

Handbook of Leadership Theory

for

Church Leaders

Sharon Drury
2003

Preface

The Handbook of Leadership Theory is dedicated to students preparing for the full-time equipping ministry in local churches. Most Bible schools, undergraduate and graduate religion departments, and seminaries have only one course that addresses church leadership, however, pastors often find that the majority of their time is spent in leadership and administrative responsibilities. This Handbook will help pastors have a better understanding of why people they serve behave the way they do, and develop more effective ways to address a variety of leadership challenges.

The Handbook is also useful for churches where the pastor oversees ordained and lay staff pastors and volunteers. This leadership scenario has much in common with business and non-profit organizations. The knowledge gained from leadership theory and practice provides the basis for offering practical suggestions for training and staff development in real-life challenges that pastors and church leaders face everyday.

May God bless this offering to life-long learners and leaders in His work.

Sharon Drury
Doctoral Student @ Regent University
July, 2003

Table of Contents

Introduction

Part One –Leader Focus

- Trait and Behavior Theories..... 6
- Charismatic Leadership..... 8
- Grid Theory.....10

Part Two – Leader-Follower Focus

- Leader-Member Exchange Theory (LMX).....13
- Transactional Leadership.....16
- Transformational Leadership.....18
- Servant Leadership..... 21

Part Three – Situational Approaches

- Contingency Model (LPC).25
- Situational Leadership Theory (SLT)27
- Path-Goal Theory of Leader Effectiveness..... 30
- Leadership Substitutes Theory32

Part Four – Combination Approaches

- Multiple Linkage Model 35
- Leadership that Matters: A Leadership Synthesis 37

Part Five – Supporting Theories

- Motivation Theories..... 40
- Power and Influence..... 43
- Ethical Motivations for Leaders 46
- Intercultural Leadership.....49
- Organizational Culture and Leadership 52
- Organizational Change Theory 54
- Women and Leadership 57
- Leadership Emergence Theory 60

Part Six – Research on Leadership Strategies

- Leadership versus Management64
- Leadership Decision-making Models67
- Conflict Resolution70
- Empowerment Strategies73
- 360 Degree Leadership76
- Hawthorne Effect78
- Pareto’s Principle.....80
- The Rhetoric of Leadership82
- Leadership Succession.....84

Introduction

Leadership has been studied since Confucius, Aristotle, and the Bible. The development of leadership research has progressed through a focus on personality traits, leader style and behavior, the group process, and the context of leadership. Scholars have identified leadership as a power relationship, the exercise of influence, an instrument of goal achievement, or the initiation of structure. Most working definitions include a combination of these elements. For the purposes of this book, leadership will be not be seen as status or headship, but rather the process whereby any individual influences other members of a group to solve problems or achieve goals. Leaders are usually agents of change, because the environment inside and outside the organization shifts. Churches are no different. In order to be effective with the people and organizations they lead, pastors and other church leaders need to apply sound leadership theory.

Why study leadership theory?

The most popular books and articles on leadership for pastors are frequently based on anecdotal success. These are generally based on the author's personal experience in their particular circumstances, typically described in limited scope and application. Pastors, however, and other church leaders should be concerned with broader truths, not just a successful person's opinion or stories describing "what worked for me." The research in leadership, on the other hand, deals with *truth*—not just what worked in an isolated instance.

This is not to say that the popular publications and seminars on leadership are untrue. They often do represent the similar truths that are found in academic analyses. However, a research-based understanding of leadership and its multiple dimensions are a more certain approach to knowing what is *true* than a collection of folk wisdom and experiential insights. Furthermore, the collection in this book provides support for some very popular principles you may already know and practice, as well as insight on other surprising findings you may not be familiar with. When someone asks, "Why do that?" a pastor can answer with solid research-based findings and not just, "That's what Bill Hybels does." This book can become the resource guide to knowing where some popular practices originate and will supply the references of some popular as well as lesser known leadership theory you may wish to study further.

How this book is organized

Each concise chapter starts with a theory or research area chosen from the field of leadership for its relevance to church life. Following that is a section *For Further Study* which lists the works referenced in first section, plus other sources of additional information on the topic of the chapter. The third section is titled *Implications for Church Leadership*, and includes many practical applications of the theories, findings, and other research on the chapter topic that can be used in real situations.

Part One

Leader Focus

The earliest studies of leadership focused on the individual leader and how they were different from those who were not in positions of leadership. This section includes trait and behavior theories that primarily emphasize the characteristics and actions of the leader.

Overview of Trait and Behavior Approaches

Trait Theory

The earliest studies of leadership focused on the traits of the person, sometimes called the Great Man Theory. This approach assumes that great leaders are born that way. Researchers sought to identify the characteristics that were similar in effective leaders. This theory was fueled by the relatively new field of psychology and emerging research on personality, intelligence, and other traits that became so prevalent in the early twentieth century. However, in the late 40s, Ralph Stogdill published his classic research that found no statistically significant difference in hundreds of studies enough to prove that traits could predict effective leadership. This famous “Stogdill paper” (1948) essentially ended most personality-based leadership research for several decades.

Style and Behavior

When most trait theory disappeared in the leadership literature, researches focused on what leaders *do*, instead of who they *are*. Style or behavior of the leader became the focus of such studies. Most of these revolved around a comparison of a relationship orientation versus task orientation of the leader. The Ohio State Leadership Studies (1963) found that leader behavior clustered in “consideration” and “initiating structure” behaviors, measured as two distinct leader behaviors. From these studies, Stogdill (1963) developed the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) short form that is still in use today. About the same time, researchers at the University of Michigan (e.g., Likert, 1961) were measuring leader behavior on a single continuum, as either “employee orientation” or “production orientation.” But later studies there paralleled most task versus relational orientation leadership research, i.e., both orientations can be found in the same leader to a lesser or greater degree (as in the Ohio State studies).

Renewed Interest in Traits

More recently, some theorists have focused again on traits of leaders versus non-leaders (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991). The Sashkins (2003) have joined this renewed interest in studying personality characteristics by using the “Big Five” Personality Factors on which most academic personality psychologist agree (p. 27). Though these five have not been compared with leader effectiveness, the Sashkins compared the “Big Five” factors with the “Derailing Factors” that McCall & Lombardo (1983) found to be the problem when executives fail—one or more of them.

“Big Five” Personality Factors on which most psychologist agree	McCall and Lombardo’s “Derailing Factors” for executives
Introversion/Extroversion	Inability to act
Openness to Experience	Fails to learn from experience
Conscientiousness	Cannot be trusted
Agreeableness	Cannot get along with people
Emotional Stability	Narcissism

(Sashkin & Sashkin, 2003, p. 28).

Therefore, trait and behavior theories of leadership continue to remain of interest to leadership scholars and practitioners.

For further study:

- Kirkpatrick, S. A., & Locke, E. A. (1991). Leadership: Do traits matter? *The Executive*, 5, 48-60.
- Likert, R. (1961). *New patterns of management*. New York: McGraw-Hill
- McCall, M. W., Jr, & Lombardo, M. M. (1983). *Off the track: Why and how successful executives get derailed* (Technical Report No. 21). Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.
- Sashkin, M. & M. G. (2003), *Leadership that matters: The critical factors for making a difference in people's lives and organizations' success*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature. *Journal of Psychology*, 25, 35-71.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1963) *Manual for the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire—Form XII*. Columbus: Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research.

Charismatic Leadership

Charismatic leadership is a term that became known in the management field initially with the work of Max Weber, published in 1924/1947. A German sociologist, Weber described certain leaders as having exceptional qualities—a charisma—that enabled them to motivate followers to achieve outstanding performance. *Charisma* is a Greek word meaning “gift bestowed by the gods.” As an adaptation of a theological concept, Weber’s model was an explanation for what sometimes happens in complex organizations—especially in times of crisis—when a leader was granted a special gift of extraordinariness by colleagues and subordinates instead of paternal or divine authority that was general expected in that era (Sashkin & Sashkin, 2003).

Robert House (1977) studied the psychological motives behind transformational leadership, and observed that charisma is the central aspect of a transforming leader, though he does not believe the terms are synonymous. House uses four phrases to define charismatic leadership:

- Dominant
- Strong desire to influence others
- Self-confident
- Strong sense of one’s own moral values

Jay Conger (1989) proposed the following four-stage model of charismatic leadership:

1. Continual assessment of the environment to formulate what must be done; establishes goals
2. Communication of his or her vision; uses motivational and persuasive arguments
3. Building trust and commitment; unexpected behavior, risk-taking; technical proficiency
4. Role modeling, empowerment, and unconventional tactics

Charismatic leaders are generally spurred to action by ideology and vision, or by crisis. They usually take on hero status with their followers, employees, and sometimes nations. The dangers, however, with this style of leadership, have been highlighted by Bass and the Sashkins, and may include extreme need for control over others and dependent followers. Writer Cynthia Ozark offers this caution:

There is a difference between wanting significant leadership and wanting a leader. The craving for a hero is very dangerous, both for the putative hero and for his followers (quoted by Hagerman, 1994).

Other personal weaknesses of charismatic leaders, such as narcissistic tendencies, failure to delegate, unpredictability, freedom from inner conflicts that most leaders have with hard decisions, and insensitivity to others can cause failure with this leadership style.

Although no universally accepted set of behaviors and traits defines charismatic leadership, several authors, (e.g., Bass (1985), House (1976) and the Sashkins (2003), have included research on the charisma component of transformational leadership and thereby have provided the clearest applications and cautions of charismatic leadership.

For further study:

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership performance beyond expectations*. New York: Academic Press.

- Conger, J. A. (1989). *The charismatic leader*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hagerman, J. O. (1994). *The God I believe*. New York: Free press, p. 154-155, from the edited transcript of his conversation with Ozark on February 2, 1992.
- House, R. J. (1977) A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In J. G. Hunt & L. L. Larson (Eds.) *Leadership: The cutting edge*. Carbondale; Southern Illinois University Press.
- Sashkin, M. & M. G. (2003), *Leadership that matters: The critical factors for making a difference in people's lives and organizations' success*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Sellers, P. (1996). What exactly is charisma? *Fortune*, January 15, 1995, 68-75.
- Weber, M. (1924/1947). *The theory of social and economic organization*. Trans. by A. M. Henderson & T. Parsons. New York: Free Press.

Implications for church leadership

The church often assumes the terms “Charisma” and “Charismatic leadership” are religious terms. They are, but they are not limited to religious or church leadership. However, seeing charisma as a “gift from God” is certainly relevant to the church, for leadership is often seen as a spiritual gift in the church. That is, many Christians see God bestowing a gift of leadership on certain Christians. In this instance, leadership is not so much a position (like pastor or elder) but a gift God has given to a certain individual. With this “spiritual gifts” approach to leadership, one assumes a pastor would have such a gift, but the crunch for many church leaders comes when there are several people in a church—ministerial and lay—claiming this gift. Some implications of charismatic leadership theory for church leadership:

Church leaders must settle their view on the spiritual gift of leadership, and how that fits with their view of the apostle, prophet, evangelist and pastor-teacher gifts. If leadership is primarily a spiritual gift, then finding the person/people with this gift and determining through church polity how they will exercise it is the key task. One’s comprehensive view of how spiritual gifts work in the church should be consistently applied to leadership along with other spiritual gifts.

Robert House’s “four phrases” describe a certain style of church leader—dominant, influential, self-confident, strong sense of moral values. This is likely only one type of church leader, not necessarily the best type. It certainly represents the style of leadership most promoted by the church growth movement and most mega-church leaders.

Just using the term charismatic does not make a style essentially Christian. Yet, through history, many of the most effective church leaders have had this style.

Can a person develop a charismatic style of leadership or are you born with it (or gifted with it at conversion)? Even if this style is preferable in some circles, an un-charismatic personality can still become an effective leader.

This style of leadership seems to emerge especially in times of crisis. It appears an un-charismatic person can become a charismatic leader as a situation may demand it.

All styles of leadership have their dangers, but charismatic leadership seems to have more. Christian theology and the Bible have much to say about the consequent dangers of the hero status—often accorded a charismatic leader. Scripture speaks to other potential dangers, including over-controlling, making followers dependant, being narcissistic and/or self-centered, over confidence in self, and insensitivity to others. Could it be that charismatic leadership styles are *both* most effective *and* most dangerous to the church leader? A charismatic leader should set into place the practices and personal policies that dull the sharp-edged sword of this style.

Blake & Mouton's Grid Theory

After Ralph Stogdill's pivotal article in 1948, leadership studies shifted from a focus on what a leader "has"—often thought to be inborn *traits*, to what a leader "does"—or the *style* and *behavioral* functions of leaders. Based on the findings of the University of Michigan and Ohio State studies which emphasized task- and relations-oriented behaviors, Blake and Mouton (1964) built a managerial grid—also published as a leadership grid—that integrated a high *concern for production* with a high *concern for people* as the one best way to achieve effective leadership. A leader's answers to statements about management assumptions are plotted on a Managerial Grid, with concern for people varying from 1 to 9 on the vertical axis, and concern for production varying from 1 to 9 on the horizontal axis. The Grid is still used in leadership training sessions today.

The following five basic cluster styles result from the interaction of task- and relations-oriented responses:

Authority-Obedience Management (high production; low people). The leader's main concern is in accomplishing the task in the most efficient way possible. A high concern for production is combined with minimum concern for the people. This leader dictates what should be done.

Country Club Management (high people; low production). The leader shows minimum concern for production and high concern for people. This leader focuses on making the people feel good, even if it ends in slower production or not achieving results.

Impoverished Management (low people; low production). The leader has minimum concern for both people and production. This leader does just enough to keep his or her job.

Organization Man (medium people; medium production). The leader goes along with the general flow of the organization. This leader is happy with the status quo.

Team Management (high people; high production). The leader integrates a high concern for people as well as for production. This leader attempts to meet organizational goals through the participation, involvement, and commitment of all the members in the organization. Synergistic integration of high concern for both people and production is the key to greatest effectiveness. However, without openness, trust, respect, even confrontation to resolve conflict as well as mutual development and change, this apparent 9, 9 orientation can take the form of paternalism. Likewise, this theory allows for leaders to masquerade their behaviors with a back-up style, as some opportunistic leaders do.

Managerial Grid Theory recommends optimum leadership behavior—team management. A study of 731 managers replicated the original findings that 9, 9 –oriented managers from a variety of companies were more likely to advance in their careers (J. Hall, 1976). However, later studies have not consistently linked the team management orientation to effective leadership in every situation. Therefore, *situational* theories have attempted to explain the contingencies that seem to moderate the effectiveness of the leader's behavior.

For further study:

Blake, R. R., & Moulton, J. S. (1964). The leadership grid. Houston, TX: Gulf.

Hall, J. (1976). To achieve or not: The manager's choice. *California Management Review*, 18, 5-18.

Implications for church leadership.

Blake and Moulton's grid theory is known intuitively in the church. Churches often seek a pastor-leader who is a "people person" and cares most about people. Thinking theologically, we might ask, "What does the church produce?" The answer might be people. That is, the church's product is people—individuals being conformed to Christ's example. Thus, a production oriented person must be most concerned with people either way. That is not to say, however, the church is not constantly tempted to supplant its people with other task-oriented behaviors. We do see church leaders who seem to care more about buildings or programs than the people in the body of Christ. In this way, church leaders can use the people as a means to some other product—perhaps to produce an enhanced reputation or an accelerated ministerial career. Some implications of Blake and Moulton's grid theory for church leadership may be:

Leaders should discover their own style on the Blake and Moulton's grid—they should know if they are a 1, 9 or a 5, 5, or a 9, 9.

Various staff leaders may match certain scores. For instance, youth pastors and staff ministers assigned to pastoral care probably will have a high people score while an executive pastor might be expected to have a high production score. A church planter may have such a high people score that they may appear to be a "country club pastor."

Churches may also fit on the Blake and Moulton's grid. That is, some churches may expect the product of their leader to be a worship service, carried out with meticulous perfection. Any concern for people by the pastor is of lesser value. Perhaps there are impoverished churches (low people; low production), country club churches (high people; low production), organizational churches (medium people and production), along with team and authority churches.

If local churches do fit on the Blake and Moulton grid, regional leaders should consider matching candidates for pastoring churches with the similar type churches. For instance, an organizational church (a 5, 5 church) might better be matched with a 5, 5 leader than a 9, 1 leader.

Of course, the ideal of most congregations is a concern for both production and people, church growth and church health, excellence in performance and excellence in relationships. Thus, church leaders should develop their own strategy to become a 9, 9 leader and lead their church in a comprehensive attempt to become a 9, 9 church collectively.

Part Two

Leader-Follower Relationship

This section includes an emphasis on the interaction of the leaders and the followers, and the influences each has on the other.

Leader-Member Exchange Theory (LMX)

In-group/Out-group

Leadership studies before 1975 generally addressed the issues from the perspective of the leader toward their followers. Leader-member exchange (LMX) theory, developed by Dansereau, Graen, and Haga (1975) emphasized the dyadic (two person) relationships between leaders and followers. The researchers found that there were two general types of relationships in the workplace. Those that were linked only by defined roles, job descriptions, and formal contracts were the *out-group*, and those that were linked by expanded and mutually-negotiated role responsibilities were the *in-group*. In each case, the leader and the follower formed an individualized working relationship (*vertical dyad*) that had its own unique characteristics. This theory, then, recognizes that there is no such thing as consistent leader behavior across all subordinates, e.g., a leader may be very structured toward one employee and very sociable with another. This emphasis varies from many studies which look at the average group member's relationship with the leader (ALS, average leader style).

Two Types of Relationships

In-group members have a common bond and value system that lends itself toward greater interaction with the leader. Research generally supports that leaders in these relationships give more challenging assignments and greater emotional support. These members are more dependable, have more communication with the leader, and have higher job performance and satisfaction than the out-group. Relationships in positive dyads result in mutual trust, respect, and reciprocal influence. Conversely, out-group members have less in common with the leader and generally receive less information, influence, and fewer challenging assignments. Communication is formalized, and production is confined to the job description.

Organizational Effectiveness

When researchers tested the theory more recently, the focus appears to avoid any emphasis on in-groups and out-groups, perhaps because it intuitively seems unfair. Though the theory was not intended to be discriminatory, nor has it been shown to create inequalities, the authors did not indicate how members move from the out-group to the in-group if a follower wants to do so. LMX researchers now emphasize how relationships influence overall organizational effectiveness. In fact, Graen & Uhl-Bien (1995) found that high quality leader-member exchanges produced less employee turnover, better job attitudes, plus higher overall performance, organizational climate, innovation, empowerment, career progress, and other positive organizational outcomes.

Leadership Making

Graen and Uhl-Bien (1991) also discovered that positive relationships can create networks of mutual exchange and influence, which they called *leadership making*. This most recent approach recommends that leaders develop high quality relationships with all employees in the work unit, as well as a network of mutually-influencing partnerships throughout the organization. The LMX researchers recognized that there will be phases in the relationship (stranger,

acquaintance, partnership) as the leader and follower develop trust and respect for one another, and eventually for the good of the group.

