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ABSTRACT
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Problem

The research of Wong and Page (2003) has suggested that no denominational church leadership models utilize a biblical servant leadership model. Most denominational leadership models utilize some form of an authoritarian hierarchical model. This suggests the need for a curriculum that can assist a denominational leadership team to transition to a biblical servant leadership model.

Methodology

This project utilized a qualitative methodology. A curriculum was developed utilizing assessments, seminars, coaching, and group feedback in order to create an environment to transition to a biblical servant leadership model for the Potomac Conference ADCOM team.
Results

There were seven members of the ADCOM team for the Potomac Conference that participated in this project. The results of the Revised Servant Leadership Profile at the beginning of the project and then again at the conclusion of the seminar suggested that the participants did not have a cohesive understanding of biblical servant leadership to start with. The group feedback session suggested that the seminars and coaching provided the key basis for an understanding of a biblical servant leadership model for the ADCOM team. This session also demonstrated the need for more emphasis on spiritual development, a theology of emotional intelligence and power and authority, and the ingredients necessary to create a culture to transition to a biblical servant leadership model.

Conclusions

This study demonstrates the need for a well-defined biblical servant leadership model that can be used within the structure of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. The capacity to lead from a biblical servant leadership model brings clarity to the (a) mission and vision, (b) the importance of effective teams, (c) the significance of healthy systems and organizational culture, and (d) the need for a deep relationship with Jesus Christ.
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CHAPTER 1

THE NEED FOR A BIBLICAL SERVANT LEADERSHIP MODEL

Introduction

The capacity for a leader to address the growing and on-going issues facing the Potomac Conference (PC) requires one to have a well-developed leadership model that can be effective in moving its mission forward. In the context of a faith-based organization, Anderson (1997) states, “the leader is the servant of the mission of the people of God” (p. 198). It is imperative that the conference president understands with clarity the mission to which the organization is called. When the mission is clear a leader may develop the organizational culture that needs to be fostered, the environment necessary to move the mission forward, which issues should be addressed, and how these issues should be addressed.

There are many leadership models and theories, which are supported by well-documented empirical data (B. Bass & Bass, 2008). The research of Farling, Stone, and Winston, (1999) suggests that many of the leadership models identified have a variety of overlapping characteristics and common forms. The work of Page (2009) concludes that of all the leadership models that have been theorized and are empirically based, the servant leadership model is the most effective to address issues facing organizational issues. The work of faith-based organizations like PC, according to Page, is to establish
an environment that will allow a shift from an authoritarian hierarchical leadership model (AHL) to a more biblical servant leadership model (BSL).

**Description of the Ministry Context**

The Potomac Conference Corporation of the Seventh-day Adventist Church (PC) exists within the structure of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists as established in 1901 and further developed in 1913 with the addition of Divisions.

The PC was formed in 1924 to fulfill, in a local context, the mission of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. The PC consists of some 188 churches, companies, and mission groups (as of this writing), in the territory of the state of Virginia (except for the counties of North Ampton and Accomack), the District of Columbia, and parts of the counties of Prince Georges and Montgomery in Maryland (General Conference, 2011-2012). The need for an effective, well-developed leadership model becomes pronounced as the church grows numerically and with diversity.

Within the structure of the Seventh-day Adventist Church there have been several leadership models (Knight, 2001; Oliver, 1989). It is my observation that historically the PC leadership model tends to follow the leadership model of the world church even though there have been differences of opinions concerning church polity (i.e. women in ministry, church authority).

**Statement of the Problem**

In order to move the mission of the PC forward (Growing Healthy Disciple-making Churches) an effective leadership model is necessary. An independent administrative assessment of the PC (Brauer, Werner, & Cress, 2007) revealed several themes. First, there was a stronger value for institutionalism and the status quo than
intentional mission. Each PC department seemed to want to do what they had always done rather than be held accountable to the PC mission. Second, there was an insignificant impact on local mission pursuits using present program resources. Third, there was limited trust and collaboration among administrative team members, departmental leaders, and staff. Fourth, the predominant leadership model observed was the AHL model.

In addition, from 2007 until 2010 there was a 67% personnel change due to retirements, promotions, re-assignments, or transfers outside the PC. The combination of redirecting to a voted mission as well as high staff turnover resulted in a climate of uncertainty, resistance, and diluted missional focus.

The assessment (Brauer, Werner, & Cress, 2011) was re-administered in 2011 by the same group. The assessment team used focus groups of pastors, teachers, office employees, and lay people of the PC, and empirical and demographic data of the PC. Again, the intent was to understand if there had been significant change in the PC administrative leadership model that would suggest that the employees in connection with laity were moving the mission forward. The assessment suggested that although there was some missional activity, the impact of an AHL model seemed to be crippling missional progress. The assessment team noted that there needed to be a different and more intentionally defined leadership model, a broader understanding of organizational culture, effective systems employed, and consistent leadership evaluation tools employed to ascertain results.

Statement of the Task

Recognizing the need to shift to a different leadership model, the task of this
ministry project was to develop an environment in which to transition from an AHL model to a BSL model for the administrative team of the PC. Each member learned via six seminars and ongoing individual coaching to identify the following: (a) characteristics of an AHL model, (b) other leadership models, (c), the tenants of a BSL model, and (d) the necessary elements needed to create an environment in which to journey on this transition from an AHL model to a BSL model. Benchmarks were also established to evaluate the effectiveness of the BSL model with the PC administrative team by use of the Revised Servant Leadership Profile (RSLP), developed by Wong and Page (2003). The members of the administrative team who participated in this journey were; President; Vice-President of Administration; Vice-President of Finance; Vice-President of Pastoral Ministry; Vice-President of Education; Assistant to the President for Strategic Initiatives; and Assistant to the President for Communication.

**Justification for the Project**

There was need for a clearly defined BSL model within the context of the PC. No research was found that identified a BSL model prototype that would work within a conference setting, how to create the environment for such change, or job descriptions appropriate for this model. The literature proposed characteristics and behaviors of servant leaders, and what someone should do, but very little on “this was tried and worked,” or “this was tried and didn’t work.”

The PC administrative team was conscious that there had been minimal mission impact from conference programs (Kidder, 2011) provided to assist pastors and teachers. Historically the PC offered and promoted the same denominational programs, seminars, and training events with little variation. There had been little collaboration between office
team members and executive officers to search for meaningful connections with those served. If there is not a successful transition to a BSL model, the present leadership structure could prove to be ill-equipped in the twenty-first century.

**Delimitations for the Project**

The scope of this project is limited to the administrative team of the PC. This is not a national study of other churches, organizations, or businesses. Other limiting factors are (a) the administrative team of the PC, in that I am the president, suggests by title and position an AHL model; (b) to lead/follow with my colleagues and to maintain appropriate boundaries of free choice in direction; (c) my lack of experience in engaging team members on a journey to transition to a BSL model; (d) pressure from other levels of church structure suggesting the PC administrative team is creating a congregational leadership model and requesting that we cease; and (e) the expense and availability for professional coaches who can connect with a BSL model.

**Description of the Project Process**

The purpose of pursuing a Doctor of Ministry is to take theories that suggest they should work in a given setting and make the application and see if they actually work. Much of this project is based on the work of Page and his book *Servant-Empowered Leadership: A Hands-on Guide to Transforming you and Your Organization* (Page, 2009) and the RSLP and the 360 Degree RSLP (Wong & Page, 2003). The concepts in this book were taught to the PC administrative team through seminars and personalized coaching, and then evaluated by taking the RSLP and the 360 Degree RSLP at the beginning of the first seminar and at the end of the last seminar. The group feedback session, a month after the last seminar, provided valuable feedback in order to understand
the effectiveness of the process and to plot the next steps necessary for the transitional journey.

The success of this project was determined by the demonstrated ability of the participants to (a) identify the differences between an AHL model and a BSL model, (b) sustain the transitional journey, (c) show missional impact of the PC to the local church/school, and (d) the president’s continued capacity to learn the skills to lead as a biblical servant leader. It is also the intent of this project that the process used, the environment established, the transitional journey begun to a BSL model, could be a basis for other conference administrative teams, departmental leaders, office staff, and local church leadership teams to move God’s mission forward successfully.

Outline of Project

The outline of this project follows the standards as set forth by the Doctor of Ministry Program of Andrews University, the guidance of the project coach, and two advisors.

1. Chapter one sets the description of the ministry context, statement of the problem, statement of the task, the justification for the project, the delimitations of the project, the methodology with which this project will take shape, and definitions of concepts and terms helpful to the reader.

2. Chapter two is a theological reflection for a biblical servant leadership model from Matthew 20:25-28. In this theological reflection an understanding of the way societal norms led (authoritarian hierarchy model) in comparison to the way Jesus led (biblical servant leadership model) is established.
3. Chapter three considers current literature of a variety of contemporary leadership models, with the primary focus being that of servant leadership. Literary comparisons will be made between these models, the impact of the Industrial Revolution’s practice of authoritarian leadership and the genesis of biblical servant leadership.

4. Chapter four reviews briefly the project context of the PC within the structures developed by the Seventh-day Adventist Church. It examines the leadership models that developed within those structures. This chapter demonstrates how the PC plans to engage in this transitional journey from an AHL model to a BSL model.

5. Chapter five considers the specifics of the project including the chronological implementation of the project, analysis and the evaluation of the project itself. Such a study has generated a number of areas where further research is needed, recommendations given, summary and conclusion. The resources used for this project are found in the appendix.

**Definition of Concepts**

This study contains a few technical concepts. In most cases they are defined in the context of the project. Consideration of some of those concepts at this juncture may prove helpful to the reader.

The first concept is *servant leader*. A servant leader, (first used by Robert Greenleaf in 1970) is defined as “the servant-leader is servant first . . . It begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve first” (Greenleaf, 2002, p. 27). Greenleaf was a Quaker, but his concepts for servant leadership did not derive from a biblical or religious perspective, but came from “reading Hermann Hesse’s novel *Journey to the...*
East” (Greenleaf, 2002, p. 21). Although there are many definitions of servant leadership (see chapter 3), the definition as proposed by Greenleaf is the standard by which other definitions are derived.

Another concept is that of a biblical servant leader. The definition of biblical servant leadership for this project came as a result of the theological reflection and literature review. The working definition for this project is “one who serves as an authentic follower of Jesus and His mission, who engages others in a life of holiness, and takes the initiative to equip others for His mission and growth of His kingdom.”

The first part of this definition denotes understanding the Lordship of Jesus in your life and understanding the will of the Father. The second portion of the definition, “living a life of holiness,” is engaging holistically in the human mess to bring hope and restoration (ransom). The third part deals with taking initiative for the ongoing success of the Father’s mission.

A third concept is hierarchy of order. Some seem to assume that whenever the term hierarchy is used it suggests being authoritarian, but this is not so. For example, in government, structures exist from local municipalities to the federal government. These do not suggest that one is less or more important, but necessary. Collin’s (2001) referred to a “hierarchy of leadership capabilities” (p. 21) as a leader matures in leadership ability. Ronay, Greenaway, Anicich, and Galinsky (2012) suggested that with the use of hierarchical differentiation productivity increases and the “lot of all group members” (p. 670) is enhanced.

The hierarchy of order suggests the simplest to the more complex (species in biology, or grade levels in education), where each level is necessary for the next level to
exist or succeed. Within the Seventh-day Adventist Church there is a hierarchy of order (organizational structure). The organizational structure of the Seventh-day Adventist church consists of the local church, conference, union, general conference. Each of these is interconnected with well-defined responsibility and authority. These organizational structures exist to be effective in completing the world mission of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. (Haloviak, 1984; Patterson, 2012).

Another concept, in contrast to the BSL model, is the authoritarian hierarchical leadership model (AHL). To understand the AHL model the definitions of authority, authoritative and authoritarian are critical.

At times there is a general misuse of the terms authority, authoritative, and authoritarian as used in regard to leadership behavior. With each of these terms there is a relationship to power and how power is exercised. Authority comes from expertise, through position granted by a community, through experience, or through integrity or “influence of character” (Webster, 1913, p. 103). Thus, power maybe granted to be exercised with the permission of the community.

Authoritative is having “due authority” (Webster, 1913, p. 103). Authoritative is the adjective form of authority and suggests authority should be granted based upon expertise, integrity, experience, or position. Matthew 7:28, 29 presents Jesus as authoritative as the “supreme interpreter of the law” (Stock, 1994, p. 126) thus giving him authority.

Authoritarian, also an adjective, suggests, “expecting or requiring people to obey rules or laws,” at the expense of “personal freedom” (Merriam-Webster). One extreme, of that which is authoritarian, is the use of physical force. Another side is when one steps
outside of the prescribed community boundaries and utilizes dictatorial behaviors, policy or coercion to expect certain preferred outcomes.

There are several colloquialisms for the AHL model: top-down, autocratic, domineering, bureaucratic, controlling, dictatorial (Conyers, 2010; Stone & Patterson, 2005) and “kingly power” (White, 1948, p. 236) to name a few. The definition, of authoritarian hierarchical leadership for this project, is leadership that is defined implicitly or explicitly “on a rank order of individuals or groups to a valued social dimension” (Magee & Galinsky, 2008, p. 5). For, individuals in a AHL model

“are able to set agendas, norms for discussion, rules for behavior, and standards for thought and opinion, all of which constrain the psychological freedom experienced by individuals lower in the hierarchy and help maintain the current power hierarchy (Magee & Galinsky, 2008, p.25).

Most often the AHL model is based on status, position and coercive power and rarely are absent from any organization (Magee & Galinsky, 2008).

Within the context of the Seventh-day Adventist Church we were organized as a hierarchy of order (see above for definition of hierarchy of order) in order to maximize mission. Each level of structure was given limited and specific power to serve as servant in relationship to the other levels of structure. In time, it seems that disproportionate power has migrated to the perceived upper levels of church structure and created an overall tacit acceptance of “top-down” rather than “bottom up” flow of authority. The need for a BSL model is to regain what was intended in the 1901 General Conference Session action that resulted in church restructuring that invested ecclesiastical authority in the collective membership rather than in leaders themselves.
Another concept within the constructs of organizational arrangement is centralized or decentralized leadership structures. These constructs suggest the flow of communication, the points of control and decision-making, and the capacity of an organization as a learning organization (Daft, 2003). A centralized form of governance suggests that the flow of communication is vertical to a decision-making body. The same group owns both policies and control. Thus, it is not a learning organization. The organization waits for resources, ideas, and finances to come from the defined central governance body in order to function within their structure.

The Seventh-day Adventist Church was designed to be a decentralized representative organization beginning in 1901 (Knight, 2001; Oliver, 1989). A decentralized representative organization is defined as one where representative voted constituencies have delegated authority for decision-making, resources, finances, and mission, within the hierarchy of order.

Summary

There are many components to a BSL model. This project does not intend to address how a BSL model can be implemented in the hierarchy of order of the Seventh-day Adventist Church structure, but only in the present context of the PC. This project sought to validate potential steps to create an environment in order to transition the PC on a journey, a journey utilizing a BSL model. The intent of this study was to develop a curriculum that could assist and train the PC administrative team with the necessary ingredients to transition from an AHL model to a BSL model.
CHAPTER 2

A THEOLOGICAL REFLECTION ON SERVANT LEADERSHIP: A STUDY OF MATTHEW 20:25–28

Introduction

In writing a theological reflection on servant leadership the temptation is to pick a point, or category, and then “proof text” to the desired outcome (Barna & Viola, 2002, p. Kindle Loc. 2223). Much of the Western historical-critical method of theological study, interpretation, and worldview of scripture, attempts to place the narrative into predetermined categories rather than allowing the narrative to speak for itself (Frei, 1974; Wright, 2010).

The term “servant leader,” or the seminal phrase “the servant as leader” (Spears, 1998, p. xi), is not a biblical phrase. However the concept is. Jesus, who was the consummate follower of His Father and His mission, who entered the human condition, was the ultimate “servant” and “leader” (Isa 53; Matt 20:25-28; Phil 2:5-11). Any biblical study of leadership “must begin and end with Jesus Christ” (Paulien, 2012, p. 2).

The New Testament was not written as a leadership manual (Howell, 2003), but throughout its pages the evidence of leadership themes, practices, and model comparisons are apparent (Paulien, 2012). The first century secular cultural terms for leaders found in the New Testament were used for secular leaders or for “God, Christ, or the Holy Spirit in human lives” (Paulien, 2012, p. 3). The New Testament writers chose new terms for
church leadership (Clarke, 2008), but saw themselves in relationship to Jesus as servants/slaves (Rom 1:1; 2 Pet 2:1; Jude 1; Rev 1:1), not servant/slaves to church members. (Only once does a New Testament writer indicate that he is a servant/slave of the church; Paul in 1 Cor 9:19).

It is the intent of this chapter to reflect on the role of servant leadership as taught and lived by Jesus Christ through the narrative of Matthew. Primarily, the book of Matthew is a “theology on the historical Jesus” (Terrian, 1983), who was the incarnate Messiah “long awaited deliver of God’s people Israel” (France, 2007, p. 25). Matthew wrote during a time which was the “peak of the Jewish nation’s expectation of the coming of the eschatological Messiah” (Akuchie, 1993, p. 39), a new Moses that would lead them to a new freedom from the grasp of Roman occupation (Deut 18:15); a political Messiah (Matt 11:2-6) not a servant suffering Messiah (Akuchie, 1993). The narrative of Matthew was written not just for history, or as a “specimen of writing, but sacred canon,” for the express purpose of knowing Him, because “theology begins and ends with faith in Christ” (Metaxas, 2010, p. 89).

