there is at least a portion of the servant leadership community that believes/agrees there is a significant value to ensuring these facets are incorporated into servant leadership models.

Though not all servant leadership models possess these facets, several do. Identifying and observing these facets in servant leadership models supports Greenleaf's test of ensuring persons must grow, become wiser, and become more autonomous. It further supports the importance and significance of servant leadership possessing selfless elements for the growth of followers through learning, development/coaching, and teaching.

## Learning in Kenotic Leadership

A definition of kenotic leadership has begun to emerge in the recent years. As with other types of leadership, there are a number of varying definitions. However, the one that appears to fit best is the idea of emptying oneself in the form of humility and altruism for the sake of mission, followers, or both (Bekker, 2011). DeMartino and Kramer (1998) iterated it as "self-abandonment into God" (p. 224).

The main purpose of kenosis is to bring people together in relationship. The kenotic leader learns by the act of emptying oneself and taking on a posture of no power, no position, and no title. The leaders humble themselves in a way that allows them to learn from their mistakes, and to humbly accept guidance or correction from others when someone expresses to them evidence about how their perspectives or actions are incorrect. Learning, in and of itself, for the kenotic leader is a means of growing closer to others and sharing together, as opposed to a posture of desiring to be smarter or more knowledgeable than someone else. The kenotic leader then uses the act of learning as a means of creating or restoring relationships.

## Conclusion

Learning plays an important role in leadership and in leadership development. Although the role of learning is slightly different for authentic, transformational, servant, and kenotic leaders, there is clearly an overlapping between them. The commonality suggests they each emphasize the importance of learning, so as to benefit the follower. The hope is through this learning, lasting change will take place to allow each leader and each follower to be who God has called them to be, and to make a difference in the life of someone else.

## References

- Avolio, B., & Bass, B. (2004). *Multifactor leadership questionnaire: Manual and sampler set*. Menlo Park, CA: Mind Garden.
- Avolio, B., & Bass, B. (2007). *MLQ: Self evaluation report*. Menlo Park, CA: Mind Garden.
- Avolio, B., & Gardner, W. (2005). Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *16*, 315–338.
- Avolio, B. J. (2005). *Leadership development in balance: Made/born*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., & Walumbwa, F. O. (2007). *Authentic leadership questionnaire*. Retrieved from <http://www.mindgarden.com/products/alq.htm>
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M., & Bass, R. (2008). *The bass handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications* (4th ed.). New York: Free Press.
- Bekker, C. J. (2011). Kenotic leadership. In F. Gandolfi (Ed.), *Fundamentals of leadership* (Vol. 1). Saarbrücken, Germany: Lambert Academic Publishing.
- Burns, J. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Clark, R. C. (2008). *Building expertise: Cognitive methods for training and performance improvement* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Pfeiffer.
- DeMartino, R., & Kramer, K. (1998). Perspectives on self-emptying: A Zen-Catholic dialogue. *Eastern Buddhist*, *31*(2), 219–244.

- Ditewig, W. T. (2006). Epilogue: The kenotic leadership of deacons. In J. Keating (Ed.), *The deacon reader*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Fazey, I., Fazey, J. A., & Fazey, D. M. A. (2005). Learning more effectively from experience. *Ecology and Society*, 10(2), 4–26.
- George, B. (2007). True north [Electronic version]. *Georgia Tech Alumni Magazine*, 4, 46–51.
- George, B., Sims, P., McLean, A. N., & Mayer, D. (2007). Discovering your authentic leadership [Electronic version]. *Harvard Business Review*, 85(2), 129–138.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Heifetz, R. A. (2009, May). *Adaptive leadership*. Session presented at the doctoral residency of Regent University, Virginia Beach, VA.
- Jago, A. G. (1982). Leadership: Perspectives in theory and research. *Management Science (Pre-1986)*, 28(3), 315.
- Laub, J. A. (1999). *Assessing the servant organization: Development of the Servant Organizational Leadership Assessment (SOLA) instrument* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database (UMI No. 9921922).
- Maples, M. F., & Webster, J. M. (1980). Thorndike's connectionism. In G. M. Gazda & R. J. Corsini (Eds.), *Theories of learning*. Itasca, IL: Peacock.
- McGee-Cooper, A., & Trammell, D. (2002). From hero-as-leader to servant-as leader. In L. C. Spears & M. Lawrence (Eds.), *Focus on leadership: Servant-leadership for the 21st century* (pp. 141–152). New York: Wiley.
- McGee-Cooper, A., & Trammell, D. (2011). *Servant leadership: A powerful tool for fast change*. Ann McGee-Cooper & Associates, Inc. Retrieved from <http://amca.com/amca/wp-content/uploads/Servant-Leadership-A-Powerful-Tool-for-Fast-Change.pdf>
- Merriam, S. B., & Caffarella, R. S. (1999). *Learning in adulthood: A comprehensive guide*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Michie, S., & Gooty, J. (2005). Values, emotions, and authenticity: Will the real leader please stand up? *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 441–457.
- Miller, C. (1995). *The empowered leader: 10 keys to servant leadership*. Nashville, TN: B & H Publishing Group.
- Northouse, P. G. (2019). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (8th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Page, D., & Wong, P. T. P. (2000). A conceptual framework for measuring servant leadership. In S. Adjibolosoo (Ed.), *The human factor in shaping the course of history and development*. Boston, MA: University Press of America.
- Pollard, C. W. (1996). The leader who serves. In F. Hesselbein, M. Goldsmith, & R. Beckhard (Eds.), *The leader of the future: New visions, strategies, and practices for the next era* (pp. 241–248). New York: Drucker Foundation.
- Popper, M., & Lipshitz, R. (2000). Organizational learning: Mechanisms, culture, and feasibility. *Management Learning, 31*, 181–196.
- Rinehart, S. T. (1998). *Upside down: The paradox of servant leadership*. Springs, CO: NavPress.
- Russell, R. F., & Stone, A. G. (2002). A review of servant leadership attributes: Developing a practical model. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 23*(3/4), 145–157.
- Shamir, B., & Eilam, G. (2005). What's your story?: A life-stories approach to authentic leadership development. *Leadership Quarterly, 16*, 395–417.
- van Dierendonck, D. (2011). Servant leadership: A review and synthesis. *Journal of Management, 37*(4), 1228–1261.
- Yukl, G. (2013). *Leadership in organizations* (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.