The ideas in LMX can be used throughout all levels of an organization since it draws attention to the importance of communication in leadership, and helps leaders be aware of the uniqueness of each employee. However, more research is needed on the means used to actually build the mutually influential relationships described in this theory.

For further study:

- Dansereau, F., Graen, G. G., & Haga W. (1975). A vertical dyad linkage approach to leadership in formal organizations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 13, 46-78.
- Graen, G. G., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1991). The transformation of professional into self-managing and partially self-designing contributions: Toward a theory of leader-making. *Journal of Management Systems*, 3(3), 33-48.
- Graen, G. G., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *Leadership Quarterly*, 6(2), 219-247.

Implications for church leadership

The very notion of an in-group and an out-group is repugnant to most Christian thinking. However, we all know such groups generally exist in the church. They are not always developed by the pastor/leader, but usually exist before the pastor arrives. A new pastor at a church frequently studies the leadership landscape among the laity to discover who makes up the current influential in-group, then gets about either working with that group or gradually creating another in-group. Though the notion of in- and out-groups appears contrary to Christian values, we must admit that even Jesus had His group of seventy, and even a smaller group of twelve apostles who formed the in-group among His followers. (In fact, some argue Jesus even had a smaller, more intimate in-group comprised of Peter, James and John.) Perhaps today's Christian resistance to the in- and out-group notion springs more from American equalitarian values than biblical tradition. Nevertheless, LMX theory has significant implications for church leadership, some of which may include the following:

1. Church leadership is more than the leader's actions. It also includes the complex interactions between the leader and the followers.
2. In many churches, a pastor can seldom discharge members/followers. Indeed, the pastor is may be employed (and sometimes voted on) by the very followers he or she is supposed to lead.
3. LMX suggests good leaders are not automatically consistent in their leadership relationships. In fact, a leader should operate differently with different people—in which case intentional inconsistency is good.
4. On arrival at a new church, an in-group probably already exists, possibly one established by the previous pastor. A new pastor will probably work with this in-group at first, and then gradually develop a revised in-group. Those previously part of the in-group, who find themselves now a part of the out-group often cause trouble for the pastor.
5. While the notion of in-group and out-group is unacceptable to our ideal ecclesiology, the more recent work in the area suggests what most church people would have said all along: the pastor should attempt to develop high quality relationships with *all* members in

a church wide *leadership making* ethos. Leader making is the work of a good church leader.

6. As for many leadership models and theories, the implications are different for large churches where the senior pastor supervises a large professional staff, and the leadership work is primarily leader-staff rather than leader-member. These larger churches often share similar implications of a model with the corporate world.

Transactional Leadership

A number of leadership approaches emphasize the exchange process in which leaders help followers accomplish objectives. Such a role has been labeled *transactional leadership*, named for the transaction or exchange that occurs—the subordinate exchanging work for the leader’s granting of reward. Transactional leadership generally uses the concepts in trait, behavior, and situational styles of leadership. Studies of these theories focus on task and relationship skills, sometimes as an either/or factor, or as behavior tendency on a task-/relations-oriented continuum.

Transactional leaders help the subordinate identify what must be done to achieve the goal, as in the several elements of the *path-goal model*. Though the exchange process may sometimes appear simplistic, as in a paycheck for work, theories of transactional leadership can be complex and include the leader helping the subordinate identify what must be done as well what might motivate the follower to succeed.

Two main elements of transactional leadership style that are generally referred to in the leadership literature:

- 1) Contingent reward.** This is the belief that a follower’s reinforcement is contingent on accomplishing objectives and will result in higher performance and satisfaction. This belief that reward results from accomplishing objectives, while widely held, has not always been proven in studies. A national sample of US workers showed that people do not believe that better pay is contingent on better performance, even though they would like it to be (Yanklovich & Immerwahr, 1983).
- 2) Management-by-exception.** This concept sees the leader only getting involved with the follower when there is an exception—when the agreed-upon objectives are not being accomplished. The influence in leader-follower exchanges such as these are likely to be minimal, especially in a passive form which only gets involved when there are problems. The active form of management-by-exception watches follower performance more closely, yet only corrects without any other formative feedback.

For further study

- Ivancevich, J. M. e. a. (1999). *Organization and behavioral management* (5th Ed.). New York: Irwin McGraw-Hill.
- Northouse, P. G. (2001). *Leadership theory and practice* (2nd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Yanklovich, D., & Immerwahr, J. (1983). *Putting the work ethic to work*. New York: Public Agenda Foundation.

Implications for church leadership

The two main notions in transactional leadership are not foreign to the Bible and Christian theology. “Contingent reward” is rooted deep in Christian teaching. While Christians believe that salvation is of faith alone, there is a common belief that God grants other rewards for faithful service. And, many Christians believe God Himself is the best example of “management by exception,” intervening in natural affairs only when the covenant with His people is being

broken. Therefore, while most Christians reject the notion that we make any sort of an exchange or transaction for our salvation, they would accept some sort of a rewards theology for fidelity and faithfulness. These notions make Christians especially open to transactional modes of leadership. Some of the implications of transactional leadership theory for church leaders may be:

1. Church leaders seldom offer financial rewards to laborers in the church setting (except in the case of paid professional staff). The rewards offered are often more intrinsic, intangible, and sometimes delayed than the simple labor-paycheck model. However, the church may not be that unique in this, for many employees do not rely primarily on financial rewards in their work, but use similar rewards as are offered by church work: personal satisfaction, meaningful work, contribution to something lasting, making a better world. Church leaders must recognize that in offering these rewards they may not offer any greater reward than non-religious organizations or companies.
2. Christianity offers eternal rewards. Therefore, church leaders should offer rewards that move to the eternal level. The souls of man and women are eternal where all other rewards are temporal. Church leaders who set their follower's sights on eternal values can offer rewards that non-religious organizations can't compete with.
3. Church work should be postured as rewarding work. It is no shame to motivate people by reminding them of the great rewards they will receive by volunteering to work in the nursery, or go on the youth retreat as a counselor. While few Christians may actually work for the reward, knowledge of the rewards may provide additional motivation for volunteers in the church. Thus, church leaders should intentionally outline the rewards and benefits of church work and intentionally sell the value of church volunteering as part of their comprehensive volunteer recruitment strategy.

Transformational Leadership

Since the publication of James McGregor Burns' book, *Leadership*, in 1978, viewing the leader as *transformational* rather than *transactional* became the focus of a great amount of leadership research. Rather than exchanging reward for achieved goals, *transformational leadership* is a comprehensive approach that strives to change or transform followers to transcend their own short-term needs for their longer-term self-development, the good of the group, the organization, and society. It is a lofty goal.

Burns (1978) believed that leaders were either transactional or transformational. You were either one or the other, and transformational was better. However, seven years later Bernard Bass (1985) proposed that both types of leadership are necessary and that transformational leadership actually enhances transactional behaviors. Since then, researchers have described the hybrid nature of leadership in many of the nation's great leaders. A transformation leader is likely the kind of leader most people have in mind today when they think of an ideal leader.

Transformational leadership models generally include four factors that are concerned with transforming behaviors, plus the two factors that involve transactional exchanges:

Transformational Factors:

1. **Charisma** or idealized influence.
Leaders are strong role model and make other want to follow their vision.
2. **Inspirational Motivation.**
Leaders communicate high expectations and use emotional appeals.
3. **Intellectual Stimulation.**
Leaders challenge followers to develop innovative ways of problem-solving.
4. **Individualized Consideration**
Leaders pay attention to individual needs and assign meaningful projects to help followers grow personally.

Transactional Factors:

5. **Contingent Reward.**
Leaders negotiate with followers about what needs done and the reward for meeting the goal (positive reinforcement).
6. **Management-by-Exception**
Leaders monitor followers and provide corrective criticism if standards are not met (essentially negative reinforcement).

Transformational leadership links leaders and followers more than previous theories, and seeks to raise the level of motivation and morality in both. The model also has the benefit of intuitive appeal and extensive research. Studies, however, have been mainly with CEOs in large companies; therefore, more research is needed with leaders at lower levels within organizations. This relatively new leadership paradigm at best sees followers converted into leaders, and at worst, could be abused by changing people's values in a wrong direction. Overall, however,

transformational leadership provides a way to motivate followers toward achievement and self-actualization instead of security, and provides opportunity for more comprehensive organizational change.

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) Form 6S (Bass & Avolio, 1992) helps determine the leader's strengths and weaknesses in transformational leadership.

For further study:

Avolio, B. J. (1999). *Full leadership development: Building the vital forces in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics*. Winter, 1990, 19-31.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1992). *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire--Short form 6S*. Binghamton, NY: Center for Leadership Studies.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.

Implications for church leadership

Transformational leadership has extraordinary appeal to church leaders who consider themselves to be in the transformational business. Pastors and church leaders consider the church a place of personal and corporate transformation, thus the term itself has great currency with church leaders. Church leaders hope to raise up other leaders and a "multiplication mentality" pervades many Christian ministries (2 Timothy 2:2). For the church, transformational leadership promotes the leadership process from a mere exchange of rewards-for-service toward a transformed and transforming community of individuals. Some of the implications of the transformational leadership model for the church may be:

1. Church leaders should seek supernatural charisma from God. In the church the "charisma" of transformation leadership is often connected with anointing or "unction" from God. That is, church people often recognize a spiritual authority in some leaders that is supernatural and God-given, and more than personality. The effective church leader ought to seek this supernatural charisma if he or she wishes to be a transformational leader. In Christian thinking God sometimes grants anointing, unction, or gifts to whom He pleases, but at other times He does so in response to a person's seeking of His gifts. Church leaders ought to seek whatever mystical or supernatural gifts from God that would enhance transforming the people.
2. Great church leaders should not shy away from casting high expectations for their people and from making highly emotional appeals—this is a portion of transformational leadership. In local churches, such behavior is exhibited in preaching. It is possible to be a transformational leader without access to the pulpit, but it is harder.
3. Transformational leaders should equip their people to think out of the (traditional) box. While transformational leaders think creatively themselves, they also encourage their people to develop this habit as well. It isn't hard to find pastors who think outside the box. However, pastors who *enable their people* to do so are harder to find. In many churches, the pastor does most of the creative thinking in order to develop a solution, and then spends the rest of their energy persuading their people to accept their own out-of-the-box solution. Only rarely does the pastor intellectually stimulate the people to enable

them to become out-of-the-box thinkers so that pastor can trust the problem to the people. Then he could watch them develop their own creative and innovate solutions.

4. Church leaders develop individuals. The very term “pastor” denotes shepherding. Individualized attention is not strange to a good shepherd. A church leader must see their task as developing the people more than growing a church. Spiritual formation—forming Christ in a community—is the pastor’s work. To do that requires attention to both communal aspects of holiness and individual development of each member of the body. Church leaders should rise above “filling jobs” in their personnel program. A good transformational leader does not start with empty jobs, and then seek people to fill them. He starts with each person’s gifts, passions, abilities, personality, and experiences and then attempts to develop that person through service in and out of the church.

Servant Leadership Theory

Robert Greenleaf is often credited for initiating the current interest in servant leadership. The concept was conceived by Greenleaf after reading Herman Hesse's (1956) mythical story, *Journey to the East*. Leo, who performs the most menial of tasks during the journey, sustains the group of travelers with his spirit and song. However, when he becomes lost the group disintegrates. It is only then that Leo was discovered to be the discrete leader who had sponsored the journey. From this, Greenleaf (1977) saw business leaders as needing to serve society more constructively than merely by increasing profits for the company. He felt "business exists as much to provide meaningful work to the person as it exists to provide a product or service to the customer" (p. 142).

The philosophy of leading by serving has been explained by countless leadership theorists to include building an environment that not only serves the needs of the organization, but also provides a climate for its workers to grow and develop as human beings. After strict usage of the Delphi method, Laub (1999) developed a functional definition of servant leaders and servant-led organizations:

Servant Leaders and Servant-led Organizations

- **Value People** – by listening receptively, serving the needs of others first, and trusting people
- **Develop People** – by providing opportunities for learning, modeling appropriate behavior and building up others through encouragement
- **Build Community** – by building strong relationships, working collaboratively and valuing individual differences
- **Display Authenticity** – by integrity and trust, openness and accountability and a willingness to learn from others
- **Provide Leadership** – by envisioning the future, taking initiative and clarifying goals
- **Share Leadership** – by creating a shared vision, sharing decision-making power and sharing status and privilege at all levels of the organization.

Though servant leadership has many parallels with *transformational leadership*, it differs in leader focus (Patterson, 2003). Transformational leaders build commitment in followers toward organizational objectives; servant leaders' highest value is the people, and organizational results are secondary outcomes. "Serving is not the means by which to get results, but the behavior of serving *is* the result" (Farling, et al., 1999, p. 3).

Servant leadership remains an intuitive-based theory because little *empirical* (observable; testable as experienced) evidence of servant-leader behavior exists. Nevertheless, the term servant leadership appears to be more than the sum of the words service and leadership. The concept continues to be influential in the future, especially in the leadership of learning organizations (Senge, 1990).

For further study:

- Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1996). Part two: Essays on power, management and organizations. In D. M. F. L. C. Spears (Ed.), *Robert K. Greenleaf on becoming a servant-leader*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Hesse, H. (1956). *The journey to the East*. London: P. Owen.
- Laub, J. A. (1999). *Assessing the servant organization: development of the organizational leadership assessment (OLA) instrument*. Unpublished Dissertation, Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton, FL.
- Farling, M. L., Stone, A. G., & Winston, B. E. (1999). Servant leadership: Setting the stage for empirical research. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 49-63.
- Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization* (1st Ed.). New York: Doubleday.

Implications for Church Leadership

Servant leadership theory can hardly be rejected by a Church built on the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ was the ultimate example of servanthood, by leaving all the glory of heaven to come as a human and accepting the way of the cross. His earthly ministry built up a Church that spread the gospel to the ends of the earth after He ascended into heaven again. The Church of the man who wrapped a towel about Himself to wash His own disciple's feet as His final lesson to them certainly cannot reject servant leadership as a proper approach to leading others. Not out loud at least. *But in practice*, servant leadership may be no more common in a church and in Christian organizations than it is in secular corporations. While church leaders salute Jesus Christ as the model servant-leader, and affirm the servant leader approach loudly, in actual operation many church leaders practice leadership "as the Gentiles" do (Matthew 20:25-28) in real life. Some of the implications of servant leadership theory for church leaders may be:

1. Church leaders must value people, for they are God's handiwork. Listening to people is important in the church. This is how the Holy Spirit guides the church—through its people, not just through the designated leader.
2. Church leaders must be people-developers more than program-pushers. The church-based servant leader starts with the people, not the program. People development is the church's product.
3. The church does not make a product, it is the product. Churches don't just have pizza parties to attract new people—they do this to build community, to become what the church is to be: a community of the saints. Community building is a primary task of the church leader.
4. Church leaders must be authentic people who inspire trust. Talking about big dreams for the people to follow isn't enough; people follow leaders, not dreams. And they follow leaders with trustworthy integrity.
5. Leaders in the church must be men and women of vision, seeing the future and clarifying goals. In the church vision isn't just a picture of a bigger church or larger congregation. It is a picture of God's kingdom as it should be and seeing one local church's part in that vision.

6. Church leaders should help their followers see God's vision directly from God, not just from the pastor. The followers can be trusted with decision-making power on how that church can become what God desires. After all, the clergy do not get filled with a different Holy Spirit than the laity.

Part Three

Situational Approaches

This section includes the impact of the setting or the relational situation the leader is in for determining leader success.

Fiedler's Contingency Model

Before Fred Fiedler, the prevailing leadership model was *trait theory*. Trait theory focuses on the personality and talents of the leader—assumed to be inborn characteristics. Fiedler was early in introducing a *situational leadership approach*—looking at leadership with the entire context or situation, not just the leader's characteristics. Using the LPC (Least Preferred Co-Worker) scale, Fiedler (1967) analyzed hundreds of leaders' styles and developed generalizations about what to do when a leader's style does not match the situation. Fiedler's contingency model is based on the following assumptions:

- ◆ **Leaders are either task-oriented or relationship-oriented.** A task oriented leader is motivated by achieving a goal. They exhibit a controlling/structuring style to get the job done. A relationship-oriented leader is motivated by developing close interpersonal relationships. They exhibit a passive/considerate style.
- ◆ **Leaders cannot be trained to change their leadership style.** That is, a leader is stuck with their basic task or relationship orientation so the job should be engineered to fit the leader's style.
- ◆ **Therefore, organizations must change the situation in order to be more effective.** Since an organization is stuck with the leader's style, the organization must change the situation to make the leader more effective. Or, a leader themselves could discern their style and make adjustments in the situation.
- ◆ **There are three aspects of a situation to be changed:** 1). Change the leader-follower relations (e.g., if the leader is relationship-oriented, put that leader in the part of the organization where developing people is the primary work). 2) Change the task structure (e.g., increase or decrease the task structure according to the leader's style). 3) Change position power (e.g., provide for greater group decision-making for the relational leader or increase the controlling information flow for the task-oriented leader).

Fiedler's contingency model is grounded in an abundance of research findings and is both descriptive and predictive (Northouse, 2001). However, Fiedler's assumption about the static nature of a leader's style has been largely ignored by the billion dollar worldwide leadership training industry—which is based on the assumption that a leader can indeed change his or her behavior, and that changing a leader will change the results. Fiedler has also been critiqued in the academic community for lacking specific measurements for his definitions of the three areas mentioned above—his variables in the model.

For further study:

Fiedler, F. E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Northouse, P. G. (2001). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (2nd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Implications for church leadership.

Though Fiedler's model is widely accepted in academic circles, many church leaders naturally resist its assumptions. Theologically, church people dislike saying "you can't change."

However, church people usually are referring to spiritual matters, or overcoming sin when they

say this, not to the basic personality or approach of a leader. So, can a leopard change its spots? Can a pastor who is highly task oriented, absorbed with the details and schedules of getting the job done become a gregarious, collaborative, and relational leader? Fiedler says no. His model does help us explain why some leaders can be so successful at one job, then fail at another. The model judges how the church sometimes places leaders in jobs with little attempt to understand their basic style and suitability to the work. Some implications of Fiedler's model for church leadership may be:

1. Leaders should know their own style—if they are either task-oriented or relationally-orientated. The LPC test or a similar device should be used with leaders to discover their basic leadership style.
2. The church and church training programs should spend less energy on trying to change the leader. The church is obsessed with developing effective leadership styles as if obtaining certain traits of a leader will be the key to getting the job done. The Fiedler contingency model confronts that notion and would say, "Spend less time trying to change the leader, and more time adjusting the situation to get more effective results."
3. Ministers need to be matched with their jobs based on their leadership styles. An "Administrative Pastor" who is task oriented is more likely to be successful at that type of position than a highly relational person. Conversely, the task oriented person might fail at the job in pastoral care or as a youth pastor.
4. Regional church leaders should consider the culture of local churches when placing or recommending pastors. Some churches collectively have expectations for a more relational pastor who visits the people, hangs around the local coffee shop, and is "laid back" and works collaboratively. Other churches expect a pastor who "has his act together," brings well-crafted plans and schedules to board meetings, and "sweats the details" for the morning worship service. Placing pastors of one style into a different style church and expecting change is likely to set the pastor up for inevitable failure.
5. Individuals who are failing at their job should ask if the cause is a mismatch of their leadership style and the situation or culture of the local church.
6. Local churches should have a comprehensive approach to recruiting, training, and placing lay leaders in positions of leadership, based on their task or relational orientation along with other aspects like desire, abilities, and spiritual gifts.