It is understood that Matthew, an eye-witness apostle of the life of Jesus, was the author, under inspiration; that it was not written by a later editor, who collected his sayings (although there is some editorial work); nor dependent on Mark or Q (Black & Beck, 2001; Farmer, 1964; Terrian, 1983; Woodley, 2011); that it was the first gospel written and for a Jewish audience (Moffet, 1988; Terrian, 1983). Matthew wrote to groups of Jewish believers to help them understand the role and purpose of the life of Jesus for that present age and the age to come. Being the first written gospel, Matthew
has given us the first understanding of biblical servant leadership from a perspective of one of the Twelve disciples.

**Defining Biblical Servant Leader**

To understand a theology of biblical servant leadership one must have a definition. In considering the teachings of Jesus and His life, as referred to in the narrative of Matthew, it is apparent that there was a contrast between leadership styles. The leadership norm of first century life was that of position, power, preeminence, and control (Rinehart, 1998, p. 29), as demonstrated in the lives of Herod the King, (Matt 2); Herod the tetrarch (Matt 14:1-11); Jewish religious leadership (Matt 5:20; Matt 11:18,19; Matt: 21:45,46; Matt 23); Pilate (Matt 27:24-26); and the desires and propensities of the disciples (Matt 20:20-24; 26:14-16, 51,52).

Matthew was clear that Jesus understood His mission to be that of fulfilling His Father’s mission (Matt 26:39, 42); of suffering (Matt 16:21; 17:22, 23; 20:17-19). His Father’s mission was to be accomplished through sacrifice (Matt 1:23; 9:35 – 10:1; 16:24, 25; 19:27-30; 28:18-20) and the qualifications necessary to complete this mission were through servanthood (Matt 20:25-28; 23:1-12). Jesus invited His disciples to embrace this type of biblical leadership, servant leadership, and not lordship (Nouwen, 1989; Rinehart, 1998). Nouwen (1989) implies that the present church has struggled with this same concept:

The world in which we live-a world of efficiency and control-has no models to offer to those who want to be shepherds in the way Jesus was a shepherd. . . . a whole new type of leadership is asked for in the church of tomorrow, a leadership which is not modeled on the power games of the world, but on the servant-leader, Jesus, who came to give His life for the salvation of many. (pp. 44-45)
The Trinity took the initiative through the Incarnate Messiah to serve. The Incarnate Messiah chose to be a follower of the Father’s mission (Matt 1; Matt 20:28; Matt 26:39, 42; Matt 28:20). He called the inhabitants of planet earth to engage in kingdom living both now and for the world to come (Wright, 2010); and equipped and sent out a group of disciples in which He empowered them to change the world (Matt 10; Matt 28:18-20).

From the person of Jesus has come a living definition of a biblical servant leader. A biblical servant leader is one who serves as an authentic follower of Jesus and His mission, who engages others in a life of holiness, and takes the initiative to equip others for His mission and growth of His kingdom.

**Three Fundamental Foundations in Understanding Servant Leadership**

It has been argued that the term leadership cannot be used in a valid biblical sense but only that of “first follower” (Sweet, 2012, Kindle Loc. 105). The relationship that Jesus had with His Father was one of “first follower.” However, by being the “first follower” of the Father, He also led others (Matt 8:18-27). Jesus chose to lead not from the cultural perspective of hero (Aristotle) but that of servant (Howell, 2003; Wright, 2010) (Matt 20:25-28).

To understand Jesus as servant leader, there are three foundational theological elements that need to be understood within the Matthean narrative: (a) Jesus as the Incarnate God who took initiative, (b) Jesus as follower, (c) and Jesus and authority.
Incarnate God Taking Initiative

The narrative of Matthew (1:1, RSV used unless otherwise noted) begins by stating: “the book of genealogy” (Βίβλος γενέσεως), the Greek version for Genesis, the book of beginnings. It seems that Matthew was describing a new beginning. The first creation was damaged, but with Jesus, as Messiah (Matt 1:1) a new exodus (Matt 2:15) to a new creation was pictured. This new story began with genealogy and established that “Jesus Christ,” although divine had human lineage (Nolland, 2005; Woodley, 2011; Wright, 2010).

The new beginning, the new creation, began with Abraham, the father of faith; through David, the great shepherd-king leader of Israel. The new beginning had Rahab and Ruth as “outsiders” who were part of the kingdom lineage, the Dispersion, and then to the establishment of the relationship of God with the human race: “A virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and His name shall be called Emmanuel [which means God with us]” (Matt 1:21).

Matthew chapter 1 delineates clearly that although the birth of Jesus was not that of human sexual activity, He was of the Holy Spirit, of human lineage. Heaven took the initiative to be human, to engage with humanity, to dwell with humanity; not above or below, but with humanity (Robinson, 2009, Kindle Loc. 354). The incarnation statement, “God with us,” was the basis for the Christology of Matthew (Hill, 1980; Kingsbury, 1975).

The life of the Incarnate One was consistently in the midst of the human mess. The narrative was clear what “God with us” meant: He hung out with fisherman (Matt 4:18-22); He taught in the synagogues and healed every disease (Matt 4:23; 22:21-45).
He went where the people were (Matt 4:25; 9:35; 11:1); touched lepers (Matt 8:3); slept in a boat (Matt 8:24); ate with tax collectors and sinners (Matt 9:10); defended and healed the sick on the Sabbath (Matt 9:9-13) paid taxes (Matt 17:24-27); blessed children (Matt 19:13-15); and socialized (Matt. 26:6) etc. Jesus was not aloof; He was engaged where people were, in real life issues (Matt 8:14,15; 28-34) (Edwards, 2010).

A key to understanding biblical servant leadership is to grasp the initiative that heaven took through the incarnation to embrace the human condition. Jesus identified this initiative: “… even as the Son of man came not to be served but to serve” (Matt 20:28). The very essence of incarnation meant servant.

Jesus came on the Father’s mission, without compromise, (Wilkes, 1998) and dwelt among people (His greatest miracle), to serve people, encourage them, mentor them, re-direct them, and confront them. To be a biblical servant leader one must align their life with the mission of heaven in order to serve, not for the sake of “established institutions, but for the sake of the established mission” (Agosto, 2005, pp. 17-23). He came to connect with people in the midst of the human mess.

The theme of the Incarnate One was not limited to the beginning of the book (Matt 1). When Jesus was with His disciples on the mountain in Galilee where they saw Him for the first time post resurrection, the theme of the incarnate, “God with us,” was re-established. As part of the “Great Commission” Jesus reiterated the incarnate theme to His followers; “… and lo, I am with you always, to the close of the age” (Matt 28:20). The incarnation experience was established for all generations and will be in effect until the “close of the age.” While “all authority” (ἐξουσία) (Matt 28:28) was given to Him, Jesus did not change His leadership model (Matthey, 1980).
Jesus as Follower

To be an effective biblical servant leader one needs to know when and how to follow. The paradoxes of being a servant leader are following, serving, and leading. The life of Jesus demonstrated these attributes and He voluntarily surrendered to the divine agenda (Matt 26: 39, 42). The paradox Jesus brought was that He led by following; following the divine agenda or mission (Sweet, 2012).

When Jesus went to the Jordan to be baptized, at the beginning of His adult ministry, he was called to submit to the authority of John and his role in the kingdom mission, that of baptism. John reacted as a subservient (Matt 3:11-14). But Jesus stated that He (Jesus) was to be the follower and that by Him following, all righteousness would be fulfilled (Matt 3:15). The Father affirmed this response by Jesus, saying: “This is my beloved Son with whom I am well pleased” (Matt 3:17). In taking the initiative to be baptized, Jesus was submissive to John and to the way of righteousness. The way of righteousness was the same for Jesus, the Pharisees, the rich and the poor; baptism, suffering, a cross. It was the same for all (Matt 3:16; 20:22-28; 10:38) (Wright, 2010).

In Matthew 4:1 the narrative stated that “Jesus was led up by the Spirit into the wilderness” where He fasted, prayed, and was tempted. Jesus could have resisted the wilderness experience. He was divine. But He followed the Spirit, even into temptation.

At the request of a Roman centurion (Matt 8:7) and of a religious ruler (Matt 9:19) Jesus was willing to follow and respond to their requests for healing. Jesus did not dictate every minute of every day. He submitted to those who were in need as it allowed Him to fulfill the mission of the Father: “I will come.”
One of the clearest enunciations of Jesus’ submission, or following the will of the Father was in the Garden of Gethsemane, where He prayed three times: "My Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me; nevertheless, not as I will, but as Thou wilt" (Matt 26:39, 42, 44).

The first words Jesus said to His first disciples were “Follow me” (Matt 4:18-22). Jesus the Incarnate One followed (the agenda of the divine) and then called His disciples to follow Him. The identity of His disciples was not to be as leaders in the church but followers of Jesus the Leader (Sweet, 2012). “A follower is one who has said yes to being chosen and who announces that human chosenness to the world” (Sweet, 2012, Kindle, loc. 901) in order to track “Another’s footsteps” (Sweet, 2012, Kindle, loc. 964) and not their own.

The mission that Jesus followed was to be and reveal the love of the Father (Matt 11:28-30), to call and initiate finding sinners (Matt 9:13; Matt 18:10-14), to serve the human condition (Matt 20:28), and to equip others to engage in the present kingdom process (Matt 10). He went to Jerusalem and ultimately was crucified and resurrected (Matt 16:21-23) to establish a foundation for the future kingdom (Matt 5-7; 19:27-30) “as rulers and priests serving our God” (Wright, 2010, p. 85). Through daily communion with His Father and baptism of the Holy Spirit, Jesus discerned the mission (Blackaby & Blackaby, 2001; White, 1941).

The church has been called to be followers of the Incarnate One and take initiative by permeating the mess and chaos of the present human condition, adhering to the Great Commandment of love (Matt 22:34-40) and the Great Commission (Matt 28:18-20); adhering to the method that Jesus exemplified (Matt 20:28) servant leadership.
So the church in its present context and leadership has been called to follow the divine agenda of the Father and of Jesus and learn followership and His Lordship (Sheets, 1968), for until one knows how to follow, one cannot truly servant lead.

The Authority of Jesus

Jesus as servant leader laid out a blue print for the path of those who followed Him: “A disciple is not above his teacher, nor a servant above his master; it is enough for the disciple to be like his teacher, and the servant like his master” (Matt 10:24,25a). Again, “If any man would come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me. For whoever would save his life will lose it, and whoever loses his life for my sake will find it” (Matt 16:24, 25).

Jesus lived this servant leadership on earth. His actions, character, and motives aligned with His teaching, a life of holiness. He was an authentic follower of His Father as well as being the revelation of the Father on earth (Matt 11:25-27). He was not above His Father; He was submissive to His Father. Jesus’ teaching and practice aligned, unlike those of His culture (Matt 23:3). This alignment of the mission of His Father, His life, and teaching gave Him authority (ἐξουσία) and influence with the crowds, disciples, and religious leaders (Matt 7:28, 29; 9:6-8; 10:1; 21:1-27).

As Jesus was teaching in the temple, the religious leaders recognized in Jesus an authority which challenged their authority (i.e. when He cleansed the temple and let those back in that were undesirable). When requested by them to identify where His authority (ἐξουσία) came from (Matt 21:1-27), Jesus stated He would tell them where His authority (ἐξουσία) came from if they could answer a simple question: “The baptism of John,
whence was it? From heaven or from men” (Matt 21:25)? Jesus entangled them in their own political conniving and they would not answer (Matt 21:27).

Jesus, through a short parable of two sons (Matt 21:28-32), described very clearly where His authority (ἐξουσία) and those who followed Him came from. The authority (ἐξουσία) came from doing “the will of the Father.” Jesus also intimated that the tax collectors and sinners had more authority (ἐξουσία) than they (Pharisees), from a kingdom perspective, because they recognized who Jesus was and followed Him.

The Pharisees attempted to “entangle Jesus in His talk” (Matt 22:15) in order to discredit His authority (ἐξουσία) in the eyes of the people. If Jesus was not an authority, or just another fringe Jew, the religious rulers would not have gone to such great lengths to challenge His authority.

When one’s life has been aligned with their teaching, and their teaching aligned with their life, and the teaching and the life revolve around a compelling mission, by default one gains authority. The authority (ἐξουσία) of Jesus allowed Him to declare a new way of leading, the way of the suffering servant (Matt 20:28). Jesus did not become incarnate in order to lead. Jesus became incarnate to serve His Father’s mission and thereby gained authority as a leader to declare a new leadership model, servant leader.

**The Significance of Matthew 20:25-28**

This pericope in the narrative of Matthew discusses in a succinct way traditional leadership norms and that of the kingdom of heaven. The incarnate one, the follower, the one with authority declares the leadership model for His church.

But Jesus called them to him and said,

“You know that the rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them, and their great men exercise authority over them. It shall not be so among you; but whoever would be
great among you must be your servant, and whoever would be first among you must be your slave; even as the Son of man came not to be served but to serve, and to give His life as a ransom for many." (Matt 20:25-28)

These verses were part of a short story (Matt 20:20-24) that was part of a larger story of biblical leadership theology. Matthew 20:25-28 serves as a summation of the Matthean view of biblical servant leadership for the church community.

Matthew chapters 18, 19, and the first portion of 20 deal very specifically with the themes of leadership that lead up to Jesus’ proclamation of what kingdom leadership was all about (France, 2007). The sequential narratives found in Matthew 18:1–20:24 are pivotal in understanding Matthew 20:25-28.

Theological Insights of Matthew 18

There is no question in the mind of Matthew that Jesus was the Messiah, the Son of God, the Son of man, the one who was to establish the present kingdom and the kingdom to come, and usher in a new covenant of living unparalleled in human history. And yet the disciples seemed committed to the idea of a political Messiah, and the resulting AHL models of secular leadership (Akuchie, 1993) in which they saw themselves as central.

Matthew 18:1-20; the “Child” and “Little Ones”

The disciples raised the question of greatness: “Who is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven?” (Matt 18:1). The metaphor that Jesus used to teach “greatness” was that of a “child” (Matt 18:2, 5) or one of the “little ones” (Matt 18:10, 14) and reiterated this point of the kingdom value of a child in Matt 19:14, “to such belongs the kingdom of heaven.” Jesus’ statement of greatness was in contrast to what the disciples and religious leaders perceived for themselves.
The “child,” “little ones” referred to here was not a representation of just physical age, but also a level of spiritual maturity. Earlier in the narrative there was reference to “little faiths” (Matt 8:26; 14:31; 16:8; 17:20), for Jesus did not come to call the spiritual experts, but “sinners” (Matt 9:13) (Woodley, 2011), the “little ones,” “little faiths.” This concept was revolutionary to the disciples thinking because of the vulnerability and insignificance of the child (France, 2007) in their culture. How could that which was vulnerable and insignificant be great? The name of the child (Matt 18:2) was not mentioned, nor gender, nor family, which makes the point of vulnerability and insignificance stronger. Matthew’s previous mention of children was the vulnerability of the incarnate child Jesus and of those nameless male children slaughtered by Herod (Matt 2:13-16).

Matthew suggested that in the “kingdom of heaven” there were no “great ones” but rather there were “little ones” in which “status-consciousness and formally constituted authority have no place” (France, 2007, p. 759). The theme that seems to be in place was not that of identifiable characteristics of a child, but rather their social status as being at the bottom of the social hierarchy and authority (Carter, 1994). Matthew stated there was no place for the human perspective of “greatness” (power, position, possessions) in the kingdom of heaven but rather the “child,” the “little ones” were key to His kingdom.

The parable of the sheep intimated that when one of the “little ones” was in trouble, vulnerable action was to be taken. The shepherd, the one responsible for the vulnerable and the insignificant, was to take action (Matt 18:12, 13). For Matthew the definition of “greatness” was the one who took initiative and pursued the vulnerable,
insignificant, and the “little ones;” for the angels of these “little ones” “always behold the face of my Father in heaven” (Matt 18:10). This action defined greatness.

So also the church community (Matt 18:15-20) was to take initiative when one of the “little ones” was in trouble and attempt to correct their path to keep them from harm. A sequence of resolution was given. This was not a hierarchical resolution of leadership. The pastor or bishop was not called to resolve the issue, but fellow brothers and sisters in the community who were serving one another were called. If the “little one” did not respond, they were to be treated as lost and the shepherd would search for them (Matt 18:10-14).

Matthew 18:21-35: Parable of Forgiveness in Leadership

Through His narrative in the parables, Jesus spoke of the leadership principles of God. Though God had not been seen or touched, Jesus, who was the incarnate of the Father on earth, spoke on behalf of the Father (Paulien, 2012). The parable of forgiveness (Matt 18:21-35) gave emphasis to these insignificant ones, a slave, who was in trouble. What followed was a statement of how servant leadership functioned in relationship to the “little ones” and how different this type of leadership was in comparison to authoritarian leadership norms.

