



Principles of Transparent and Authentic Leadership from Scripture

Patrick S. Millsap

INTRODUCTION

Antonakis and Day (2018) cautions our understanding of authentic and transparent leadership, having noted that authentic leadership is a spinoff theory from transformational and charismatic leadership. Authentic, ethical, and servant forms of leadership are connected, due to some elements that they share in common. One element is that they are all “loaded” in terms of how they are defined, which means that they include the outcome in their definitions. Also, the term is positively and morally valenced. Constructs, in science, should not be defined by their outcomes as this may lead to circular theorizing. It has been shown that transformational and authentic leadership are very highly correlated (Antonakis & Day, 2018, pp. 68–69). Given the preceding caveat, Yukl (2013)

P. S. Millsap (✉)

Mount Saint Mary’s University, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA, USA

e-mail: patrickmillsap@cox.net

noted that authentic leadership is grounded in positive psychology and psychological theories of self-regulation. All theorists emphasize consistency in a leader's words, action, and values, with additional aspects that include positive leader values, leader self-awareness, and a trusting relationship with followers. Authentic leaders create high mutual trust through honesty, altruism, kindness, fairness, accountability, and optimism, with an emphasis on follower welfare and development. Authentic leaders have a high self-awareness about the values, beliefs, emotions, self-identities, and abilities, which allows them to make accurate assessments about who they are, as a reality, and what they believe. They do not seek leadership positions to gratify a need for esteem status, as a desire to be liked, admired, and to retain their position, which would be self-seeking. As a result, they are less defensive (Yukl, 2013, pp. 351–352).

Scripture is given by inspiration of God; therefore, it is authentic. Scripture is profitable for doctrine, reproof, correction and for instruction in what is right so that individuals may be perfect, or mature, and capable of doing good works 2 Timothy 3:16–17 (NKJV). The Old Testament is replete with stories that reveal God's authentic working and actions toward humanity to reveal a reality beyond our current perception, to awaken the individual to that which is truly authentic and of the kingdom of God. This chapter highlights Balaam, who was a prophet and leader in the Old Testament whose wisdom was sought after by many kings. Balaam is the opposite of what would be an authentic leader, but by way of apophatic teaching, much is learned through the story noted in Numbers as "*Balaam and his donkey*." The story is a narration from the aspect of one watching and listening in, but who is not a participant. The text is reviewed through an inner texture treatment to break down the elements of the story.

Robbins (1996) noted that narrational inner texture, an element of socio-rhetorical criticism, or the narrational voice as a rhetorical device within the text gains acceptance as a reliable guide to the meaning of the text, because of the way the narrator tells the story (Robbins, 1996, p. 55). The narrator is perceived to be Moses, who is commonly accepted as the one who wrote the first five books of the Old Testament, also known as the Pentateuch (Thompson's Original and Complete System of Bible Study, Index 4226). Inner texture concerns relationships among word-phrase and narrational patterns that produce aesthetic patterns in the text. These intermingling patterns are the contexts for networks of

signification that create meaning, and therefore, values in the concepts found in the text (Robbins, 1996, p. 46). Osborne (2006) noted that Old Testament allusions are utilized in the New Testament to convey meaning to readers, which may have had a greater impact at the time of the writing as a way of presupposing the reader's knowledge. He noted that an individual writer's traits, such as the Apostle Paul, the Apostle Peter, and the Apostle John, use a very high incidence of allusions. The allusion presupposes the original Old Testament context behind the allusion and not merely the allusion itself, which intensifies the thrust of the context (Osborne, 2006, pp. 167–168). The New Testament notes this, as there are scriptures that mention Balaam as a negative role model and not to follow his example.

Vanhoozer (1998) noted that speech acts, such as narration, could become the equivalent of the character's action at the level that may entail actual history. Texts not only display a world but communicate a way of perceiving that world, thus a possible training, or portraying, ways of being human (Vanhoozer, 1998, p. 227). The author also noted that there is a relation between authorial intentions and communicative action. Therefore, there needs to be a way to distinguish between “mapping intentions” and “meaning intentions.” The first has to do with planning and plotting a course, and the second has to do with historical deeds and destinations. It is important to explain the author's intent in terms of action, what happened, versus what may happen, which is psychology and inference (Vanhoozer, 1998, p. 246). Moses, as noted, wrote the pericope to be reviewed, but the nature of its detail in terms of what was said, who is speaking, and the tone that is taken by each speaker is difficult to comprehend as having been heard specifically by him in person. Also, Balaam is traveling to see the enemy of Israel; therefore, Moses would not have been privy to the conversation between Balaam and his donkey. The narration also notes that there is no one else present during the exchange, except for the angel. Numbers 22:22 (NKJV) does mention two servants are traveling with him, but they are not part of the narrative, so we have no information about them. The conclusion is, therefore, one of faith. Moses wrote the narrative for the book of Numbers by the inspiration of God. The entire story of Balaam, who had been requested by Balak, the Son of Zippor, king of the Moabites, to curse Israel, is found in Numbers 22:01–24:25 (NKJV). The pericope consists of the verses in Numbers 22:22–22:35 (NKJV).