# 8

## The Impact of Kenosis on the Transformational Authentic Leader

Andrea R. Ramirez

**Abstract** Leaders are often appraised on the results achieved rather than the degree to which such leaders make sacrifices. This inter-textual analysis of Philippians 2 hymn and several related pericopes from the gospels and epistles provide a relational connection between self-emptying acts of humility and True Leadership. A key relationship for the forms of moral leadership is *kenosis* or self-emptying sacrifice, particularly in correspondence with transformational and authentic leadership. The desirable outcome of a kenotic approach to leadership is reconciliation of relationships between the leader and their followers and benefactors. The value of kenosis is punctuated when a leader has an awareness of self along with an awareness of others in a way that reveals their authenticity as it simultaneously cultivates genuine reconciliation.

**Keywords** Kenosis • Reconciliation • Transformational • Authentic Leadership • Scripture

---

A. R. Ramirez (✉)

National Hispanic Christian Leadership Coalition (NHCLC),  
Washington, DC, USA

© The Author(s) 2020

D. P. Peltz, J. H. Wilson (eds.), *True Leadership*, Christian Faith Perspectives in Leadership and Business, [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-46660-2\\_8](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-46660-2_8)

## The Impact of Kenosis on the Transformational Authentic Leader

In the preceding chapters, examples of authentic leadership have been reviewed by examining the lives of Moses and Jethro; it is time to consider another aspect to continue to illuminate our understanding of True Leadership. This illumination comes forth by the exploration of how the concept and application of *kenosis*, or *self-emptying*, is supported as a component of True Leadership used within authentic leadership as well as transformational, authentic, and servant leaders. In efforts to deepen our understanding of True Leadership, the concept of kenosis, in addition to answering the question of how kenosis can engage with other forms of moral leadership, is explored. Although various definitions of kenosis are reviewed, for the purpose of this study, kenosis can be defined when an individual working out of humility empties, hides, or limits one's form (Gavrilyuk, 2005; Haught, 2005; Stening, 2006). The question thus becomes, *why would an individual, in particular a leader, participate in acts of kenosis?* The general purpose of kenosis is examined, illustrated, and revealed to be ultimately for the sake of reconciliation between individuals, in this case between leader and follower.

The concept of reconciliation seems to follow the business negotiation principle that a relationship can be enriched when the focus shifts to be concentrated on *interests* rather than on *positions* (Fisher & Ury, 1981). The design of reconciliation seems to support the consideration that a relationship with people should be revered as the highest priority (Pfeffer, 1998). For authentic leaders to experience reconciliation, a transformation of a leader's form might need to occur. Kenosis seems to be the proverbial place where leadership and reconciliation meet. However, regarding the appearance of a leader's form, Miller (1995) explained, "leadership is not as it *appears* but as it *performs*" (p. 8). 1 Samuel 16:7 provides wisdom in regard to searching for leadership beyond appearance with, "But the Lord said to Samuel, 'do not look at his appearance or at his physical stature, because I have refused him. For the Lord does not see as man sees; a man looks at the outward appearance, but the Lord looks at the heart'" (16:7, NKJV). This type of transformation of a leader's form

requires the emptying of self, also known as kenosis. Kenosis is further examined with the continued use of a biblical perspective to review places throughout scripture where Jesus serves as the example of an authentic and transformational leader to demonstrate the act of self-emptying.

Two techniques of scriptural analysis were applied in this chapter. The first technique used was inter-textual analysis. An inter-textual analysis compares what is said in one text with what appears in additional texts to provide deeper understanding of the concepts presented among the texts (Robbins, 1996). The second analysis that was applied was the socio-rhetorical analysis approach. The socio-rhetorical analysis allows researchers to focus on the relationship between the work and the author of the text to recognize the technique “requires an exploration of other texts, the object of the analysis is, nevertheless, to interpret aspects internal to the text under consideration” (Robbins, 1996, p. 96). The main text reviewed was Philippians 2; however, the intertexture was conducted on various scripture passages and academic articles to ensure a thorough inter-textual analysis. These tools were used to help consider the following questions: To what extent should an authentic leader practice kenosis? What are appropriate limits to this practice? Should authentic leaders practice the full extent of kenosis with every individual they encounter? Finally, various debates surrounding the issue of kenosis were reviewed to provide a historical framework for which this topic exists.

The purpose of this chapter is to provide clarity on the concept of kenosis. Additionally, it delves into the extent kenosis should be practiced, its purpose within interactions, its relationship with authentic leadership, its potential impact on transformational authentic leaders, and the conclusions derived from the results of this analysis. To start this discussion, it is critical to understand the concept of kenosis.

## The Concept of Kenosis

The ideology of self-emptying, or *kenosis*, has been an issue of debate within circles of theology (Castelo, 2007; Gavrilyuk, 2005; Villafane, 2006). The debate comprises issues surrounding how far the impact of kenosis reaches, if it is truly indicative of the nature of Christ, and within



the context of how to imitate this behavior when following the leadership of Jesus Christ (Gorman 2009; Hamm, 2010). This concept has been proposed as a part of a proto-model of Christian leadership and was explored using the repetitive-progressive inner-textual analysis of Philippians 2 (Bekker, 2006; Robbins, 1996). However, further exploration is needed to determine how kenosis is supported as a component of other forms of leadership through additional passages of scripture along with pertinent academic articles written on this subject.

There are various theologies surrounding the concept of kenosis. Below are several examples of the issues that comprise the debates surrounding the concept. These examples are meant to provide a background of the ideologies found in current literature about this topic. Hamm's (2010) understanding of the Philippians hymn was it provided "the foundational model of how God the Father saves by revealing the divine nature in the self-emptying and self-humiliation of Jesus in the incarnation and in his obedient life, death, and resurrection" (p. 453). Brierley (2009) explained there have been four broad historical phases of the exploration of kenosis that included (1) an attempt to explain how the divine word became human, (2) discussion surrounding the hiding of the divine nature when Christ took on human nature, (3) the translation of the incarnation and the divine nature in and of itself, and (4) the application of kenosis as a model to follow by all humanity. Brierley argued that kenosis has been a long-standing virtue because as an ethic, it is "essential to divinity, and thus to the cosmos" (2009, p. 72).

Gavrilyuk (2005) expanded upon Bulgakov's three main aspects of kenotic thought, which included, "God's self-emptying as a feature of the inner life of the Trinity, creation as a kenotic act, and the incarnation as the kenosis par excellence" (p. 253). Therefore, the debates surround what purpose the concept of kenosis plays in philosophical understanding. Does it serve to better understand the nature of the Trinity or to provide clarity regarding creation or to serve as the ultimate example for mankind through the incarnation of Christ? Some protestant theologians of the twentieth century, who were learners of kenosis, limited the concept to particular events like Christ's suffering, humiliation, and death (2005). However, Bulgakov proposed kenosis had a broader impact and could be seen in all areas of Christ's life (Gavrilyuk, 2005). One way to

explore this argument is to review other passages of scripture illuminating the life of Christ to see if kenosis is found outside of situations where Christ is suffering, being humiliated, or experiencing death.