Hersey-Blanchard's Situational Leadership Theory

Different situations demand different leadership approaches. An intuitive model of leadership is one developed by Paul Hersey and Ken Blanchard in 1969, and has been used in over 400 of the Fortune 500 companies training programs (1993). Unlike Mouton & Blake's Grid Theory or Fiedler's model, the Hersey-Blanchard Situational Leadership Theory (SLT) proposes that the leader adjusts her or her style to meet the particular situation and needs of the follower. Hersey-Blanchard assumes followers are at different developmental levels, and recommends treating each follower differently. Therefore, the model requires flexibility in the leader's style after an evaluation of the follower's competence and commitment. The process for determining the situational leadership behavior (of the leader) includes three elements:

- ◆ **The readiness (maturity) level that followers exhibit in performing a specific task, function, or objective.**
- ◆ **The amount of guidance and direction (task behavior) a leader gives.**
- ◆ **The amount of socio-emotional support (relationship behavior) a leader gives.**

Two main leadership activities are recognized in this model: **directive** (establishing/clarifying goals, making deadlines, establishing proper procedure, determining evaluation, all often done in a one-way communication mode). The second activity is **supportive** (with frequent two-way communication including problem solving, asking for input, praising, sharing information, and listening). Using these two activities, a grid can be formed to produce four types of leadership styles:

- ◆ **Directive/Telling** – gives specific directions; close supervision (high directive/low supportive)
- ◆ **Coaching/Selling** – explains decisions; provides opportunity for clarifying (high directive/high supportive)
- ◆ **Supporting/Participating** – solicits input; shares decision-making (high supportive/low directive)
- ◆ **Delegating**- turns over responsibility for decisions and completion (low supportive/low directive)

Developmental levels of followers focus on competence and commitment to the task, not in labeling employees for any other reason. The highest level follower has the skills to do the job and the motivation to complete it. However, this situational model is based on the idea that followers move backward and forward on the competence and commitment continuum, or what the authors call maturity. To complete the model's recommended leadership behavior, correct diagnosis of the employee's developmental level is critical. Criticisms leveled at this model include Hersey and Blanchard's unclear definition of the maturity or developmental levels, and the impracticality of diagnosing and adapting leader style for one-to-one relationships with each employee or follower. Many folks reading the above list assume that the coaching leader (high

directive/high supporting) is automatically “best.” That is not the point of the Hersey-Blanchard model. Instead, the leader must use all four styles depending on the individual follower’s needs and maturity.

For further study:

Blanchard, K. H., Zigarmi, P., & Zigarmi, D. (1985). *Leadership and the one minute manager: Increasing effectiveness through situational leadership*. New York: William Morrow.

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1993). *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources* (6th Ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Implications for church leadership.

The best research in leadership theory often springs from a business setting where the leader is the boss and the follower an employee. In the church, however, the leader is sometimes the employee and the followers are the boss. Churches are volunteer organizations where the volunteers often employ or elect their leader. In some churches, the followers actually vote on their pastor every year or two to determine if they would like to keep him or her. This complicates the adaptation of leadership theory to the church, when the former is derived from leader-employee models. Nevertheless, a church leader is responsible to deploy the volunteers properly. Christian theology certainly supports the notion of a leader serving the followers and not “lording over them like the Gentiles do” (Matthew 20:25-28). And there is the notion of diverse spiritual gifts and the widely accepted idea of “many members—one body.” These concepts nudge the church leader to be sensitive to an individual’s gifts and needs. Thus, the Hersey-Blanchard model may fit the thinking in a church setting, especially where a servant leader approach is preferred for theological and polity reasons. The model especially relates to deploying and placing volunteers in a church setting. Some of the implications of the Hersey-Blanchard model for church leadership may be:

1. Church leaders should adapt their personal style of leading to each individual’s maturity and competence, producing a highly personalized style of leadership. In this model, the leader adapts to each individual rather than expecting the individuals to learn the leader’s style and adapt to it.
2. Pastors and other church leaders must develop the sensitivity to their follower’s competencies and commitment in order to assess the style the follower will respond to best.
3. The highly individualistic style of leadership of the Hershey-Blanchard model requires longevity of the leader—time to assess the maturity and competence levels of the followers, and adaptation of the leader’s style to each follower.
4. The model suggests followers sometimes move back and forth on the competence and commitment continuum, meaning the particular style fitting a follower may be a moving target. Thus, the leader cannot rely on a one-time assessment, but must continue in a highly relational, close monitoring of the follower and “what make him/her tick.” Intuitive assessment and adaptation is a constant duty.
5. This model especially relates to full time staff in a church under the direction of a senior pastor. Using this model, he or she will discern if the staffer, a) requires high direction but does not need much support; b) responds best to a constant coaching, including lots of formative direction and continual support; c) works best with high support but does not

need much direction; d) or is able to do the work without much support or direction.

These, of course, are the same questions to be asked of volunteer followers in the church.

6. The bottom line of the Hersey-Blanchard model is for leaders to know the followers. In the church, this reflects the biblical notion that a good shepherd should know the sheep.

Path-Goal Theory of Leader Effectiveness

Path-Goal theory is a *situational leadership approach* developed by House and Mitchell (1974). It focuses on how leaders motivate followers to accomplish goals and enhance performance and satisfaction. The leader in Path-Goal theory helps the followers set goals, then assists them in developing a path to achieving their goals. Instead of recommending just the task/relationship actions for leaders, this theory recommends four behaviors that best meet the subordinate's needs and will therefore more likely produce effective leadership. One or another of the four behaviors are employed, depending on the follower's needs. Therefore, a leader needs to be skillful in all four behaviors:

- **Directive** – leader tends to give explicit expectations; initiating structure; “telling” style
- **Supportive** – leader treats followers as equals; consideration behavior; approachable style
- **Participative** – leader tends toward shared decision-making; collaborative behavior
- **Achievement-oriented** – leader sets challenging goals; shows confidence they are capable to meet them

Based on assumptions from Expectancy Theory (Vroom, 1964), this model explains how behavior of the leader causes expectancies/motivations in the subordinate that create effort and satisfaction. The rationale is that followers will perform better if they think they are capable, and if they perceive the work will get results and be worth the effort.

In choosing which of the leadership behaviors to use, two variables influence the choice: the subordinate's characteristics, and the characteristics of the task. The leader behavior is contingent on these characteristics, making this a situational leadership approach. No one leadership behavior works for motivating every person and the leader supplies what is missing to motivate the follower. After this initial assessment of the follower and the task, the leader then helps the follower define goals and then reach them in the most efficient way. Leaders may even adapt their styles with an individual during the completion of a task, if one part of the job needs a different motivation from another.

Although it is a complex and sometimes confusing theory, it reminds leaders to continually think of their central purposes as a leader: to help define goals, clarifies paths to get there, remove obstacles that may exist, and provide support and encouragement for achievement of goals. Most of the responsibility is on the leader however, and there is little emphasis identified for the follower. Some argue this kind of leadership may be counterproductive over time in that it may promote dependency on the leader.

For Further study:

- House, R. J., & Mitchell, R. R. (1974). Path-goal theory of leadership. *Journal of Contemporary Business*, 3, 81-97.
- Northouse, P. G. (2001). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (2nd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Implications for church leadership

All situational leadership theories nudge church leaders to think more about the needs and motivational triggers of their people, in relation to their own style and needs. All of the situational theories start by listening and assessing the followers, and not with the leader who summarily says, “That’s the kind of leader I am—live with it” (even if under his or her breath). Christian teaching tells us we are to be other-oriented and a sign of spiritual maturity is starting with others and not me. Thus, some form of servant leadership mindset should prevail in the church of the Jesus Christ. It’s the *kenosis* view of Jesus presented in Philippians 2.

Path-goal theory calls Christian leaders to load all four leadership behaviors in their quiver and to fire the arrow needed for the particular situation or follower. This other-oriented approach to leadership seems to fit well with Christian teaching and the lifestyle of Jesus Christ. Some of the implications of Path-Goal theory for church leaders may be:

1. Church leaders (especially pastors) should avoid a focus on “discovering my style” of leadership in order to announce it and expect everyone else in the church to adapt to their style. Mature and effective leaders develop multiple styles of leadership, adapting them to the situation and follower. This approach isn’t just being a good leader—it is being a good Christian.
2. Church leaders likely feel more natural with one of the four Path-Goal behaviors over the others. Discovering this behavior preference may assist the leader in expanding his or her “repertoire” in order to develop those less preferred or practiced.
3. Path-Goal theory proposes a role as leader that helps the followers define their goals, then assists the followers in developing a path toward the goal of achievement. This other-oriented theory puts the leader in a servant role, with the focus on the follower. It is a stranger to the notion of the leader setting all the goals while “up on the mountain” to come down later to “cast the vision” to the followers. This model has the leader enabling the followers to define their goals, then develop a path to achieve them.
4. Denominational polity and tradition may be a factor in favoring one leader behavior over another. Highly congregational forms of government might expect a participative and supportive leader. Churches with Episcopal or hierarchical polity might expect a directive approach, while many independent mega-church boards might prefer a leader who practices achievement-oriented behaviors exclusively.
5. Church leaders may need to purposely resist any leader-dependency that might develop if using this model of leadership.
6. Church leaders who examine Path-Goal’s four leadership behaviors often quickly attempt to rank them as bad-good-better-best.” House and Mitchell’s Path-Goal theory rejects that notion. Directive leadership is not automatically bad and achievement-oriented leadership automatically good. In Path-Goal theory, all four behaviors are good, depending on the situation. The leader adjusts to the situation, using the behavior that fits the person and the task.

Leadership Substitutes Theory

Kerr & Jermier (1978) stress the importance for leaders to recognize that there are factors in the subordinate, the task, or the organization which can make leader's action unnecessary. These factors are referred to as *leadership substitutes*. That is, these factors become a substitute for leader behaviors. Such factors can make it impossible for leadership to make a difference. For example, the authors found that formalizing procedures in a professional setting negates the need for leaders to intervene. People in this situation are more satisfied if leaders do not give further directions. In another study, they found that subordinates' ability, professional orientation, and desire for autonomy make any directives from the leader counterproductive.

Two broad situational categories should be considered: any formal reward systems already in the organization, and the intrinsically-motivating aspects of the work itself. Task and/or relationship orientation of the leader are also a part of this theory. For example, socially supportive behaviors by a leader are neutralized by close-knit work groups. Likewise, a well-trained, long-experienced employee doesn't need a task-oriented leader to structure the task.

These and other factors, or *leadership substitutes*, make leadership behavior not only unnecessary but perhaps impossible. When such conditions exist, they will influence the follower's satisfaction and performance, and knowledge of such modifiers, neutralizers, and substitutes should modify the leader's behavior. Otherwise, some categories of leadership behavior may be seen redundant or even an irritant in the workplace or organization.

For further study:

- Ivancevich, J. M., & Matteson, M. T. (1999). *Organizational behavior and management*. Boston: Irwin McGraw-Hill.
- Kerr, S., & Jermier, J. (1978). Substitutes for leadership: Their meaning and measurement. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 22, 374-403.

Implications for church leadership

Leadership Substitutes Theory reminds us that leaders can sometimes over-lead, just like parents can sometimes over-parent. There are times when a leader should simply do nothing and resist intervening. The idea should be deeply rooted in our notion of God. The God of the Christians acts in history, but does not always act. Sometimes God does not act, or He delays acting. There are things God lets us do for ourselves and does not overrule our free will or even actively help us or even lead us. Sometimes God makes His will clear about a decision we are making; at other times He appears to delegate to us the choice without explicit guidance. The modeling of God's leadership through the Holy Spirit is an example to us that sometimes as leaders we need to do nothing at all and let the people do what God is calling them to do. Sometimes church leaders do not have to make a way, but should get out of the way. Some of the implications of Kerr & Jermier's Leadership Substitutes Theory for church leadership may be:

1. A formal reward system in the organization is an instance where leader action may be unnecessary. The church often has some reward systems in place but, other than for professional staff, few of them are monetary. However, the other instance is where there is a high level of the intrinsic motivation derived from the work itself. On this second instance, church work rates high. Most volunteer church work supplies deep satisfaction, even promises eternal rewards. Thus, when a person—especially a volunteer—is engaged in church work that is fulfilling and bringing great satisfaction because of the intrinsic value of the work, a church leader may need to restrict intervention. Doing something may be worse than doing nothing at all.
2. In some churches (and especially in some unit of a church, e.g, a group of youth sponsors), the social network is so strong that a socially supporting action by the church leader accomplishes little, or even has the reverse effect. It may appear the pastor is “horning in” on a stable and satisfying web of relationships.
3. The theory may relate to staff supervision by a senior pastor, especially highly specialized and trained staff (e.g., a professional musician). Such a person may resist or resent too much interference in their work and prefer instead to be given broad goals rather than constant over-leading and/or micro-managing.
4. Perhaps the major implication for a church leader from Leadership Substitutes Theory is similar to the first rule of medicine: “First, do no harm.” Church leaders, especially senior pastors, are often activist-oriented people who feel compelled to act, to change things, to intervene in their responsibility as a leader. However, Leadership Substitutes Theory reminds us that there are substitutes for leadership—and sometimes “Nothing is a good thing to do.”

Part Four

Combination Approaches

An overview of the complex nature of leadership is explained in two theories in this section.

Yukl's Multiple Linkage Model

Dr. Gary Yukl, of the State University of New York at Albany, has taught and published research on leadership since 1970. His *Multiple Linkage Model* poses a leadership theory where a complex collection of elements affect the leader-follower situation, not just the leader's behavior. Yukl thus addresses the criticisms of theories which call for a leader to tailor behavior to individual follower maturity (such as Hersey-Blanchard's SLT), or such can be balanced by the additional emphasis of total group effectiveness in the Yukl model. This model not only addresses the situational variables concerning individual follower behavior, it also addresses the interacting effects of the leader's group and the work environment.

The Yukl model suggests six intervening variables, but other situational influences can affect how important each of these six are. For example, clarifying roles for subordinates may be more significant in a fast-changing or unpredictable environment where cooperation is more important when various groups share equipment. The six aspects of a situation listed below also interact with each other in having a delayed impact on the success of leader behavior.

1. Subordinate effort
2. Role clarity and task skills
3. Organization of the work
4. Cooperation and teamwork
5. Resources and support
6. External coordination

Yukl (1994) labels his model a contingency theory. The model builds on *path-goal theory* and *leadership substitutes theory*. Yukl claims that the empirical findings from research on his foundational theories provides the evidence for his model's soundness. However, he admits that this model is complex and comprehensive, and more of an overall framework to guide a leader's thinking than a refined and proven theory. It also may help explain why some factors may be overwhelming and uncontrollable, no matter how insightful and influential a leader may be.

For further study:

Ivancevich, J. M. e. a. (1999). *Organization and behavioral management* (5th Ed.). New York: Irwin McGraw-Hill.

Yukl, G. (1994). *Leadership in organizations* (3rd Ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Implication for church leadership

Yukl's model teaches the church that things aren't as simple as they are often presented. For instance, leading people in the church (or anywhere else) isn't as simple as it practicing good leader behaviors and getting rid of "stinkin' thinkin." Achievement in the church is not a success slot machine—insert the right leadership behaviors and out comes achievement. "It's all leadership" is a common saying among motivational speakers, but it simply isn't always true. A successful situation is a result of a variety of factors beyond the leader's behavior and mindset. Even Jesus could "do no great miracle" in Nazareth. However, that is not to say the leader

should be casual about practicing intentional behaviors and attempting to achieve success in God's eyes. Yukl's model helps the church leader discover some of the complex factors beyond his or her own behavior that must be managed. Some of the implications of Yukl's multiple linkage model for church leadership may be:

1. Followers in a church, can "freeze out" a leader and refuse to cooperate, thus grounding the vision before it takes off—even when the leader has the right ideas and attitudes. This foot-dragging is perhaps easier in the church full of volunteers than in a business full of paid employees. Follower action or resistance is a factor in success in a church (subordinate effort).
2. Success may be blocked by lack of clarity in who does what and who has is responsible to whom. Most people in the church who do not clearly know what to do, do nothing (role clarity and task skills).
3. Sometimes a church has a leader with great vision and attitude, many willing and hard-working volunteers, and everybody knows their role and skills. But the church is so disorganized and the management so disheveled that success is hampered or blocked altogether (organization of the work).
4. Success can escape a church even when it is full of talented people and led by a talented staff, if they can't communicate and cooperate and "get their act together (cooperation and teamwork).
5. Even if a church has a high degree of cooperation in most of these variables, they may not have the building, the money, or the staff, and sometimes success can be delayed or deferred (resources and support).
6. Finally, a factor in the success of a church can be the harmonization of what a local church is doing with other churches, the culture of the community, or between units within the church as disparate as the women's missionary society and the youth group (external coordination).
7. Yukl's Multiple Linkage model should be of major interest to church leaders, for it lays to rest the simplistic approach of the leadership hucksters who suggest that all you need to become successful is this program or that attitude. If success were that simple, it would not be so rare. Leadership that produces organizational success is a complex collection of factors which all interplay with each other. Leading a church is not like simple arithmetic, but rather more along the lines of leading and managing a complex ecosystem. The model may also remind us to be humble when successful at leading.

Sashkin's Leadership Synthesis

Marshall and Molly G. Sashkin (2003) believe that most leadership theories focus too narrowly. Some approaches center on, 1) personal characteristics of the leader; others propose, 2) a set of behaviors or *skillsets* to become an effective leader, and still others focus on, 3) the organizational context of leadership. A few theories combine two of these approaches. The Sashkins, a husband-and-wife team of management and leadership experts, have used their decades of experience in teaching, research, and publishing to recommend a new leadership model that combines all three elements: *traits, behaviors, and context*.