CHRONOLOGICAL, HISTORICAL, NARRATIVE CONTEXT BEFORE THE PERICOPE: NUMBERS 22:22–22:35

As noted, the pericope consists of Numbers 22:22–22:35 (NKJV). Leading into the pericope, as a chronological sequence, is a narrated piece concerning Israel’s defeat of Og, king of Bashan, and taking possession of his land. Israel then moves to camp in the plains of Moab on the side of Jordan across from Jericho (Numbers 21:33–35, 22:1, NKJV). Balak, the son of Zippor, was the king of the Moabites during this time and had heard and seen all that Israel had accomplished (Numbers 22:4, NKJV). He realized the severity of his situation and reached out to Balaam, the son of Beor, who was at Pethor, which was near the Euphrates River in the land of the sons of his people into bring him on-side for his cause. He noted that the Israelites were a people who had come from Egypt and that they were covering the earth and had now settled next to him in Moab, in a way that was in opposition (Numbers 22:5, NKJV). Pethor, or Pitru, is thought to have been about 400 miles from Moab, in Mesopotamia on the River Euphrates. The distance required an estimated three-week journey each way to both inform Balaam and return (“International Standard Bible Encyclopedia,” 2019, p. 1).

The request from Balak was to have Balaam curse Israel, as he felt they were too mighty for him to oppose. He sent the elders of both Moab and Midian with a diviner’s fee, or honor, to employ Balaam for the task of cursing Israel. Alter (2004) noted that the honor, or payment, would be lavish in value, he would also receive special raiment that would enhance his status as an authority figure (Alter, 2004, p. 11). He noted that whom Balaam blesses is blessed, and whom he curses is cursed, which reveals an authority that is given deference by kings (Numbers 22:6–7, NKJV). Thus, Balaam would be considered to be in the ranks of a highly paid, authoritative consultant that was brought into help the organization achieve success for a price. Balaam received the dignitaries and asked them to wait while he inquired of the Lord. As he goes to the Lord, the Lord asks him as to whom these men are. Balaam recounts the details of the request and that he has been requested to curse the Israelites so that once cursed Balak would be able to drive them out of the land. The narrative flows in such a way that Balaam does not seem to have an awareness

of Israel having been delivered from the hand of Pharaoh, in Egypt, by God's hand (Numbers 22:8–11, NKJV). God forbids Balaam to go with them and not to curse them, for he has blessed them (Numbers 22:12, NKJV). Balaam returns to the envoy and lets them know that God will not allow him to return to Moab with them. The messengers return to Balak and relay the message that Balaam has refused (Numbers 22:13–14, NKJV). Balak now sends princes to Balaam and asks him to come and let nothing hinder him from coming. The king states that he will honor him greatly and that he will do whatever Balaam instructs him to do, but to please come and curse these people for him (Numbers 22:15–17, NKJV). Each trip was approximately three-weeks to cover the 400 miles, so at least nine weeks had passed by this point in time from the initial inquiry. Also, Balak says that he will do whatever Balaam requires, but that excludes the act of cursing Israel; which is the task to be performed.

Balaam noted to the new group of envoys that through Balak were to give him his house full of silver and gold; he would be unable to go beyond the word of the Lord, his God, to do any more than what he had done. He then asked them to stay while he inquired of the Lord again. This time the Lord changes his mind and tells Balaam he may go with them, but that he may only speak that which the Lord gives him to speak. The caveat given is that “if the men come and call you, arise and go with them... The narration notes that Balaam rose in the morning, saddled his donkey, and went with the princes (Numbers 22:18–21, NKJV). Balaam did not wait for this final inquiry from the envoys. Instead, he made the next step. Small things are very important in the life of a leader, especially an authentic one. Moses is told at Horeb to smite the rock to give water to the Israelites (Exodus 17:6, NKJV). But, at Meribah, he is told to speak to the rock and instead smites the rock two times. The Lord notes that because Moses and Aaron did not believe God, to sanctify him in the eyes of the children of Israel, they would not be allowed to bring the congregation into the land (Numbers 20: 11–13, NKJV). God produces leaders in an authentic way that engages both the reality in the world and the reality that emanates and is imputed, from the kingdom of God. Authenticity is of great interest to God in the world, as is holiness (I Peter 1:16, NKJV). Holiness and authenticity have to

do with integrity, very similar to the physical integrity of objects such as steel and diamonds. Integrity gives an individual the capacity to withstand both an inward and outward onslaught that endeavors to break down that integrity. Authenticity is something God desires in leaders, for it is from one's authenticity that individuals come to understand the kingdom of God, as a perception of reality. If a leader changes portions of God's instruction, then the outcomes change as well. Balaam had taken a step that he was not to take until the envoys initiated the first move. Therefore, something of Balaam's character and intention has been revealed in the opening verses of the chapter.