Gavrilyuk (2005) questioned what was it God was emptying Himself of. Gavrilyuk explained Bulgakov pointed to the fact it was not for the purpose of hiding His divine nature, as Clare of Assisi posed (Karecki, 2008). Bulgakov interpreted Philippians 2:7 as indicative of the fact Christ, being fully God while being fully human, did not empty Himself of His *divine nature* but rather emptied Himself of His *divine form* (Gavrilyuk, 2005). Another argument related to kenosis was if it was a demonstration of God succumbing to the limitations of His creation or something altogether different (Dawe, 1963; Stening, 2006). Stening (2006) argued, “for me this kenosis goes too far. While God in Christ did indeed endure the limitations of a human body...God the Father in heaven still reigned supreme” (p. 5). A different aspect of kenosis involves the act of creating beings outside of Himself while desiring a relationship with them. This was a humbling act in itself and enlarged God’s greatness as a Creator (Haught, 2005; Stening, 2006). It is astounding to consider that “God demonstrates his own love toward us, in that while we were still sinners, Christ died for us” (Romans 5:8, NKJV). Therefore, this scripture conveys the Creator humbled Himself in loving the creation, even in the midst of rebellion and a breach of relationship.

In an interview between two academic scholars, one Buddhist and the other Catholic, the distinct approaches to self-emptying were evident (DeMartino & Kramer, 1998). Ultimately, the difference resided in the Christian belief is to self-empty but with a remainder for a need for God, whereas the Buddhist belief is that by one becoming nothing in turn also becomes all (1998). Therefore, when considering the difference kenosis has within Christian faith, apart from other religions, it can be concluded although there is an emptying out of oneself which allows openness for others, there is still a remaining factor for a need for God. In reference to Galatians 2:20, Paul said:

I have been crucified with Christ; it is no longer I who live, but Christ lives in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave Himself for me. (NKJV)

Kramer provided clarity for this passage whereby kenosis was based on the Christian writings and ideologies of St. John, Deissmann, and Eliade (1998). DeMartino and Kramer (1998) explained:

One could call this a union without identity in which soul is united with God through a coherence of spiritual discipline (self-power) and unconditioned Grace (Other power). This union does not imply ... absorption—there is always a living awareness of, indeed the necessity of, the Otherness of God. (p. 223)

DeMartino and Kramer (1998) further explained the definition of kenosis for the Christian is “self-abandonment into God” (p. 224). Baird (2007) explained, “the divine kenotic gesture is met by the human kenotic response of absolute exposure to the other” (p. 427). Perhaps this was evident in Paul’s statements of emptying out of himself in Galatians 5:20 was actually a response to Christ’s act of kenosis toward mankind.

Earlier, questions were presented regarding to what extent self-emptying was appropriate for a leader, and what boundaries might be needed, if any? Szabolcs (2003) presented a consideration in regard to *epoche* as an extreme type of kenosis. This type of kenosis suspends judgment for the purpose of creating a space within, to allow receptivity. However, Szabolcs (2003) cautioned, “we should regulate ... this kind of self-emptying, because if we are empty, we do not have anything to share ... *epoche* should endue the double nature of biblical kenosis ... to be full and empty at the same time, fully divine and fully human” (p. 9).

A different approach was found in the writings of Hadewijch of Antwerp in the thirteenth century, whose language indicated she was a part of the upper class but chose to live a life of poverty and contemplation (Hadewijch, 2000). Hadewijch exhorted with “give yourself completely in abandonment to God, to become what he is. For the honor of Love, renounce yourself as far as you can” (p. 201). Perhaps reviewing additional passages of scripture will inform as to what extent self-emptying is demonstrated in scripture, how leaders can emulate this practice, and, most importantly, what is the true intent for acts of kenosis?

## The Transforming Power of Kenosis: Reconciliation

Szabolcs (2003) identified four passages, in addition to Philippians 2:6–11, where the term *emptying out* was used, which included (a) Romans 4:14, (b) 1 Corinthians 1:17, (c) 1 Corinthians 9:15, and (d) 2 Corinthians 9:3. Each provided a different perspective on the definition of emptying. In Romans 4:14, the term has a meaning of making faith void, or null, when individuals try to lean upon the law rather than in Christ (2003). 1 Corinthians 1:17 references how Paul's concern it is Christ's power that saves, and if Paul should boast of power then the cross would be emptied of its power (2003). 1 Corinthians 9:15 refers to the emptiness with a meaning of depravity with, "for it would be better for me to die than that anyone should make my boasting void" (NKJV). 2 Corinthians 9:3 "speaks about the fear that the boasting of Paul with the congregation might prove to have been empty" (Szabolcs, 2003, p. 9). These are important passages in understanding various uses in scripture for the term *emptying out*. Additional passages provided greater clarification on kenosis included the temptation of Christ detailed in Matthew 4, and the explanation of Christ becoming as His brothers in Hebrews 2:5–18. The inter-textual analysis using both cultural and social inter-textual approaches continued as these passages were interpreted in conjunction with the understanding of Philippians 2:6–11 (Robbins, 1996).

Matthew 4 explains Christ was literally carried to the place of temptation by Satan (Matthew 4:8). Gill (2010) explained Christ was carried in the air by Satan, an example of truly emptying or limiting Himself of His strength and power to crush Satan (Romans 16:20). Matthew 4:2 explained Jesus fasted and as Wesley (1754–1765) pointed out, He therefore was physically hungry and therefore ready for the first temptation. Jesus explained His strength in John 6:35 and said, "I am the bread of life. He who comes to Me shall never hunger, and he who believes in Me shall never thirst" (NKJV). Therefore, the originator of that which causes hunger and thirst to be quenched, allowed His very body to be hungry for the sake of translating Himself into a form that humans could relate with (Hebrews 2). In Hebrews 2:18, an explanation of the rationale of

this temptation was presented with “For in that He Himself has suffered, being tempted, He is able to aid those who are tempted” (NKJV).

The passage in Hebrews 2:18 correlates with what was found in Philippians 2:7, which says, “but made Himself of no reputation, taking the form of a bondservant, and coming in the likeness of men” (NKJV). Perhaps this notion of a bondservant is rather a servant to human functions such as hunger, thirst, and requirements of sleep. Kenosis was clearly seen as Christ limited His own power for the purpose relating with His creation in a way that would allow a path to follow in times of being tempted. It was fitting Szabolcs presented kenosis was God translating Himself into terms humans could understand by becoming human and encountering human situations and fears (2005). The believers who received this message in Hebrews were dealing with the social pressures of disapproval from their neighbors (DeSilva, 2004). The author of Hebrews was attempting to aid these believers with reminders of the benefits of being connected and in relationship with Christ, as well as helping them walk through difficult situations (2004). This passage was found as a way to aid these believers to remembering Christ Himself went through times of disapproval (Luke 5:21). C.S. Lewis (1952) summed this up with, “God became a man to turn creatures into sons” (p. 182).