There was only one who could resolve the plight of the slave, the master. The parable chose to initially demonstrate common practice in relationship to debt; sell and recover what you could. But servant leadership for the “kingdom of heaven” (Matt 18:23) does not function that way. Servant leadership for the “kingdom of heaven” was to pursue the mission of the Father, which in this context was to rescue the “little ones” that were in trouble, even if the trouble was of their own making. The master extended
compassion, “the heart of that slave’s master went out to him” (France, 2007, p. 701), a leadership characteristic rarely seen among the Gentile or Jewish religious leaders. The implication was clear: if the master took initiative to extend compassion, then His disciples should take initiative to extend compassion to insignificants and “little ones” whenever they were “in trouble” even if the “little ones” caused the trouble that made them vulnerable. Greatness for Matthew was initiative and compassion for the “little ones.”

Theological Insights of Matthew 19

The discussion shifts from that of a dialogue with the disciples to one with the Pharisees and a young man. Although the disciples were still witnesses and were intersected into the dialogue, the theme of greatness is still under consideration.

Matthew 19:3-12

The Pharisees tested Jesus in an attempt to force Him to retreat to their control, their power. The topic was marriage and divorce (Matt 19:3-12), a controversial topic focused from an understanding of Deuteronomy 24:1-4 and the current reality of Herod Antipas’ situation (Matt 14).

In the male dominated society of Judaism, the woman was seen as “insignificant,” they were property with no legal rights or education (Tetlow, 1980). Jesus called the value of marriage back to the equality of Genesis 1 and 2 (Wright, 2010). The disciples were again confronted with the fact that another group of “insignificants,” women were significant in the kingdom of heaven; similarly just as the children, “insignificants,” became “significant” in the next pericope (Matt 19:13-15).
Jesus stated the reason divorce and remarriage was difficult was because of their “hardness of hearts” (Matt 19:8). The topic of “hardness of hearts,” as conveyed by Matthew, reached beyond just the marriage issue. The “hardness of hearts” was why the disciples, religious leaders, secular leaders, leaders of all ages struggled with greatness, compassion, acceptance of “insignificants” like women and children; why the rich young man turned away, why the concept of being a servant was so difficult to accept.

The disciples questioned Jesus’ value of marriage; they saw this position as an impossibility (France, 2007). Matthew recounted these difficult issues about the kingdom of heaven one after the other to demonstrate their “hardness of hearts” and how this hardness was keeping them from seeing a new way of kingdom living and leadership. The disciples were beginning to feel that this kingdom living and kingdom leading was unfeasible. Jesus acknowledged that not everyone was able to accept this new order of kingdom thinking, but He presented Himself as the one “who was the cure for the hardness of hearts” about the kingdom (Wright, 2010, p. 121).

Matthew 19:13-15: The Treatment of the “Little Ones”

Matthew inserts again the reality of children (Matt 19:13-15). Parents are bringing the “little ones” to Jesus to pray and lay hands on. The disciples responded in the traditional way by rebuking the people for interrupting Jesus with “insignificants (Matt 19:13). The point here was that (Matt 19:12, 14, 23, 24) those who comprised the kingdom of heaven were those who were, in fact, “unimportant, the dependent, the vulnerable” (France, 2007, p. 727). Jesus took time and served them. Disciples, followers of Jesus, exist to serve “insignificants.”
Matthew 19:16-30

At this point the text shifts and brings into discussion someone who was not a “child,” or “little one,” or “insignificant” in the perspective of local culture (Matt 19:16-30). The “significant” young man was seeking what it takes for full maturity (τεληος), not “moral flawlessness” (France, 2007; Wright, 2010). The generally accepted worldview of the time was that wealth and commandment keeping implied God’s blessing and a sign of maturity. Poverty and lack of attention to the rules implied God’s curse and spiritual immaturity.

The essence of kingdom maturity in this passage was to “sell” and “give” in order to “come” and “follow.” This was the answer of Jesus to that of perfection in relationship to being a servant, “a little one” (Agosto, 2005). True kingdom maturity is not based on human worthiness or significance, but God’s call to follow Him in humility and generosity. It is about what God chooses to do in us: “a character formed by overflowing generous love” (Wright, 2010, p. 121).

Jesus described the type of follower that would be part of the kingdom of heaven. The follower of Jesus would be more concerned about others than themselves and in taking care of others (most specifically the little ones and insignificants) they themselves would become mature. The selling and giving would help this young man to understand that the good life of the kingdom was about engaging with the “little ones,” the “insignificants,” not the accumulation of goods and status and the focus of rule keeping.

Again the disciples were stunned at this kingdom teaching, “who then can be saved?” (Matt 19:25). This type of authentic servant living did not come naturally: "With men this is impossible, but with God all things are possible" Matt 19:26. Jesus stated that
following Him in kingdom living was a miracle from heaven. This young man thought he could attain the heavenly kingdom on his own merits.

This narrative concluded when Peter suggested that the disciples had done what this young man was unwilling to do (Matt 19:27). Jesus affirmed that the spirit of coming and following was the spirit of kingdom leadership and that they would participate with heaven in leadership, not from a position of traditional roles, but from that of redemption (Matt 19:28-30).

Theological Insights of Matthew 20

Matthew 19:30 introduced the idea of the first being last and the last first, another twist to kingdom living, kingdom followership, kingdom leadership and that of being a servant.

Matthew 20:1-16: An Understanding of First and Last

The Matthean narrative shifts to parabolic teaching to address the issue of social status within the kingdom of heaven. The social pecking order was huge in first century life both in the secular and religious practice (Matt 23:6, 7) (Akuchie, 1993). This parable taught that those who seemed to have everything, “firsts,” really did not if they did not understand the generosity, humility, service, love and grace of the “owner of the vineyard” (Matt 20:8).

The Jews were given the blessings of being God’s people, but had hoarded that blessing for self in isolation, not benevolence. They came up with their own religious-secular plan for “firstness” and made an arrogant “firstness” the object of belonging. But Jesus demonstrated that the “lasts,” another implication of “little ones” and “insignificants,” (whom the disciples had little time for), were the object of God’s love.
and grace and in essence were “firsts.” The disciples who had given up everything in order to follow Him (Matt 19:27-29) were essentially “lasts” but were now “firsts;” the rich young man who had kept what he felt were all the necessary requirements, appeared to be “first” but in kingdom logic he was now “last.”

Matthew used a paradox application to the theology of “first” and “last.” Those who strove to be first for the sake of being first found themselves last. Those whom society placed last as the outsider, the little ones, the insignificants, heaven placed them as firsts. Jesus who was truly the first in the kingdom of heaven, made Himself last in order to serve and ameliorate the human mess.

**Matthew 20:17-19: The Suffering Servant**

Matthew inserted into the narrative for the third time the reflection of the keystone to the Father’s will. Jesus would go to Jerusalem, be crucified and humiliated, but also be raised on the third day (Matt 20:17-19; 16:21; 17:22, 23). The Messiah was going to Jerusalem to restore all of creation, to restore the divine purpose of what it is to be human (Matt 19:27-29) and to inaugurate a new kingdom of shared leadership upon His resurrection (Wright, 2010). This was to be accomplished through sacrifice.

In each insert there were three key pieces to the Father’s mission; for this follower of the Father (servant) letting nothing dissuade him from following through (leader); (a) go to Jerusalem and suffer at the hands of men, (b) death, and (c) resurrection. Jesus was called to mission (follower) and lead His disciples on the same journey; “we are going up” (Matt 20:18). Jesus had stated that if they were going to follow Him they must “carry their cross” (Matt 10:38; 16:24) (France, 2007). Followers follow in the leader’s steps. Jesus was leading by example (Akuchie, 1993).
Each time Jesus took the disciples down the road of suffering, they seemed repulsed and attempted to head back up the perceived “mountain of glory,” hoping that “Messiahship” meant an earthly victory, not defeat (Matt 16:22); greatness, not obscurity (Matt 18:1) and power, not servitude (Matt 20:20,21). Jesus continued to remind them that the way up is down (Akuchie, 1993; Bruner, 1990).

Matthew 20:20-24: The Zebedee Trio’s Desire for Leadership

The scene abruptly changed as Matthew strategically placed the story of the wife of Zebedee playing the traditional role of a Hebrew mother (Akuchie, 1993; Cheney, 1997), accompanied by her two disciple sons. The contrast between Matt 20:17-19 and 20:20-24 heightened the perception that the disciples of Jesus did not understand the role of leadership in the kingdom of heaven.

These two disciples along with the other 10 sensed a clear understanding of a kingdom being established. Jesus brought up the issue of His Messiahship and then “strictly charged them to tell no one that He was the Christ” (Matt 16:20). The disciples had witnessed the miracles of Jesus, a new law given, and seen the evidence and fulfillment of Old Testament statements about Messiah. Jesus had also stated that they would “sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel” (Matt 19:28). Kingdom talk had been prevalent.

Zebedee’s wife knelt in deference to her understanding of the type of kingdom she and her sons anticipated Jesus would establish. They knew He was the Messiah. The title “Son of man” had a kingly reference (Dan 7:13, 14) and Jesus had spoken of Him sitting on His glorious throne (Matt 19:27-29).
Jesus asked: “What do you want?” (Matt 20:21a). She made a clear request for traditional kingdom power and authority. “Command imperative is used because she recognizes Jesus’ authority, that these two sons of mine sit on your right hand and on your left hand” (Stock, 1994, p. 313) (Matt 20:21). Later in the narrative the only evidence Matthew gave of ones gaining access to the left and right of Christ were those who were crucified with Him (Matt 27:38).

Jesus had resisted the devil’s strategy to exercise the traditional leadership style just after His baptism (Matt 4:1-10). He again faced this temptation through a different mouthpiece. If Jesus chose to exercise this type of leadership, He would have evoked the same type of response as there was toward the traditional leadership (Matthey, 1980). Jesus accepted adoration (Matt 14:33; 21:9, 15; 26:7; 28:9), but would not accept political adoration (Matt 14:22).

The narrative makes clear that the mission of Jesus (which is to become the mission of His followers) is that of “calling sinners.” It is a call to associate with the “child,” the “little ones,” the “insignificants,” “the vulnerable” and to take the initiative to enter into the chaos of life for those who were “in trouble” spiritually, physically and emotionally. Following this kingdom journey of service would trample present cultural understandings of leadership (Nouwen, 1989). The list of insignificants in Matthew is extensive, lepers, lame, tax collectors, harlots, blind, demoniacs, deaf, maimed, women, children, paralytics, those with withered hands to name just a few. Jesus spent little time with the perceived “significants” (Matt 8:18, a ruler) other than in confrontation (Matt 22, 23). The “significants” appeared to be threatened by Jesus’ model of servant leadership and authority.
The disciples’ minds were gridlocked with the idea that rulership, kingdoms, control, position, and power were the only structural possibilities for leadership. The style of leadership, biblical servant leadership that Jesus taught and lived was foreign to their view as it has been to just about every generation within the Christian church (Nouwen, 1989).

Jesus posed a question that would demonstrate how well they understood the servant leadership training they had received during their three years with Him, “Are you able to drink the cup I am to drink?” (Matt 20:22). The answer, based on chapters 18 and 19 should have been, “We can’t, but with God all things are possible” (Woodley, 2011, Kindle, Loc. 2589). But in the rush of thinking that they might be able to one-up the other disciples they responded, “We are able” (Matt 20:22) not realizing that the cup was suffering, not ambition and glory (Davis & Allison, 1997).

Judas never lost hope of this earthly kingdom idea and forced this idea of an earthly kingdom all the way to the betrayal and condemnation of Jesus (Matt 26:14-16; 27:3-5). The kingdom message of being an agent for the mission of the Father, of being a servant and taking initiative for the “little ones”, of engaging in a different kind of kingdom found no place in the heart and life of Judas.

The stage was now set for Matthew’s statement on servant leadership. The 10 heard of this dialogue between the Zebedee trio and Jesus and “they are indignant” (Matt 20:24; ἡγανάκτησαν, seldom used meaning “to be unwilling,” “incensed” [Stock, 1994, p. 314]). Their anger is focused on the two brothers, (who were two of the first called, Matt 4:21, 22 and were part of the inner circle, Matt 17:1). The anger was about the perceived role of leadership that these two requested of Jesus. The two brothers had
attempted to elbow their way past the ten who were every bit as status conscious as the two brothers (Davis & Allison, 1997; France, 2007; Nolland, 2005).

Matthew 20:25-28: Jesus’ Statement on Leadership

The disciples feuded with each other and so “Jesus called them to Him” (Matt 20:25a). It was time for the spoken lesson on leadership that Jesus had lived out as the Son of man, “which was a radically different value-scale of the kingdom of heaven” (France, 2007). A servant of man and yet their servant leader (Sheets, 1968; Woodley, 2011).

Jesus addresses initially the standard of leadership known, lived, and experienced in Jewish culture (and by Roman rule). Jesus did not do away with leadership, or structure, greatness, or authority, but redefined their purpose.

The type of leadership experienced by first century people was modeled by what they saw in “Roman and local governments, voluntary associations (e.g. trade guilds) in their cities, the Jewish synagogue, and the structure of the family” (Sumney, 2002, p. 27).

Each of these structures had a very specific hierarchy in which each level had expectations of honor, status, dominance, power, and control. Often the highest positions of government (e.g. Caesar, kings) were seen as those with deistic abilities (Tiede, 1992). “Whether Jew, Greek, or Roman, the world of the New Testament functioned in a climate with the ‘monopolizing of leadership to a narrow circle, generation after generation . . . ’ ” (Agosto, 2005, p. 5). Most often the wealthy, the educated, certain occupations, and individuals adept at patronage were those who assumed the positions that Jesus described as “Gentiles” and “great men” (Matt 20:25).
Servants and slaves in society allowed the ruling class to maintain their life style of leisure, estates, creativity, workload, and status in society. In fact not having slaves “was unimaginable in antiquity” (Beavis, 1992, p. 39) and was seen as the foundation for the Greco-Roman world. There was no appreciable number in the middle class. Most of society was made up of servants, slaves, military, and peasants. This lower rung of society was approximately 90% of the population (Agosto, 2005) and in Rome approximately one-third of the population was estimated to be slaves (Beavis, 1992). When Jesus spoke of “servants” and “slaves,” He directed his comments to an audience who had a ready understanding.

The cynic philosophers, Plato, Aristotle, and others had espoused a different model of leadership (Sumney, 2002; C. West, 1980), what might even be termed as servant leadership. Seeley (1993) noted this perspective from several sources, but it was not lived out in the Greco-Roman world.

The good king receives his office from Zeus on the condition that he shall "plan and study the welfare of his subjects." He "honours and loves the good, yet extends his care to all.” No one is as great a practitioner of φιλανθρωπία as the good king. He "displays a soul benignant and gentle towards all.” Dio even implies that the king experiences some sort of equality with his slaves:

In the title "master," ... he can take no delight, nay, not even in relation to his slaves (δοῦλοι), much less to his free subjects; for he looks upon himself as being king, not for the sake of his individual self, but for the sake of all men (χάρις των ἄνθρωπων ἀπάντων). (Seeley, 1993, p. 236)

Servant leadership was spoken about, but not practiced. The culture had well established the concept of “great ones” over the “little ones,” or “insignificants.” Homage was due, anticipated, and expected. The terms “lord it over” (κατακυριεύουσιν) and
“exercise authority over (καταεξουσιάζουσιν)” are both compounds that begin with (κατα) which means “down” or “bear down on” (France, 2007, p. 760), the “ruling of the dominant dictator” or “to play the tyrant” (MacArthur, 1988, p. 239). Jesus expresses the hierarchical structure of the Gentiles and of the “great ones” demanding to be served by the “little ones.” Nowhere is it mentioned or implied that the rule of the “Gentiles” or “great men” is “among” or with the people that Jesus models (Matt 20:29-34).

Jesus gave imagery of the leadership model that was prevalent in first century culture. This was what the Zebedee trio was trying to gain and was desired by the other ten disciples. He now sets forth a change of direction for leadership; “It shall not be so among you” (Matt 20:26). First century cultural leadership was not the model for the followers of the “kingdom of heaven.”

An interesting comparison was made about leadership for the “kingdom of heaven.” If you want to be great—be a servant. If you want to be first—be a slave. This reference in Matt 20:25 was alluded to in Matt 19:30 and 20:16 and spoke of a core value of “the kingdom of heaven,” the relationship of what is truly “first” and “last.”

Much has been said to describe and define the “servant” (διάκονος) (vs 26) and the “slave” (δούλος) (vs 27) concept. During this era servants and slaves were anything from abused workers, servile positions, to table waiters, or emissaries for the ruling class (Beavis, 1992; Sumney, 2002). Yet they were always subject to “the power and will of their master” (Carter, 1994, p. 171). In the Greco-Roman world it was the desire of the “significants” to have a slave that was faithful, loyal and obedient, but these were “rare, servile characteristics” (Beavis, 1992, p. 43). In the parable found in Matt 24:45-51 the
servant/slave that was not obedient received a severe punishment: “cut him to pieces” (NIV). These individuals were property.

Some individuals would sell themselves as slaves in order to gain more status (Agosto, 2005), but as Plato stated, “how can anyone be happy when he is the slave of anyone else at all?” (as cited in Bruner, 1990, p. 333).

Jesus brought together interesting contrasts; “first” and “last,” “Gentile” and “servant,” and “great men” and “slave.” The disciples did not comprehend how shame and humiliation (Matt 20:17-20), having no rights or status was the height of greatness (Goldsmith, 2001).