This completes the chronological, historical narrative intro leading up to the pericope, Numbers 22:1–21 (NKJV), which is given in a narrative form that follows chronological events as they occur. As noted, Moses is considered to be the author of the book of Numbers, and the dialogue is very specific and could not have been heard by him, as he was 400 miles away. It is the Spirit of God that has given him this narrative. The pericope follows the same narrative format as given in the preceding sequence, which is chronological, historical, and conversational.

INNER TEXTURE TREATMENT OF NUMBERS 22:22–22:35

See Table 6.1.

PERICOPE APPLICATIONS FOR THE CONTEXTS OF LEADERSHIP, FOLLOWERSHIP, AND THE ORGANIZATION

There are several levels between leaders, followers, and organizational contexts in the story. Balak, the king of the Moabites, sends envoys to hire Balaam, a powerful diviner whose ability to curse (hex) someone is well known. He believes he will be able to use Balaam to curse Israel and thus be able to control destiny through a technical manipulation in the realm of the spirit world through his ability to curse (Alter, 2004, p. 7). The envoys, who were diviners as well, fail to bring back Balaam to the king and he increases his request of "bestowing honor" on Balaam by sending princes to entice him to come to Moab. Balaam capitulates and saddles his donkey to go to Moab. Thus, the organizational side of the Moab group is complete. The donkey belongs to Balaam but is not an active participant in the enticement of Balaam. The donkey is a faithful

Table 6.1 Numbers 22: 22–35

<p><i>Text: Num. 22:22–35 (delivered in Narrator style—as one watching the action)</i> <i>Version: New King James Version</i></p>	<p><i>Who is speaking</i></p>	<p><i>Who is spoken to & nature of communication</i></p>	<p><i>Purpose/corroboration</i> <i>Version: New King James Version</i></p>
<p>Num. 22:22 Then God’s anger was aroused because he went,</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">and the angel of the LORD took His stand in the way as</p> <p>↑</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">an adversary against him</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">And he was riding on his donkey, and his two servants</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">were with him</p>	<p>Narrator</p>	<p>Description of the situation</p> <p>Those involved are Balaam, the donkey, the angel, and two servants</p>	<p>The result of his going without being requested by those asking (Verse: 20) kindles God’s anger because he went</p> <p>The angel stands against him</p>
<p>Num. 22:23 Now the donkey saw the angel of the LORD standing in the way with His drawn sword in His hand</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">and the donkey turned aside</p> <p>↑</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">out of the way and went into the field</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">So Balaam struck the</p> <p>↑</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">donkey to turn her back onto the road</p>	<p>The Narrator explains what the donkey sees, which explains the donkey’s logical response</p>	<p>Description of the situation and the action, which is known only to the donkey</p>	<p>Action: The donkey takes action without any communication from its master, Balaam, who is the leader in this scenario</p> <p>Balaam’s response to the donkey’s perceived disobedience</p>
<p>Num. 22:24–25 Then the angel of the LORD stood in a narrow path between the vineyards, <i>with</i> a wall on this side and a wall on that side</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">And when the donkey saw</p> <p>↑</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">the angel of the LORD, she pushed herself against the wall and crushed Balaam’s foot against the wall;</p>	<p>The Narrator explains the movement of the angel to block Balaam’s progress</p> <p>The donkey’s gender is female</p> <p>Balaam is physically injured</p>	<p>Description of the actions being taken by the angel</p>	<p>We do not, at this point in the story, know the donkey’s reasoning. We can only surmise what may be occurring in the mind of an animal</p> <p>Balaam’s response is one of cruelty, but he is also in pain</p> <p>Proverbs 12:10 notes that the righteous man regards the life of his</p>

(continued)

Table 6.1 (continued)

<i>Text: Num. 22:22–35 (delivered in Narrator style—as one watching the action)</i> <i>Version: New King James Version</i>	<i>Who is speaking</i>	<i>Who is spoken to & nature of communication</i>	<i>Purpose/corroboration</i> <i>Version: New King James Version</i>
<p>↑ so he struck her again</p>	Balaam strikes the donkey again		beast: but the tender mercies of the wicked are cruel. Balaam knows nothing of what is occurring in reality and only knows that what he wants is not being accomplished, so he is treating his follower, the donkey, harshly to derive obedience, which reveals the selfishness of an individual
<p>Num. 22: 26–27 Then the angel of the LORD went further, and stood in a narrow place where there <i>was</i> no way to turn either to the right hand or to the left</p> <p>↑ And when the donkey saw the angel of the LORD, she lay down under Balaam;</p> <p>↑ so Balaam’s anger was aroused, and he struck the donkey with his staff</p>	The Narrator explains the angel’s second move to block Balaam’s	Descriptive of the action taken by the angel and by the donkey. The way is entirely blocked, and there is no further move to make, so the donkey lays down under its rider, Balaam	There are several levels of communication in play that are not openly discussed, but they are revealed in the narrative. First, the angel has not taken the life of Balaam but instead is blocking his way. Secondly, the donkey can see the angel, which could only have been given by God. As a result, there is a great deal to unravel at deeper levels of interpretation. Also, the leader-follower context applies to the relationship between Balaam and the donkey, the angel and God, and finally, the angel and the donkey – at this juncture of the narration
<p>Num. 22:28–29 Then the LORD opened the mouth of the donkey, and she said to Balaam</p> <p>↑ “What have I done to you, that you have struck me</p>	God opens the mouth of the donkey to speak human language	Balaam	This is the first communication in the text that is not merely physical, with Balaam striking the donkey