It was interesting to note that kenosis and clues to the purpose of this concept were discovered within classic literature. Bouchard (2005) performed an analysis of *King Lear*, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, and *The King Is Alive* to determine when kenosis should be used. Bouchard (2005) saw evidence where King Lear explained the purpose of kenosis is for restoration whereby “we can see ... how Kent, Edgar, the Fool, and Cordelia assume roles of inferior or foreign status out of compassion and loyalty ... they respond to a crisis in which kingship and kinship are at an impasse” (p. 163). Colossians 1:16 explains: “For by Him all things were created that are in heaven and that are on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or powers. All things were created through Him and for Him” (NKJV). Robertson (1960) pointed to Romans 8:29 and concluded, Jesus is “the author of salvation, the leader of the sons of God, the Elder Brother of us all” (p. 1). Therefore, what was found in Hebrews 2:7 was astonishing. Strong evidence of kenosis was apparent in this passage where it speaks of the place of

humans: “You have made him a little lower than the angels; You have crowned him with glory and honor, and set him over the works of our hands” (NKJV). Then, specific to understanding Christ’s role, Hebrews 2 continues in verse 9 with: “But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels, for the suffering of death crowned with glory and honor, that He, *by the grace of God, might taste death for everyone*” (NKJV). Therefore, for Christ to come in the form less than His own creation of angels was significant in the journey to find additional scriptural support of kenosis. In the search for the boundaries of kenosis for a leader, reflection upon the purpose of these acts of kenosis requires further exploration. In each instance, it is for the glory of God for the purpose of salvation and reconciliation of the relationship between man and God. The purpose was made clear in Hebrews 2:17: “Therefore, *in all things He had to be made like His brethren*, that He might be a merciful and faithful High Priest in the things pertaining to God, to make propitiation for the sins of the people” (NKJV). This verse supported Bulgakov’s assertion that kenosis touched all elements of Christ’s life, and was not limited to only suffering, humiliation, and death (Gavrilyuk, 2005). Robertson (1960) further stated Jesus “lived his human life in order to be able to be a sympathizing and effective leader in the work of salvation” (p. 1). Therefore, perhaps an appropriate conclusion for the Christian leader might be to follow in the steps of kenosis when what is at stake is the reconciliation of the follower to the greater mission. If there is a breach in the relationship, perhaps this is when there should be a call for limiting, emptying out, or opening oneself to others, as a Christian leader, for connectivity with Father God or His mission.

Additional passages that supported the concept of kenosis were found in the Philippians 2 hymn explained, and seemed to support, the lessening of an individual before experiencing the joy of victory, such as those found in John 12:24 and Matthew 16:26 (Szabolcs, 2003, p. 10). Szabolcs (2003) explained John 12:24 demonstrated the “grain of wheat must fall into the ground and die if it is to produce any fruit ... Matthew 16:26 to lose our life in order to find it” (p. 10). It appeared these passages supported the consideration there was greatness in lowering one’s position for the greater purpose of reconciliation. As Szabolcs (2003) continued, “this is not talking about the dying for the other as the final good. This is

a death in the hope of a resurrection” (p. 10). Therefore, this act of kenosis was for the sole purpose of ultimate reconciliation through the resurrection. Szabolcs (2003) concluded, “the way God chose to engage in dialogue with humankind was kenosis, and we are challenged to follow Christ’s footsteps” (p. 10). Scriptural support for this conclusion was found in John 14:15 where Jesus explained if His followers love them, they will obey Him and also in the instruction to “pursue peace with all people, and holiness, without which no one will see the Lord” (Hebrews 12:14, NKJV). Alongside these verses was Paul’s example of meeting individuals wherever they were culturally for the sake of Christ, “and to the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might win Jews; to those who are under the law, as under the law, that I might win those who are under the law” (1 Corinthians 9:20, NKJV). Therefore, it can be understood the ultimate purpose of kenosis was always for the reconciliation of the relationship.

## The Impact of Kenosis on Authentic Leadership

To apply kenosis to authentic leadership, there were two aspects to consider. The first consideration was the ultimate purpose of kenosis is for the sake of reconciliation of a relationship. The second was kenosis, at times, requires the leader to be true to oneself by being true to the mission of relationship. There may also be times that involve the consideration of the values of another individual. An example of this second consideration of another’s values was found scripturally in 1 Corinthians 9:20 where Paul explained he connected with others based on their values so that he might be able to share the good news of Christ with them. This mentality of being aware of others’ values, and even aware of one’s own value, as it related to staying loyal to the mission, seemed to fit very well with the themes of authentic leadership. To make the connection of how kenosis fits within authentic leadership, it seemed appropriate to consider how authentic leaders have been defined. Avolio, Luthans, and Walumbwa (2004) stated authentic leaders are

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

Luthans and Avolio (2003) explained authentic leadership as a “process that draws from both positive psychological capacities and a highly developed organizational context, which results in both greater *self-awareness* and *self-regulated* positive behaviors on the part of leaders and associates, fostering positive self-development” (p. 243). The two definitions seemed to indicate a leader is both self-aware and aware of others' values. When kenosis is applied, it allows the leader to be aware of what needs to be emptied to pursue reconciliation for the greater mission. Perhaps, the self-awareness of an authentic leader coupled with the awareness of the values and feelings of others might allow for greater knowledge of what needs to be emptied out or reduced. Perhaps, this would be in a form such as pride, arrogance, superior ability that causes others to feel intimidated, educational achievements, or cultural norms. Remaining cognizant of the understanding authentic leaders have an awareness of others seems to be a critical element to comprehending the impact kenosis has upon the authentic leader.

Two aspects of Shamir and Eilam's (2005) definition of authentic leadership were the authentic leader works out of personal values, and they do not yield to the expectations of others. Alternatively, Henderson and Hoy (1983) classified a leader being *inauthentic* when they yielded to the expectations of the leadership role rather than bringing their own thoughts and emotions to the role. It seems an authentic leader might have an easier time practicing kenosis since they know what they are about, which lessens the possibility of peer pressure or the expectations of others, causing them to lose sight of who they are regardless of their form. In other words, if authentic leaders empty themselves out of position, title, or a superior form, they are still aware of their identity and thus their purpose. Examples were demonstrated by Christ being continuously self-aware of His identity and purpose and His unwavering



commitment to the integrity of His mission, regardless of critiques in passages such as Luke 2:41–50 and John 14:6.