Matthew emphasized this point by his placement of the plural “your” (ofday) along with the imperative “will be” (έσται) (Matt 20:26); “the person in your midst who wants to be great must make the fundamental decision to be the servant of all the rest of you” which is “the immediate acceptance of a way of life” (Bruner, 1990, p. 333).

Studies have shown that διάκονεο, the Greek verb behind “one who serves,” may have referred not to “table service as such but a task or office of high status in which the servant is authorized to act as an emissary for a ruler or a divinity.” Thus Jesus offers his disciples a servant leadership that is noble because it comes from the directive of the Divine Creator (Agosto, 2005, pp. 48, 49).

Jesus made crystal clear that the attributes of leadership, which the Gentiles and great men used, was based on pride, self-adulation, power, control, position, possessions, and was self-focused. It had no place at all in the leadership of the “kingdom of heaven.” The leadership model exemplified in the life of Jesus was based on the metaphor of the
servant (διάκονια) (Stanley, 1967). This model of leadership that Jesus lived and taught was seen as a threat to the authoritarian leadership models of His day (Tiede, 1992).

Jesus set up His own life as the model for leadership—the life of the servant and leader. Jesus stated very clearly and precisely why He came—the mission of the Father: “even as the Son of man came not to be served but to serve, and to give His life as a ransom for many” (Matt 20:28).

To the Gentile leader this statement (Matt 20:28) was in direct contrast to their understanding of service, which was viewed “as undignified and unworthy of a freeman” (Stanley, 1967, p. 557). It was anticipated that the servant or slave would give his life in ransom for the master, for the success of the master (Akuchie, 1993). At best a Jew considered the role of service only to those whom they deemed worthy or if in some way that could gain some type of merit from God (Stanley, 1967).

Jesus served most conspicuously by giving His life as a “ransom” (λύτρον—word found only here and Mk 10:45). Ransom was offered on behalf of or “in place of” (France, 2007, p. 755), or for someone “being held captive against their will” (Woodley, 2011, Kindle Loc. 2603). In the secular context, ransom was primarily used for the “manumission of slaves and release of prisoners of war, but also of an offering to a god to gain release from a curse, an omen, or a state of servitude brought on by one’s offences” (Nolland, 2005, p. 824). “The ransom, either in the form of money or personal presence, takes the place of the captive” (Woodley, 2011, Kindle loc. 2603). The disciples were not only being held captive by sin and an oppressive Roman government, but in the context of this passage by their concepts of leadership of “fame, power, and privilege” (Woodley, 2011, Kindle, loc. 2603)
The idea of ransom (λύτρον) has reference to several Old Testament passages (Exod 5:14-6:7; 21:30: 30:12; Lev 5:14-6:7; Num 5:5-8; Isa 53:5, 6, 8, 10-12). This denotes that “atonement is made by (the) suffering (servant)” (Brown, 1971, p. 196). This gave the idea of a “vicarious punishment leading to deliverance” and that this ransom (λύτρον) and service had been “firmly placed before us not as a historical accident but as his deliberate goal” (France, 2007, p. 763).

This type of act of service, of ransom, (servant leadership—from the God who took initiative) is identified by many as love, αγαπάω love (Patterson, Grenny, Maxfield, & McMillan, 2003). Αγαπάω love was a word and concept that the early Christian church took from secular society. It was “soaked in the message and achievement of Jesus and given a new life” (Wright, 2010, p. 184). Αγαπάω love “refers to a moral love, doing the right thing at the right time for the right reason” (Winston, 2006, p. 5) and from the mind of a Jew “giving without expecting to take” (Dessler, 1985, p. 126). Wuest (1997) explains this when he states:

(Agapao) speaks of a love that is awakened by a sense of value in an object that causes one to prize it. It springs from an apprehension of the preciousness of an object. It is a love of esteem and approbation. The quality of this love is determined by the character of the one who loves; not that of the object loved. (p.11)

Therefore, αγαπάω was the foundation for ransom and of all true servant leadership for it “transcends mere notions of love, stands unique as a concept of love, and fulfills love’s greatest potential as a moral agent in the praxis of leadership” (Ayers, 2008, p. 2). So the αγαπάω of λύτρον of Jesus as the “Son of man” was the ultimate expression of being a servant and leader. “Son of man,” a term, as compared to “Son of God” in Matthew is confessional in nature. “Son of Man,” in the context of Matthew, is
“a Christological title with which Jesus encounters the world, first the Jews and then the Gentiles, and particularly his opponents and unbelievers” (Kingsbury, 1975, p. 200).

Matthew 20:29-34: The Practical Application

The Matthean narrative gives a practical explanation of Jesus’ theology of servant leadership. Jesus headed out of Jericho, out of the limelight, experiencing the common everyday life with His disciples and a nameless crowd. There are two “insignificants,” blind men, by the road. No one notices them until they “cry out.” The crowd immediately “rebukes” the “insignificants.” Why? Because insignificants were not worthy to be served. They are a bother. There was no prestige, power, honor, or bettering one’s social status in serving these “insignificants.”

Jesus stopped and called the “insignificants” to come to Him. He asked them the very same question that He had asked the Zebedee trio: “What do you want me to do for you?” (Matt 20:32). The “insignificants” ask for healing, release from a captivity over which they had no power to escape. The λύτρον of Jesus was not only expressed at the cross, but was an essential ingredient of His everyday life. “And Jesus in pity touched their eyes, and immediately they received their sight and followed him” (Matt 20:32). The Incarnate took initiative and engaged as a servant extending ransom to a captive, an “insignificant” and gained a follower.

Conclusion

Through story and teaching the Matthean narrative reminded the early church of the leadership model it was to exemplify: servant leadership. The servant leadership model discussed in the narrative had no similarities to the authoritarian leadership models.
The life of Jesus was and is the clearest demonstration of servant leadership. The Incarnate One followed the mission of the Father (Sheets, 1968; Tiede, 1992). Everything He did was in response to the mission of the Father: dwelling among people, engaging the little ones, children, insignificant, vulnerable; healing; rebuking the spiritual leadership; His death and resurrection. Jesus’ mission was to free everyone (λῦτρον) to live the heavenly kingdom life now in preparation for eternal kingdom (Powell, 1990; Tiede, 1992; Wright, 2010). Biblical servant leadership, as exemplified by Christ, was not a partial leadership style (part servant leadership part traditional forms). It was all servant leadership.

The narrative makes clear that in the church community Jesus called servants and not heroes (Howell, 2003; Wright, 2010). The servant leader that God calls is not to come up with some new visionary plan, but rather to stay fixed on the divine agenda, “the evangelization of the lost, the edification of the saved, and the establishment of vital churches” (Howell, 2003, p. 301). For servant leadership finds its motive from God’s commissioning a person to carry out a divine plan among a group of people. Becoming a servant to the mission and a follower of the God who called you is the heart of servant leadership. (Wilkes, p. 77)

The narrative’s expectation was that because of the suffering atonement of Jesus for all (not the suffering of other martyrs or good people, Brown, 1971) all followers and servant leaders in Christ would take initiative through compassion, humility, and love (αγαπάω). As a recipient of the ransom (λῦτρον) of the ultimate Servant Leader Jesus, those who follow him would be active in participating in ransom (λῦτρον) for those in need even in the midst of the human mess. The Matthean narrative is clear: servant leadership does not come naturally. Motives are suspect. Humans tend to operate from the concepts of “hardness of heart,” pursuit of human greatness, recognition, and
position. They rebuke those who come to Jesus, and confuse what should be “first” with what should be “last.”

The reality of a BSL model is foreign to human thought and tradition. In order to engage in true biblical servant leadership one must become a new creation. This change is made possible by the Incarnate One, the one who ransoms (λῦτρον) and who transforms the character in order to be in alignment with the divine agenda. “With men this is impossible, but with God all things are possible” (Matt 19:26).
CHAPTER 3

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter provides a review of literature contributing to an understanding of a transitional journey from an authoritarian hierarchical leadership (AHL) model to that of a biblical servant leadership (BSL) model.

Burns (1978) has stated that leadership, its different models and different forms, is “one of the most observed and least understood phenomena on earth” (p. 2). Bass co-produced a tome entitled Bass and Stodgill’s Handbook of Leadership: Research, Theory and Application. It has 189 pages of bibliography and in conclusion Bass stated, “the endless accumulation of empirical data has not produced an integrated understanding of leadership” (Bass & Stogdill, 1990, p. 179). There is a plethora of information on leadership, but there seems to be no unity on a precise definition of leadership, how to connect the different models of leadership, the science of leadership, the art of leadership, or the spirituality of leadership.

In reviewing the literature which pertains to this project, there are three major foci. The first focuses on AHL models and whether there are viable applications (Heifetz & Laurie, 2001; VanGelder, 2007) to the Potomac Conference for the 21st century.

The second focuses on biblical servant leadership as an appropriate model and which attributes, characteristics, or traits could be most effective in this context.
The third focuses on the principles of transition for a faith-based organization from an AHL model to a BSL model. Tension is created in shifting a faith-based organization’s model and focus on leadership. The challenge is to honor one’s heritage, yet be connected to the present realities; to be progressive, but not maverick or rogue; passionate, but not arrogant.

**Authoritarian Hierarchical Leadership (AHL) Models**

Different types of hierarchical leadership models have been around since the beginning of time (Serrat, 2009). Over the past several centuries a certain pattern of hierarchical structure has emerged (Heifetz & Laurie, 2001; McGee-Cooper & Trammell, 2002) and has been adapted by faith-based and church organizations, family structures, and governments. However, over the past several decades most concepts of AHL models seem to grow increasingly with disfavor and are deemed irrelevant (Wong & Page, 2003).

Most recent literature has identified AHL leadership models as no longer effective, archaic and irrelevant. Such terms as “egotistical pride,” “evil,” (Wong & Page, 2003, pp. 6, 7); “top-down,” “conventional bureaucracy of control,” “maladaptive,” “fixed boundaries,” (Child & McGrath, 2001, p. 1136); “intrusive,” “status quo,” (Cueni, 2006, pp. 226, 231), “centralized regulatory practices,” “mediocrity, routinization and dead traditionalism,” (Fredrickson, 2009, p. 227), have been used derogatorily and not with affirmation. Most authors agree that there must be a move away from AHL models. There is no agreement as to what model(s) would be most effective today.
These current descriptions of AHL models intimate the potential problems but do not define the model. There seems to be an assumption that AHL models are innately understood.

For this project a AHL model will be defined as that which is a top-down model of leadership practices that (a) has a centralized form of governance (Frederickson, 2009, p. 227) and is office based (Bandy, 2004, p. 68); (b) a one-size fits all mentality (Knight, 2007, p. 175); (c) decisions are made and controlled from a higher level of organization and then, through the formalization of policies, prohibit certain behaviors for the sake of the institution (Frederickson, 2009, p. 228) creating a paternalistic setting (Laub, 2003, p. 2); (d) highest priorities tend to be strategic plans for “growth, prosperity, and glitz” (Hertig, 2007, p. 300); (e) often using coercion and manipulation, (Stanko, 2000, p. x) in order to create a stable and certain environment (Frederickson, 2009, p. 228); (f) success is viewed as moving up the bureaucratic ladder (Knight, 2007, p. 167; Rugenstein, 2005, p. 80).

Challenges to AHL Models

Because of different technological advances, scientific research, globalization, and other cultural shifts, AHL models of leadership are seen as outdated in providing the leadership necessary for the globalization we live in. Lichtenstein et al. (2006) have argued that we live in a complex world, therefore authoritarian, “hierarchical views of leadership are less and less useful” (p. 2).

Irving (2005) demonstrated that, through the study of quantum theory, relationships, and the understanding of how minute particles in relationship to large
realities, the universe must be studied in the context of that relationship. But one must take it to another step to understand:

(a) the whole over the part, (b) dynamic processes over static processes, (c) organizational networks over organizational hierarchies, and (d) systemic interconnectedness over linear progression and thought. Such a holistic focus on interconnectedness, relationship, and dynamic process in networked organizations naturally lends itself to the use of relationally-oriented organizational structures such as teams. In this shift toward quantum-relational approaches to organizing, it is not surprising that new forms of leadership are needed to excel within these changing dynamics. (pp. 67, 68)

Bonabeau and Meyer (2001), in their observation of insects, there are other leadership constructs. They coined the phrase “swarm intelligence” (p. 108). They argued that:

social insects work without supervision. In fact, their teamwork is largely self-organized, and coordination arises from the different interactions among individuals in the colony. Although these interactions might be primitive . . . taken together they result in efficient solutions to difficult problems. (p. 109)

In the context of insects, AHL models do not exist. Bonabeau and Meyer (2001) noted that through swarm intelligence there is much more flexibility (the ability to adapt to environmental changes), robustness (if one or more members fail the group can still perform the needed responsibilities), and self-organization (supervision and top-down control are not evident).

Brafman and Beckstrom (2006) noted that when someone comes in contact with an organization or institution the immediate impulse is to look for and understand hierarchical structures. They argued that because of our predilection to hierarchy we have been slow to recognize the value of leaderless organizations. They refer to research that has been done in neurology, the human brain, and spiders and starfish. As diverse as these studies were, they pointed to common abilities. These leadership structures for adaptation and resilience provided no direction for these systems and organisms.
Another approach to understanding leadership is through the study of complexity science. Complexity science according to Coveney (2003) is the “study of the behavior of large collections of … simple, interacting units, endowed with the potential to evolve with time” (p. 1,058). The cause for these complexities is globalization, the technological revolution, deregulation, and democratization (Uhl-Bien, Marion, & McKelvey, 2008). Rather than looking only for hierarchical structures, although they may be present, the focus is on how multiple entities are interfacing in linear or horizontal relationships. Complexity science suggests that there are numerous factors at different levels that must always be taken into account in order to fully understand any situation.

Uhl-Bien et al. (2007) established what they call the complexity leadership theory. This theory attempts to embrace:

the learning, creative, and adaptive capacity of complex adaptive systems (CAS) within a context of knowledge-producing organizations. Complexity Leadership Theory seeks to foster CAS dynamics while at the same time enabling control structures for coordinating formal organizations and producing outcomes appropriate to the vision and mission of the organization. (p. 300)

Uhl-Bien et al. (2008) did not call for the eradication of all hierarchical models. The call is for alternatives, a redefining and a reformattting of these models from the Industrial Age to the Knowledge Era. A need to switch from established stability and a certainty mentality, to a hyper-competitive, hyper-changing environment. The emphasis needs to be placed on structures that will support development, social networks, adaptability, quick flexibility, and innovation at all levels of structures and not just at the top layers of organizations. The complexity levels that organizations now have can no longer endure where all decisions are made at a level far removed from where the CAS are. This established what is known as the Law of Requisite Complexity which simply states, “it takes complexity to defeat complexity—a system must possess complexity
equal to that of its environment in order to function effectively” (p. 301).

The Law of Requisite Complexity requires you to consider four elements that are part of the fabric of thinking in leadership structures (Uhl-Bien et al., 2008): first, context, which is not “an antecedent, mediator, or moderator variable; rather, it is the ambiance that spawns a given system’s dynamic persona” (p. 299); second, having an adaptive understanding of the relationship between leadership to that of the leader; third, recognizing the difference between managerial functions and leadership functions; fourth, being cognizant of the need for adaptation.

The research of Armour and Browning (2000) identified different approaches to leadership models based on a culture’s worldview. The worldview determines whether the culture follows an AHL model or a complexity leadership model. In the lower systems of thinking there is “minimal abstraction, little ambiguity, simple explanations for phenomena, and local and immediate interests.” In the higher systems of thinking there is “high degrees of abstraction, extensive ambiguity and paradox, complex explanations for phenomena, global and long-term interests” (p. 24).

Different cultural systems of thinking do not denote “greater intelligence, fuller maturity, or moral superiority” (p. 24). As documented in the GLOBE study, world views determines ones relationship to hierarchy, change, stability, gender, social issues, culture, team, etc., because “leader effectiveness is contextual, that is, it is embedded in the societal and organizational norms, values beliefs of the people being led” (Hoppe, 2007, p. 1). When an organization like a church denomination embraces many cultures, it creates tension for leaders, especially if they believe their leadership approach to be inspired.
Challenges of AHL Models for the Seventh-day Adventist Church

Seventh-day Adventists exist in the midst of these discussions and yet have an established leadership structural model. The church leadership structural model has been debated since its inception. For example, “Are the organizational structures and systems inspired and/or is the mission inspired?” and “What are the appropriate responses to traditional institutional and congregational systems versus an AHL model in achieving the mission of the church?” At first the denomination was fearful to be an organized system because it would be an acknowledgement of unbelief, or interpreted that Jesus was not returning soon. As the church realized that Jesus’ return was not imminent, it realized the mission was to the world, and to succeed needed an organizational system. As the church began to grow, its early organizational systems proved inadequate (Knight, 2001; Oliver, 1989, 2010).