(continued)

Table 6.1 (continued)

<i>Text: Num. 22:22–35 (delivered in Narrator style—as one watching the action)</i> <i>Version: New King James Version</i>	<i>Who is speaking</i>	<i>Who is spoken to & nature of communication</i>	<i>Purpose/corroboration</i> <i>Version: New King James Version</i>
<p>these three times?"</p> <p>↑ And Balaam said to the donkey</p> <p>“Because you have</p> <p>↑ abused me. I wish there were a sword in my hand, for now, I would kill you!”</p>	<p>donkey</p> <p>Balaam</p>	<p>donkey</p>	<p>The donkey is quoted as asking a question of its master (leader) that implies the need for an answer</p> <p>Balaam noted that he had been mocked. The Hebrew (<i>Hithpael</i>) means to make a fool of or make sport of someone (“Transliteration: <i>alal</i>,” 2019, p. 1)</p> <p>This is the same man who is on his way to receive honors from a king. He is being thwarted by a domesticated animal, which has moved him to want to kill the animal, which would leave him on foot. This does not reveal authentic leadership</p>
<p>Num. 22:30 So the donkey said to Balaam,</p> <p>“Am I not your donkey on which you have ridden, ever</p> <p>↑ since <i>I became</i> yours, to this day? Was I ever disposed to do this to you?”</p> <p>↑ And he said, “No”</p>	<p>donkey</p> <p>Balaam</p>	<p>Balaam</p> <p>donkey</p>	<p>A discourse between Balaam and his donkey, without mention of the strangeness of the exchange. Balaam simply replies, “No,” in a logical manner</p> <p>The logic of the donkey’s statement is true in that it seems that the animal has been faithful to Balaam from the moment he obtained him. The animal has been disposed of or accustomed to obeying him. Jones (2019) noted that according to Ben Hart of the</p>

(continued)

Table 6.1 (continued)

<p><i>Text: Num. 22:22–35 (delivered in Narrator style—as one watching the action)</i> <i>Version: New King James Version</i></p>	<p><i>Who is speaking</i></p>	<p><i>Who is spoken to & nature of communication</i></p>	<p><i>Purpose/corroboration</i> <i>Version: New King James Version</i></p>
			<p>Donkey Preserve in the United Kingdom, donkey's are trustworthy because they will stop and think rather than bolt, unlike horses. This is not a character flaw, but a character trait in donkeys (Jones, 2019, p. 1)</p>
<p>Num 22: 31–33 Then the LORD opened the eyes of Balaam, and he saw the angel of the LORD standing in the way, and his sword drawn in his hand</p> <p>↳ and he bowed down his head, and fell flat on his face</p> <p>And the angel of the LORD said unto him,</p> <p>↳ Wherefore hast thou smitten thine ass these three times?</p> <p>↳ behold, I went out to withstand thee, because <i>thy</i> way is perverse before me:</p> <p>↳ “The donkey saw Me and turned aside from Me these three times</p>	<p>Lord opens Balaams eyes to the authentic reality</p> <p>Balaam's response is one of contrition</p> <p>angel</p> <p>angel inquires as to the reason for his actions</p> <p>This is followed by the angel's reasons for being against Balaam</p> <p>angel notes that the donkey saves him</p>	<p>Reality is given to Balaam</p> <p>No words yet had been spoken only a revealing</p> <p>To Balaam</p> <p>Inquiry</p> <p>Reasons are given to Balaam</p> <p>Balaam</p>	<p>Authenticity is based on a true perception based in reality</p> <p>Balaam's response is authentic and genuine</p> <p>Balaam's cruelty to the donkey is noted. The reason for the encounter is due to Balaam's perverse way. The connotation is that Balaam has been destructive or fully selfish in his way ("Yarat," 2019, p. 1), which are not traits of being authentic</p> <p>The angel tells Balaam that if the donkey had not turned aside the three times, he would have killed Balaam and left the donkey alive. It is due to the donkey's</p>

(continued)