In Luke 2:41–50, Jesus explained to His earthly parents He had a mission to be about His Heavenly Father's business and He never lost sight of that mission, regardless of His age or what activity His earthly family was involved in. In John 14:6, Jesus explained His purpose in the midst of practicing kenosis in human form: "Jesus said to him, 'I am the way, the truth, and the life. No one comes to the Father except through Me'" (NKJV). Therefore, it seems authentic leaders are able to draw upon the ability to be self-aware and aware of others to equip them to practice kenosis in that they know which areas to empty out. Hence, they can pinpoint how others are feeling, and what others value, while remaining cognizant of the mission at hand.

## **The Impact of Kenosis on Transformational Authentic Leaders**

The *transformational authentic leader* incorporates ideals from transformational leadership as well as authentic leadership. Burns (1978) explained transformational leadership helps to raise the awareness of the follower to identify with the overall mission. Bass (1985, 1996) outlined the reasons transformational leaders are able to motivate followers, which included "(1) making them more aware of the importance of task outcomes, (2) inducing them to transcend their own self-interest for the sake of the organization or team, and (3) activating their higher-order needs" (Yukl, 2013, p. 322). Authentic leadership leads to greater *self-awareness*, as well as more awareness of the values, knowledge, and perspectives of others (Avolio, Luthans, & Walumbwa, 2004). Thus, the transformational authentic leader is able to evaluate the psychological environment using the knowledge of awareness of their own values in addition to those of others. Once the transformational authentic leader is able to take an assessment of what followers really need and desire at a deeper level, they are able to build upon that knowledge by connecting those needs and desires to the overall mission. Therefore, the operational definition of a transformational authentic leader is a leader that is able to acknowledge

the importance of the individual's values and help the follower to see either how those values might need to be shifted to support the importance of the mission or how transcending their self-interest to support the mission they actually are able to achieve a higher-order need.

Perhaps, to best understand a transformational authentic leader, it would be helpful to consider what could occur when a leader is an authentic leader but does not demonstrate transformational leadership. Eagly and Karau (2002) explained sometimes a leader can experience authenticity but has an inability to help the follower connect with that authenticity. The leader, although authentic, does not evoke the follower to render trust in the leader. Establishing trust is a critical aspect for a leader of a global team to consider (Marquardt & Horvath, 2001). Trust is the reason an authentic leader who practices transformational leadership is effective. The transformational authentic leader seems to be able to evoke trust through connecting followers with the leader's authenticity. This understanding then leads to the consideration about where kenosis fits into the life of the transformational authentic leader. When the overall mission is reconciliation, the transformational authentic leader is able to aid followers to acknowledge their own values and perspectives, and also transcend their own self-interest for the sake of upholding morals such as unity. This type of leadership was demonstrated with the exhortation to the Church of Ephesus from Paul who stated: "I, therefore, the prisoner of the Lord, beseech you to walk worthy of the calling with which you were called ... bearing with one another in love, endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace" (Eph. 4:1, 2b-3, NKJV). It was observed in this verse Paul led in a transformational way while raising the consciousness of the believers in Ephesus toward keeping the overall mission of unity. In addition, he engaged with their values that came forth from being called by Christ to walk in a way of love. Reflection on a different portion of Hebrews 2:17 shows: "Therefore, in all things He had to be made like His brethren, *that He might be a merciful and faithful High Priest* in the things pertaining to God, *to make propitiation for the sins of the people*" (NKJV). This passage offered evidence of Christ's example of transformational authentic leadership through kenosis. It was His sincere awareness of the need for a High Priest for mankind that works together with His ability to empty Himself out to

come in human form, which in turn allowed for His followers to transcend self-interest for the sake of unity. Further support of this example was provided in Ephesians 2:14–18:

For He Himself is our peace, who has made both one, and *has broken down the middle wall of separation*, having abolished in His flesh the enmity, that it, the law of commandments contained in ordinances, so as to create in Himself one new man from the two, *thus making peace, and that He might reconcile them both to God* in one body through the cross, thereby putting to death the enmity. And He came and preached peace to you who were afar off and to those who were near. For *through Him we both have access by one Spirit to the Father*. (NKJV)

Therefore, the purpose of using kenosis for a transformational authentic leader is to build awareness in a way that advances the overall mission, which is ultimately the reconciliation between individuals.

## Concluding Thoughts

In considering (1) the concept of kenosis, (2) to what extent it should be used, (3) how it applies within authentic leadership, and (4) how the transformational authentic leader can make use of it, the appropriate conclusion seems to be kenosis should be used when the reconciliation of a relationship is at stake. When a leader desires to follow in the footsteps of Christ, and there is a breach of relationship, the situation calls for limiting, emptying out, and opening oneself up to others for connectivity with Father God and His mission of unity. Kenosis seems to fit within the life of a transformational authentic leader. This type of leader appears to be able to utilize the ability to be aware of others' values and needs to inspire followers to shift their focus toward the overall mission. In so doing, this leader is likely to meet more of the higher-order needs of the follower. To some degree, the transformational authentic leader has an advantage on knowing how to apply kenosis because of the ability to be aware of what areas in oneself that need to be emptied based on the needs and values of the other party to reconcile the relationship.

## References

- Avolio, B. J., Luthans, F., & Walumba, F. O. (2004). *Authentic leadership: Theory building for veritable sustained performance*. Working paper, Gallup Leadership Institute, University of Nebraska-Lincoln.
- Baird, M. L. (2007). Whose kenosis? An analysis of Levinas, Derrida, and Vattimo on God's self-emptying and the secularization of the west. *The Heythrop Journal*, *XLVIII*, 423–437. Retrieved June 5, 2010, from Wiley InterScience Database.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1996). *A new paradigm of leadership: An inquiry into transformational leadership*. Alexandria, VA: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.
- Bekker, C. J. (2006). *The Philippians hymn (2:5–11) as an early mimetic Christological model of Christian leadership in Roman Philippi*. Virginia Beach, VA: Servant Leadership Research Roundtable.
- Bouchard, L. D. (2005). Playing nothing for someone: Lear, bottom, and kenotic integrity. *Literature & Theology*, *19*(2), 159–180. Retrieved June 4, 2010, from ProQuest Religion. <https://doi.org/10.1093/lithe/frio18>
- Brierley, M. (2009). Exploring kenotic Christology: The self-emptying of God. *Modern Believing*, *50*(1), 71–73. Retrieved June 5, 2010, from Atlas Database.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.
- Castelo, D. (2007). Review of the book exploring kenotic Christology: The self-emptying of God. In C. S. Evans (Ed.), *Seminario Biblico Mexicano*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. Retrieved June 5, 2010, from Atlas Database. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jts/flm006>
- Dawe, D. (1963). *The form of a servant*. Philadelphia, PA: The Westminster Press.
- DeMartino, R., & Kramer, K. (1998). Perspectives on self-emptying: A Zen-Catholic dialogue. *Eastern Buddhist*, *31*(2), 219–244. Retrieved June 5, 2010, from Atlas Database.
- DeSilva, D. A. (2004). *An introduction to the New Testament: Contexts, methods, and ministry formation*. Nottingham, UK: InterVarsity Press.
- Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review*, *109*, 573–598.
- Fisher, R., & Ury, W. (1981). *Getting to yes: Negotiating agreement without giving in* (2nd ed.). New York: Penguin Group.