It has been noted that even Ellen White, a co-founder of the church, was concerned with “kingly powers” and inappropriate authoritarian abuses in the early years of our denomination (Haloviak, 1993, p. 2). From 1901 – 1913 the denomination transitioned its systems to a committee structure to address these fears. In 1932 there was an independently appointed 14 member Survey Commission that addressed the AHL model. It was believed there were too many employees at headquarters and not enough in the local field. In 1969 there was a call to re-organize because too many funds were being used to support headquarters and not the local congregation. In 1989, there was another call by a North American Division conference president for radical system changes away from AHL models (Haloviak, 2007).
It has been argued that the Seventh-day Adventist structure has more layers than any other religious denomination, has lost its sense of service, and is more about the AHL model. The focus seems to be on a top down, authoritarian model (Knight, 2007). Some insist that it is time to transition the denominational leadership model (Hackleman, 2008) to that of “servant,” as compared to Knight’s “boss” or career “bureaucrat” (2007, p. 175).

The Future of Hierarchical Models

Bradbury and Lichtenstein (2000), Child and McGrath (2001), Frederickson (2009), Hagley (2008), Heifetz and Laurie (2001), Krause (2004), and Plowman et. al. (2007) have stated that to be focused on one leadership construct will prove to be inadequate. These authors conclude it is vital to wrestle with different models in order to find and adapt the right model for an organization for a particular time.

Creff’s (2004) research has noted that the Ubuntu of South Africa had a very traditional tribal top-down hierarchical model. Although exposed to different leadership models they are reluctant to transition. To transition would be to change their culture and therefore change the people, which would create a new culture.

Hertig (2007) argues that the Christian church is caught in basically this same conundrum. It is the “last secular institution left, trying to hang onto modernity” (p. 299). The church seems to fear the consequences of giving up a monolithic authoritarian hierarchical worldview and accept, in some aspects, a flexible local cultural adaption of worldviews. The fear suggests that by accepting certain local cultural issues the identity and mission of the world church would be compromised. Therefore, it would not be the same church.
Stanko (2000) suggests that there are times for hierarchical models in an organization; when the leader must wrestle with the elements of mission, vision, and values, and the setting of broad goals for an organization and direction. After all, God did not call a committee to Mount Sinai; he called Moses.

The church needs to be certain of its mission and allow systems and leadership models to be developed that will further its mission, not its organizational culture. The church has not been called to be a museum, but an organic vibrant movement. The church must be part of the discussion, not controlled by the discussion (West & Stoeckle, 2005).

**Servant Leadership (SL) as a Leadership Model**

The discussion of leadership has become part of American life. In politics, politicians tend to lambast the lack of leadership in their opponents in order to build their leadership profile. In for-profit and non-profit arenas consultants are brought in to help understand leadership models and cultures and re-direct these organizations. Then there are the discussions around the water cooler of how to transition what is happening in local governments, sport teams, school boards, other social venues or the church.

SL is seen as a model of leadership that can address the challenges of the 21st century (Dennis & Bocarnea, 2005; Greenleaf, 1998; Jones, 2006; Laub, 1999, 2004; Patterson, 2004; Patterson et al., 2003;Sendjaya, 2002, 2003; Wayne, 2009; Wong & Page, 2003). Irving (2005), citing Tarr (1995) stated: “(a) it works; (b) it reinforces the nature of one’s profession and calls upon its more noble instincts; (c) it is action-oriented; and (d) servant leadership is a commitment to the celebration of people and their potential” (p. 7). Early research suggested the SL was a philosophy or a way of life, not a tenable theory. The systematic literature review by Parris and Peachey (2012) states,
servant leadership is a tenable theory” (p. 378).

Robert Greenleaf, who coined the phrase “servant leadership,” stated a leader must be a “servant first” (2002, p. 21). Greenleaf asserted:

do those being served grow as a person: do they, while being served, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants? And what is the effect on the privileged in society; will she or he benefit or at least, not be further deprived? (2002, p. 27)

Greenleaf’s view on SL has spawned a large body of literature and movements in the latter part of the 20th century and into the 21st century. The basic concepts of SL, however, have been supported for centuries; Lao Tzu (6th century B.C. China), Chanakya (1st century B.C.; India), and Jesus (1st Century A.D.). Sanders (1994) during the early 1960’s established the idea of being a servant in the context of leadership, but did not develop the idea as extensively as Greenleaf. Tutsch (2008), in reviewing the 19th and 20th century author Ellen White, noted an emphasis of leader as servant.

Not all authors seemed to be ready to acknowledge SL as a viable leadership model, but some agree with parts of the ideas of SL (Bennis, Spreitzer, & Cummings, 2001; Collins, 2001; Kouzes & Posner, 2007; Quinn, 2009). These authors have suggested many similar themes, but do not use the term SL. Spears and Lawrence (2002) collected many essays under the title of SL, but several of the essays never use the term servant or SL.

Behaviors, Traits, Attributes, and Characteristics of Servant Leadership

Many authors have wrestled with defining, describing, and researching SL. No uniform mechanism to differentiate between a general understanding of leadership behaviors, traits, attributes, and characteristics, and SL behaviors, traits, attributes, and
characteristics, has been clearly established (Serrat, 2009). Authors who have wrestled with SL have identified certain lists of behaviors or traits (Hebert, 2003), (a) distinguishable attributes or values (Helland, 2004; Russell, 2001), (b) a disciplined life that is a centered life in spirituality (Delbecq et al., 2003), (c) a character (Joseph & Winston, 2005; Martoia, 2003).

Hebert (2003) defined SL as “a leadership style characterized by a principal motivation of the leader to serve the needs of others” (p. 19). Her definition was derived from the theory that the true test of SL was the effectiveness and productivity of the followers, and “their (followers or employees) level of personal job satisfaction” (p. 16).

Patterson (2003) submitted a list of characteristics that demonstrate what he believes are the true dimensions of SL; agapao love, humility, altruism, vision, trust, empowerment, and service. Irving (2005) noted that Patterson’s model “provided a basis for a variety of explorations of the servant leadership construct including Nelson (2003), Bryant (2003), and Dennis (2005)” (pp. 22,23).

Greenleaf (2002) demonstrated 10 basic attributes of SL. They were listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of others, and a concern for building community.

Russell and Stone (2002), as cited in Irving (2005), proposed characteristics that identified a servant leader, vision, credibility, trust, service, modeling, pioneering, appreciation of others, and empowerment. They argued that these attributes ultimately impacted “organizational performance” (p. 10).

Irving (2005) noted from the work of Jennings and Stahl-Wert that there are five action points of SL. These action points provide the basis for SL: “(a) up end the
pyramid, (b) raise the bar, (c) blaze the trail, (d) build on strength, and (e) run to great purpose” (p. 24).

McGee-Cooper and Trammell (2002) suggested that a servant leader would listen without judgment, be authentic, build community, share power, and develop people. Autry (2001) argued that a servant leader is more about being than doing. Therefore a servant leader will be authentic, vulnerable, accepting, present and useful. Cordeira (2004) stated that the “crown jewels” for SL are “humility and reach ability” (p. 11). Fryar (2001) emphatically stated that a SL desires “each follower to live a life of significance and purpose; wants followers to fully develop their gifts and abilities; value wholeness and growth for their followers and themselves” (pp. 12, 13).

Barna (2001) from his research added two other significant characteristics. One must be the “right person inside” (p. 6); someone who has the right maturity. The second element, people must be able to build relationships in an authentic way.

From the many lists of SL that authors have submitted, there does not seem to be a consensus of behaviors, traits, attributes, or characteristics that belong specifically to SL versus other leadership models.

Leadership Models That Incorporate Themes of Servant Leadership

Avolio and Gardner (2005) suggested the term “authentic leadership” allowed for a more generic, yet “positive” foundation for leadership in which the “true self” can be evident in one’s leadership. The concept of “authentic leadership” allows for the incorporation of “transformation, charismatic, servant, spiritual or other forms of positive leadership” (p. 329). They saw SL as one of many possible leadership models.
Matteson and Irving (2006) suggested the idea of “self-sacrificial leadership.” They cited Choi and Mai-Dalton (1999) for their definition of self-sacrificial leadership: “the total/partial abandonment, and/or permanent/temporary postponement of personal interests, privileges, and welfare in the (a) division of labor, (b) distribution of rewards, and/or (c) exercise of power” (p. 399). Self-sacrificial leadership has its greatest impact during crises (usually temporary). When there is not a crisis, self-sacrificial leadership is not seen as effective (Halverson, Hollady, Kazama, & Quinones, 2004). De Cremer (2006) demonstrated that though self-sacrificing leadership is viable, it is dependent on the leader’s public display of self-confidence and humility in relationship to followers. Matteson and Irving (2006) noted, however, that there was no empirical data that would differentiate between SL models and the “self-sacrificial” model.

Hebert (2003) considered “situational leadership theories” (p. 31) and the impact of followers. She discussed the work of Hersey and Blanchard (1993) and Robbins and Coulter (2002), which denoted the significance of the “readiness of followers to follow.” These authors believed that “situational leadership” truly is the relationship “between people who are leaders and people who are followers” (p. 31). Moxley, who was cited by Spears and Lawrence (2002), sees leadership as a partnership, a linear shared relationship as compared to a hierarchical system.

Covey, Covey, and Merrill (2008) believed that trust was the key to any leader’s ability to be effective. They listed four attributes necessary for trust, integrity, intent, capabilities, and results; followed by 13 necessary behaviors. Csorba (2004) focused on seven principles of trust as the key to any leaders ability to succeed. Cloud (2006) espoused the idea that integrity was the most important ingredient for a leader to be
successful. Collins (2001), Kouzes and Posner (2007), and George and Sims (2007) spoke of purpose and passion, empowering others to lead, and humility as essential to leadership. Lencioni (2010) spoke of the need for humility, selflessness, and transparency. When these three are engaged it will lead to suffering, but also, great leadership.


Spirituality and Servant Leadership

The ideas of spirituality and SL are intertwined. Benefiel (2005) defines spirituality “as the human spirit fully engaged” (p. 9). Wax (2005) differentiated between spirituality and religious. He defined spirituality as “private, inner experiences and beliefs that are based on a conviction of a more spiritual universe beyond what is visible.” Religious is defined as an “affiliation and association with public institutions” (p. 6). These definitions seem to coincide with the basic elements of SL and would be acceptable in most secular or faith based environments.
Some who live in the faith-based environment would take spirituality to a deeper level however. Nouwen (1989) connects spirituality and servant leaders as ones who have “an ardent desire to dwell in God’s presence, to listen to God’s voice, to look at God’s beauty, to touch God’s incarnate Word and to taste fully God’s infinite goodness” (p. 29). Groeschel (2008) would agree with Nouwen when he states that someone who is a servant leader, is one who has a “passion for his (God’s) presence, a deep craving to reach the lost, sincere integrity, Spirit-filled faith, down-to-earth humility, brokenness” (p. 31). This is what Nouwen and Groschel would identify as the “the human spirit fully engaged.” For Sanders (1994), and Standish (Standish, 2007), ”the human spirit fully engaged” would be the suffering servant as described in 1 Peter 2:21: “For to this you have been called, because Christ also suffered for you, leaving you an example that you should follow in his steps.”

Blackaby and Blackaby (2001) connect spirituality and leadership with their definition of spiritual leadership: “spiritual leadership is moving people onto God’s agenda” (p. 20). Their stated focus of a spiritual leadership is to determine the essence of God’s will, engage others with His will and express it in the communities one is called to serve.

These last elements of spirituality are almost impossible to quantify or measure, yet must be part of the discussion in SL. This seems to be why several authors have difficulty in allowing for the viability of SL since science cannot quantify aspects of SL.

The Basis for Defining a SL Model

In considering the literature on SL, more authors are accepting the challenge of defining SL. Authors who came to grips with definitions for SL found several different
ingredients that became the foundation for many of the designations. For Hebert (2003) and Sims (2009) it is about one’s motivation; for Patterson, Grenny, Maxfield, and McMillan (2003) it is about spiritual partnerships and understanding the virtues of the servant leader, love, humility, altruism, vision, trust, empowerment, and service. For Laub (2004) Matteson and Irving (2006) it is about character; for Patterson, Russell, and Stone as cited in Patterson (2004) it is about focus; Russell (2001) also believes that the values are the distinguishing factor for SL; for Avolio and Gardner (2005) it is about authenticity; for Fryar (2006) it is about one’s identity.

Although many of these foundational concepts of SL have some overlap, they also have a certain amount of distinctness, which provides a basis for defining SL. The literature consistently defines SL in some part, as the needs of others over the needs of the leader. One’s motivation, focus, virtues, values, character, spirituality, and authenticity seem to be intrinsic to SL.

An Empirical Basis for SL

In establishing the behaviors, traits, attributes, and characteristics for SL there was for a number of years a lack of empirical research. Wong and Page, from Trinity Western University (2003), established one of the first SL empirical instruments, the Servant Leadership Profile, to solve this issue. Their research established eight valid factors: leading, servanthood, visioning, developing others, team-building, empowering others, shared decision making, and integrity. They also identified that SL must be defined by a lack of negative qualities; (a) abuse of power and control, and (b) pride and (c) narcissism. In 2000 and 2003 Wong and Page revised the initial instrument to determine how an individual is actually progressing as a servant leader.
Dennis and Bocarnea (2005) established an assessment instrument to be given to followers that measures the seven characteristics that Patterson (2003) identified for SL. Laub (1999) established what is known as the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA). In constructing this instrument he considered three basic tenants, (a) How is SL defined? (b) What are the characteristics of SL? and (c) Can the presence of these characteristics within organizations be assessed through a written instrument? From his research he recognized six fundamental behaviors of servant leaders. They are: values people, develops people, builds community, displays authenticity, provides leadership, and shares leadership.

LaFasto and Larson (2001) established the Team Effectiveness Questionnaire that provided a process to measure the effectiveness of teams in a SL organization. In reviewing more than 6,000 responses from different leaders and teams they established five key factors: collaborative team members, positive team relationships, productive group problem solving, leadership that encourages collective achievement and an organizational environment that genuinely promotes collaboration and teamwork.

**Transitioning Organizations to a SL Model**

To transition an organization from one model of leadership to another, requires change and these terms (transition and change) will be used somewhat interchangeably in this literature review. Heifetz and Linsky (2002) stated, “to lead is to live dangerously, because when leadership counts, when you lead people through difficult change, you challenge what people hold dear . . . with nothing more to offer perhaps than a possibility” (p. 2).
There is an abundance of literature on transitioning and how leader(s) needed to change themselves in attitudes, roles, actions and characteristics for transition to be successful (Burton & Obel, 2004; Yukl, 2006). There is an increase of literature on transitioning church/faith-based organizations. The principles of transition/change seem to be interchangeable between general leadership and SL models for a successful permanent change.

Change is filled with power struggles, emits emotion, and has the capacity to motivate either positively or negatively. “It is rare to find a neutral response to change.” (Withrow, 2008, p. 40). When a servant leader, or leader, transitions an organization “one should expect sabotage” (Freidman, 2007, p. ix).

Steinke (2006) argues that when it comes to needed change, “religious institutions are the worst offenders of encouraging immaturity and irresponsibility” (p. 13). The status quo is disrupted, people get upset, people might get fired or have to change and that would not be the “Christian thing to do” (p. 13). Therefore, in any religious organization, unless there is an emotionally healthy leader, the least healthy “set the agendas and where adaptation is constantly toward weakness rather than strength” (Freidman, 2007, p. 12). Quinn (2004) makes a case that all organizations and individuals are gravitationally pulled toward entropy. Most organizations tend to be “comfort centered, externally driven, self-focused, and internally closed” (p. 9).

However, as Elton (2008) has argued from his hermeneutic of change that from a historical perspective “God has always been in the midst of change, but God’s love and promises for the world have not changed.” From a descriptive view, “God is active and present in the midst of change and God’s people are simultaneously saints and sinners”
Leadership Models of Transitioning

Sims (2009) noted steps that AHL models follow in transitioning. He identifies these steps as a preferred future for the organization. By using structures to obtain this future, it directs the change by removing as much disorder while creating stability. Then it is necessary to use relationships to help enact the preferred future. Lichtenstein (2000) observes that in transitioning from an AHL model, one controls change by minimizing uncertainty, limiting information, centralizing decision making, straying as little as possible from stability, and maintaining structures of organizational behaviors.

Southerland (1999), though not as dogmatic, believed that the leader was the one (top-down) that must prepare for vision, define the vision, plant the vision, share the vision, implement the vision, deal with opposition, make course corrections, and evaluate the results. In AHL models of transitioning, leadership sets the pace, sets the vision, sets the controls, and the followers comply.

Sims (2009) believed servant leaders or emergent leaders followed a different process. These leaders used organizational systems that encouraged collaboration between leadership and followers that identified the preferred future. They would also identify the patterns of change and used those patterns to help identify the preferred future. These leaders were so opposed to the status quo that they encouraged instability to make sure that systems changed and considered processes that would foster what was developing through the different patterns for this preferred future.
Plowman et al. (2007) believed that SL used language for information, understanding, and empowerment; encouraged “unplanned interactions in teams that (could) speed up the emergence of intelligence throughout an organization” (p. 147); saw “conflict as the fuel that drives system growth and enables learning and adaptive behaviors” (p. 145); recognized that change should be continuous and the basis for all further change; and that relationships were used for the “power of capability” (p.521). Rath (2006), Patterson, Grenny, Maxfield, and McMillan (2007), and Quinn (2009) also noted the significance of relationships, not for manipulation, but for increased organizational intelligence.

Factors for Transitioning

Some organizations are not aware of the need to transition and it is therefore necessary for the leader(s) to introduce tension or conflict (Andrade, Plowman, & Duchon, 2008). However, to use tension or conflict to create a point of transition is ill-advised if just for the sake of change.