Sanford (1950) noted that leadership occurs as part of an intricate relation between leaders and followers in a specific organizational context (Sanford, 1950). Kellerman (2008) noted that leadership and followership should not be just joined together, but that they should be thought of in tandem, or as inseparable, as one does not exist without the other (Kellerman, 2008, p. 239). The entire story of Balak and the Moabites, which is found in Numbers 22:01 to Numbers 24:25 (NKJV) and includes the pericope, is about seeing, or gazing, which is to have one's eyes opened to reality and is a trait of authentic leaders and followers (Alter, 2004, p. 8). Alter (2004) also noted that this implies the ability to not see as well. The thematic keyword of the entire episode is "to see," or *ra'oh*, or to gaze. Balak, the Moabite king, sees the vast multitudes of the Israelites and is afraid. Therefore, he endeavors to hire a diviner to curse the Israelites, which will solve his organizational problem. The diviner is enticed to come but is blind to his avarice and guile, but his beast of burden, a donkey, is not. The angel of the Lord sees everything clearly and allows an unveiling to take place for Balaam to see the reality his follower, the donkey, already sees (Alter, 2004, p. 8). The donkey is the lynch-pin of the story in that she is the first to be able to see the authentic reality that is taking place. She makes decisions based on the reality she sees that shows her concern for her leader or master. The opening of Balaam's eyes creates a different relationship between the two sides, which is dealt with in the remaining section that ends at Numbers 24:25 (NKJV). The application of the pericope, or what it means for authentic leadership and followership today, is given in three segments. First, is the application to the context of leadership; second, is the application to the context of followership; and third, is application to the organizational context, which affects the first two contexts.

CONTEXT OF LEADERSHIP

The application of the story of Balaam and his donkey is found in the New Testament in the form of apophatic teaching, which is to describe something as what it is not or giving a moral lesson in a way that describes what not to do (Apophatic Theology, 2019, p. 1). As noted above, the writings of the Apostles Peter, Paul and John employ narrative that is allusionary, or alluding to something, in nature, which occurs in 2 Peter 2:15 & 16 (NKJV) concerning the warning to false teachers and compares them to Balaam's folly. Peter notes that they have forsaken the right way and gone

astray, following the way of Balaam, who loved the wages of righteousness. He was rebuked for his iniquity by a dumb donkey speaking with a human voice, which restrained his madness (2 Peter 2:15–16, NKJV). Balaam, as a prophet, diviner, and leader is not authentic but is a false teacher who thinks in terms of his own needs and not the needs of others. Balaam is a man of guile, which is associated with deceit and uncleanness (I Thessalonians 2:3, NKJV). He, therefore, is one who is considered to have perverted justice, by showing partiality, and taking bribes which has blinded (hence not able to see) the eyes of the wise and twisted the words of the righteous (Deuteronomy 16:19, NKJV). Romans 2:11 (NKJV) notes that there is no partiality with God; therefore, partiality would not exist in an authentic leader. Selfishness leads to blindness and lack of being able to see reality, both in the known world and spiritually. These traits are in opposition to authenticity, transparency, and integrity.

Jude 1:11 (NKJV) notes that those who are selfish and only serving themselves have crept into the body of Christ. These people are like Balaam in that they seek only personal profit. They are considered to be spots in the love feasts of the body of Christ, and feast without fear serving only themselves. They are like clouds without water, trees without fruit—that are twice dead and pulled up by the roots, and wandering stars for whom is reserved the blackness of darkness forever (Jude 1:12–13, NKJV). These are attributes of leaders that are not authentic or transparent, and they are compared specifically to Balaam in a negative way that reveals non-authentic, non-transparent leadership.

Yukl (2013), as noted above, stated that authentic leaders are not motivated by a desire to be liked and admired to retain their position. Instead, they are motivated by a desire for self-improvement and self-verification, which allows them to be less defensive and more open to learning from feedback and mistakes (Yukl, 2013, p. 352). Balaam punishes his donkey because he feels that the donkey has abused, or mocked, him (Numbers 22:24, NKJV). Alter (2004) noted that the first two beatings by Balaam were probably with a switch, but the third beating was performed with a staff. Balaam also states that if he had a sword he would kill the donkey (Alter, 2004, p. 13). These are punishments given in light of Balaam's selfish desires and not being open to self-improvement or self-verification; therefore, he is very defensive of his selfish position. Konopaske, Ivancevich, and Matteson (2018) defined punishment as presenting an uncomfortable or unwanted consequence for a particular behavior and is an increasingly used managerial strategy. Although it may

suppress behavior if used effectively, it is considered to be a controversial method to be utilized by leaders. This method is only utilized after a careful and objective consideration of all the relevant aspects of the situation are known (Konopaske, Ivancevich, & Matteson, 2018, p. 165). Balaam utilizes punishment as a first response, which reveals that he is not in a state of mind where he is thinking about anything other than himself and how he is perceived.