- Gavrilyuk, P. L. (2005). The kenotic theology of Sergius Bulgakov. *Scottish Journal of Theology Ltd*, 58(3), 251–269. <https://doi.org/10.1019/S0036930605001390>. United Kingdom.
- Gill, J. (2010). John Gill's exposition of the Bible. *Bible Study Tools*. Jupiter Corporation. Retrieved June 6, 2010, from <http://www.biblestudytools.com/commentaries/gills-exposition-of-the-bible/matthew-4-8.html>
- Gorman, M. J. (2009). *Inhabiting the cruciform God: Kenosis, justification, and theosis in Paul's narrative soteriology*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Hadewijch of Antwerp. (2000). Abandon yourself to God. In R. J. Foster & E. Griffin (Eds.), *Spiritual classics: Selected readings for individuals and groups on the twelve spiritual disciplines*. San Francisco: Harper.
- Hamm, D. (2010). Inhabiting the cruciform God: Kenosis, justification, and theosis in Paul's Narrative Soteriology [review of the book *Inhabiting the cruciform God: Kenosis, justification, and theosis in Paul's Narrative Soteriology*]. *Theological Studies*, 71(2), 453. Retrieved June 5, 2010, from ProQuest Religion. (Document ID: 2043368251).
- Haight, J. F. (2005). The Boyle lecture 2003: Darwin, design and the promise of nature. *Science and Christian Belief*, 17(1), 5–20.
- 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.
- Karecki, M. (2008). Clare of Assisi: Foot-washing leadership. *Inner Resources for Leaders*, 1(1), 1–9.
- Lewis, C. S. (1952). *Mere Christianity*. San Francisco: HarperCollins.
- Luthans, F. and 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), San Francisco, CA: Barrett-Koehler.
- Marquardt, M., & Horvath, L. (2001). *Global teams: How top multinationals span boundaries and cultures with high-speed teamwork*. Palo Alto, CA: Davies-Black Publishing.
- Miller, C. (1995). *The empowered leader: 10 keys to servant leadership*. Broadman and Holman Publishers: Nashville.
- Pfeffer, J. (1998). *The human equation: Building profits by putting people first*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Robbins, V. K. (1996). *The tapestry of early Christian discourse: Rhetoric, society, and ideology*. New York: Routledge.

- Robertson, A. T. (1960). *Robertson's word pictures of the New Testament*. Nashville, TN: Broadman Press. Retrieved June 6, 2010, from <http://www.biblestudytools.com/commentaries/robertsons-word-pictures>
- Shamir, B., & Eilam, G. (2005). "What's your story?": A life-stories approach to authentic leadership development. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(1), 395–417.
- Stening, R. J. (2006). God's statistical universe. *ISCAST Online Journal*, 2(1). Retrieved June 6, 2010, from [http://www.iscast.org/journal/articles/Stening\\_R\\_2006-09\\_Gods\\_Statistical\\_Universe.pdf](http://www.iscast.org/journal/articles/Stening_R_2006-09_Gods_Statistical_Universe.pdf)
- Szabolcs, N. (2003). The ministry of reconciliation through kenosis. *Mozaik*, 1(1), 8–10.
- Villafane, E. (2006). *Beyond cheap grace: A call to radical discipleship, incarnation, and justice*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing.
- Wesley, J. (1754–1765). Wesley explanatory notes. *Bible Study Tools*. Jupiter Corporation. Retrieved June 6, 2010, from <http://www.biblestudytools.com/commentaries/wesleys-explanatory-notes/matthew/matthew-4.html>
- Yukl, G. (2013). *Leadership in organizations* (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

# Final Thoughts

The purpose of this book has been to cast light on True Leadership with the exploration of authentic, transformational, servant, and kenotic leaderships through various perspectives. The authors' sincerest hopes are that leaders will take this information as a means of following the steps of Christ and will lead courageously knowing that the Ultimate Leader is always with them. As Joshua 1:9 admonished, "Have I not commanded you? Be strong and of good courage; do not be afraid, nor be dismayed, for the Lord your God is with you wherever you go" (NKJV). Onward leaders as we follow in His footsteps!

# Index

## A

Ability, 18, 35, 39, 55, 68, 76, 81, 86, 95, 96, 105, 111, 129–132  
Action, xi, xii, 7, 8, 11, 18, 21, 35, 52, 56–58, 66, 67, 70, 71, 79, 85, 89, 93, 95, 97, 100, 102, 104, 111–113, 115  
Act, xii, xiii, 11, 12, 18, 20, 28, 57, 85, 106, 110, 115, 120–124, 127, 128  
Acts, 57, 105  
Africa, 31–32, 59  
Authenticity, xi–xiii, 7, 8, 10, 12, 19, 33, 40, 41, 60, 65–73, 75–89, 92, 104, 106, 112, 131  
Authentic leader, xi, 12, 18, 35, 50, 67–69, 72, 76, 78, 79, 81, 83–88, 92, 93, 95, 101, 102, 104–106, 111, 112, 119–132  
Authentic leadership, xi, xii, 4, 11, 12, 15–43, 50, 66–68, 76–79,

83–85, 87, 91–106, 111–112, 120, 121, 128–132

Awareness, 34, 39, 76, 97, 129–132

## B

Behaviors, xii, 2, 9, 11, 12, 18, 25, 32, 35, 51, 52, 68, 69, 71, 72, 92, 93, 95, 97, 105, 110–113, 122, 129  
Beliefs, 11, 12, 16, 28, 67, 68, 73, 95, 111, 123  
Bible, 53–58, 68  
Business, 2, 24, 96, 120, 130

## C

Change, 54, 94, 95, 98, 110, 116  
Character, xi, xiii, 3, 4, 9, 11, 65–73, 98, 104, 105