For an organization to be successful in transitioning there must be trust (Errol & Winston, 2005). Patterson (2003) submitted that a SL model began with the leader establishing trust. When a leader has established trust, the leader has established “integrity, respect for others and service” (p. 21) and citing Kezar (2002) “includes helping people to feel comfortable and creating an open environment where everyone has a voice, and everyone works collaboratively and collectively while using skills such as truth telling; this environment is one of trust” (p. 22). Joseph and Winston (2005) research has substantiated that trust (in the context of SL) “increases job satisfaction,
organizational commitment, turnover intentions, belief in information provided by the leader, and commitment to decisions” (p. 16).

Park (2009) noted that effective transitions included timing, defining vision, planting vision, sharing vision, feedback, expected obstacles, evaluation, training, and effective structures. Most of these must happen not sequentially, but independently, simultaneously. Deutschman (2007) noted that to be successful in transitioning one must replace facts, fear, and force with relate (to create community, culture and hopeful optimism), repeat (practicing repetition in learning new skills, systems), and reframe (new thinking). Herrington, Bonem, and Furr (2000) suggested four disciplines: generating and sustaining creative tension; harnessing the power of mental models; enabling team learning; practicing systems thinking.

Lichtenstein (2000) suggested that there are three basic factors for transitioning: self-referencing (newly emergent dynamic order to be based on principles, values, and elements that are intrinsic or self-referenced); increased capacity (find the resources within the organization to better follow through on its goals); interdependent organizing (the delicate balance between structured organization and informal organizing at the edge of chaos). (pp. 133,134)

Understanding Cycles of an Organization

A reason an organization may need to transition is because it is on the downside of its own life cycle: facing a slow or rapid death due to irrelevancy; living in the status quo; ineffective corporate bureaucratic practices, outdated systems, conflict; or different leadership with a new mission and vision. According to Borden (2006) all organizations go through a life cycle from birth, infancy, childhood, adolescence, adulthood, maturity, empty nest, retirement, old age, and death. Unless leaders recast the mission, vision, and values, all organizations will die. The best time to create a transition is when an
organization is in the maturity stage. However, when an organization is in maturity they think they are fine; the organization then becomes susceptible to hubris. And thus usually begins the cycle to death, when an organization is at its peak (Collins, 2009).

Herein lays one of the basic tensions of identifying the best time to transition an organization, to go from strength to a new strength; from healthy to better health, rather than waiting until weakness needs to be transitioned to strength, from sickness to health, from self to servant. Therefore, a leader needs to have an alert urgency (Borden, 2003; Kotter, 2008), be trusted (Patterson et al., 2003), consistently discern the health of the organization and make appropriate corrections, not for equilibrium, but for mission (Knight, 2007).

**SL Model**

For a successful transition to take place it is not dependent on precise ideas, specific steps, or formulas driven by leadership (AHL model). Rather it is an organic process guided by leadership (Gigerenzer, 2007), whose motive is to serve, collaborates and empowers (Patterson et al., 2003) all parts of the organization (SL model). Kanter (2004) and Winston, (2003) argued that followers have as much to do with successful transitioning as leaders.

When a transitioning process begins Plowman et al. (2007) made the case that it is impossible to truly know the full extent of the change, the rate by which an organization will change, and whether the change will end up being “convergent or radical, evolutionary or revolutionary” (p. 517). There are so many variables and intangible factors, local systems and subliminal and non-subliminal customs and norms that “act in parallel without explicit coordination or central communication” (p. 519).
With the complexity of the environment (Heifetz & Laurie, 2001; Mortenson, 2006; Sims, 2009; Uhl-Bien et al., 2008) and the adaptive challenges that an organization faces, a servant leadership model that is frequently discussed to address these variables is that of team. Irving (2005) citing Greenleaf noted that a servant leader must “evolve from being chief into the builder of the team” (p. 7). When one has created a team with the principles of SL, the ability to be flexible for change, to withstand obstacles, to adapt to new trends, to be productive is increased significantly (Barna, 2009; Hebert, 2003; Irving, 2005; Irving & Longbotham, 2006; Lencioni, 2002; Logan, King, & Fischer-Wright, 2008; Rath, 2006; Stark, 2005).

Conclusion

Though there is an abundance of literature about AHL models, SL models, and transitioning organizations, there needs to be more research as to what the organization that is servant-led truly becomes and what systems (Van Gelder, 2006) are essential. It is possible to have SL and a dying organization. SL does not guarantee a growing, healthy, mission-minded organization. The ideal is to have SL, an organization that has productive servant-minded systems, growing and healthy, and is effectively completing its mission.

AHL models are not proving to be effective in the complexity of the 21st century (Heifetz & Laurie, 2001). And leaderless organizations (Brafman & Beckstrom, 2006) are not the answer either. The ability to understand complex systems, adapt with speed and flexibility (Drummond, 2007), and the motivation and humility of a servant, will be key ingredients for successful servant leaders and productive servant organizations (Elmer, 2006).
The literature does not negate all forms of hierarchical leadership models. It clearly suggests that organizations must continually redefine hierarchical models to be more horizontal than vertical (Serrat, 2009). Also, the organization must be mission driven rather than institutional driven, servant driven rather than authoritarian driven, and team driven rather than individualistic or submissive work force driven (Institute, 2010).

To be successful in transitioning, the literatures also indicated that one must understand the complexity of the organization and where the organization is in its life cycle. The leadership would also need to have the heart of a servant and courage. Though science can assist in transitioning, there are other variables for a faith based organization, i.e. theology, faith, and the role of God in change (Wayne, 2009). To believe there are certain predictable outcomes is naïve. As noted by Page (2009), “servant-empowered leadership is a self-disciplining model. Disciplined people need little hierarchy, bureaucracy or excessive control” (p. xv).
CHAPTER 4

SERVANT LEADERSHIP IN THE POTOMAC CONFERENCE (PC): TRANSITIONING FROM A HIERARCHICAL MODEL TO A BIBLICAL SERVANT LEADERSHIP MODEL

Introduction

From the time I accepted the call to ministry and received a paid call to the ministry by a local conference, I had begun a journey of being on the receiving end of church structure, systems, actions, and policies. As a theology student in an academic environment and then pastoring in a local district, frequently the discussion shifted to the “stories” of how administrative leaders at all levels of church administration were appropriately and/or inappropriately dealing with issues (Harris Pine Mills—the Church’s ability to run a business; Donald Davenport—the church’s engagement in financing; Desmond Ford—the church’s capacity with theological dissent). The discussions also included local issues, pastoral placement processes, church redistricting, salary structures, a paralysis for timely decisions and local conflict between pastor and congregations, etc. Equipped with assumptions little reason or evidence, Paul (1995) describes as the “element of thought” (p. 529). I casted doubt, blame, and judgment on situations and sided with the “victim,” which often led to casting judgment. I tended to be suspicious of most levels of church administration.

When I became an administrator in a local conference of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, I realized I was now faced with many difficult issues. Now I was at
the receiving end and being accused of mishandling issues, not being transparent, demonstrating a lack of integrity, and at times being autocratic. I was faced with a dilemma: “How would I lead, what principles would I follow, how would I choose to implement policies and procedures, in light of a local conference moving forward in mission? How would I address issues that needed direction?”

As I became acquainted with and spoke with leaders at different levels of the organized church structure, I became aware of the plethora of leadership styles, an apparent lack of leadership training, yet pressure for loyalty and results. As I became exposed to different authors, both secular and religious, with their leadership theories, quick fixes, and principles, I realized I did not have a good foundation for basic leadership other than instinct, emulating others, prayer, and trial and error.

In my frustration and fear of now being “called” as a conference leader in the Seventh-day Adventist Church, I chose to become a student of leadership out of necessity. I have learned that though there are elements of leadership that remain an art form (Sipe & Frick, 2009), there is also much to be learned of leadership as a science. I realized that I had left too much of my leadership function to chance, and that much could be added to the mission and positive direction of an organization by the application of good leadership principles.

It is my perception that in the average workplace in America there is a growing awareness of the difference of what good leadership practices or poor leadership practices can bring to the fulfillment of mission, productivity, outcomes, and employee satisfaction. Most of the adult membership of the church is employed in a secular context. There seems to be a growing opinion that many of the leadership practices that
Seventh-day Adventist Church leaders use within its structures and systems are obsolete and inadequate, and fewer members in North America seem to perceive the administrative church processes as relevant.

It is my assumption that if the PC administrative team follows a (BSL) model, they will impact members at the local church and employees of the conference in mission and vision. The PC administrative team can be to them a resource, a partner, and a support for the ongoing process of mission to which the local church is designed to contribute (Mt 28:18-20) (Sipe & Frick, 2009). It is anticipated that taking the journey to transition to a BSL model, the PC will be more spiritually focused. Mission focus will be increased, trust and confidence will be built through demonstration of sound character, which will lead to an ability to have appropriate conflict, grow commitment, accept accountability and be intentional with positive results (Lencioni, 2002).

As a result of this research, there will be in place a long-term educational process for biblical servant leaders training for each of the administrators of the PC, department leaders, conference office employees, pastors and teachers. Through learning, reflection, and implementation the administration team will continue to focus on the responsibility of being part of a BSL model. For as Jesus said to his disciples:

You know that the rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them, and their great men exercise authority over them. It shall not be so among you; but whoever would be great among you must be your servant, and whoever would be first among you must be your slave; even as the Son of man came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many. (Mt 20:25–28)

The administrative team will also continue to pursue the practical application of the PC definition of a biblical servant leader:
A biblical servant leader is one who serves as an authentic follower of Jesus and His mission, who engages others in a life of holiness, and takes the initiative to equip others for His mission and growth of His kingdom.

This chapter will take a brief reflective look at a historical progression of the structures and leadership models in the Seventh-day Adventist Church (as it relates to the ministry context for the PC), its philosophical shifts of thought on leadership, the need for a BSL model and how the PC plans to engage in this transitional journey from an AHL model to a BSL model.

**A Brief History of Seventh-day Adventist Church Structure**

The structure of the Seventh-day Adventist Church has been a source of debate from its inception. There is no question that for any organization to have long term meaning there must be organizational structure. The tension is what type of structure combined with what leadership models (authority and power) will make the structure effective for mission. My observation has been that some argue that the church should abandon its present structure (representative) for a congregational style; authority at the local level and independent of everyone else. Others have suggested that the church has metamorphosed from a representative form of governance, to a structure (see General Conference, 2012, p. 37, where it suggests we are neither congregational nor hierarchical) with authority residing at the top layers of structure and little authority at the local level (Cottrell, 1984; Hackleman, 2008; Scragg, 1990; Norris, 2007).

All structures should be designed for the mission of the organization (Borden, 2003; Knight, 2007; Scagg, 1990). White (1911) states that it was God’s plan from the beginning that the church “was organized for service, and its mission is to carry the gospel to the world” (p. 9). The structure that has served the Seventh-day Adventist
Church since the last major reorganization (1903) has served to move the mission globally.

However, the growing complexity of the world in which the church exists, the leadership models of those elected or appointed to lead, and the realities of what the church is create stress on how one chooses to lead within the structures to fulfill the mission. Some factors that seem to create stress on leaders are: (a) growth of the church; (b) influence from areas of the world where authoritarian hierarchical practices are primary; (c) some forms of remnant theology; (d) desire to maintain a perceived solidarity of doctrine and orthodoxy; (e) zeal for institutional unity; (f) a vague understanding of the true purpose of each level of church structure; (g) the litigious nature of the western world and (h) the perceived need for uniformity of policy.

Both Oliver (1989) and Knight (2001 & 2007) deal extensively with the history of Seventh-day Adventist church structures and leadership. This next section considers a brief summary of the struggle to establish an appropriate structure to complete the mission given to the Seventh-day Adventist Church. This section also reflects on other developments that could be a shifting the organization from being mission-focused, representative organization to a preservation-focused organization through hierarchical mandates (Scragg, 1990). What appears to be clear is that there is not an emphasis, understanding, or training for a BSL model at the local conference level.

The Christian Connection

Two of the early influencers of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, James White and Joseph Bates came from the Christian Connection movement, the fifth largest denomination at that time (1840’s) in the United States (Hatch, 1989). The overarching
sentiment of this Christian movement was that any “organization was the devil” (Knight, 2001, p. 16). Each individual was believed to have the final authority because “the Bible and that alone, [w]as the only role of faith and practice” (Freese, 1852, p. 40). Eventually the Christian Connection movement realized the need for some organization and implemented conferences because “safeguarding the ministry and churches outweighed all fears” (Morrill, 1912, p. 126). Sometimes to safeguard against too much perceived creedalism or structure, at the close of the conference meetings on policies, they would burn their minutes in order to not be held responsible by them in the future (Haloviak, 1995).

The Seventh-day Adventist Church: 1844 – 1863

The Seventh-day Adventist Church was officially organized in May of 1863. The group of believers had transitioned from a body bound together by the advent disappointment of October 22, 1844, to Sabbatarianism, and a movement of people with a prophetic mission. For many the idea of structure to enhance mission was deemed as engaging in the evils of Babylon. Others felt that not even membership lists should be kept (Knight, 2001), and many separated from the organization when structure was implemented (Schwarz, 1979). At the time of organization there were three layers of church structure: the local church, the local state conferences and a General Conference. There was no policy book, church manual, or minister’s manual, for the structure was seen as “advisory rather than executive” (Haloviak, 1995, p. 2).

The structure of the church in 1863 paralleled the Christian Connection, not only in its position on name, conference and general conference structure, but in its use of terms for church officials [elders, deacons], method of organizing churches, the simple church covenant and the authority of the local church over admittance and disfellowshipping of its members. (Haloviak, 1995, p. 8)
As the understanding of the mission and prophetic calling of the Seventh-day Adventist Church broadened, it was clear that the initial structures needed to change. With the addition of multiple institutions and new opportunities to take the gospel outside of North America it was apparent that the present structure was hindering the mission of the church (Knight, 2001). Through much struggle the most significant structural reorganization took place during this time.

Initially, as the organization grew, a centralized form of structure emerged, common during the rise of the Industrial Revolution. Organizations used an authoritarian hierarchical system in an attempt to deal with this complexity (Uhl-Bien, Marion, & McKelvey, 2008). For the Seventh-day Adventist Church most decisions seemed to be made at church headquarters (Knight, 2001). Ellen White, a church founder, did not endorse this centralized structure. In 1888 she stated: “Elder Butler (General Conference President) . . . has been in office three years too long and now all humility and lowliness of mind have departed from him. He thinks his position gives him such power, that his voice is infallible” (Knight, 2001, p. 73; White, 1896).

From the late 1870’s until 1903 strong statements appeared about organizational structure and practices of authority; “kingly powers” (Oliver, 1989); “Romanism” (White, 1962, p. 363); and “papalism” (Knight, 2001, p. 89); a “spirit of domination” (Bates, 2002, p. 1); each administrator “thinking they were the very one who must bear all the responsibilities” (White, 1896). The “work of God” had been “retarded by criminal unbelief in [God’s] power to use the common people to carry forward His work successfully” (White, 1895, p. 495). The gravitational pull to a centralized form of
governance by the church as compared to decentralized has been a long-standing pattern even today (Knight, 2007; Patterson, 2009).

To combat some of the issues of centralized authority, unions (1894) and divisions (1913) (Haloviak, 2007) were added so that the mission of the church could advance more readily. Timely communication for decision-making was a factor in the creation of these structures. The present leadership structure now has more layers (five) “than any other Christian church organization in history” (Knight, 2007, p. 69) (this includes the understanding of the difference of a Division from the General Conference). Initially the church leaders, at church headquarters in Battle Creek, saw these additional structures as a threat to their authority and the mission of the church. Others rebutted that this structure came from Scripture, Ellen White, and “divine providence” (Oliver, 1989, p. 272).

When the major portion of the re-organization was completed in 1903, the form was representative governance “designed to support an upward flow of authority from the people to the leaders who serve the church under that loaned authority at the various levels of the church structure” (Patterson, 2012, p. 2).

There were some influential church leaders who still had difficulty with this form of governance, so “Daniels (the General Conference President) tended toward a more authoritarian stance. He felt that such an attitude was necessary in order to keep the church unified” (Oliver, 1989, p. 295).

Not until the late 1920’s and 1930’s was there a policy book, church manual, or minister’s manual to establish clarity of process with mission within church structures. There was an attempt as early as 1883 to create a church manual in order to create unity
of thought in doctrine, practice and mission. This was defeated as it was deemed unnecessary (Haloviak, 1993).

The Seventh-day Adventist Church: 1918 - Present

The purpose of reorganization in 1901, 1903, and 1913 and finalized in 1918, was to decentralize the governance structures of the church and authority base in order for the mission of the church to move forward at a much more rapid pace, and not be log-jammed by individual agendas or decision-making juggernauts. The intent was to involve more people directly in contributing to the leadership of the mission. This representative form of church governance has the expectation of moving the mission forward. Functionality and efficiency seemed to have held sway (Oliver, 1989). Those called to lead were to ensure the forward thrust of God’s stated mission through the church, provide vision for His mission, and to engage as many resources as possible for the mission to advance (Blackaby & Blackaby, 2001). 1912 – 1922 proved to be the second largest net percentage membership growth of the Seventh-day Adventist Church; 92% (General Conference – Office of Archives, 2012).