The Sashkins stress that any one person's experience or even research findings are inadequate, thus their approach is built on a large body of leadership research. As a result, their book provides a comprehensive overview of the main theories of leadership, where they critique each one, and then synthesize a new approach called *Leadership That Matters*. The guiding theme is the authors' definition of the role of leaders— i.e., to make meaning for followers. Leadership is different than motivating followers to accomplish goals (which they label managing), or more than developing vision (the ideal image of some future state). They believe leaders create the conditions that enable others—followers—to make their own meaning (2003, p. 4), and agree with Lao Tzu, that “leadership is mainly about knowing how to follow.”

While they are not alone in seeing the gaps and common elements in the various theories, the Sashkins asked the hard questions of each theory enough to distill a new composite research-based model. For example, transformational leadership has not been proven to be an either/or approach on a single continuum (Burns, 1978), but rather two sets of behaviors on mutually independent scales (Bass, 1985). The authors contend that the transformational leader models focus too much on the leader-follower relationship and not enough on working with followers to create a new organizational culture.

The Sashkins build considerably on the organizational leadership models of other researchers, and on personality and sociological theory. The common elements they emphasize and define are seen below in their eight-element model of leadership:

1. *Communication* – active listening; appropriate use of feedback.
2. *Trust* – consistency and credibility.
3. *Caring* – respect toward and concern for followers
4. *Creating Opportunities* – willingness to take risks and employ others in ways that observers might see as dangerous to the leader.
5. *Self-confidence* – a sense that one can be effective (self-efficacy); what drives behavioral action.
6. *Empowerment Orientation* - instilling self-motivation to act; enabling others to be effective
7. *Vision* – cognitive capability; ability to create the future in the mind and will.
8. *Organizational Context* (culture) – “the way we do things around here;” what transformational leaders are trying to reform.

Leadership that Matters incorporates three categories in the comprehensive model: behavioral elements (#1-4); personality characteristics/traits (#5-7); and context/organizational culture (#8). Thus, the composite Sashkin model goes further than other comprehensive models such as Yukl's *Multiple Linkage Model*. Because the Sashkins' add personality characteristics to the mix, they bring leadership studies nearly full circle, by re-focusing on traits or personality characteristics.

For further study:

Sashkin, M. & M. G. (2003), *Leadership that matters: The critical factors for making a difference in people's lives and organization's success*.

Implications for Church Leadership

Sashkins' work summarizes what many church leaders have assumed all along while reading this book: many of the leadership debates do not need to be responded to with an either/or reply so much as a both/an reply, or all of above—as in the Sashkins' model. Leadership in this model includes everything from trait theory through organizational culture, and proposes that the leadership environment is a complex collection of factors. The implications of the Sashkin's work for church leadership may include the following:

1. Successful leadership is a result of a complex set of factors. The Sashkins remind us that we cannot summarily announce that the reason for one pastor's success was obvious A, or the reason that church is growing is B. Effective leadership results from a complex set of factors and, in the church, these include totally unknown or controllable factors such as supernatural blessings and anointing from God. While seminars on the "six steps to successful leadership" can be helpful, they cannot be comprehensive enough to guarantee success even if those steps could be implemented perfectly. They are perhaps sixty steps... or 600, and some of those elements are out of the control of the leader and the followers. Some factors are in the hands of God alone.
2. However, the Sashkins' eight elements which are derived from multiple leadership theories do provide a core list of the secrets of successful leadership. Church leaders ought to examine themselves for signs of these core elements and if they are absent, develop them.
3. The church leadership ecosystem is even more complex than for business or other organizations. The church is a supernatural organism guided by an invisible Holy Spirit where the primary battles are in an unseen world. Thus, church leaders can never assume any leadership model can fully explain the effectiveness of one leader over another—it is more complex than this—including a spiritual dimension. Nevertheless, this cannot be an excuse for a church leader to be an ignorant leader, or to disregard the principles of solid research on how leaders can be most effective. As always with God there is synergy—God acts and we act with Him. He seldom acts alone and we shouldn't act alone.

Part Five

Supporting Theories

This section includes several studies which broaden the basis for an understanding and application of leadership theory in the church.

Motivation Theories

Several popular theories of motivation are discussed in the leadership literature, and are usually based on a psychological explanation that helps leaders and managers better understand their workers.

NEED THEORY – Abraham Maslow (1943) proposed that humans have certain needs that must be satisfied in hierarchical order: 1) physiological, 2) safety/security, 3) belongingness, 4) esteem, 5) self-actualization. He believed that people were basically good or neutral rather than evil, and that they cannot choose behavior that satisfies higher-level needs until the more basic needs are met. **Frederick Herzberg's** (1966) need theory deals with an individual's satisfaction/dissatisfaction with an organization. It is based on two sets of factors: maintenance (extrinsic) factors (e.g., good supervision, comfortable environment) effecting dissatisfaction; and motivator (intrinsic) factors (e.g., autonomy, recognition, achievement opportunities) affecting satisfaction.

LEARNED NEEDS THEORY – David McClelland's (1962) early work stated that many human needs are acquired from the culture, specifically the need for achievement, the need for affiliation, and the need for power (see section on “Ethical Motivations for Leaders” for descriptions). When a need is strong, individuals will choose behavior which meets that need. Such needs were developed from coping with their environment, and tend to occur more often when behavior is rewarded more frequently (a Skinnerian approach). This theory also complements the views of situational leadership theory that may focus on task and/or relationship management.

THEORY X AND THEORY Y – Douglas McGregor (1960) believed that managers hold certain assumptions about people in organizational settings. Theory X meant that people are basically lazy, require structure and direction. Without it, they will act irresponsibly. Theory Y assumes that people are not lazy, do not have to be closely supervised, and want to work, especially when it is meaningful and challenging. Argyris & Schon (1982), argue that leaders need to take care that they do not treat others with Theory Y statements (espoused theory) and then behave with Theory X assumptions (theory in action).

EXPECTANCY THEORY – Victor Vroom's (1964) theory of motivation is a more complex theory, because it combines a focus that is external, with a consideration of internal individual meaning. His theory is based on the assumption that most behavior is under the voluntary control of the person. Behavior is related to outcome and success, however the value and attractiveness of these outcomes varies from one to another. The Path-Goal Model of Leadership uses this theory as its basis for structuring the choices in leader style, follower characteristics, and environmental factors.

POSITIVE REINFORCEMENT – B. F. Skinner (1948) emphasized the external situation in his approach to personality and motivation. His fictional book, *Walden Two*, applied his principles of operant conditioning and scheduled reinforcement. The approach is to clarify the desired behavior and achieve it by incentives and positive reinforcement, or reward systems.

The Skinnerian view is an extreme behaviorist approach, and sees an individual as a rather passive victim of events in his or her environment.

Most theories of motivation support the belief that leaders can influence the motivation state of others. When leaders take an active role in motivating others in their circle of responsibility, they are being sensitive to the variations in intrinsic motivational needs, as well as seeking to provide different structures for need satisfaction extrinsically. Marcini (1999) stresses learning and involvement and prefers to call this “engagement” of followers.

For further study:

Argyris, C., & Schon, D. (1982). *Theory in practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Marcini, J. W. (1999). Out with Motivation, in with Engagement. *National Productivity Review*, 18(4) 43-46.

Maslow, A. H., (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50, 370-396.

McClelland, D. C. (1962). Business Drive and National Achievement, *Harvard Business Review*, July-August, 1962, 99-112.

McGregor, D. (1960). *The human side of the enterprise*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Skinner, B. F. (1948) *Walden two*. New York: Macmillan.

Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York: Wiley & Sons.

Implications for church leadership.

Motivation is a concern for church leaders because part of their job is to motivate people to do the right thing. Churches are always seeking volunteers to work in the nursery, or youth sponsors, or are trying to get their members to fulfill the Great Commission (Matthew 28:19-20). Pastors and church leaders have to be motivators. And most realize that intrinsic motivation is more powerful and long-lasting than extrinsic motivation.

However, there are theological reason why ministers should care, not just about whether the people *are* motivated—but *why*. In Christian thinking, the quality of a deed (or service) is not based on the deed itself but on the motivation. This notion is most prominent in the teaching of Jesus on the hypocrites praying publicly (Matthew 6:1-18). If their motivation was to be seen and praised, they received no reward in heaven. Thus, Christian leaders must have considerable concern not only that people will be motivated to do a right deed or service, but that they will be motivated for the right reasons. Therefore, theories of motivation are highly relevant for church leaders.

Some implications of the above theories of motivation for church leadership may be:

1. Churches leaders must be aware of what motivates people if they intend to get volunteers to respond. Churches have perhaps always been aware of motivations, but a leader who is conscious of them can be more effective at getting people to respond. For example, people want to belong—to be a part of an exciting group of people (affiliation). People want to be a part of something worthwhile that is moving forward, making a contribution (achievement). And people want to participate in decision-making, be in on the action, have a vote, and be given authority (power). These three motivators are human motivators, thus they are factors in motivation of all church members. Knowing and using them enables a church leader more effective in multiplying their leadership.

2. It may be that individual churches specialize in promoting one basic motivation excessively while ignoring the power of other intrinsic and extrinsic factors. If so, leaders in these churches might consider monitoring their motivational message to ensure balance.
3. It is also possible that an individual pastor or church leader might be inclined to motivate others using the motivator that he or she would be most motivated by. Such overuse of this motivational assumption may be an indicator of the most powerful motivator in the leader's life. Additionally, recognizing which is the master motivator for an individual leader, and an examination of what may not motivate him/herself, may help the leader develop a broader approach to the motivation of others. "Know thyself" is good advice at this point.
4. Every church leader should examine their own outlook on the Theory X and Theory Y continuum, ensuring their view is grounded in their theology.

Power & Influence

Power is the *potential* to influence another person to behave in a certain way. Influence is power in action (Dahl, 1957). Sources of power include interpersonal qualities and/or organizational structures. There are two kind of power: structural and interpersonal power. *Structural power* occurs when individuals are in a position to have, 1) access to resources, 2) ability to affect decision-making processes, and 3) access to relevant and important information (Kanter, 1979). Structure also impacts informal, non-positional power by its impact on the way information flows within an organization. *Interpersonal power*, on the other hand, is grounded in the individual's expertise or style, and not in the position or level in the organization.

One of the most often-quoted list of power bases comes from the work of French & Raven (1959). They suggest five interpersonal sources of power, however, not all of these are available to everyone in an organization.

The French & Raven Model

- Legitimate Power – the authority that comes with the position a person holds; sometimes called position power
- Reward Power – based on ability to reward a follower for compliance
- Coercive Power – the power to punish (opposite of reward power)
- Expert Power – possessing special knowledge or skill that is highly valued
- Referent Power – based on desire of followers to identify with, and be accepted by, the leader (as aspect of charisma)

Legitimate, reward, and coercive power generally operate in conjunction with a prescribed position, however, fear of rejection can operate interpersonally without formal authority. Expert and referent power, however, are personal qualities which are used in all levels of an organization.

Two Kinds of Power

McClelland (1976) tested his theory of achievement, power, and affiliation motivations with managers and executives in the United States. To his surprise, he found that their strongest need *by far* was the need for power. He expanded his finding by observing that this need for power was expressed in two ways:

- Type I – *Prosocial Power*
In order to meet organizational goals, executives were found to use their influence to share power and were open to themselves being influenced. They did not see power as a “zero sum game,” where the more others have, the less you have. In fact, studies at the University of Michigan found that organizations where power and influence is broadly distributed had significantly higher performance and productivity compared to the organizations in which power was concentrated at the top (Sashkin, 2003).
- Type II – *Personalized Power*
Some managers and executives were found to see their power as something to differentiate themselves from everyone else. They sought special parking places, status office space, and submission symbols from their subordinates. Their organizations did

not perform as well as those headed by Type I leaders, and the executives themselves were “frequently depressive, often alcoholic, typically divorced, and had few, if any, friends... very unhappy people” (Sashkin, 2003, p. 59).

Power can be thought of as *asymmetrical*, when one person has more power than the other, or *symmetrical*, when both parties are equal—and this can change over time as people gain or lose power. An individual seldom has all the power in an organization—and with good reason. Lord Acton, in a letter to Bishop Mandell Creighton, in 1887 said, “Power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely. Great men are almost always bad men” (The Phrase Finder, 2003). However, the most effective leaders know when and how to share their power for personal or organizational benefit.

For further study:

Dahl, R. (1957). The Concept of Power. *Behavioral Science*, July 1957, 202-3

Kanter, R. M. (1979). Power Failures in Management Circuits. *Harvard Business Review*, July-August, 1979, 65-75.

French, J. R. P. & Raven, B. (1959). The Basis of Social Power. In D. Cartwright, (Ed.). *Studies in Social Power*, Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 150-167.

The Phrase Finder. Retrieved March 22, 2003. <http://phrases.shu.ac.uk/meanings/288200.html>

McClelland, D. C. & Burnham, D. H. (1976). Power is the great motivator. *Harvard Business Review*, 54, 2. 100-110.

Sashkin, M. G. & Sashkin, M. (2003). *Leadership that matters: The critical factors for making a difference in people's lives and organizational success*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler

Implication for church leaders

Christ promised power to His followers after the Holy Spirit had come upon them, so some power must be a good thing for Christians. However, Christ also taught that power-seeking can be wrong for believers. Thus, we have the two-edged sword concerning power in the church; it can be either good or evil. For this reason, church leaders should be aware of power and influence issues in the leadership research. Some of the implications for church leaders from this research may be:

1. If leadership is influencing people to change and power is the potential to influence them, then church leaders must have power. Ministers have some structural power granted to them by the polity of a church—but since the church is made up mostly of members and not employees, the minister's structural power is limited far more than that of a leader in most other organizations. However, the ministers interpersonal power may be greater than that of a leader in business—considering that in some churches the members have chosen their leader by vote. This grants a “corporate” anointing the day the pastor comes to the church.
2. Of the five types of power proposed by French & Raven, the minister holds certain kinds of power more than others. The minister has a significant amount of legitimate power derived from ordination and appointment to the church. The minister has less reward power (which is mostly in God's hands), though he or she might hold such power over staff members if in a senior pastor role. A minister has limited coercive power (other

than what might be used illegitimately in stirring up rejection of a person in the group). Ministers who are well-trained should possess expert power, especially in theological and biblical matters (though often less so in business, legal or financial matters, if they have laity who are professionals in those fields). Referent power is probably the highest potential power a minister possesses and it is gained by his or her charisma and constant pastoral care. Most ministers observe that leading a person to Christ or going through “the valley of the shadow of death” in a hospital corridor will gain them authority that can be used later with those people. Of course, this is a benefit of pastoral care, not a legitimate motivation for it.

3. McClelland’s research on the need for power should cause ministers and other church leaders to step back and do a self-assessment. Perhaps accomplishing something for God’s kingdom (achievement), or becoming a part of a great church (affiliation) would be higher motivations for a church leader than having personalized power over others or even pro-social power with others (power). If so, church leaders would have a different outcome than the research findings on managers and executives in the U.S. Church leaders should remember the need for power should be made to be positive. For if power is the potential to influence people, and one’s influence is to move that person toward positive change, then power would not have to be necessarily corrupt, as in the quote by Lord Acton.

Ethical Motivations in the Leader

Most leadership literature assumes a need for some form of power in the leader. Harvard social psychologist, David McClelland (1987) found that effective leadership is motivated by a set of three learned motivations: affiliation, power, and achievement. Kanungo & Mendonca (1996) applied these three motivations to build an ethical model for leaders. They suggested both a positive and a negative expression for each of McClelland's motivations.

McClelland's three motivations and the Kanungo & Mendonca positive/negative expressions are shown in the following list:

- **Affiliation** – need for friendship and social contact
 - Negative: Avoidance; clings for fear of rejection
 - Positive: Approaching, as in a concern for others (Boyatis, 1973)
- **Achievement** – need for production, responsibility, realizing goals, solving problems.
 - Negative: Personal gain only
 - Positive: Social achievements, or collective capability
- **Power** – need for impact, authority, pressure, winning arguments.
 - Negative: Personal; emphasizing dominance and submission, and self-aggrandizement
 - Positive: Institutional; persuasive and inspirational for purposes of the organization

Kanungo & Mendonca suggest that *altruism* is the value that drives the positive—versus the negative—expression in each of the above categories. Altruism (intent is to benefit others) is thus the antidote to a negative *egotistic* motivation (intent is to benefit self), as it moderates or overcomes the effects of the negative option for each intrinsic motivation. The authors observed that “organizational leaders are consistently effective only when they are motivated by concern for others even when it results in some cost to self” (p. 37). In order for a leader to achieve such an altruistic vision for their organization and the people in it, the authors stress the following process:

- 1) **Assessing the Environment.** Instead of focusing their own inward needs and not considering followers' needs, turn outward and focus on the welfare of whole organization.
- 2) **Casting the Vision.** After formulating a vision for the good of the organization, be willing to assume the risk of seeing the potential in all followers and articulating the vision in a way they can understand.
- 3) **Implementing the Plan** Through encouragement (filling with courage), empowering (shared decision-making), and modeling (taking the risk of sacrifice), people can be effective leaders.

Motivations are not fixed attributes, according to McClelland (1977), but can be learned, unlearned, and changed. He believes that the formation of a positive motivation happens only as the leader matures through developmental stages. As for developing altruism, Dillman (2000)

suggests Kohlberg's Stages of Moral Development (1968) as the framework for forming such a high moral ethic.

Leadership is more than a position. It is a moral relationship between people, held together by loyalty and trust, and rooted in the leader's commitment to values and accountability when exercising power and authority (Ciulla, 1998). This requires leaders to be ethical and consistent in their espoused values (words) as well as their behavior (deeds).

For further study:

- Boyatis, R. E. (1973). Affiliation motivation. In D. McClelland (Ed.), *Human motivation: A book of readings* (p. 252-278) Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.
- Ciulla, J. B.(Ed.) (1998). *Ethics, the heart of leadership*. Westport, CN: Praeger Publishers.
- Dillman, S. W. (2000). Leading with love: Altruism as the moral antecedent to servant leadership. Unpublished manuscript. Regent University.
- Kanungo, R. N. & Mendona, M. (1996). *Ethical dimensions of leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Kohlberg, L. (1968). Moral development. *International encyclopedia of social sciences*. New York: Crowell, Collier, Macmillan.
- McClelland, D. C. (1977) The impact of power motivation training on alcoholics. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*. 38 (1), 142-144.
- McClelland, D. C. (1987). *Human motivation*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Implications for church leadership.