- Christ, xii, 2–4, 6, 7, 10, 12, 16, 29, 50, 58, 60, 94, 121–123, 125–129, 131, 132, 137
- Christian, 4, 29, 56, 58–60, 68, 95–97, 105, 122–124, 127
- Church, 7, 10, 29, 50, 53, 57–60, 69, 96, 105, 113
- Community, 19, 28, 29, 33, 39–41, 50, 102, 115
- Context, xi, 9, 12, 40, 67, 71, 72, 92, 93, 98, 102, 122, 129
- Convictions, 18, 35, 70, 78, 79, 92, 95, 111
- Corporate, 16, 22, 76
- Creation, 2, 5, 106, 122, 123, 126, 127
- Culture, 32, 58, 96, 100, 101, 111, 112
- D**
- Darkness, 2–6, 8–12
- Death, 3, 23, 58, 122, 123, 127, 128
- Definitions, xxvii, 12, 20, 33, 41, 71, 72, 77–79, 110–112, 115, 120, 124, 125, 129, 130
- Destiny, 75–89
- Development, 18, 19, 21, 22, 76, 78, 79, 82, 83, 91–106, 109–116, 129
- Dialogue, 92, 96, 98, 101–104, 128
- Difference, 12, 17, 42, 51, 54, 56, 76, 116, 123
- Dimensions, 12, 25–27, 31, 32, 69, 80, 92–97, 100–104
- Discourse, 17, 41, 98, 101, 104
- Discussion, 4, 5, 7, 39–40, 78, 81, 85, 102, 104, 110, 113, 121, 122
- Distinction, 3, 8, 12, 17, 20, 21, 41, 65–73
- Divine, 2, 3, 5–7, 12, 14, 97, 101, 122–124
- E**
- Education, 76, 81, 97, 111
- Effectiveness, 76, 81, 83, 94, 104
- Emotions, 68–70, 79, 80, 93–95, 102, 129
- Environment, 28, 108, 110–112, 114, 130
- Ethics, 69, 71
- Events, 32, 79, 80, 82, 92–94, 105, 122
- Evidence, 2, 16, 53, 68, 70, 113, 115, 126, 131
- Evil, 8, 67, 69
- Expectations, 71, 101, 129
- Experience, 2, 3, 7, 9, 12, 18, 22, 24, 28, 32, 58, 70, 76, 80–84, 92, 94, 95, 97, 99, 101, 103, 104, 110–113, 120, 131
- Expertise, 80–85, 87, 88
- F**
- Fact, 76, 123
- Faith, 20, 56, 97, 98, 123, 125
- Father, 97, 101, 106, 122, 123, 127, 130, 132
- Focus, 7, 18, 22, 39, 40, 50–52, 71, 78, 83, 94, 100, 102–104, 110, 111, 113, 120, 121, 132
- Following, 4, 11, 31, 36, 39, 71, 77, 83, 87, 89, 104, 121, 122, 137
- Form, xi, xii, xxvii, 2–12, 21, 22, 29, 30, 40–42, 52, 76–78, 85, 87,

94, 115, 120, 122, 123,  
125–127, 129, 130, 132  
Future, 23, 32, 41–42, 88, 93, 94,  
100–102, 104, 105

## G

Global, 40–42, 87, 96, 131  
Goals, xii, 8, 9, 19, 21, 30, 32, 35,  
52, 54, 68, 69, 71, 80, 83  
God, xii, 2–6, 9, 10, 54, 55, 58, 59,  
67, 70, 76, 77, 84, 87, 88, 92,  
94, 96–106, 115, 116,  
122–124, 126–128, 131,  
132, 137  
Good, vii, viii, 2, 6, 7, 10, 17, 21,  
35, 39, 50, 66–68, 70, 71, 77,  
83, 84, 100, 105, 127,  
128, 137

## H

Heart, ix, 11, 35, 56, 57, 59, 67,  
78, 88, 120  
Hebrew, 55, 92, 97, 98, 100–102,  
113, 125–128, 131  
History, vii, viii, xi, 53, 58–60, 70,  
76–89, 98, 100  
Humanity, xiii, 66, 106, 122  
Humility, xii, xiii, 5, 10, 12, 24, 30,  
32, 56, 69, 98, 115, 120

## I

Ideal, xii, xiii, xxvii, 2, 3, 12, 50, 130  
Identity, 8, 95, 124, 129  
Image, 8, 77, 85–86, 88  
Impact, ix, 24, 40–41, 50, 59, 79,  
93, 96, 120–132

Importance, xxvii, 3, 20, 115, 116,  
130, 131  
Inauthentic, xi, 17, 19–20, 41,  
70, 72, 129  
Indicated, 17–20, 22, 28, 29, 31, 59,  
78, 80, 113, 124  
Influence, xii, 9, 11, 32, 67, 69–71,  
76, 78, 79, 82, 92, 95, 110  
Integrity, 10, 17, 22, 71, 78, 79,  
100, 103, 112, 130

## J

Jesus, xii, 3–10, 12, 56, 57, 66, 67,  
70, 72, 105, 113, 121, 122,  
125–128, 130  
Jethro, xiii, 92, 101–104, 120  
Joshua, 54–56, 70, 113, 137  
Journey, vii, 11–12, 76, 83, 85, 86,  
102, 127

## K

Kenosis, xi–xiii, 10, 110,  
115, 120–132  
Kenotic leadership, xii, xiii,  
xxvii, 4, 11, 12, 110,  
111, 115, 137  
Knowledge, xx, 5, 23, 24, 72, 76, 80,  
81, 83, 84, 86, 129, 130

## L

Land, 54, 55, 88, 100  
Law, xxi, 56, 67, 70, 105, 125,  
128, 132  
Leadership, vii, xi, xxvii, 2–12,  
16–43, 50, 66, 76, 92–106,  
110–116, 120

Learning, xii, xiii, xx, xxi, 28, 85, 86, 105, 110–116  
 Life, ix, 4, 5, 10, 18, 54–57, 59, 67, 76, 77, 79–88, 92–106, 111, 113, 116, 122–125, 127, 130–132  
 Light, viii, xii, 2–6, 8–10, 12, 106, 137  
 Limitations, xiv, 84, 97, 100, 102, 103, 123  
 Literature, xii, 2, 25, 36, 53, 60, 77–79, 81, 122, 126  
 Lord, 2, 10, 54–56, 87, 88, 98, 106, 120, 128, 131, 137  
 Love, 24, 30, 32, 96, 123, 124, 128, 131