The final scripture in the New Testament, concerning Balaam, is found in Revelations 2:14 (NKJV) and is speaking to the church at Pergamos, the compromising church, which is one of the seven churches written to in the book of Revelations. John notes that the Lord has a few things against the church and the first noted is that there are those in the church who hold the doctrine of Balaam, who taught Balak to put a stumbling block before the children of Israel, to eat food sacrificed to idols and to commit sexual immorality (Revelations 2:14, NKJV). Yukl (2013) noted that authentic leaders maintain the capacity to lead followers through their enhanced confidence, clarity of values, and integrity. As a result, followers have a personal identification with the authentic, transparent leader, as well as a social identification with the organizational group that allows for an indirect follower effect through follower self-concepts and self-identities that would be considered a form of mentoring (Yukl, 2013, p. 352). The authentic leader assists in creating an authentic relationship with followers, in an organizational context that is consistent with the leader's values as well as the follower's values. Riggio, Chaleff, and Lipman-Blumen (2008) noted that the theory of authentic leadership development (ALD) that acknowledges leadership development as an interactive process by leaders, followers and the context in which they find themselves embedded over time. Thus, authentic leaders are individuals who are self-aware, transparent, and ethical in the way they approach leadership in the organization (Riggio et al., 2008, p. 327). Therefore, the leader-follower process, in context, is continually in a transformational state of becoming authentic. These are important aspects for those desiring to develop in an authentic leadership that is transparent versus the inauthentic, closed, selfish leadership that Balaam practices. Gardner, Avolio, Luthans, May, and Walumbwa (2005) noted that authentic follower development is a result of the modeling done by authentic leaders, which produces higher levels of follower self-awareness and self-regulation that lead to positive follower development (Gardner et al., 2005, p. 346) Contrary to this conception de Zilwa (2016) noted

that authentic followership involves relational interactions between the follower, leader, and the context and that authentic followership is a proactive process. This proactive process is initiated by the authentic follower and allows the follower to decide if they will or will not follow the leader. In this sense it is constructionist (de Zilwa, 2016, p. 311). The interrelation of leader, follower, and context are noted throughout this chapter and share possible new concepts of what these titles may mean in reality.

CONTEXT OF FOLLOWERSHIP

The follower in the story is the donkey. The donkey is attached to the Moab organizational group in that the donkey is the property of Balaam. But, the donkey is faithful to Balaam and not to Balaam's schemes with Balak, king of Moab. Therefore, the donkey is an authentic follower from the beginning of the story and is not associated with the negative attributes of Balaam, as noted above. Kelley (1992) noted five types of followers, which he exhibits on a grid that ranges from being active to being passive, as a horizontal axis, and being an independent, critical thinker to being a dependent, uncritical thinker on the vertical axis. The combination of variables on the two-axis gives the following results. (1) Passive follower, passive and dependent, uncritical thinking; (2) Conformist follower, active and dependent, uncritical thinking; (3) Alienated follower, passive and independent critical thinking; (4) Exemplary follower, active and independent, critical thinking; (5) Pragmatist follower, is situated in a mid-position amongst all the variables (Kelley, 1992). The donkey displays attributes of the exemplary follower, who is actively engaged, able to see reality, and act according irrespective of the leader. The donkey is also acting as a courageous follower, in that she is not following the unction of her leader, but is responding to the reality of the situation, as she perceives it. In her actions, she is revealing self-awareness and self-identity, but not selfishness. She perceives, or sees, the reality of the situation and is acting authentically. Chaleff (2009) noted that the courageous follower's role is to find ways leaders can receive the feedback they need. It helps if the follower links the information given to a positive outcome for the leader, which supplies motivation to the leader to follow the advice (Chaleff, 2009, p. 90).

As noted, the donkey, more than being exemplary, is exhibiting attributes of being a courageous follower. Courageous followership

exhibits the following attributes: (1) participates in transformation; (2) constructively challenges counterproductive policies and organizational behaviors; (3) assumes responsibility for the common purpose of the organization; (4) supports both the leader and the group; and (5) takes moral action when needed (Chaleff, 2009, p. 40). The donkey initiates the transformation and in this respect becomes the authentic leader, who acts based on the reality exhibited, rather than the mere follower. She challenges the counterproductive policies at a cost three separate times; she also assumed responsibility for her actions in taking the existing punishment being delivered to her by the leader. She is supporting the minor group that consists of her and her leader in endeavoring to keep both of them safe. Finally, she takes moral action in ceasing to move forward and laying down, which did not support the leader in his quest to move forward at great risk. The donkey has acted in a way that reveals authentic followership. She has decided not to follow the leader in order to protect him. Avolio et al. (2004) noted that authentic followership is proactive, which reverses the conventional view that leader's influence and direct the follower's behavior (De Zilwa, 2016, p. 311) Not until the angel gives the donkey speech, Numbers 22:28 (NKJV), is there a revealing of the authentic reality of the situation, which allows the leader, Balaam, to enter the conversation.