For church leaders, the motivation should be as important as the result. William Law and John Wesley (and Jesus long before) believe right intentions are even more important than right actions. The Pharisees of Jesus' day were condemned by Jesus not for their wrong actions of praying or fasting, but for their wrong motivations (to be seen and praised by others—Matthew 6). The church leader can never say, "Well, it worked and we grew, so it's good" in defending the ends justify the means. A leader might *say* this, but to God the motivation is as important as the result, or more so. Research on ethical motivations helps church leaders face and ponder their own motivation for leading the church. Perhaps we can't simply say this leader has a good motivation while that one has a bad motivation. More likely we all have mixed motivations and periodically doing self-examination and sorting of our motivations is good Christian self-leadership. Some of the implications of ethical motivations research for church leaders may be:

1. *Why* do you want to succeed? The research in U.S. businesses shows three primary motivations: to be part of a great group of people (affiliation); to accomplish something great (achievement) or to make a real impact in life (power). These three classic motivations may be a factor in what attracts ministers to leadership in the church. Which is the more powerful motivating factor for you? The research found power to be the greatest motivator for business leaders, and it would be interesting to do a similar study with pastors.
2. Each of the three motivations has both a positive and a negative manifestation. Church leaders should put aside relationship-avoidance or excessive clinging relationships (negative affiliation). They should resist temptation to work only for personal gain and career development (negative achievement). And they should reject the impulse to build a personal

kingdom of power (negative power). Rather, a Christian church leader should steer their motivations toward the positive side of these three: building strong other-oriented social groups (positive affiliation), working for the collective achievements of the local church (positive achievement) and building the institution of the church and kingdom of God (positive power).

3. Church leaders should regularly enter a process of self-examination to ponder their personal motivation, seeking God to cleanse the elements of motivation that issue from a desire to build a great ministerial career, great personal kingdom, or become famous. Dying out to such motivations can permit higher level motivations to emerge. This will enable a minister to succeed not just in the people's eyes, but also God's. An effective church leader in God's sight will have positive expressions of affiliation, achievement, and power, using altruistic values to avoid developing a personal career path, or seeking to develop fame among ministerial peers.

4. Self-assessment is the beginning of the three-step process for re-creating an organization with positive ethical motivations. Beginning with the primary leader, the entire collection of leaders—ministerial and lay—can move the inner motivations for leading from negative affiliation, achievement, and power motivations, to altruistic, positive, and ethical motivations.

Intercultural Leadership

A leader's role is always performed in a context, and the behavior or personality of a leader may emerge from or be in conflict with the context. Therefore, leadership effectiveness in overseas countries or in cross-cultural situations within a country requires a careful study of not only the culture, history, expectations, and working environment, but also an awareness of the leader's own ability to develop an appropriate style for the context of the leadership situation. For example, a leader may need to blend various attitudes and behaviors in order to have influence in a particular national culture that values participative management.

What people value is one way of identifying the cultural dimensions of a people group. Hofstede (1983, 1991) studied 116,000 people in 50 countries and discovered four basic values:

- a) **Power distance** – authority distribution in organizations: a high level of power distance equates with hierarchical structure; a low power distance level results in superiors and subordinates with more equal power
- b) **Uncertainty avoidance** – the extent to which people can tolerate ambiguity: high levels have more rules, laws, and less aggressive employees; low levels of uncertainty avoidance produce less formality and more risk-taking.
- c) **Individualism** – the tendency to fend for oneself: high levels have a preference for self-respect and autonomy; low levels prefer harmony and consensus decision-making.
- d) **Masculinity** – traditional masculine values: masculinity prefers assertiveness and materialism; feminine values prefer relationships and quality of life.

Hofstede cautions leaders to not over generalize any one cultural environment, because there will be individuals who do not fit their own typical culture.

In an international comparison, Bass (1979) identified seven factors that are linked to leader effectiveness in cross-cultural leadership:

- 1) Preferred awareness (willingness to be aware of other's feelings).
- 2) Actual awareness (actual understanding of oneself and others).
- 3) Submissiveness (to rules and authority).
- 4) Reliance on others (in problem solving).
- 5) Favoring of group decision-making.
- 6) Concern for human relations.
- 7) Cooperative peer relations.

Admittedly, the style of the leader is but one variable in the leadership context. The leader-follower relationship, the peer influence, the task, and the work environment will also affect leader effectiveness.

Diversity within a workplace is an increasing trend related to cultural studies. Valuing ethnic and cultural diversity is promoted in the leadership literature, because of caring for the needs of individual employees and for increased opportunities for influence and growth into new areas. However, leaders also need to be aware of and prepare for the potential problems of miscommunication, misunderstanding, and cultural differences in, e.g., responding to authority. Nevertheless, knowing and appreciating the uniqueness of the culture can make the leadership task less frustrating.

For further study:

Lewis, R. D. (1996). How to lead in another language. *Management Today*, March, 82-84.
Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and organizations*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Implications for Church Leadership

Intercultural notions are precious to Christians because of our God-concept. We do not have a distant stationary God for whom we are constantly reaching. We understand God to be a reaching God, one who “became flesh and dwelt among us” (John 1). God came to our human culture and lived among us as a man. This models for us the notion of reaching all nations and cultures by going to them, adapting to their ways, and reaching them with the absolutes of the gospel. When all this is loaded into leadership, one gets an adapting leader—a leader who studies the leadership culture of the local setting, then adapts his or her own leadership style to the cultural setting in order to accomplish God’s mission for that church. This adaptive leadership is obviously required in international settings, but it is also required for multi-cultural settings in our homeland, as well.

1. Almost all church leadership is intercultural. That is, seldom is a pastor perfectly matched with a culture identical to his or her own, even in the home country. While the cultural context may have even greater variance in an overseas culture, the cultural differences should not be overlooked in the several appointments a North American pastor might serve in a lifetime of ministry: a sprawling California bedroom community, a slowly declining upstate New York community, a booming inner-city Chicago church plant, a small Nebraska farming community, and a mixed South Florida community of retired snowbirds and recent immigrants. We sometimes assume there is one universal culture across America that spreads from the Chesapeake’s Eastern Shore to the Cascade villages of Oregon. Wrong! The principles of intercultural ministry once reserved for missions are now highly relevant to those who stay in their own country. A pastor must be prepared to exegete the culture of any assignment in order to develop the leadership style most effective in that setting. The assumption that there is one uniform leadership style that will work everywhere is at minimum simplistic and false, and probably also dangerous and damaging to the church and leader. Effective leaders must learn the culture of the church they serve, for even in one country, there is likely a diversity of cultures.
2. The pastor should be the adaptor. Pastors must be the professionals—learning the local culture and adapting their leadership style to it, not demanding the local culture learn to live with and accept the pastor’s leadership style. This concept is a core idea of sound missiology. The missionary is the professional who adapts to the alien culture, not expecting the local folk to understand me and the way I lead. Missionaries know that in tribal cultures decision-making may operate differently from American democracy, or that in group cultures, authority flows through different channels than through the American-cherished one-man-one-vote system. We expect our missionaries to learn the culture where they are sent, adapting worship styles, church government, and leadership to the culture they serve. Yet some of the same pastors who expect this professional behavior from missionaries they sponsor don’t exhibit similar values in their own

leadership context—which is also intercultural, too. All leadership is intercultural to a certain degree. Since, in most churches the culture is mixed, the leadership style must therefore be forged to suit a diversity of cultures. In such a complex setting, an amateur leader will be tempted to simply revert to their own preferred leadership style rather than forging a style suited to the diverse culture. However, the professional leader will learn the culture and shape a style perfectly suited to that culture. Many pastors know only one or two leadership styles. This lack of professional training in leadership hampers a pastor. Like the carpenter with only a screw driver and a hammer, the pastor with only two leadership styles tries his or her best, but the result just isn't enough. Pastors need to develop a full leadership toolbox to be able to use the right leadership style suited to that very culture.

3. Wise church leaders could start with Hofstede's four basic values in estimating their local church's culture: Power distance, Uncertainty Avoidance, Individualism and Masculinity.
4. Bass outlined seven factors that contributed to leadership effectiveness in intercultural settings. Every pastor who wants to be an effective leader ought to turn these seven factors into a personal self-examination questionnaire. They may be the vary factors that make a great pastor-leader.

Organizational Culture and Leadership

Edgar Schein appears to be the most often-quoted writer on the subject of organizational culture for leaders. He defines organizational culture as “a pattern of shared basic assumptions that the group learned as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid and therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to these problems” (1992, p. 12). Schein recommends analyzing organizational culture on three levels, in order to understand the embedded sources of the values and actions commonly seen in an organization.

Levels of Organizational Culture (Schein, 1992. p. 17)

Artifacts – visible organizational structures and processes (hard to decipher meaning)

Espoused Values – strategies, goals, philosophies (includes justifications for behavior)

Basic Underlying Assumptions – unconscious, taken-for-granted beliefs, perceptions, thoughts, and feelings (ultimate source of values and action)

Each level affects the other levels. This interconnected set of values identified as the preferred (or obligatory) state of behavior within the organization is sometimes called an ideology. An ideology is a deeper level than the espoused values and norms (specific expectations) and the public identity of an organization.

Not every collection of people develops a culture. It is only formed when there has been enough shared history for the people to become a group rather than a crowd. Socialization is the general process by which organizations bring new members into the culture, i.e., the older workers pass on the shared values, assumptions, and attitudes of the organization.

Since organizations are most effective when the members share values, leaders need to see organizational culture as a valuable resource to manage (Schein, 1992). As for influencing cultural change, Mainero & Tromley (1989) believe that behavior affects values and suggest five ways courageous leaders attempt to change culture (see next Chapter for more change theory).

Intervention Points for Influencing Organizational Culture

- 1) Behavioral change (requiring compliance to new routines, with the belief that values and beliefs will follow)
- 2) Justification for behavior (members seeing inherent worth in new behavior)
- 3) Cultural communication to motivate new behavior (memos, rituals, stories, dress)
- 4) Socialization of new members (or hire ones who fit with the culture)
- 5) Removal of members who deviate from the culture (weeding out cultural misfits, after careful diagnosis)

Founding leaders are able over time to embed their basic assumptions in the patterns of the group, and therefore help to create the organizational culture. However, if a leader sets out to

change the existing culture of an organization, he or she can expect it to be difficult, time consuming, and highly anxiety provoking (Schein, 1992). Yet, leaders are sometimes able to get at the deeper levels of how cultural assumptions were made, and deal with any dysfunction at that level. This must include the leaders revealing assumptions within themselves, and a willingness to absorb the anxiety and risk produced by such a challenge in the organization.

For further study:

Hatch, M. J. (1993). Dynamics of Organizational Culture. *Academy of Management Review*, October, 1993.

Mainero, L. A. & Tromley, C. L. (1989). *Developing managerial skills in organizational behavior*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall

Schein, E. (1992). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass

Implications for church leadership

The church is not merely a collection of people in a human organization but a spiritual organism under the influence of the Holy Spirit. The Bible and theology lay out clear underlying assumptions about the church—this is called our *ecclesiology*. The Bible should provide common values for the church. These underlying (and perhaps never-stated) assumptions and publicly declared values should then produce the artifacts of our present-day structure and systems in the church. We share many underlying assumptions and values across denominational and theological lines, however, the artifacts may differ widely. Church leaders should be keen on understanding organizational culture, for one of our tasks is to cultivate a common culture in the church based on common values and assumptions. Indeed, one of the purposes of preaching is to “get the church on the same page” concerning values and assumptions. Some of the implications for church leadership from the research in organizational culture may be:

1. Pastors often attempt to change the artifacts (the structures, programs and processes) without addressing the espoused values and underlying assumptions first. Such surface changing seldom works. Changing the people’s underlying assumptions and espoused values may take longer than merely changing a program or process, but it leads to more permanent change in a congregation.
2. Due to a series of program-pastors, some churches have hardly any common ground in values or assumptions. These churches need long term teaching, preaching, and discipling to bring the group to collective common values and assumptions. Until then such a people may have no more in common than a random crowd attending a movie theater—they come because they like the show but have nothing else in common. A leader’s job in such a church is to develop an organizational culture based on solid biblical and theological foundations. Preaching is the primary pathway to such commonality.
3. Mainero & Tromley, however, offer a counterpoint to the above. They raise a point often debated in the church: do we change people’s minds first, expecting them to thus change their behavior; or can we start by changing their behavior first, then leading them to the underlying values and beliefs? Mainero & Tromley suggest we can start at the behavioral end (e.g., starting outreach teams instead of just preaching on evangelism) before the people are even convinced in their minds of that value. Then, as the people act in new ways, their values and assumptions will catch up to their behavior.

Organizational Change Theory

Organizational change is a generalized term for organizational development (OD) and organizational transformation (OT) theory and practice. The theory and practice of OD deals with planned change efforts in managing the human dynamics in an organization. These “first order” changes include staff training and other continuous improvement strategies. OT addresses more massive changes in structures, processes, culture, and dealing with an external environment. This is often unplanned, radical, and revolutionary to the organization’s structures. Leaders who initiate and/or manage organizational change efforts intend to improve organizational effectiveness and individual well-being. Three theorists are notable in the field and important for leaders to know when understanding organizational change.

LEWIN’s (1947) Three-Step Procedure is a result of four years of studies and action research designed to change food habits in line with war needs during WWII. Since Lewin believed that all human systems attempt to maintain equilibrium that provides predictability and meaning, he concluded that all change processes needed to follow this procedure:

1. *unfreezing* – sufficient discomfort creating motivation concerning new goals, and psychological safety to develop readiness to change.
2. *moving./changing* – cognitive restructuring; includes demonstrations, training, and empowerment.
3. *refreezing* – applying reinforcement and feedback; often includes new rewards for desired behavior, and new accountability measures to help establish the new level of behavior.

At the heart of this classic theory are the principles that enable people to unlearn old behaviors (cognitive change) and learn new ones (behavioral change).

TICHY’s (1983) Technical, Political, Cultural Framework (TPC) uses the metaphor of a strategic three-strand rope to stress the importance of overarching, inter-related systems that cut across the other components that affect the organization: The three strands are:

- Technical – based on hard data, representing rational perspective;
- Political – based on power dynamics between individuals and groups;
- Cultural – based on shared values and norms.

All three of these systems must be aligned with each other and with any one “change lever” in an organization for change to be effective. Change levers are the individual components of an organization, such as mission, strategy, interest groups, task, formal structures, people, processes, informal networks, and environment. TPC places strong emphasis on effective leadership as essential to change, since it is perceived to pervade the whole organizational framework.

GLADWELL’s (2000) book, *The Tipping Point* provides an appropriate description of how change happens “virally” and seldom happens as planned. It can be explained by the following three characteristics:

- Contagiousness – the word-of-mouth spreading of the fame/notoriety of a product or event.

- Small causes can have big effects - little changes can have large consequences.
- Change happens suddenly – the notion of reaching critical mass, when the virus has spread sufficiently, it seems the whole world is instantly aware of the phenomenon.

Gladwell argues that this kind of change happens because of the following three primary components: a) “The Law of the Few” says there are three kinds of influential people in an organization: *connectors* - infectious people with personality-based strengths to spread the word, *mavens* – collectors of information, and *salesmen* – persuaders that relate, empathize, and influence; b) the content of the message and its “stickiness factor” constantly refined for maximum effect; and c) the context/environment in which the infection occurs. Much of Gladwell’s theory for understanding change appears to be based on his belief that peer pressure is more powerful than the influence of a hierarchical boss.

Any change begins with a *vision* for the future. However, Burke (2002) states that leaders “should not assume that this thought process [vision] will then generate the necessary behavior for the organization change” (p. 136). Instead, he urges concentration on the *behavior* needed, believing that people will attribute appropriate explanation as to why this new direction makes sense (see *Sensemaking*, Weick, 1995). Burke’s argument is based on the 19th century work of William James (1890) who found that emotional behavior precedes emotional experience. Though much of this is unconscious and seems out of control, the theory encourages leaders to reinforce the things that attract people to the new direction.

For further study:

- Burke, W. W. (2002). *Organization change: theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Gladwell, M. (2000). *The tipping point: How little things can make a big difference*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Kotter, John P. (1996). *Leading Change*. Boston, MS: Harvard Business School Press.
- Lewin, K. (1947). Group decision and social change. IN T. M. Newcomb, El. L. Hartley, and Others, *Readings in social psychology* (p. 330-344) New York: Henry Holt.
- James, W. (1890). *Principles of psychology*. (Vols. 1 and 2) New York: Holt.
- Tichy, N. M. (1983). *Managing strategic change: Technical, political, and cultural dynamics*. New York: Wiley.
- Weick, K. E. (1995). *Sensemaking in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Implications for Church Leadership

Most church leaders assume things need changing. Indeed, the notion of the kingdom of God growing like a mustard plant or spreading through the whole lump of dough like yeast assumes change. In some sense all Christians are change-agents. The world is out of sync with God’s will and Christians are in the work of helping God bring it back into alignment—“thy kingdom come” (Matthew 6). While everything does not have to be changed, leaders are called to change the things that need changing (and have the wisdom to know what needs changed and what should be left alone.) Most church leaders assume it is their responsibility to understand from God’s leading what changes should be made. Therefore, organizational change theory is relevant to pastors since it speaks to how to effect these changes. Some implications from organizational change theory for church leadership may be:

1. Changing often occurs in stages, beginning with Lewin's process of unfreezing—preparing for change to occur. This role is similar to John the Baptist's work, but is often not as popular with pastors. But forcing change without the proper preparation may backfire in a church organization and result in unintended consequences—perhaps the changing of the pastor.
2. Tichy's three-strand rope implies that change is not one-dimensional; rather it includes at least three inter-related systems. Church leaders are often better equipped to outline the technical-rational arguments for change than they are to understand the political-power dynamics and the cultural-shared values elements. Church leaders should be skilled at working with all three strands.
3. Gladwell's "tipping point" concept helps church leaders understand how sometimes change strikes like lightning rather than coming in a measured, incremental process. Sometimes after a long period of trying to change, a massive shift just happens so swiftly that the church launches forward, skipping several decades of what would have been incremental change. The pastor presiding during this time warp change gets the credit for the shift, but is often unable to tell what secret measures brought on the "tipping point." In the church, however, the extraordinary blessing and action of the Holy Spirit must always be factored in, for the Spirit can always bring the church to the "tipping point."

Women and Leadership

A trend in research on women and leadership can be seen in a series of questions (Indvik, 2001), the first of which is, Can women be leaders? Most leadership literature is written from the premise that there is a leader in all of us, and with the motivation to lead, anyone can develop leadership potential (Klenke, 1996). Overall, Klenke believes that context, rather than gender, is the raw material that provides the basis for which men and women structure their leadership role.

Since the first question above is generally answered affirmatively, this led to three further questions which form the section headings below.

How do male and female leaders differ in behavior and effectiveness as leaders?

The difference between how women lead differently than men depends on which generation of female leadership the person was from. Research has shown that the first generation of women led like men, in a command and control mode. The second generation of women leaders differed from the first generation leaders in that they tended to use their own feminine strengths and traits in leading. Judith Rosener (1990) identified these four in particular: encouraging participation, sharing information and power, enhancing the self-esteem of others, energizing others (spreading enthusiasm around). Rosen reported that these women felt their style came naturally. She also found the same work-family stresses in women leaders as men leaders, except when there were children at home—then women had slightly greater stress.

Why do so few women leaders reach the top?