## M

Management, 52, 84  
 Methods, 2, 24, 25, 28, 94, 113  
 Mind, ix, xii, 11, 50–60, 97  
 Ministry, 29, 31, 56–58  
 Mission, xii, xxvii, 12, 50, 52, 53, 58, 72, 101, 115, 127–132  
 Moral leadership, xi–xiii, xxvii, 78, 120  
 Morality, xi, 11, 32, 66–67, 69–72, 78, 79  
 Moses, xiii, 30, 53–56, 60, 92–106, 120

## N

Nature, xiii, 2, 8, 11, 19, 21, 22, 50, 57, 66, 121–124  
 Needs, vii–ix, xxvii, 18–21, 29, 35, 41, 68, 76, 84, 93, 94, 102, 110–113, 120, 123, 129–132

## O

Order, 11, 12, 17, 20, 92, 113, 127  
 Organization, viii, xiii, 19–21, 24, 25, 28, 32, 33, 39–41, 71, 72, 79, 81, 84, 95, 96, 110, 130  
 Others, viii, ix, xi–xiii, 2–4, 7, 9, 10, 12, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23–25, 27, 28, 30, 31, 35, 39–41, 43, 50, 52, 53, 57–60, 68–70, 72, 76, 77, 79–84, 88, 92–97, 102, 104, 106, 110–115, 120–124, 127–130, 132  
 Outcomes, xi, 17, 20, 25, 29, 52, 53, 110, 111, 130

## P

Passage, 6, 10, 30, 92, 97, 98, 101, 102, 121–127, 130, 131  
 Paul, Apostle, 2, 6, 10, 57, 68, 69, 123–125, 128, 131  
 People, vii, viii, 2, 4, 28, 31–34, 39, 50, 53–56, 58–60, 66, 67, 71, 72, 78–80, 88, 92, 94, 97–105, 110, 113, 115, 120, 127, 128  
 Perceptions, 7, 9, 28, 31, 41, 67, 68, 71, 81, 93, 95  
 Perspective, viii, ix, xi, xii, 8, 16, 18–19, 23, 36, 52, 66, 68, 72, 76, 93–98, 100, 102, 103, 105, 111, 113, 115, 121, 125, 129–131, 137  
 Philosophy, 16, 17, 24, 57, 96  
 Pieces, 50, 76, 77, 79–88, 97, 111  
 Pillars, 22, 33–34, 36, 39, 42, 88  
 Plato, 2, 3, 5–9, 66  
 Plato's cave, 4

- Position, xii, 8, 10, 12, 19, 22, 31, 40, 60, 68, 115, 120, 127, 129
- Potential, xiii, 4, 16, 17, 29, 35, 39–42, 76, 121
- Power, xii, 2, 31, 32, 60, 87, 110, 115, 124–128
- Practice, xi, xiii, 2, 8, 9, 11, 16, 21, 24, 28, 39, 40, 67, 69, 73, 78, 83, 85, 92, 111, 121, 124, 130, 131
- Principles, xiii, 3, 8, 12, 22, 30, 70, 85, 120
- Project, 3, 8, 25, 28, 41, 53, 104
- Purpose, 4, 7, 50, 53, 58, 72, 76, 78, 81, 83, 84, 86–88, 92, 96, 98, 103, 105, 112, 113, 115, 120–124, 126–130, 132, 137
- Q**
- Qualitative, 16, 17, 23–25, 27–29, 32, 33, 71, 81
- Quantitative, 16, 17, 19, 24, 25, 27, 29, 32, 33
- R**
- Reality, vii, 7–9, 41, 72, 76, 92–97, 105, 106, 110
- Reconciliation, xiii, 12, 120, 125–129, 131, 132
- Reflection, 18, 84, 85, 94, 127, 131
- Relationship, 12, 17, 28, 31, 32, 39–41, 50, 54, 57, 60, 76, 78, 80, 81, 85, 87, 92, 96, 97, 105, 110–112, 115, 120, 121, 123, 126–128, 132
- Research, viii, xii, xx, 7, 17–19, 23–24, 27–29, 32–34, 36, 40–42, 50, 53, 71, 93, 95
- Review, 24, 53, 77, 79, 121, 123
- S**
- Scholars, 2, 6, 7, 17, 21, 29, 71, 76, 78, 123
- School, 28, 29, 33, 58
- Scripture, xiii, xxvii, 3, 4, 10, 11, 29–30, 58, 70, 84, 87, 104, 121–125
- Seeking, 7, 52, 76, 83, 87, 95, 105, 112, 113
- Self, viii, ix, 9, 18, 25, 28, 32, 68, 72, 77, 94, 96, 105, 121
- Servant leadership, xii, 4, 16–43, 56, 113–115
- Service, xiii, xx, 24, 39, 56, 84, 105
- Skills, 18, 32, 76, 80–83, 86, 92, 99, 100, 110
- Society, 58, 69, 114
- Spirit, 28, 56, 131, 132
- Study, xii, xx, 2–4, 9, 24, 25, 27–29, 32, 33, 40, 67, 71, 120
- Success, xi–xiii, 21, 31, 53, 70, 79, 81, 112
- T**
- Testament, 5, 10–11, 56, 57, 113
- Text, xi, xii, xxvii, 2, 4–7, 9, 10, 16, 17, 28, 57, 121
- Theology, 29–30, 121, 122
- Theory, xi–xiii, 2, 4–8, 11, 16, 17, 24, 36, 41, 42, 50, 92, 93, 97

Time, vii, xi, 21, 23, 28, 52, 55, 57,  
58, 68, 69, 83, 96, 97, 99,  
100, 102, 103, 105, 111, 113,  
120, 124, 126, 128, 129

Transactional leadership, 50, 52,  
53, 56, 58

Transformational leadership, xii,  
xxvii, 4, 8, 11, 12, 17, 19, 20,  
41, 50, 51, 53, 56, 57, 60,  
69–73, 78, 112–113, 130, 131

True leadership, xii, xiii, xxvii, 2–12,  
77, 88, 120, 137

## U

Understanding, viii, 10, 12, 17, 21,  
29, 33, 42, 53, 58, 81, 84,  
120–122, 125, 127, 129, 131

## V

Values, ix, xii, xxvii, 10–12, 18, 19,  
25, 28, 35, 39, 52–54, 57,  
68–70, 72, 76, 78, 79, 81, 85,  
86, 92, 94, 95, 97, 111,  
115, 128–132

Virtue, 8, 24, 66, 67, 69, 71, 95,  
105, 122

Vision, xii, 11, 18, 24, 28, 36, 40,  
51, 56, 57, 86, 92, 96

## W

Wisdom, 5, 56, 76, 81, 94, 95, 105,  
111, 120

World, vii–ix, xi, 2, 5, 6, 9, 41, 42,  
50, 56–60, 80

Writings, xii, 2, 3, 6, 34, 71, 124