The donkey receives the ability to speak in the narrative in a way that Balaam may converse with her. He is out of control, and she asks what she has done that he has beaten her three times (Num. 22:28, NKJV). Balaam's retort is that she has abused, or mocked him and that he would kill her if he had a sword. Her answer is authentic. She questions his logic, or his ability to see things clearly, by asking if she had ever done anything like this before. The rhetorical means of questioning allows Balaam to ponder his relationship with his follower, the donkey, and reply that this has never happened before (Num. 22:30, NKJV). This questioning is courageous in that the donkey is noting a history that is not congruent, authentically, with the incident that is taking place. Thus, the question of whether or not the donkey is acting authentically is answered by Balaam. She is acting in an authentic transparent manner, and Balaam is not. Num. 22:31 (NKJV) narrates the sequence where the angel opens Balaam's eyes to see what the donkey has been able to see, and thus, authentic reality is revealed to him. Balaam prostrates himself in the same position as the donkey, and the sword, which he would like to have had, is welded by the angel. He has come into

an authentic, transparent reality that reveals what God is doing organizationally; which negates all other previous organizational interests. The ability of the authentic leader and follower to perceive reality through different means of perception is important for both authentic leadership and followership. Yukl (2013) noted that follower perception of leader authenticity might be influenced by follower perception of the situation. Trust may be undermined if the leader's actions do not appear to be congruent with authenticity (Yukl, 2013, p. 352). Balaam's actions are not authentic or genuine, but instead selfish. The donkey speaks to question Balaam's motives, and then the angel opens his eyes, only then is the authenticity of the situation revealed, perceived, or seen. Balaam has been allowed to gaze upon the real situation. This is brought about by the donkey's faithful leadership, instead of proper leadership on the part of Balaam. The donkey has acted from a position of followership, as a courageous follower. Authenticity, as noted above, implies self-awareness and self-perception. Application is for followers as well as leaders. Chaleff (2009) noted that all leaders are followers in some sense. But whether or not the leader is a positive role model, we still, as courageous followers, must prepare ourselves to become courageous leaders (Chaleff, 2009, p. 30). This assessment of being a courageous follower is closely linked to the concepts described concerning authenticity. He also noted that leaders and followers are joined in the context of organizational purpose (Chaleff, 2009, p. 3). Aligning the leadership-followership-organizational context through time is an on-going process of transformation. The individual who desires to become an authentic leader must be open to the organizational context as an important part of leadership process.

THE ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

As noted, authentic leadership and followership are embedded in the context of an organization, which has an organizational intention, purpose, and culture. An organization's intention and purpose is a part of the company's vision and mission. Suffice to say organizations are made up of individuals that fall into the category of leader or follower in the organization, and in some sense many individuals may occupy both roles simultaneously. The organizational context, for this chapter, will focus on organizational culture. The pericope notes two specific organizational cultures or groups. The first is the Moab group, which consists of Balak, king of Moab, the envoys and the princes, along with Balaam who has

been summoned to perform on their behalf against the Israelites. The second group is that of the Lord, the angel, and Israel as represented by the angel. The donkey is with Balaam and is attached to him in such a way that she is protective of him alone and therefore does not belong expressly to either group; therefore she has no hidden, or selfish, agenda.

Hiebert (2008) noted that the levels of culture range from surface culture, which is sensory and contains behaviors, signs, and rituals, through belief systems, which are explicit, down to core worldview themes that retain epistemology and are implicit (Hiebert, 2008, p. 33). Ashkanasy, Wilderom, and Peterson (2011) noted that in an organization conversation between the “we” and the “us,” of those involved in the organization, set up dynamic processes of listening and responding, thus the organization’s responses are always contextualized by the organization’s cultural meanings. Therefore, organizational culture and identity dynamics are intertwined, which is similar to that noted above in the leadership-followership process (Ashkanasy et al., 2011, pp. 345–347). Authentic leadership-followership is pre-loaded, as noted above, in that the term is also the outcome, which is to say that authentic leadership-followership implies an outcome that is morally good (Antonakis & Day, 2018, p. 68). That being said the attributes, as noted above, of an authentic leader or follower lean toward positive outcomes from both leaders and followers. Thus, the authentic, transparent organizational culture should also lead to positive, moral outcomes for all stakeholders involved.

The conversation in organizational culture between the “we” and the “us” of those involved in the organizational context should be similar to the I/Thou relationship. Buber (1937) noted that there is a radical difference between a person’s attitude to other human beings and their attitude to things. The attitude to other people should be a relation between persons, and to things it is a connection of objects. In this relationship, the “I” of the first individual encounters the “Thou” of the other, whereas concerning things, the “I” encounters the “It.” In the I/Thou relation the “I” meets the other, which has no boundary, and can only be known in relation to oneself. Whereas the I/It relationship presupposes a single center of consciousness, the “I,” and the person may dispose of the “it” in any fashion it desires (Buber, 1950, pp. vi–vii). Authentic leadership is inherently an I/Thou exchange. In organizational culture, to remain authentic, those involved need to work to maintain and I/Thou exchange in the “we” and the “us” dynamic. If the conversational exchange, and

therefore the relationship, becomes an I/It exchange than the possibility of creating an authentic organizational culture, which would be necessary for authentic leaders and followers, would be slim. As an application, the I/Thou exchange is necessary for the “we” and “us” exchange, for both leaders and followers, in authentic organizational culture. Knowledge of this fact for those who desire to create an authentic organizational context and culture is preeminent.