Judith Indvik (2001, p. 226) summarized her findings from a meta-analysis of popular and data-based explanations that help answer this question.

- a) *Organizational Barriers* – sometimes higher standards for women; an inhospitable culture; preference for gender similarity as a basis for promotion; ignorance/inaction by male CEOs; imbalance of recognizing excessive difficulties; lack of definitive developmental opportunities.
- b) *Interpersonal Barriers* – male prejudice, stereotyping, preconceptions; lack of emotional and interpersonal support; exclusion from informal networks; lack of male mentors.
- c) *Personal Barriers* – lack of political savvy; work/home conflict.

How can more women leaders be successful in leadership?

Research on women and leadership often includes advocacy for women reaching the top of the leadership hierarchy in organizations. One careful study resulted in a set of guidelines for women aspiring to be such leaders. Mainiero (1994) researched 55 executive women's career histories and identified four stages in their developmental process:

- Stage 1 – *Transcending political naiveté* (she valued being direct; became aware of the corporate culture)
- Stage 2 – *Building credibility* (she performed against accepted stereotypes; worked within the system; took business risks; built alliances and interpersonal networks)

Stage 3 – *Refining a style* (she delegated and built teams; overcame obstacles through persistence; used personal influence)

Stage 4 – *Shouldering responsibilities* (she learned to be alone at the top; mentored others; managed work/non-work balance)

Theoretical explanations regarding women and leadership generally are supported by demographic studies. However, with the two categories in this kind of bipolar research, such either/or thinking can be unconsciously prejudicial and tends to make the two groups adversarial. Yet, objective research can clarify the proactive role that organizations must take as well as the choices emerging female leaders must make in order to grow.

For further study:

Indvik, J. (2001). Women and Leadership. In P. G. Northouse (Ed.), *Leadership: Theory and Practice* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Klenke, K. (1996). *Women and leadership: A contextual perspective* (1st ed.). New York: Springer Publishing Company.

Mainiero, L. (1994). On breaking the glass ceiling: The political seasoning of powerful women executives. *Organizational Dynamics, Spring*, 5-20.

Rosener, J. (1990). Ways women lead. *Harvard Business Review, Nov-Dec*, 32-37.

Implications for church leadership

Asking questions about women as leaders drives to the heart of both Christian theology and the application of a biblical hermeneutic. Did God create males and females equal? Were women somehow created less than males and are thus destined to assist males but never lead them? What part might the fall (Genesis 3) play in the male-female roles? In what ways do male and female roles at home bleed over to the church? Do roles change over time so that the household social order of the first century regarding master-slave or husband-wife relationships does not automatically transfer to our century without application? These are questions of theology and hermeneutics. Some implications for church leaders may be:

1. The *a priori* question, “Can women be leaders?” is still being answered in many churches. The nearly unanimous answer has been, “yes, women can lead” however, the question remaining is, “*Who* can they lead?” Some say women can be effective leaders of other women and of children, but they cannot lead men. Or, perhaps it might be stated they *should not* lead men. Using several passages from St. Paul’s writings, these Christians ban women from leading men, while encouraging them to exercise leadership among children and other women. In these settings, the latter questions are not yet being addressed, since the first question has not yet been answered affirmatively. While the general flow of the church is toward openness to women leading the entire church—including leading men—it will take more time until the entire church comes to common ground on this issue, for it involves intricate questions of exegesis and application of Scripture. For the time being, women are invited into leadership within a variety of denominations within the church (notably in Charismatic and Wesleyan traditions), but await full embracing of their leadership role in the rest of the Christian church. For now, women called to leadership in denominations barring their exercise of that leadership

must either wait until they are granted freedom to lead, or migrate to denominations that are more encouraging toward women leaders.

2. Judith Rosener's study confirms what many pastors have observed: the first women who break in to leadership learn to play the men's game by the men's rules. That is, they figure out how to succeed in the system just like the men did. While this leaves these first generation women leaders open to denigration for being "manish," it is often the only way for women to compete in the first generation of leadership. It is as if women must play the men's game by the men's rules in order to prove it can be done. While this may prove something to men, this factor can be a powerful obstacle to women rising to leadership—they feel like they must abandon their feminine side in order to achieve. Many women are unwilling to do this in order to lead, and thus surrender any attempt to become leaders. As the church appreciates both the feminine and the masculine approach to leadership, women—especially those who insist on retaining their more feminine approaches to leadership—will step forward in leader positions. Those currently in positions of power and influence in the church can provide for this expansion of leadership approaches by making the church a warmer climate for women in leadership.
3. The church (including all prospective women leaders) should admit there are considerable barriers to women in leadership. While the biblical hermeneutic debate may be the first issue to resolve, there are other cultural, organizational, interpersonal, and personal barriers for women called to leadership in any setting. Denying or disregarding these barriers will help neither the church nor women. They must be faced squarely and both women and the church will have to adapt and change in order to release the energy of women called and anointed by God for church leadership.
4. The Mainiero study provides a route map for rising to leadership. A woman called to lead Christ's church must first abandon her naiveté and do well compared to the present rules-of-engagement. As she builds credibility and her network, she will develop and refine her own style, overcome obstacles, and use her personal influence in the church. As she rises to leadership, she will learn how to be alone and will mentor others as she manages to balance her work/home interests. Women can succeed at leadership in both business and in the church. It may be harder, but once the church releases both feminine and masculine approaches to leadership, it will be a far stronger church.

Leadership Emergence Theory

Leadership Emergence Theory was developed by Dr. J. Robert Clinton of Fuller Theological Seminary (1988). The concept is based on the notion that a sovereign God is actively at work in the developmental process of a leader throughout life, providing experiences both good and bad. These experiences are designed to train the person for later use by God. His theory was developed by observing several sequential stages that Bible leaders and leaders from church history seemed to experience in their development. Clinton's theory is best summarized in a six-stage model where he describes the developmental process of a leader.

Phase I – Sovereign Foundations

The early stages of life totally beyond the leader's control, yet often critical in the leader's development. It includes such God's sovereign influence over one's family, childhood church, and school experiences both good and bad, which God uses to develop the early attitudes and sensitivities of a future leader. In this phase, God intends to develop the basic personality and character of the future leader implanting skills, gifts, burdens and concerns which He will later tap for ministry to others.

Phase II – Inner Life Growth

God is primarily concerned with the inside of the emerging leader, in order to develop character and commitment. To do this, God provides "Integrity Checks" and other tests and lessons of obedience and submission. God is working to develop the future leader's inner character and skill base for use later. Even in the emerging leader's place of ministry, while beneficial to others, God's focus is on the development in the leader. If he or she continually fails these checks, he or she may be held back from moving on to the next phase. A "Boundary Event" often signals the end of this stage.

Phase III – Ministry Maturing

During this phase, one's life ministry success may begin to happen and God accomplishes a great impact through the leader. One's gifts and skills are leveraged for important influence on others as the leader gives, and gives, and gives. But he or she may be so busy ministering that the outer success may outpace the inner growth. Some sort of mid-life crisis-type "Boundary Event" may signal entrance to the next phase of development where God will switch back His primary focus to inside work. A person might get stuck in this phase if they do not follow God's leading. This would result in a plateaued ministry and sometimes collapse.

Phase IV – Life Maturing

Though outer success may continue through this phase, God shifts His primary attention inside the leader in order to bring "Union Life" where being and doing are joined. This phase might even include isolation, exile, or great trials in order for God to re-focus on inner growth. God is forging an even deeper character for the great ministry at the next phase, though it must be admitted that many leaders do not finish well. Some never even get into this phase, let alone beyond it.

Phase V – Convergence

Assuming a leader has passed God’s tests, he or she might experience “Convergence” where all of life, gifts, abilities and experiences converge into one stream of high-impact ministry. Here one sees how all of life’s experiences have become strands weaving a tapestry of interconnected service. God’s Kingdom gets the ministry impact from the person. This is a very rare phase, since many get stuck in lower phases—a “Plateau Barrier,” by failing to pass God’s tests and checks.

Phase VI – Afterglow

This is a very rare phase of life which very few reach. It cannot be sought; instead, it comes to a person. “Afterglow” is when one’s ministry ripples out to many, even while retired or on a reduced schedule. For example, one’s life reputation may actually influence more people than the leader ever did in active ministry. Mentees multiply the leader’s ministry to others the leader never knew. It may be like being a saint of the church or a senior statesman in government. When a leader in the “Afterglow” phase speaks, everyone listens. It may even extend to a posthumous phase, lasting decades or even centuries.

Clinton has proposed these six stages of sequential leadership development, and his book provides checkpoints to clarify where one is in the process of emerging as a leaders

For further study:

Clinton, J. R. (1988). *The making of a leader*. Colorado Springs, CO: NavPress

Implications for church leaders

To most Christian thinkers, leaders do not merely rise to the occasion or develop themselves to be capable to lead the people of God. Instead, most believe they are called out or raised up by God for this responsibility. In Christian thinking as outlined in the Bible, God is at work in a person’s life long before they reach their critical role as a leader. Thus, when Joseph says, “You meant it for evil but God meant it for good” (Genesis 50), the Bible suggests that God meant these events (negative events, in Joseph’s case) for good. Therefore, most Christian leaders consider Moses’ time in the wilderness, or the apostle Paul’s years of study under Gamaleiel as God at work preparing a future leader. This view of God’s sovereign actions in a future leader’s life is at the root of Clinton’s Leadership Emergence Theory. Some of the implications of Clinton’s Leadership Emergence Theory for church leadership may be:

1. If God has been at work in a leader’s life since birth or before, it stands to reason a leader ought to attempt to discern how God was at work and what this indicates. Thus, examination of past experiences—both good and bad—may be hints to future use by God in leadership.
2. If L.E.T. is accurate, then a leader or pastor should not try to hurry to future stages prematurely. Each stage has lessons that need learning before moving on to the next stage. When a series of stages is laid out—especially in America, most leaders seek an immediate shortcut to the final stage, as if excellence is in the destination rather than the journey. L.E.T. teaches us to allow God to guide us stage-by-stage as life unfolds, and

to take the long view of an entire life that is given to service and leadership, not merely a decade or two.

3. L.E.T. research suggest that very few leaders finish well—even Bible leaders. This implies that a leader may be very successful, yet still fail to end their career well. This should warn leaders to avoid temptation and encourage a deep conviction to finish well—two important guardians for the successful church leader.

Part Six

Research on Strategies

This section provides the background for many popular topics in the practice of leadership.

Leadership vs. Management

Leadership and management are often used as if they were synonymous; some authors treat leadership as if it is good management. However, Joseph Rost (1991) and a few others have sought to define the nuances of each. Rost believes leadership is “a rare phenomenon, not a common one in organizational behavior” (p. 99 in Hickman, 1998). He identifies leadership with critical and strategic decision-making, and management with the more routine, yet necessary, tasks in an organization.

Likewise, Warren Bennis does not equate the two and wrote in 1977, “Leading does not mean managing: the difference between the two is crucial. I know many institutions that are very well managed and very poorly led.” (p. 3). Perhaps the most memorable description concerning this distinction is from Bennis and Nanus’ 1985 book,

“Managers are people who do things right and leaders are people who do the right thing. The difference may be summarized as activities of vision and judgment—effectiveness, versus activities of mastering routines—efficiency” (p. 21).

Rost, however, does not want to elevate leadership at the expense of management. Many who attempt to distinguish leadership from management inadvertently do this when they imply that leadership is excellence in decision-making, and anything less is management. Instead, Rost defines management as an *authority* relationship between a manager and at least one subordinate where they coordinate activities in order to produce and sell products or services. Leadership, however, is an *influence* relationship between leaders and followers, for the intention to change something. Rost also believes that management is unidirectional (top down), but leadership is multidirectional (i.e., leaders influence other leaders and followers, and followers influence other followers and leaders). Sometimes a managerial relationship evolves into leadership/influence relationship, and often leaders will be involved in management functions. Many authors mention a considerable amount of overlap. In general, however, leadership includes more intuitive decisions and unplanned actions, which may be why DePree’s (1987) book is titled, *Leadership is an Art*.

Perhaps Zalesnik (1977) has the most extreme view concerning leadership and management, since he distinguishes managers and leaders as two different types of people. He argues that managers are reactive and prefer to work with people to quickly solve problems in an unemotional style. Conversely, leaders are emotionally active, seek to shape and expand ideas, and intend to change the way people think about what is possible.

John Kotter (1990) has addressed the distinction between leadership and management by listing the most important aspects of each. For management, they are planning and budgeting, organizing and staffing, controlling and problem-solving—all of which produce a degree of predictability and order in short-term results for the stakeholders. For leadership, he lists establishing direction (vision and strategies), aligning people (communication and team-building), and motivating and inspiring (overcoming barriers and satisfying human needs)—all of which are intended to produce change, often to a dramatic degree.

Peter Northouse (2001) notes that the study of leadership can be traced back to Aristotle, whereas management studies emerged at the turn of the 20th century with industrialization. He acknowledges that the study of leadership has as many as 65 different classification systems and therefore approaches the subject with an overview of many approaches to leadership. He agrees that there is much overlap with management. Northouse defines leadership as “a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal” (p. 3).

Leadership is a topic with universal appeal, which is evident in the abundance of popular literature on the subject. Academic research on leadership includes interdisciplinary studies with these basic elements: leaders (traits/styles/behaviors); followers (relations/maturity/human development); situations (micro/macro environment); organizations (culture/structure/authority/communication/change); and philosophical/theological aspects (motivation/ethics/values/mission/purpose).

For further study

- DePree. (1987). *Leadership is an art*. New York: Doubleday.
- Gardner, J. W. (1990). *On leadership*. New York: Macmillan.
- Goleman, Daniel (2000). Leadership that gets results. *Harvard Business Review*, March, 78(2), 78.
- Hickman, G. R. (1998) *Leading organizations: perspectives for a new era*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Kotter, J. P. (1996) *Leading change*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press
- Northouse, P. G. (2001). *Leadership theory and practice* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Rost, J. C. (1991) *Leadership for the 21st century*. Westport, CN: Praeger Publishers.

Implications for church leaders

Quibbling over the meaning of terms is no strange activity to church leaders—most of our disagreement on interpreting the Bible is based on how we variously interpret words. Words are moving targets—they mean what the speakers and listeners mean them to mean, and have no meaning in themselves. For example, the phrase “donning gay apparel” might mean classy clothing in one generation and something quite different in the next. Leadership and management, as terms, have no inherent meaning—the meaning is breathed into the words by those using the terms. Is a pastor a leader, or manager, or both? If both, what do these terms mean and how does he or she function as a leader and manager? Some of the implications of the nuances of these terms for the church may include:

1. Both leadership and management are required in an effective church. Long range big-picture thinking is needed as well as day-to-day administration. The naming of seminary courses for pastors has reflected a migration of emphasis from Church Administration and later Church Management” courses to the more recent “Church Leadership” courses. However, a minister who is expert at strategic planning and inept at budgeting will probably be a short-term leader at a church. Church leaders should be skilled at both leading and managing.
2. Some churches have opted to divide the two kinds of work between the paid staff and laity—with the minister being responsible for leadership tasks and the laity for the

management ones. In mega-churches, this division of labor sometimes happens among the paid professionals, with the senior pastor serving as leader and the staff as managers, administering the church to accomplish the senior pastors long-range objectives.

However, in most churches the minister must be both a leader and a manager.

3. A church leader should examine his or her own style to discover if they are stronger as a leader or manager, and attempt to strengthen the other arm so as to become ambidextrous, or arrange their staff so as to augment and compliment their strengths and weaknesses.
4. If leadership is especially related to change, do natural leaders tend toward changing things just for change sake? If so, then leader-types should have a clear picture of *what* needs changing and *why* rooted in their theology and God's commission for the church. Then, they can make the right changes that will move the church to the right future. All improvement requires change; but all change does not bring improvement.
5. After Winston Churchill lost the top spot in the post war period, some remarked that "he may be out of office but he is not out of leadership"—a simple statement that shows the distinction between a positional leadership and a leader because of influence. Leadership is more than a position. Popular leadership guru John Maxwell often defines leadership with one word: *influence*. Rost observes that leadership (versus management) is multidirectional in influence, not just flowing downward from position. Therefore, in addition to influence, Rost adds the factor that leadership is multidirectional and intends to produce change. Combining all of this together, one might define leadership as *long range multidirectional influence intending to produce change*.

Decision-making Models

Vroom and Yetton proposed a series of procedures for making decisions, ranging from a unilateral directive decision by the leader without input, to highly participatory forms of decision-making. Theirs was an early decision flow process model designed to help a leader determine whether directive or participative decision-making would be more appropriate. This deductive approach to decision-making assumes that no one style is best for all situations. The choice depends on whether the leader is aiming for decision quality or subordinates' acceptance of the decision, or some combination of these. The Vroom & Yetton model (1973, p. 13), had six decision procedures, summarized as follows:

Autocratic decision-making

1. **Decide.** The leader solves the problem with the information at hand.
2. **Collect information and decide.** The leader collects information from subordinates, then makes the decision.

Consultation decision-making

3. **Share problem individually, collect ideas, and decide.** The leader shares the problem individually with followers, gathers suggestions, then makes the decision.
4. **Share problem with group, collect ideas, and decide.** The leader shares the problem with subordinates as a group, reflecting their collective ideas, and then you make the decision.

Group participative decision-making

5. **Share problem individually, collect alternative solutions, consensus decision.** The leader shares the problem individually, generating alternative solutions, and attempt to reach consensus on a decision.
6. **Share problem with group, develop alternative solutions, consensus decision.** The leader shares the problem guiding the group to generate alternative solutions, attempting to reach consensus as a group on a decision.

The first two decision-making procedures (in the original model) are **Autocratic** decision-making processes; the second two are varieties of **Consultation**; the last two are a **Group** or participative decision-making process, where the leader is willing to accept and implement any solution which has support of the group. A year later, Vroom and Jago (1974) added a seventh choice to the above list, **Delegative** decision-making:

Delegative decision-making

7. **Delegate problem, support subordinate's solution.** The leader delegates the entire problem to a subordinate and gives responsibility and support for his or her solution

Vroom and Yetton provided seven questions to help diagnose the demands of the situation. The Yes or No answers determine what decision style to use by eliminating one or more of the options from the directive/participative continuum above. (This process was later diagrammed as a decision tree by Vroom). The questions, referred to as "7 Rules," are:

1. Does the problem possess a quality requirement?
2. Does the leader have sufficient information to make a high-quality decision?
3. Is the problem structured?
4. Is acceptance of the decision by subordinates important for effective implementation?
5. If the leader were to make the decision alone, are they reasonably certain that it would be accepted by subordinates?
6. Do subordinates share the organizational goals to be attained in solving this problem?
7. Is conflict among subordinates likely in preferred solution?