Beginning in 1926, it was thought necessary to organize the policies voted by the General Conference into one place. This became known as the Working Policy of the General Conference. When it was first published it was “for the purpose of guiding” the different structures of the church (Neufeld, 1966, p. 1,436). The present Working Policy (General Conference, 2011-2012) states that the Working Policy “is, therefore, the authoritative voice of the Church in all matters pertaining to the mission and to the administration of the work . . .” and “shall be strictly adhered to by all organizations.” In 1932 the first Church Manual was produced to be “a guide in matters of church
administration” (General Conference, 1932, p. 6). The 2010 *Church Manual* states, “they (standards, practices, and principles) are to be followed in all matters pertaining to the administration and operation of local churches” (General Conference, 2010, p. 18). It is important to note the shift in language over time.

In the year 1980 the General Conference voted in a model constitution. The purpose stated: “This model is to be followed as nearly as possible by union conferences” (GCSDA, 1980, C 70 05). Again in 1995, the same model constitution: “Those sections of the model bylaws that appear in bold print (not part of the 1980 model constitution) are essential to the unity of the Church worldwide” (GCSDA, 1995, pp. 165-166). The document goes on to mandate that for the purpose of “full harmony” there is to be no variance unless the Executive Committee or at an Annual Council authorizes changes.

In 1985 a document entitled, “Preserving the Unity of Church and Message,” was presented to the General Conference in session and voted. In the opening paragraph this document states concerning church structure “its organization permits both a centralized structure (an authoritative and effective world headquarters with division offices) and a decentralized sharing of administrative and promotional responsibilities” (Wilson, 1985, p. 9).

In the creation of these documents (*Working Policy, Church Manual, “Model Constitution,” “Preserving the Unity”*) the church organizational language began to shift from “guide” to “shall;” from “guidelines” to “strictly adhered to” because it is “essential to the unity of the Church.” These statements suggest not invalidity of the principles of the structure as voted in the early 20th century, but rather a shift in
understanding what denotes unity, where should authority of the church organization reside, and a possible lack of clarity of a BSL model (Wong & Page, 2003).

The Seventh-day Adventist Church: Structure and Authority

Structure as voted in 1901 and 1903 was representative in nature as a hierarchy of order, not power (Patterson, 2012). In order to be more clearly focused on mission and to make certain that this was “the people’s church,” authority would need to reside in the collective voice of local congregations. Church leadership would need to learn to “trust the voice of the body” (Patterson, 2012, p. 9). The Seventh-day Adventist Church Manual states (General Conference, 2010): “authority rests in the membership and is expressed through duly elected representatives at each level of organization, with executive responsibility delegated to representative bodies and officers for the governing of the Church at each separate level” (p. 28).

In the conclusion of the 1985 document “Preserving The Unity Of Church and Message,” the author appeals to John 17 and states: “the Church must remain united, and this requires strong, centralized authority, derived from all of its parts” and made an appeal to John 17 (Wilson, 1985, p. 17). The implication suggests that for the mission of the church to move forward in global unity a centralized form of governance, granted by the appropriate representatives is the most effective.

At a worship service for new employees of the General Conference in 1976, Elder Pierson, General Conference President stated, “when we begin work in the General Conference office we become part of what inspiration describes as God's highest authority on earth . . . This office is the headquarters of our Commanding Officer—the Lord Jesus Christ Himself. Do we think of it this way?” (Pierson, 1976, p.
7). Although this statement was not spoken in a duly called General Conference session, and the intent seems to want to inspire employees to higher degree of accountability, it does suggest a perspective of the role of “headquarters.”

These two examples combined with a shift in the language of the major documents used for governance imply an ongoing tension between the dimensions of leadership models; centralized or decentralized, authoritarian hierarchy or representative. The structure did not create the tension. The tension came as individuals dealt with how best to respond to the issues of maintaining mission and unity.

Throughout the course of human history this tension of governance structure for mission, unity and authority are evidenced. This trajectory of an “institutional life cycle” (Page, 2009, p. 340), church, or business is well documented (Borden, 2006; Quinn & Cameron, 1983). As stated by Plato in the Republic: “The people have always some champion whom they set over them and nurse into greatness. Yes, that is their way. This and no other is the root from which a tyrant springs” (p. 140); and from Lord Acton (quoted by Shea, 2012, p. 1): “All power tends to corrupt; absolute power corrupts absolutely.” It is not the perimeters of this paper to determine where the organized church is on a particular cycle, but to presume that the organized church is not susceptible to these cycles might be presumptuous.

The principle set forth for structure in 1901-1918 was sound: a representative form of governance with representative authority residing at the local level. The temptation for each leader, in difficult times, whether for unity or mission, in our finiteness is to gravitate toward centralized authority (White, 1895). This is where organizations drift into trouble. Patterson (2012, p. 6) in discussing hierarchical
patterns of leadership states: “the intuitive assumption is that the ‘lower’ organizations are accountable to the higher organization—intuitive but wrong.”

**Servant Leadership and Church Structure**

Bennis (2002) reminds us of an ancient Chinese imprecation: “I curse you; may you live in an important age” (p. 13). To make significant deep change is difficult and painful (Quinn, 1996) and calls for leaders to move from the safety of the normal to the unknown (the curse); yet, if organizations do not continually reflect and revisit their reason for existence (Page, 2009), they will become more focused on the preservation of the organization instead of the mission for which they were called. This includes denominations. The tendencies of organizations, if leadership is not self-differentiating, are to acquiesce toward “weakness and not strength” (Freidman, 2007, p. 12), authoritarian not representative. In the complexity and diversity of today’s environment where the church is called to mission, the more centralized an organization becomes the less likely it will remain servant led. When the leadership model is more authoritarian hierarchical, the less likely it will be servant led (Nouwen, 1989). As observed by Patterson (2012, p. 6): “the tendency of human organizations is to move from a model of distributed authority toward a consolidation of authority—from authority exercised by many to authority exercised by a few or in extreme cases one.”

An organization’s structure does not determine if it is authoritarian hierarchical, bureaucratic, or servant led. Processes, systems, and authority configurations that leaders put into place to work between the different levels of an organization will help identify the leadership model. The leader’s character and how they choose to engage
with mission will also assist in pinpointing the leadership model being utilized (Rodin, 2010).

The research of Wong and Page (2003), noted in the context of denominational leadership, has yet to find a denominational leadership model that utilizes effectively BSL principles. In a phone call with Page (D. Page, personal communication, February 16, 2012) I inquired whether the results might be different in the nine years since their publication began—he assured me the results were the same. He suggested many organizations discuss principles of BSL, but in actual practice do not implement them. The conclusion of Wong and Page (2003), as they reflect on authoritarian hierarchical organizations, is “one obvious reason why servant leadership does not work is that it cannot flourish in an hierarchical organization” (p. 6).

The tension for denominational leadership practices to drift to an authoritarian or centralized hierarchy seems to be for the reasons of: (a) control of orthodoxy, (b) control of mission, (c) control of subordinate leaders with potential for creativity, (d) because God is our CEO, (e) trends to centralized authoritarian decision making, and (f) “egotistic pride” (Wong & Page, 2003, p. 6).

The BSL principles that Jesus set in Mt 20:25-28 are still the mandate for leaders at any level of denominational leadership, i.e. PC. In my journey to understand BSL it is my responsibility to focus on the church administration where I have been elected to serve. It is my calling that I transition to a biblical servant leader.

**A BSL Model for the PC**

As stated above, the world that the church is to engage in, is complex and diverse. Sometimes in an attempt to address these issues, leaders try complex solutions.
The research of Heath and Heath (2010) suggests that complex problems are best solved with simple solutions. The best way to move the church closer to its mission, is found in the simple, yet profound leadership principle of Jesus; servant leadership as found in Mt 20:25-28. White (1962) reminds us “those in authority should manifest the Spirit of Christ. They should deal as He would deal with every case that requires attention” (p. 362). This is a high calling.

The leadership team of the PC has not been immune to the dynamics that the church organization at large has faced. The history of PC suggests that it has the capacity to draw to a centralized, AHL model. Soon after I arrived in the PC, an Administrative Retreat (January, 16-19, 2007) was held. At one of the sessions (January 18, 2007) a master chart was made in order to determine what were the expected decisions that the administrative team (President, VP of Administration, VP of Finance) was to make, who made them, and what decisions other individuals in the PC were expected to make. What became obvious was that the administrative team made the overwhelming majority of decisions. Eighty-five percent of the decisions were made by one of the administrative team members, even down to the color of paper that could be used for programs.

The administrative team assumed that this was a major factor in why the administrative team was feeling burnout, why other employees expressed dissatisfaction in working in the PC, why trust and accountability were almost non-existent. (This was substantiated by a full assessment of the PC systems, employee satisfaction, feedback groups from pastors, teachers and lay people of perceptions of the value of the PC office team. Brauer, Werner, & Cress, 2007).
It was apparent that the administrative team at that time (2007) was centralized utilizing authoritarian hierarchy to do the work of the organization. It was recognized that change was needed, but what kind of change, when should the change begin, how would change be accepted, especially with the diversity of the PC, was not fully understood.

Borden (2006) observes that a leader should not wait for different layers of denominational leaders to lead change. If God is calling for change at a particular level, it is important to start now, otherwise it is disobedience. In the words of Sipe and Frick (2009), “Servant Leadership starts with you” (Kindle, loc. 256). The PC administrative team decided that a change to a BSL needed to take place within the boundaries of authority given to it by the larger church organization (hierarchy of order). We are an interdependent church organization, not independent (1 Cor 12).

BSL and Mission of the PC

Sipe and Frick (2009) observed “every successful attempt to implement Servant Leadership in an organization began with small-group conversations” (Kindle loc. 247). The journey to transform into a BSL model is not a solo event.

The mission of the church has been clearly defined by Jesus Christ to go make disciples (Mt. 28:18-20; Borden, 2003). The PC administrative team recognized the need to contextualize the mission of Mt 28 to the mission of its territory. A significant step in the journey of transformation was with the development of a mission statement in which the clarity of Mt 28:18-20 would be understood and practiced in our context. Our mission is to “build healthy disciple-making churches.” In the words of Wilkes (1998),
Biblical servant leadership never begins with the individual’s wishes to better the world or attain a personal goal. Servant leadership finds its motive from God’s commissioning a person to carry out a divine plan among a group of people. Becoming a servant to the mission and a follower of the God who called you is the heart of servant leadership. (p. 77)

In reflection of Mt 20:25-28, the context of being a biblical servant leader is to understand the biblical mission to which one has been called; not one’s personal mission, personal agenda, or personal dream. The fulfillment of this mission comes through service. As Greenleaf (2002) perceived “a servant-leader is servant first” (p. 27). The administrative team exists to serve the other employees of the conference office and employees who work at the local level of mission; which in turn exist to serve those who are engaged in the mission, those struggling to know mission, and serve those for whom the mission exists. Roxburgh and Romaunk (2006, pp. 63, 64) observe that the culture of the church will shift when the church (and organizations) spends less time on themselves and focuses their attention on “listening to Scripture; dialoguing with one another; learning to listen; and becoming aware of and understanding what is happening in their neighborhood, community, and the places of their everyday lives.” This is a necessary process for biblical servant leaders.

Greenleaf (2002) poses the appropriate yet obvious question,

How do we know that we are truly serving the needs of those we serve?” The best test, and difficult to administer, is this: Do those served grow as persons? Do they, while being served, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants? And, what is the effect on the least privileged in society? Will they benefit or at least not be further deprived? (p. 27)
The Continued Journey of Transformation for the PC

The journey of transformation is not a point in time; it does not happen overnight. It cannot be captured in a seminar, book, or DVD series nor is it a program, a plan, or an organizational slogan. The journey of transformation to a BSL model is a discipline, a process, learning, and a lifestyle. It is organic and is something that changes the fabric of one’s personal life and therefore the organization.

The group that was the foundation for this transition was the administrative team of the PC: President; VP for Administration; VP for Finance; VP for Pastoral Ministry; VP for Education; Asst. to the President for Strategic Initiatives; and Asst. to the President for Communications. This group consisted of six males and one female. Through a series of reflections, assessments, discussions, and perceived missed opportunities it was recognized that a different leadership model was needed. Upon this basis this group agreed to engage on this journey to a BSL model.

There were four significant steps taken to begin this transitional journey for the administrative team: (1) administering the Revised Servant Leadership Profile (RSLP) for each individual and the 360 Degree Profile on me, as president; (2) A seminar and dialogue of the book by Page, Servant Empowered Leadership: A Hands-on Guide to Transforming you and Your Organization (2009); (3) Coaching; (4) Reflection through the group feedback session.

Administering the Revised Servant Leadership Profile (RSLP)

In the research for this project, many helpful resources were found. However, the work of Wong and Page stood out as a practical resource for understanding and implementing a servant leadership model in a church organization. Although Robert
Greenleaf coined the phrase “servant leader,” and was the individual who built the theory of servant leadership, he did not empirically demonstrate the essence of servant leadership.

Wong and Page developed the first empirical servant leadership tool known as the Servant Leadership Profile and later the Revised Servant Leadership Profile (RSLP) with two basic outcomes, an understanding of servanthood and leadership. The heart of servanthood is that the leader

…develops the people, who help build the organization. The focus here is on the leader’s character and desire to serve. With respect to the leadership part, the leader builds the organization by effectively using people as resources; the emphasis here is on leadership skills, such as vision-casting and team-building. (Wong & Page, 2003, p. 5)

Each member of the administrative team took the RSLP, as they perceived themselves. The six members of the team took the 360 Degree RSLP, as they perceived the President of the PC. The RSLP determined seven factors of servant leadership: (1) Developing and Empowering Others; (2) Power and Pride; (3) Authentic Leadership; (4) Open, Participatory Leadership; (5) Inspiring Leadership; (6) Visionary Leadership; (7) Courageous Leadership. At the conclusion of the seminar the RSLP and the 360 Degree RSLP was re-taken in order to determine if the seminar, dialogue, coaching, specific examples, had increased the understanding of servant leadership. Also, whether or not the principles of a BSL model could be noted in the leadership skills being developed by each member. The skills and attributes of a servant leadership model can be learned (Wong & Page, 2003).
Seminar: Servant Empowered Leadership

According to Bennis (1999) “character is the key to leadership” (p. 3). Sipes and Frick (2009) observed a servant-leader lives, loves, and leads by conscience—the inward moral sense of what is right and what is wrong” (Kindle loc. 278). Lickona (1991) states, “good character consists of knowing the good, desiring the good, and doing the good—habits of the mind, habits of the heart, and habits of action” (p. 51).

Page (2009) in preparation for his book sent a questionnaire to 166 prominent Christian leaders and asked the question, “What is missing in Christian leadership today?” Eight items surfaced from this questionnaire as missing: not practicing servant leadership; missing an authentic relationship with God; ignoring character development; failure to develop younger leaders; unwilling to become courageous risk takers; devoid of vision, teamwork, accountability. In the context of being a biblical servant leader, each one of the above listed items touches on character. The intent of the seminar was to address these issues of character; how to pro-actively develop the character traits necessary to be a biblical servant leader, and appropriately reflect on character in “moments of truth” (Sipe & Frick, 2009, p. Kindle 332).

The administrative team participated in six seminar sessions, one per month, for two and one-half hours. The primary objectives of the seminars was to (a) expose members of the PC administrative team to an deeper understanding of being a biblical servant leader; (b) understand character traits of biblical servant leaders; (c) commit to a lifestyle of being a biblical servant leader; (d) provide feedback to the president how the PC administrative team could grow in the area of being biblical servant leaders; and (e)
within each respective discipline represented by the administrative team of how these principles could be shared to those whom they influenced.

The seminars presented dealt with the following topics: (a) Understanding leadership models, why biblical servant leadership fits us, and learning to serve as a leader; (b) Understanding organizational culture in order to lead biblically by vision/mission/ and values; (c) Developing effective communication clarity for a team mission/vision/ and values; (d) Building a team of biblical servant leaders; (e) Learning to lead change as a biblical servant leader and managing the conflict that change brings; (f) Concluding well as a biblical servant leader.

**Coaching**

Stoltzfus (2005) defines coaching as “practicing the disciplines of believing in people in order to empower them to change” (p. 7). Coaching, as defined by Whitworth Whitworth, Kimsey-House, Kimsey-House, and Sandahl, (2007), “makes it possible for clients to take the risks they need to take in order to climb on in their lives” (Kindle loc. 1656). The coaching segment, administered by Dr. Nick Howard and Associates, LLC, was a central piece in connecting the different parts of the project for a better understanding of being effective biblical servant leaders. It provided a safe resource for deeper dialogue and penetration into these attributes of a BSL model. The coach was able to discern the best learning style of each member of the administrative team and coach to their learning patterns (Hammond, Austin, Orcutt, & Rosso, 2001).

Glasser, a psychiatrist and psychologist has estimated that “we remember 10 percent of what we read, 20 percent of what we hear, 30 percent of what we see, 50 percent of what we see and hear, 70 percent of what we discuss with others, 80 per cent of
what we experience personally, and 95 per cent of what we teach someone else” (cited in Page, 2009, p. 10). The coaching provided an increase in learning, the desire to learn, and retention. Now each of the members is engaging in teaching their staff in biblical servant leader principles. The purpose of enhancing the desire to learn, as stated by Kouzes and Posner (2007) is because “the more you are engaged in learning the more successfully you are in leading” (p. 203).