CONCLUSION

Authentic leadership, followership, and organizational contexts, or cultures, may exist as a subset of other forms of leadership, followership, and organizational structures. Antonakis and Day (2018) noted that authentic leadership is closely associated with both servant and transformational leadership. The concept of being authentic, transparent, and having integrity are embedded in both servant and transformational leadership (Antonakis & Day, 2018, pp. 68–69). As a result, many forms of leadership may improve by using models of authentic leadership within their main leadership focus. Yukl (2013) noted that LMX theory has several conceptual weaknesses that limit its utility, but that it can improve by using a clear description of the way a leader develops different dyadic relationships (Yukl, 2013, p. 224). It may well be that further study of authentic leadership and authentic followership as it applies to other forms of leadership may assist our understanding of the human dynamics of trust, openness, integrity, perception of the other, and transparency that are inherent in authentic leadership. Also, by studying biblical constructs, such as Balaam and his donkey, we are allowed to view, historically, what authentic leadership is not and what authentic followership may look like. Apophatic teaching may allow for strong examples of what would be categorized as inauthentic leadership, which may extend our meaning and understanding of the category. It is recommended that further study of leadership and followership in scripture be continued to verify different leadership models that would either be authentic or inauthentic to gain a deeper understanding of leadership models in scripture.

REFERENCES

- Alter, R. (2004, Autumn). Balaam and the ass: An excerpt from a new translation of the five books of Moses. *The Kenyon Review*, 26(4), 6–32. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4338644>.
- Antonakis, J., & Day, D. V. (2018). *The nature of leadership* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage Publication.
- Apophatic Theology. (2019). Retrieved from https://search-credoreference-com.ezproxy.regent.edu/content/entry/cupdct/apophatic_theology/0.
- Ashkanasy, N. M., Wilderom, C. P., & Peterson, M. F. (2011). *The handbook of organizational culture and climate* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Avolio, B., Gardner, W., Walumba, F., Luthans, F., & May, D. (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.
- Buber, M. (1937). *I and Thou*. Edinburgh, Scotland: T. & T. Clark.
- Buber, M. (1950). *I and Thou*. Edinburgh, Scotland: T. & T. Clark.
- Chaleff, I. (2009). *The courageous follower: Standing up to & for our leaders* (3rd ed.). Oakland, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- De Zilwa, D. (2016). *The strengths and capacities of authentic followership*. *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal*, 37(3), 310–324. Retrieved from <https://doi-org.ezproxy.regent.edu/10.1108/LODJ-01-2014-0010>.
- Gardner, W. L., Avolio, B. J., Luthans, F., May, D. R., & Walumbwa, F. (2005). “Can you see the real me?” A self-based model of authentic leader and follower development. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(3), 343–372. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.03.003>.
- Hiebert, P. G. (2008). *Transforming worldviews: An anthropological understanding of how people change*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.
- Jones, C. (2019). *Are donkey’s stubborn?* Retrieved from <https://animals.mom.me/donkeys-stubborn-3410.html>.
- Kellerman, B. (2008). *Followership: How followers are creating change and changing leaders*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.
- Kelley, R. E. (1992). *The power of followership: How to create leaders people want to follow and followers who lead themselves* (1st ed.). Retrieved from <http://library.regent.edu/record=b1387655>.
- Konopaske, R., Ivancevich, J. M., & Matteson, M. T. (2018). *Organizational management and behavior* (11th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Mock (Abuse). (2019). Retrieved from <https://www.blueletterbible.org/lang/lexicon/lexicon.cfm?Strongs=H5953&t=KJV>.
- Osborne, G. R. (2006). *The hermeneutical spiral: A comprehensive introduction to biblical interpretation* (2nd ed.). Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.

- Perverse. (2019). Retrieved from <https://www.blueletterbible.org/lang/lexicon/lexicon.cfm?Strongs=H3399&t=KJV>.
- Pethor. (2019). Retrieved from <https://biblehub.com/topical/p/pethor.htm>.
- Riggio, R. E., Chaleff, I., & Lipman-Blumen, J. (2008). *The art of followership: How great followers create great leaders and organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Josey Bass.
- Robbins, V. K. (1996). *The tapestry of early Christian Discourse: Rhetoric, society, and ideology*. New York: Routledge.
- Sanford, F. H. (1950). Authoritarianism and leadership: A study of the follower's orientation to authority. *Institute for Research in Human Relations*. Retrieved from <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1952-00818-000>.
- Vanhoozer, K. J. (1998). *Is there a meaning in this text? The Bible, the reader, and the morality of the literary knowledge*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Yukl, G. (2013). *Leadership in organizations* (8th ed.). Boston: Pearson.