In a study of 96 managers who were unaware of the model, the authors found that the more often the 7 rules were violated, the solution (from the perception of the managers) was judged as less effective, particularly when the subordinates' acceptance was involved. Several years later, Vroom and Jago' (1988) adjusted the earlier models (as a result of further research) and incorporated situational demands, such as time and financial constraints that fall between each Yes/No alternative. This accommodated for more complex leadership decision-making.

For further study:

Ivancevich, J. M., & Matteson, M. T. (1999). *Organization and behavioral management* (5th ed.). New York: Irwin McGraw-Hill.

Vroom, V. H., & Jago, A. G. (1988). *The new leadership: Managing participation in organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Vroom, V. H., & Yetton, P. W. (1973). *Leadership and decision-making*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Implications for church leadership.

Decision-making in the church is not merely a matter of who has the power and what might be the best thing to do. Instead, deciding has theological implications. If a church is deciding whether to stay downtown in their present facility and minister to their current neighborhood, or move out to the suburbs to minister to new housing developments, it is trying to decide theologically, What is God's will? Churches assume there is such a thing as God's will in their decisions, at least the important ones. Seeking God's will is thus part of the process in Christian decision-making. How does God reveal His will for a church? How will they know if God wants them to stay in town and minister to those who leave nearby, or to move to the suburbs? Will God make His will clear for the church by telling the pastor alone? Or, will God reveal His will to the members collectively?

How does God reveal His will for a congregation in order for them to make a decision? The polity of a church is where a denomination answers the theological question, "Who decides what God's will is for us." Church polity prescribes who has the decision-making power for these decisions. Some church polity gives the people this power, believing that God reveals His will for a church through the body of Christ collectively, not just through a leader. Other church polity grants almost-apostolic authority to the pastor in such decisions. And there are all kinds of blended polity between, including some where a regional board or committee will determine God's will for a local church in the matter of relocating. The point is that decision-making power is a theological matter to the church, and thus a church leader must maintain their

theology integrity as they manage the decision process. Some of the implications of Vroom and Yetton's decision-making models for church leaders may be:

1. Pastors must learn how to manage the decision-making process. Church polity influences (perhaps controls) how most important decisions are made in the church. Autocratic decision-making on important issues is relatively rare in ordinary church circles, though it may emerge in large mega-churches where the senior pastor exercises enough power to make decisions without gaining broad support first. Church polity will usually dictate the decision-making process in the church, where many times it is the followers, not the leaders, who are granted major participatory power in decision processes. Few pastors can run their church as if they were the owner-manager. Therefore, a pastor usually must become a master at "managing the decision-making process," not be the master decision-maker. Due to church polity structures, a pastor is usually working with the third set of processes for major decisions. Learning how to manage this group process, yet retaining a leadership role in the church, is perhaps the most vexing leadership problem a pastor faces.
2. Pastors should avoid manipulation of the decision-making process. Local church decision-making power (for key decisions, at least) is often given to the members, yet the pastor is the trained professional leader and often knows which is the best solution. Therefore, a challenging situation often develops in church leadership. The pastor knows the best solution, but does not have the power to decide. In these situations, the pastor may set up a process that looks very much like a participatory decision process, but in reality is a process where the pastor can manipulate the local board into deciding what the pastor has already pre-determined is the right decision. If all goes smoothly, nobody will notice. But if the hidden solution of the pastor receives resistance, the pastor's manipulation of the process often becomes more evident and the laity feels manipulated. How does a pastor avoid this predicament? Usually a pastor can bring laity into the discussion earlier in the process—at the consultative level even before the pastor has determined what the decision should be. While manipulative leadership can make things happen for a time, eventually it will erode the pastor's credibility as a leader and ultimately it is counterproductive.
3. In large churches, the pastor may use this process more with staff than the board. The decision-making process in larger mega-churches is different than that of average-size churches. No matter what the polity, decision-making power in large churches often gravitates to the full-time paid staff. What was once done by the board or committees is now done by the professional staff. In these churches, sometimes the boards becomes more like a College Boards of Trustees, dealing mostly with financial issues and replacing the senior pastor when he or she resigns or needs to leave for other reasons. Thus, in larger churches the decision-making process outlined above often reflects the senior pastor's role with staff ministers, and therefore it has more in common with the business process from which these models emerged. A senior pastor, for example, should determine which of the seven procedures will work best for decisions to be made about staff specialties, such as youth camp, the Easter pageant, or new Sunday school classes.

Conflict Resolution

Conflict occurs in all segments of organizations. The question is not the existence of it, but rather character and intensity, plus the manner in which it is expressed, channeled, or camouflaged (Burns, 1978). Some authors prefer to call this managing conflict. Others, however, see the need for leadership in modeling how to handle conflict—and its related issues of power, values, and change—constructively, so that leader-follower needs and organizational goals are not jeopardized. In addition, many leaders see conflict as an opportunity to develop their followers (McKenna, 1989).

Morton Deutsch's (1973) extensive research in the field has found that conflict between parties with *cooperative* rather than *competitive* relations is likely to be less destructive. Destructive conflict has a tendency to escalate and expand beyond the initial cause. Therefore, it is important for leaders to continually strengthen an environment of conflict-limiting factors, such as encouragement of creative thinking, commitment to cooperation, and “benevolent misperception” (minimizing differences vs. enhancing flaws)—all of which keep the conflict within bounds. Leaders must also avoid negative competitive strategies and power tactics (e.g., threats, coercion, and deception), lack of communication, and oversensitivity. These can drive out the conflict-limiting factors listed earlier—if those are weak. Though it is an oversimplification of Deutsch's work, the truth of “cooperation breeds cooperation, while competition breeds competition” (p. 367) has many applications for leaders of organizations.

Gerald Goldhaber (1979), who wrote the seminal work on organizational communication, believes conflict is not only inevitable, but a certain amount is highly desirable (p. 253). Goldhaber primarily addresses group conflict, which can be *within* a group and tear it apart or decrease its activity; or it may occur *between* groups, which may actually tend to bring members together and increase their activity. His recommendations generally include a time for each side to describe their own image and the perception of the other's view, then reporting this to the other group. After separate discussions of what may cause the discrepancy in the varying perceptions on the issue, the groups come together to suggest their alternatives solutions/compromises for the problem. Furthermore, leaders will encourage planning on how to relate differently toward each other in the future.

Ken Sande (1997) addressed personal conflict resolution from his experience as a lawyer and as a Christian. He believed that lawsuits tend to drive people further apart, and there should be a better way. Peacemaker Ministries began in 1982 for resolving conflicts out of court in a cooperative rather than an adversarial (the legal system's) manner. In order to help people change the attitudes and habits that led to the conflict, he leads the involved parties through four basic stages (p. 10-11):

1. *Glorify God* (1 Cor. 10:31) – showing a complete love for God and protecting from impulsive, self-centered behaviors that escalate conflict.
2. *Get the log out of your eye* (Matt. 7:5) – facing up to our own attitudes, faults, and responsibilities before pointing out what others did wrong.

3. *Go and show your brother his fault* (Matt. 18:15 – confronting constructively when others fail to accept responsibility for their actions; may require other neutral individuals to help restore peace.

4. *Go and be reconciled* (Matt. 5:24) – committing to restoring damaged relationships; requires forgiveness and cooperative negotiation.

Sande believes God’s peacemaking principles may be applied in the home, workplace, church, and neighborhood. He expands on each with helpful questions for the leader to guide the parties through the process of conflict resolution.

For further study:

Burns, J. M. (1978) *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.

Deutsch, M. (1973) *The resolution of conflict: constructive and destructive processes*. New Haven, CN: Yale University Press

Goldhaber, G. M. (1979) *Organizational Communication*, 2nd Ed. Dubuque, IA: Wm C. Brown Company Publishers.

McKenna, D. (1989). *Power to follow, grace to lead*. Dallas, TX: Word.

Sande, K. (1997) *The Peacemaker: A biblical guide to resolving personal conflict*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books.

Implications for church leaders:

Jesus was the great peacemaker. In one of the Beatitudes, He blesses peacemakers, yet elsewhere Jesus also said He did not come to bring peace but a sword. Both Jesus and Paul offer specific instructions on handling conflict between believers in the church. The church, while reflecting a perfect body in heaven, is essentially an earthly institution (where Martin Luther placed it in his scheme of things). As an earthly institution including less-than-perfect human beings with varied experiences, opinions and representing varied cultures, we can expect conflict in the church and among churches and denominations. However, conflict in the church does not always issue from our human tendencies, but can also be prompted by supernatural influences. Divisions, strife, and sectarianism (e.g., being of Paul vs. Apollos) are sometimes condemned in Scripture as more than human frailties, but as sin and prompted by the Devil. Either way, church leaders will face conflict. Experienced church leaders don’t debate the existence of conflict so much as they try to determine how to avoid, resolve, or manage it. Some of the implications of conflict resolution theory for church leaders may be:

1. Every church leader must decide their view on conflict. Is conflict in the church something bad that should be avoided? Is conflict bad, but should be expected and resolved? Or is conflict actually a good sign of health and diversity and should be managed by the church leader? Many church leaders have not determined their theological stance on conflict in the church. Most church leaders need more thought on their ecclesiology to determine where conflict fits in their view of the church. Once this decision is made, the church leader can approach conflict as resolving or managing it.
2. Goldhaber raises the question for church leaders as to the potential good results of conflict. Is there more conflict in a church that is changing, growing, and doing new things than a church that is static, declining, or predictable? To what extent is conflict

between denominations or local churches actually a good thing? How can a church leader manage conflict in a way to produce greater gains for the Kingdom?

3. Ken Sande and Peacemaker Ministries provide a summary of the biblical approach to conflict management and resolution. This appears to be a formula presented by Jesus 2000 years ago that all churches and individuals can use today. What would a church look like that implemented these practices? How would a church implement these four steps and maintain them as practices in a local body? What about a senior pastor as the church leader who insists that people go to the “offending party” (soloist, Sunday school teacher, youth pastor) and complain direct. Does this approach ever border on shirking responsibility as the church’s leader? Does it squelch feedback?
4. Certainly, most effective church leaders learn the skills of practicing conflict-limiting practices, including high levels of cooperation instead of competition and power tactics, heavy emphasis on communication, creative thinking, and developing a culture of what Deutsh calls “benevolent misperception” (grace) to keep conflict from becoming destructive.

Empowerment Strategies

Empowering others in an organization is rooted in the theoretical support for a prosocial power orientation in leaders (see Power and Influence section), as well as the Transformational Leadership model (separate section) and Expectancy Theory (in Motivation Theories section). Empowerment has been defined as “a process of enhancing feelings of self-efficacy among organizational members through the identification of conditions that foster powerlessness and through their removal by both formal organizational practices and informal techniques of providing efficacy information” (Conger & Kanungo, p. 474). In other words, leaders can help followers increase their expectations of what can be accomplished if they will provide or show how to get the resources needed for the followers to reach their increased goals.

Bandura (1982) describes *self-efficacy* as the belief in one’s effectiveness, or his/her ability to cope with a specific situation. This is part of social cognitive theory of personality, which supports the theoretical basis for empowerment strategies. That theory emphasizes the expectancies people have of themselves and others, including their self-efficacy and any expectations of rewards and punishments received from others for their behavior. Such self-perceptions may change over time, with varying levels of the same activity, and/or in different circumstances.

Conger and Kanungo (1988) offer Five Stages of Developing Empowerment

1. Identifying conditions that lead to feelings of powerlessness (e.g., centralized resources; authoritarianism; low-value rewards; unrealistic goals)
2. Implementing programs or techniques that enable others to be empowered (shared goal-setting; merit-based pay)
3. Removal of barriers (those identified in first stage) and supplying self-efficacy information (autonomy; discretionary opportunities; learning opportunities; encouragement and support of calculated risks; mistakes tolerated/learned from)
4. Feelings of empowerment; effort-performance expectations increase (confidence; self-assurance)
5. Worker begins actions of shared leadership and task accomplishment.

Transforming Followers into Leaders

Empowerment is the process by which leaders *transform followers into leaders*. Doing so is the central task of a transformational leadership style, according to Sashkin & Sashkin (2003).

These authors list three *paradoxes* that transformational leaders will have to face in order to develop their followers into leaders (p. 131-137):

- *Self-confidence*, which tends to make transformational leaders act alone, must be turned outward, or such leaders will likely burn out. Since self-confident leaders want actions that lead to results, empowerment-oriented leaders should carefully structure “learning opportunities” (Senge, 1990) for followers that include the followers increasingly controlling the outcomes. Coaching by the leader-teacher decreases until eventually self-confidence results in the follower because they achieved the goal alone.

- *High need for power* initially motivates them to accept leadership responsibility, but must be used to benefit the organization and its members, rather than satisfy their own needs. As a “steward” of the power in the organizations (Senge, 1990), transformational leaders should model sharing influence and power *with* instead of *over* others. They should also set up safeguards as to how power is used in their organization. In so doing, they prevent their newly-empowered followers from using power in personalized and dysfunctional ways, and can promote use of power that benefits the organization.
- *Vision*, also called cognitive capability, is what transformational leaders use to decide what actions they must take to make happen for the outcomes they desire—often a complex chain of cause and effect that happens over relatively long periods of time. Instead of relaying what actions to take, however, (sometimes a mistake made in casting a vision for the organization), empowered followers must develop the cognitive capability in order to help lead in the construction of the future. This shared vision and long range planning will involve thinking through, identifying, and taking the specific actions needed in order to accomplish the desired future for the organization. Empowering leaders can work along side followers-turned-leaders in decision-making over longer and longer time spans, and leave followers alone for the short term tasks.

As shown above, empowerment involves both relational and task/structure aspects of leadership. When leaders delegate responsibility properly, they must delegate the power of information and authority structures that goes along with the increased responsibility. In so doing, the leader gives up a parent role and becomes a partner with the worker. The empowering leader initially works one-to-one in a coaching style in order to guide followers in accomplishing a meaningful task, until they eventually do it alone. Feedback on performance is important for confirming the follower-turned-leader’s learning and confidence—a byproduct of acting and achieving alone.

For further study:

- Conger, J. A. & Kanungo, R. N. (1988). The Empowerment Process: Integrating Theory and Practice. *Academy of Management Review*, July, 1988.
- Bandura, A. (1982) Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologist*, 37, 122-147.
- Sashkin, M., & Sashkin, M. G. (2003). *Leader that matters: The critical factors for making a difference in people's lives and organizations' success*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization* (1st ed.). New York: Doubleday.

Implications for church leaders

God is the original implementer of empowerment. God is sovereign and thus able to accomplish everything He wants faster and better than humans could—yet He has chosen to empower His people to accomplish His purposes. Why? Why does God opt for a lesser quality job done slower? Why not use His power to accomplish His will instantly and in absolute perfection? Jesus (God incarnate) empowered people, too. He sent out the disciples to do miracles, the disciples baptized (though He didn’t), and Jesus gathered a band of average men and handed over the future of His Kingdom on earth—the church—to them. He promised they would receive power after the Holy Spirit came on them and they would spread the church to the ends

of the earth. So empowerment is not a foreign notion to Christian theology. The question to ponder as a church leader is this. If God the Father (and God-in-Christ, the Son) empowered others far less talented and powerful to do the work, shouldn't we? Some of the implications for church leadership from the empowerment strategies are:

1. The task of the church was not given to the ministers but to all the people, thus a minister cannot assume the work as a lone ranger. The minister's job is to rally the people to accomplish the task of the church. The people cannot accomplish the task without power, therefore, the church leader is especially obligated to empower the people to do the ministry of the church. Empowerment is akin to equipping—the pastor-teacher's chief role (Ephesians 4:11-12).
2. How do we know a person feels empowered? They have a sense of what Bandura called self-efficacy. They feel like they can be effective and do it on their own. In the church, this self-efficacy is probably better seen as "Spirit-efficacy," similar to Paul's statement, "I can do all things through Christ who strengthens me" (Phil. 4:13). It is an attitude that relies on the Holy Spirit for strength and efficacy.
3. Conger and Kanungo's five stages of developing empowerment should ring a bell with pastors and church leaders. Experienced ministers often have discovered that their prime task is not so much in causing good things to happen as to remove the barriers for those good things to happen. Often a church is not growing because of the clear barriers to growth. This is why so many church growth initiatives fail to work when implemented—the problem is not the absence of a good church growth program; it is the presence of barriers to growth in the system and attitudes of the people. Likewise, a church leader who wishes to develop an empowered and effective people must first search out the barriers to empowerment before implementing an empowerment strategy.
4. Many church leaders tend toward the charismatic-transformational style of leadership. Sashkin & Sashkin's paradoxes point out the internal resistance this type of leader may have toward empowerment. Such leaders need to work harder at creating self-confidence in others than expressing their own self-confidence. They will have to distribute power rather than giving in to their human desire to collect power for themselves. And they will need to adopt another motif for developing vision, that is often announced as "Going up to the mountain for the vision and then coming down to cast it to the people." Vision must be captured as a group of people directly from God and not just mediated through the leader.

360 Degree Leadership

Since leadership and management practitioners believe that multiple sources of feedback are more accurate than a single opinion, 360 degree feedback methods, sometimes called multi-rater or collateral feedback, have become a popular human resources tool. Additionally, as organizations become flatter and emphasize more teamwork, getting feedback from upward, downward, and parallel sources becomes essential for the leader. Authoritarian and dictator-style leaders seldom last long in today's organizations.

Kouzes & Posner, the best-selling authors of *The Leadership Challenge* (1987) and *Credibility*, (1993), also designed a multi-rater feedback assessment called the *Leadership Practices Inventory* (LPI, 1997). This easy-to-use instrument combines 360 degree feedback from self-assessment, direct reports, managers, coworkers/peers, and colleagues from outside the organization. It is designed for improving leadership skills in five essential areas: challenging the process, inspiring a shared vision, enabling others to act, modeling the way, and encouraging the heart.

More recently, author and pastor Bill Hybels applies the 360 degree concept in a slightly different way. He believes there are 4 directional aspects to great leadership:

1. Leading down (those we are responsible for), using vision, building team, problem solving, inspiring, setting goals, establishing values, raising up leaders, leading change.
2. Leading up (those we are accountable to), not passive or manipulating, but wise use of influence, relationship, prayer and trust.
3. Lateral leadership (our peers), as in mutual servanthood or win/win negotiation.
4. Self-leadership (myself), instead of plateauing over time, we need to take time out to grow internally. Hybels states this is *the* difference between average and outstanding leadership.

In a meta-analysis of 360 feedback methods, Church and Braken (1997), found a variety of applications for multirater feedback in organizations:

- 1) Leadership development. A multi-source feedback system when everyone in the organization participates; no one feels singled out for evaluation.
- 2) Intensive personal self-development. One person selects superiors, subordinates, and peers to give feedback on performance.
- 3) Handling a difficult person. A senior leader summarizes a series of verbatim comments from the group.
- 4) Measuring customer perceptions.
- 5) Succession planning.
- 6) General cultural assessment across the organization.
- 7) Organizational-change initiatives.

These authors added, however, that individual perception of peer and upward feedback is more positive when the feedback is used for developmental rather than administrative purposes.

Though many perceive 360 degree feedback as a rare opportunity for employees to receive honest feedback about how they are perceived by others in the organization, leaders need to be aware that the opinions of some immature people might be given too much weight. Additionally, for upward appraisals to be effective, Romano (1994) believes questions must be appropriate for the targeted position. Furthermore, anonymity is essential.

For further study:

- Church, A. H., & Bracken, D. W. (1997). Advancing the state of the art of 360-degree feedback: guest editors' comments on the research and practice of multi-rater assessment methods. (Special Issue: 360-Degree Feedback Systems). *Group & Organization Management*, June 1997 v22 n2 p149(13)
- Hybels, B. (2002). *Courageous leadership*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Kouzes, B. Z. (1997). *Leadership practices inventory (LPI)*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass
- Manz, C. (1991). *Mastering self-leadership*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Romano, C. (1994). Conquering the fear of feedback. *HR Focus*, March 1994 v71 n3 p9(2)

Implications for church leaders:

The idea of asking for and receiving feedback is often difficult for ministers. Some feel that if their job is to speak for God, then “feedback” or counsel should only come from God. Should any weight be given to criticism from a church leader’s followers? This research suggests yes. Perhaps it is similar to God used the grumbling from the Israelites and the advice from Jethro to speak to Moses concerning his responsibilities at different times. Pastors need feedback from their people.

Most pastors and church leaders serve at the will of their congregation. This means they can’t fire their members, but the members can fire them! This is all the more reason ministers need to get a sense of where their followers stand on issues. Ministers who are cut off from the feedback of their followers risk an early demise that sometimes blindsides them. Instead, pastors would do well to utilize 360 degree feedback methods in the following ways:

1. Broad feedback from everyone in the congregation via comment cards in the pews.
2. People in town who have never attended the church.
3. Feedback from and for their paid staff members.
4. Feedback from people who left the church.
5. Denominational leaders.
6. Day Alone with God (DAWG), life-planning retreats, and times of meditation and reflection.

Hawthorne Effect

In the early 1900s Fredrick Taylor's scientific management approach dominated thinking about employees and efficient production. While scientific management dominated the thinking, some resisted the notion and what it did to people—especially “line workers” who were sometimes treated like machines that could be fine-tuned for better performance. From 1924 to 1932, a series of studies with 20,000 Western Electric employees in the Hawthorne plant near Chicago would affect Taylor's approach. The initial study examined the effect of lighting on the work groups' output. When lighting was increased, worker production increased leading to the notion that increased lighting may increase production. Subsequently, however, the lighting was reduced and production continued to increase. These were puzzling findings. Production increased when lighting was increased *and* when it was decreased. To further complicate the findings, in a control-group test room where the lighting was kept constant the production increased as well.

A team of Harvard researchers came in, and concluded that the presence of the researcher affected the outcome of the study, not the physical surroundings. Some postulated that making the workers feel special is what increased production. The term “Hawthorne Effect” was coined later (in the mid 50s) to argue that the act of observing a group changes its performance. The Hawthorne studies were also believed to show that economic rewards did not totally explain worker behavior. Likewise, Mary Parker Follett had emerged as a spokesperson opposing Taylor's scientific management for its lack of attention to human needs and relationships in the workplace. Participatory management and other factors affected motivation and production. These findings contributed the emergence of the human relations movement.

However, subsequent research raised doubts about the actual Hawthorne studies. Adair, Sharpe, and Huynh (1989) did a meta-analysis of 86 different studies they believed involved use of control groups to counteract the Hawthorne effect, and concluded that there is no such effect whatsoever —arguing that the Hawthorne Effect is a myth. They concluded if there is such an effect, it is too small to be of importance since 86 studies did not find it. Gina Kolata followed up by questioning the validity of the Hawthorne results in her New York Times article, *Scientific Myths that are too good to die* (12/6/98).

Nevertheless, the Hawthorne studies are referred to in most every management and leadership meeting and most management texts. The original studies, however flawed, changed the way leadership and management have viewed workers ever since.

For further study:

- Adair, J. G. (1984). The Hawthorne Effect: A Reconsideration of the Methodological Artifact. *Journal of Applied Psychology* May 1984 v69 p334-345., 69, 334-345.
- Ivancevich, J. M., & Matteson, M. T. (1999). *Organization and behavioral management* (5th ed.). New York: Irwin McGraw-Hill.

Implications for Church Leadership

The lesson for researchers from the Hawthorne Effect is that their presence may affect their findings. That is, having professors carefully observing workers and meticulously recording production has an effect on production itself. In the church, the Hawthorne Effect has been widely quoted as the basis for leaders to give attention to or affirm followers. For example, many pastors practice MBWA (Management by Walking Around) in order to affirm and encourage the troops and increase morale and results. Affirmation, hand written notes, showing up and watching the play practice, supposedly boosts production and morale. While the original effect has not been shown to be certifiably true, most church leaders act like it is true—they intuitively believe it must be true. The church often uses the Hawthorne Effect as an argument for an “incarnational leadership” style, where the leader is present with the front line workers observing, encouraging, and affirming. Perhaps this wide application of the Hawthorne Effect is not due to the research at all, but because of the strong biblical mandate for such a style of leadership. Jesus Himself was the model of a leader who “did not think it robbery to be equal with God, yet He took on the form of a man” (Philippians 2). In Christ we have the ultimate example of coming down to the “line workers.” Some of the implications of the Hawthorne Effect for church leadership may be:

1. One lesson which might rise from the Hawthorne Effect is that there is no stopping an idea whose time has come. Perhaps it was time for a correction to the way the industrial age and scientific management treated workers. When the Hawthorne study arrived and seemingly supporting changes that many hoped for, it prevailed no matter how true the study would turn out to be. That is, sometimes in life there are changes seeking evidence, not just research calling for changes. Change does not always begin as an implication of a scientific study. Pastors should look for changes emerging today in the church that may be seeking research to support them.
2. The church often uses a Bible verse of proof text to support a position. That is, church leaders know what the right action is and so do the people. When a suitable text is found that supplies the apparent biblical support for behavior, the church is relieved, even if the use of that particular text is taken totally out of context. Thus, the deeper issue for church leaders is how they actually come to make decisions on what is right and true. Is it on the evidence or through some other means, like the Holy Spirit’s leading, or a Spirit-breathed collective consensus? Some answers may seem like they were discovered in a Bible verse and then taken to life, but many times, the answer started with life and people went upstream to the Bible for their support.
3. Pastors have certainly observed a sort of Hawthorne Effect when visiting their people, or even dropping in to the local diner for coffee. The presence of a minister seems to alter the tone and content of the conversation. If so, one implication here is for pastors to find ways to be incognito in the world, in order to stay in touch with real world thinking in their communities.
4. If attention to front line workers in the church does indeed increase their morale and production (or even if it doesn’t and this is the right thing to do anyway as a Christian leader), church leaders ought to have a purposeful strategy for doing so—a schedule, a system, and a sequence for observing and praising volunteers.

Pareto Principle

The 80:20 Rule

Vilfredo Pareto (1848-1923) was an Italian economist who studied the distribution of wealth in a variety of countries in the early 1900s. He discovered a common phenomenon: about 80 percent of the wealth in most countries was controlled by a consistent minority, or about 20 percent of the people. Pareto called this a "predictable imbalance" i.e., the relationship between input and output is rarely, if ever, balanced.

In his 1950 book, *The Quality Control Handbook*, J.M. Juran first recognized the applicability of the Pareto principle to many fields. His particular focus was the quality defects in manufacturing and confirmed that relatively few defects accounted for their manufacturing problems. In honor of Pareto's original findings, he named this consistent mathematical relationship the Pareto Principle, now more commonly referred to as the 80:20 rule.

Richard Koch (1998) presented an analysis of Pareto Principle as it applies to leadership and management. Koch argues this 80:20 rule is found in almost every part of modern life from stock investment to time management. He suggests that leaders and managers should find the highly leveraged 20% elements in an organization and pour their energy into these highly-productive people and activities that have influence beyond their apparent size. Thus, the 80:20 rule has been expanded far beyond its first economic use. Leaders soon learn that a minority of people produce the majority of results.

For further study:

Juran, J. M. (1950) *The Quality Control Handbook*. New York: McGraw-Hill

Koch, R. (1998). *The 80/20 Principle : The Secret of Achieving More With Less*. New York: Bantam Doubleday Dell Publishing.

Pareto, V. (1906). Manual of Political Economy. *Economic Journal*, Vol. 16, Issue 64 (December), p.553-7.

Implications for church leaders

While one might quibble about the 80 percent or 20 percent (it is sometimes 60:40 or 90:10), the insight is broadly applied to leadership and management. The "80:20 rule" has become one of the best known leadership shorthand terms reflecting the notion that most of the results (of a life, of a program, of a financial campaign) come from a minority of effort (by people, or inputs).

Some applications of the 80:20 rule in church leadership are:

80% of the work is usually done by 20% of the people.

80% of the problems are usually caused by 20% of the people.

80% of the value of my day is often produced by 20% of the activity.
80% of my mentoring multiplication will likely come from 20% of the mentees.
80% of our new converts will probably come from 20% of the programs.
80% of the giving in a capital campaign often comes from 20% of the donors.
80% of the quality can be achieved in 20% of the time -- perfection takes 5 times longer.

It is quite likely that Jesus worked with the assumptions of the 80:20 rule, when He purposefully left the crowds to focus most of his time with the twelve apostles. He even had an inner circle of Peter, James, and John whom He mentored more intensely. Admittedly, there are dangers of implementing 80:20 thinking all of the time, for example, life-threatening situations some families face or the evangelism opportunities that surface unexpectedly. However, when pastors set priorities for the year, they would do well to search for the 20 percent elements, i.e., those areas, efforts, programs, and people that are producing the most results in their overall ministry. Then church leaders can pour most of their energy into them.

The Rhetoric of Leadership

Rhetoric is fundamentally the art of speaking or writing correctly. It is communicating with words. Aristotle suggested that rhetoric is “the art of finding the possible means of persuasion in reference to any given situation,” making *persuasion* an additional element of rhetoric (Garver, 1994). Simons (1989) takes that definition a bit further by stating that “rhetoric is the form that discourse takes when it goes public” emphasizing rhetoric is a matter of *public* communication (usually speech), rather than a private communication. Public persuasion is close to the idea of rhetoric used in leadership studies. Leadership generally involves persuasion, thus its importance for a leader to develop skill in rhetoric. The rhetoric of leadership appears to be an emerging field of study and research under the larger subject area of communication in leadership.

Most leadership studies include the importance of communication skills as a leadership strategy. One author highlighted it by stating, “Leadership is a language game” (Pondy, 1977). This is a reflection of the philosophical premise that most questions in life center on defining what we mean. Leaders do this for others, in that they help reduce uncertainty and ambiguities in life, and help determine what is meaningful in an organization (Sashkin, 2003). Strategic and revolutionary change in organizations requires even more social interaction and sensemaking (Weick, 1995). Thus, choosing the right words and effectively persuading the people to adopt a common vision and values and goals can make a leader more effective.

Well-chosen Words

The quality of a person’s daily talk, as well as public speaking, makes a difference in his or her success in emerging as a leader, whether speaking to those superior or subordinate. The ability to be explicit with workers is an important supervisory skill as well as being able to sell ideas to a superior. This was positively correlated in several studies noted by Bass (1990). Since rhetoric is a learned skill, this become a top training priority for many organizations. Some leaders become skilled in using metaphors in their rhetoric to get followers excited about their messages. A classic example of well-chosen words in rhetoric is Churchill’s “Iron Curtain,” the short phrase which spoke volumes after World War II and became a mainstay in language for decades thereafter. Coining a phrase that is memorable and repeatable is an important skill of rhetoric. This is sometimes called the “stickiness factor” of the message; such phrases can help to launch new ideas that create change more effectively (Gladwell, 2000). Leadership rhetoric may also use narrative—telling stories—in order to create meaning and sometimes to persuade others. Using narrative as a means of persuasion in planning meetings will often win over the rules of traditional argument (Littlejohn, 1999). In a study of gender and communication, Reardon (1991) reported that speeches are less persuasive when the speaker is a woman, largely because of they use language forms of uncertainty, emotionality, and qualifying terms, such as “maybe,” “I’m sorry” and “perhaps.” Thus, developing rhetoric skills can be especially important for some women.

Rhetoric and Reality

Aristotle’s work on leadership titled *Rhetoric* argued that a leader has three interrelated means of achieving his fellow citizens’ trust: appeal to their character (ethos), appeal to their reason

(logos), and appeal to the emotions (pathos). He goes on to point out that the character of the leader is the most compelling for the troops (Garver, 1994). If the character of the leader is a key element of rhetoric—that is, the messenger’s character, not just the message, then it is important that the reality of a leader’s character match their rhetoric in their communication.

For further study:

- Bass, B. M. (1990) *Handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications*. 3rd Ed. New York: Free Press.
- Burns, J. M. (1978) *Leadership*.
- Garver, E. (1994) *Aristotle’s Rhetoric: An Art of Character*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- Gladwell, M. (2000). *The Tipping Point*.
- Littlejohn, S. W. (1999). *Theories of human communication*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Pondy, L. R. (1977) Leadership is a language game. In M. McCall and M. Lonbardo (Eds), *Leadership: Where else do we go?* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Reardon, K. K. (1991). *Persuasion in practice*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Simons, H. W. (1989) *Rhetoric in the human sciences*. London: Sage
- Weick, K. E. (1995). *Sensemaking in organizations*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Woodward, K. L. (2003). Gospel on the Potomac. *Newsweek*, March 10, 2003, p. 29.

Implications for Church Leadership

In the beginning God “spoke” and creation happened. God desires to communicate to humans and has chosen to do so through words of the Bible and the living Word, His Son, Jesus Christ. The gospel is a collection of truths best wrapped in words and flesh—both for Jesus and for us. Since the reformation, preaching has been central to worship, providing an opportunity for the minister-leader to practice rhetoric from the pulpit. When the minister or church leader speaks, he or she is following God’s means of communication: putting ideas into words to communicate and cause others to respond to Him. Some of the implications of the rhetoric of leadership for church leaders may be:

1. Church leaders should carefully plan the words and phrases they use repeatedly. An oft repeated term or phrase will influence the people over time—and leaders should intentionally choose words that will influence their followers in the right direction.
2. Rhetoric can be used for good or for ill purposes. Adolph Hitler was a master at rhetoric, using it for evil purposes. A church leader must resist the temptation to use rhetoric to harm detractors, manipulate the masses, or practice self-promotion.
3. Sometimes the church leader uses rhetoric to gather people to a vision and values already captured by the church leader, but who is now attempting to cast that vision to the people. At other times, the church leader may be articulating the collective values and vision the people already have. The first case takes longer to get everybody on board, while the second case is almost immediately effective.

Leadership Succession

Replacing the top leader in an organization usually causes fear, hope, and anxiety in members of an organization. Perhaps because of this, top leadership experts Finklestein and Hambrick (1996) state that research on executive succession has grown exponentially over the last fifteen years. The average tenure in office of CEOs in industry was found to be similar to those in higher education and hospital administration. The median was a little more than five years, though the expected term of office was closer to ten years (Wilson & McLaughlin, 1984).

Finklestein & Hambrick (1996) have observed three types of succession processes:

- the "relay race" where there is an heir apparent in the organization;
- the "horse race" where a variety of contestants are vying for the top spot (or sometimes insiders are competing for the heir apparent slot);
- the "crisis" succession process, when there has been an impending illness, death, or abrupt dismissal (p. 175-177).

In each of these cases, the amount of influence by the incumbent to the extent the board allows, and the selection of outsider versus an insider, are intriguing subjects considered in succession literature. It is widely believed that an incumbent top leader generally influences the choice of a new leader unless there are negative forces, such as environmental shifts or poor organizational performance. Finklestein & Hambrick, however, believe that incumbents lack objectivity. However, they also found that incumbents are relied upon if current organizational performance is strong, if the incumbent has had a long tenure, and when the board has had little exposure to the senior management team. Observing that "inertia is a great force on succession," the incumbent's influence will tend to side with an insider, and will also be an insider who is most similar to the predecessor (p.187).

Additionally, Kesner & Sebor (1994) found that pre-succession performance influenced the criteria used to evaluate and choose successors. For example, if performance was unacceptable, then boards replaced insiders with outsiders. Outsider succession correlates not only with poor organizational performance, but also with board activism, and is reportedly part of the "cleansing rituals" initiated by a board (Finklestein & Hambrick, 1996, p. 183). In most institutions when the precipitating concerns for succession occur, the hiring and sometimes firing of a top leader usually empowers a board, especially when the performance of the organization is in crisis (Finkelstein & Hambrick, 1996).

The leadership succession literature strongly recommends an assessment of the organization and its current leadership before beginning the process of succession. Then, succession becomes an opportunity for reflection, development, and improvement of the total organization.

For further study:

Finkelstein, S. & Hambrick, D. (1996). *Top executives and their effects on organizations*. St. Paul, MN: West Publishing Company.

- Kesner, I. F. & Sehora, T. C., (1994). Executive succession: Past, present, and future. *Journal of Management* 20(2): 327.
- Lorsch, J. W. (1989). *Pawns or potentates: The reality of America's boards*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Wilson, M. P., & McLaughlin, C. P. (1984). *Leadership and management in academic medicine*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Implications for Church Leadership

The Bible is packed with succession stories from the father-to-son succession of the patriarchs, the Moses-Joshua handoff, and Jesus empowering His disciples to do even greater things than He had done. While the Bible's patterns of succession do not always follow traditional patterns (eldest son, etc.), the notion of a God-anointed "passing of the mantle" (II Kings 2:14) appears frequently. In the early church and through history, this notion eventually found the term, "apostolic succession" (II Cor. 12:12). The orderly transfer of power from one church leader to another is a concern today, especially when a pastor resigns or is expelled. Some of the implications for church leadership of leadership succession research may be:

1. All three types of succession occur in today's church polity. When a senior minister resigns, it is often a "relay race," i.e., a popular associate or youth pastor takes the senior minister's job or the church interviews and votes on one candidate at a time. In the "horse race," the board interviews several candidates during the same time span and sees which one rises to the top. In a crisis dismissal, the board may grab power and either ramrod a hasty choice into office or go into a period of uncertainty for a year or more.
2. Ironically, when things are going well, a church is in great health and is growing, the retiring pastor has the most influence in naming a successor—yet the research shows his or her choice may actually be the wrong choice. Most church leaders have seen this observation played out in various churches for years.
3. The chances of a staff person getting the appointment as the senior minister increases the happier the board is with the present minister and the better things are going in the church overall. When things are not going well, the church tends to look outside for a successor.