Reflection Through the Group Feedback Session

According to Pratt (2007) “reflection is to step back, ponder, consider, make sense of, and integrate” (p. 62). Reflection is an important learning tool for all professions. As stated by Atkins and Murphy (1993), “Reflection, therefore, must involve the self and must lead to a changed perspective. It is these crucial aspects which distinguish reflection from analysis” (p. 1,191).

Reflection as a skill, or reflection as a significant part of processes of an organization, has been rarely seen as beneficial. Most leaders tend to want to see more “action than reflection” (Daudelin, 1996, p. 36). Or in the words of Mintzberg (1989, p. 10) “Study after study has shown that managers (possibly PC administrative team) work at an unrelenting pace, that their activities are characterized by brevity, variety, and discontinuity, and that they are strongly oriented to action and dislike reflective activities.”

The significance of reflection is not that it is just done from the viewpoint of the individual, but should be something that we learned to do from an organizational perspective as well (Vince, 2002). The potential of understanding a larger perspective
enhances the learning experience and since it is done organizationally will tend to have a longer shelf life.

Howard came and provided a reflective coaching session with the administrative team. The administrative team spent time reflecting on the RSLP, 360 Degree RSLP, seminar presentations, and how well they would be able to engage in the BSL model for the future.

**Summary and Conclusion**

Throughout the history of the Seventh-day Adventist Church there has not been a consistent integrated focus on administrative leadership training. With the many different cultures that make up the Seventh-day Adventist Church, it is my observation that individual leaders tend to use the leadership models portrayed either in the home, learned in academic training, the work place, or culture within which they live. Although the concept of BSL is not a model that has been widely understood in its present context the essence of the principles can be traced back several thousand years (Sipe & Frick, 2009). Even the writings of the church suggest a focus on heaven’s mission and seeking individuals of sound character to lead (Haloviak, 1984, 1994; White, 1962).

The basic question, as raised by Jesus with the sons of Zebedee, is still in effect today for it is at the core of leadership: “Who exists to serve whom?” Does the local church exist to serve the local Conference, and the local Conference the local Union, and the local Union its respective Division and General Conference? Or does the local church exist to serve its community, and the local Conference exist to serve the local church and the local Union exists to serve the local Conference, and the local Division
and General Conference exist to serve the Unions? The former seems to be reflected in the organizational model of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. However, as the *Church Manual* states (General Conference, 2010, p. 28): “The Seventh-day Adventist form of governance is representative, which recognizes that authority rests in the membership and is expressed through duly elected representatives at each level of organization . . . .”

As has been demonstrated, there is tendency for organizations to become centralized and reverse the order of “serving.” Often for the perceived sake of “unity” and “mission” one will try to trump recognized BSL principles even if organizational principles are thereby violated. The representative system adopted by the Seventh-day Adventist Church can be a cumbersome obstacle to an increasingly centralized and hierarchical organization in need of expeditiously administering a large and complex organization.

PC, as an administrative team, recognizes these challenges of leading and administering the world church but is nonetheless beginning the journey to transition from an AHL model to a BSL model. One of the first steps was to recognize that PC did not understand nor follow BSL principles as often as it should in dealing with difficult issues that required professional experienced guidance. We now turn our attention to the specific and necessary ingredients of BSL for this transitional journey.
CHAPTER 5

DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS OF PROJECT,
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Introduction

It is one thing to study a topic, understand a topic, and be able to discuss a topic. It is another to take steps down a path using what has been learned and make it part of the fabric of the organization. Transition calls for change; change that suggests that “one’s tools, loyalties, ways of thinking, values, beliefs, or habits of a lifetime” (Heifetz & Linsky, 2002, pp. 2, 12) might need to be adjusted. This can create a variety of responses.

At the core of transitioning to a BSL model, one must make the decision regarding the place and role of Jesus (God) in their life and in this process. The foundation for success in using a biblical servant leader model is not based on personality, skill sets, or pedigree, but rather the depth of an authentic relationship with Jesus (Blackaby & Blackaby, 2001; C. Miller, 2000). Rodin (2010, p. 89) suggests, “Jesus came to be the Lord of our life, not our example of good leadership.” In transitioning to a BSL model there is no allowance to have a “secular life” part of the time and a “spiritual life” at other times (R. Blackaby & Blackaby, 2001; Blanchard & Hodges, 2005), although the complexities of culture, diversity, politics, and globalization might pressure differently (Badaracco, 2002). Jesus is to be Lord and the message remains clear, being a servant “is a mandate” (Blanchard & Hodges, 2003, p. 12).
there is clarity that Jesus is Lord, then one can understand and begin the process of transitioning to a BSL model.

Jesus is the model for merging servanthood and leadership. His capacity to be a servant and leader was his relationship with the Father and the Holy Spirit. John 5:19 states: “Jesus said to them, ‘Truly, truly, I say to you, the Son can do nothing of his own accord, but only what he sees the Father doing; for whatever he does, that the Son does likewise.’” His ability to engage with the Father came from his time in prayer (Mark 1:35; John 17). During this time White (1941, p. 139) suggests, “daily He received a fresh baptism of the Holy Spirit . . . and His soul and His lips were anointed with grace, that he might impart to others” (p. 139).

In this relationship, of Father, Spirit and Son, Jesus knew how to respond as a biblical servant leader to every event, every conversation, and every social setting: when to cleanse the temple (Matt 21:12-17); redirect James, John and their mother (Matt 20:20-23); write in the sand (John 8:1-11); feed the multitudes (Matt 14:13-21); when to be angry and grieved (Mark 3:1-6); when to speak in parables (Matt 13; Luke 16); and when to wash feet (John 13:1-20) etc.

A central part of the mission of the Trinity was to rescue the fallen population of planet earth. The method chosen by the Trinity was that Jesus would come as a servant (Isa 53; Matt 20:25-28; Phil 2:5-8), redeem by His grace (Eph 2:4-10), transform by “His divine power” (2 Pet 1:3-9, Col 3:12-16); and challenge His followers, that in “whatever you do in word or deed, do everything in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God the Father through him” (Col 3:17). Jesus is the example for all His followers (2 Pet 2:21). As Blackaby and Blackaby (2001, p. 96) assert, “There is no greater source of
influence for spiritual leaders than the manifest presence of God in their lives” (p. 96). As White (1942, p. 58) suggests:

When every other voice is hushed, and in quietness we wait before Him, the silence of the soul makes more distinct the voice of God. He bids us, ‘Be still, and know that I am God.’ Psalm 46:10. *This is the effectual preparation for all labor for God.*” (italics supplied)

The capacity to build an environment to transition to a BSL model is directly coupled to the relationship the administrative team, individually and corporately, has with Jesus Christ.

This chapter will consider an application of a specific process used in providing the environment to transition to a BSL model, the research method used, analysis of the transitional model, recommendations, summary, and conclusions.

**The Process of Establishing a BSL Model in the PC**

The material and process recommended by Dr. Don Page was representative of the biblical principles of servant leadership that the administrative team desired to implement in the PC. His approach seemed helpful, adaptable, and flexible. Page has used this material with many organizations, churches, and government entities to assist in transitioning to a servant-empowered model of leadership. I followed the model prescribed by Page in his book entitled “*Servant Empowered Leader: A Hands-on Guide to Transforming You and Your Organization*” (2009) and utilized other resources he provided: (a) a CD resource entitled *Team Leader Exercises and Resources*, and (b) two assessments entitled the *Revised Servant Leadership Profile* (RSLP) and the *360 Degree RSLP*. 
Recruitment Process for Participants
for the PC BSL Model

When I began my advanced degree classes through Andrews University (January 2010), I had been reading and contemplating for some time what it meant to lead from a biblical model. Several models of leadership were considered. However, the PC administrative team turned toward looking at a biblical model of leadership because “it does work” (Page, 2009, p. xiii).

It was in this process (in short) that the idea of this project germinated. The participants for this intervention were the members of the administrative team of the PC chosen by the PC constituency to lead: President; Vice President for Administration; Vice President for Finance; Vice President for Pastoral Ministries; Vice President for Education; Assistant to the President for Strategic Initiatives; and Assistant to the President for Communications. I believed that in order for the PC organization to transition from an AHL model to a BSL model, the administrators chosen for the PC would need to participate. As Blanchard and Hodges (2005, p. 4) observe, “leadership is a process of influence. Anytime you seek to influence the thinking, behavior, or development of people toward accomplishing a goal in their personal or professional lives, you are taking on the role of a leader.” To make this transition to a BSL model, the team would need appropriate influence. A mandate would not work.

The project was explained in full to the administrative team and each member was given an option that assured anonymity to decline or accept this journey (March 27, 2012). It was unanimously accepted as a journey to pursue. If anyone of the members had declined, it would have been necessary to choose a different process to maintain the
anonymity of the group to minimize inappropriate pressure by the president on any member of the PC administrative team.

Time Frame for Project to Establish an Environment for a BSL Model

With the approval from the Andrews University IRB Committee (March 22, 2012), I officially began the process with the PC administrative team. On March 27 all of the appropriate documents were signed by the administrative team members in order to move forward with the intervention.

The first formal setting was on April 10, 2012 at the PC office. At this first meeting the outline of what would be taking place over the next 8 months was distributed. Each member took the RSLP to understand his or her own capacity for servant leadership. Each member took the 360 Degree RSLP which reflected on my (the President) capacity for creating an environment for a BSL model.

At the completion of these assessments, the PC administrative team began with the first seminar: “Understanding Leadership Models and Why the PC Team Should Consider a BSL Model.” The seminars continued on the following dates: May 1, 2012 (two topics); June 4, 2012 (two topics); August 3, 2012 (one topic); September 11, 2012 (two topics); October 2, 2012 (two topics); November 7, 2012 was a review of topics covered and re-taking of the RSLP and 360 Degree RSLP. These assessments were administered by Trinity Western University. The results will be discussed later in this chapter.

Between these presentations each member of the PC administrative team was personally coached by Nick Howard and Associates, LLC, a professional coaching firm in an anonymous debriefing of the previous presentation. Additionally, on December 13,
2012, Howard met with the PC administrative team for a group feedback session (details of the group feedback session will be discussed later in the chapter).

Prior to the December 13 meeting I worked with Howard to establish what would seem to be appropriate evaluative questions for the group feedback session. After the group feedback session on December 13, Howard reviewed with me the content of the day. On January 14, 2013, I received Howard’s report of the group feedback session. No names were attached to any of the content or discussions of the group feedback session.

Curriculum for the Intervention of a BSL Model

The curriculum chosen for this intervention was the work of Don Page, professor emeritus of Trinity Western University. His journey consisted of working for the Canadian Federal Government as a policy analyst and advisor in the Foreign Affairs Department. He was recruited by Trinity Western University to establish within that academic institution the principles of servant leadership as a way of life. He identified the leadership model he founded as “servant-empowered leadership.” He defined servant-empowered leadership as “a self-disciplining model. Disciplined people need little hierarchy, bureaucracy or excessive control. A culture of discipline combined with an ethic of entrepreneurship results in great performance” (Page, 2009, p. xv).

There were four major pieces to the curriculum selected: (a) the RSLP and the 360 Degree RSLP; (b) a seminar I prepared and presented based on the book by Page, Servant-Empowered Leadership, which included 10 topics and a conclusion; (c) coaching; and (d) the group feedback session.
The RSLP and the 360 Degree RSLP

The RSLP and the 360 Degree RSLP were designed by Wong and Page to create an empirical basis for establishing characteristics and qualities of servant leaders. What they established from their research were seven factors from a self-assessment based on 62 questions. The instrument was designed to measure both positive and negative leadership characteristics.

The seven characteristics were:

1. Developing and Empowering Others;
2. Power and Pride;
3. Authentic Leadership;
4. Open, Participatory Leadership;
5. Inspiring Leadership;
6. Visionary Leadership;
7. Courageous Leadership.

These characteristics were rated on a scale of 1 – 7. Characteristics 1, 3-7 were positive traits and characteristic 2 was a negative trait. In this profile a score above 5.6 was considered to be a strong servant leader. For characteristic 2 if the score was below two it was considered strong characteristic for servant leadership.

Both self-assessments were administered on-line and were scored by Trinity Western University. When the results came back the administrative team discussed the different factors and the implications suggested. After the second self-assessment I discussed the results of the 360 Degree RSLP with Howard, and he also discussed the results with the administrative team during the group feedback session in my absence.
BSL Model Seminar

In preparation for the seminar, I read through the book *Servant-Empowered Leadership* several times and spent much time in reflection and prayer. Each of the seminar units consisted of (a) a devotional connecting the topic(s) to be covered in light of a BSL model; (b) the topic(s); (c) practical applications of material covered with specific issues in the PC that one or all were facing; (d) summary of material covered; and (e) sending a report of the material covered along with the keynote presentation to the coaches for their review with the participants of the administrative team.

The topics were covered in six presentations and then followed by a summary presentation. The first seminar (April 10) was “Understanding Leadership Models and why the PC Team Should Consider a BSL Model.” This seminar considered the development of different leadership models; the five major leadership models in existence today; the difference between managers and leaders; the use of power and authority by leaders; the need to build relationships; and the six stages of leadership. I then gave them my definition of a biblical servant leader from my research: “A biblical servant leader is one who serves as an authentic follower of Jesus and His mission, who engages others in a life of holiness, and takes initiative to equip others for His mission and growth of His kingdom.”

The dialogue for each seminar centered on how this would play out in day-to-day operations in the PC, in what ways it might change how the PC administrative team would lead and/or be structured, and what would need to be put into place to be successful within this leadership model. Stott (1985, p. 26) has said, “leaders have power, but power is safe only in the hand of those who humble themselves to serve.”
The second seminar (May 1) considered two topics: (a) The biblical servant leader model viewed from the perspective of a body as illustrated in 1 Cor 12, and (b) understanding vision and integrating the PC vision into the biblical vision for the church. The third seminar (June 4) considered two topics: (a) How communication adds clarity to the vision and mission of God, and (b) integrating values into the implementation of mission and vision (the values of the PC are spirituality, integrity, excellence, team, and service. The fourth seminar (August 3) considered one topic: What are the necessary steps for biblical servant leaders to be developed? The fifth seminar (September 11) considered two topics: (a) What are the desired characteristics within a team of biblical servant leaders, and (b) conflict resolution in the context of a biblical servant leadership team. The sixth seminar (October 2) considered two topics: (a) The impact of change and the changes necessary for the PC to transition to a BSL model, and (b) what are the necessary phases for a BSL model to assure the longevity of the mission/vision?

**Coaching**

The PC administrative team utilized the services of Dr. Nick Howard and Associates, LLC, for the coaching portion of this intervention. Howard, a former therapist felt called to coach business and church leaders. After each seminar presentation I would send my notes, comments, and Keynote presentation to Howard who shared this with two coaches, Jim Boyle and Alberto Arroyo who served our team. Each administrative team member had a personal coach paid for by the PC. The coaches discussed with the PC administrative team member the material covered to see what made an impact, what was realistic, what was challenging, what areas would need to be changed, and what was learned. At the conclusion of the six coaching experiences (by teleconference), Howard
had a phone conference with the other coaches to summarize their observations from the coaching sessions. Howard then met with the PC administrative team to complete the last piece of the intervention curriculum, the group feedback session.

**Group Feedback Session**

The intent of the group feedback session was to provide the opportunity for “reflective practice” (McClure, 2005). The strength of reflective practice as a key method of learning is a long established fact in the academic community (Kolb, 1984). Reflective practice “is a forum of response of the learner to experience” (Boud, Keogh, & Walker, 1985, p. 18) and as stated by Boyd and Fales (1983) it “is the core difference between whether a person repeats the same experience several times becoming highly proficient at one behavior, or learns from experience in such a way that he or she is cognitively or affectively changed” (p. 100). For this reason during each of the seminars presented, there was time dedicated for reflective practice. This provided the groundwork for our group feedback session with Howard.

The group feedback session had four parts (December 13, 2012): first Howard wanted to observe how we interacted as a team on a difficult issue. By doing so he was looking to see how the team members expressed themselves, how they participated and listened to each other and at what depth. Such observations would reveal such things as honesty, integrity, and ownership as the team members dealt with the issue at hand. He also wanted to observe whether we were integrating any of the principles of a BSL model into our discussion. Second, he reviewed the scores from the 360 Degree RSLP and the implications for transitioning to a BSL model. Third, he directed a discussion to assist in ascertaining usefulness of the seminar material, effectiveness of combining coaching with
reflection on the seminars, and if there was specific feedback for me that could be suggested for my growth as a biblical servant leader. For the integrity of this discussion I was not present for most of it. Also, he met individually with each member to see if other important information could be gleaned with none of the other members present. Fourth, he established a conversation as to ongoing steps for the PC administrative team to take in order to transition successfully. I was present for the fourth part to listen to the report generated from the group and interpersonal reflections with Howard and then gave a response to these observations.

**Analysis and Outcomes of Transitioning to a BSL Model for the PC**

The intent of this project was to see if by creating greater awareness through assessments, seminars, coaching and a group feedback session the PC might begin the journey to transition from an AHL model to a BSL model.

Hannah (1988, p. 38) states, “All organizations are perfectly designed to get the results they get. For better or worse ....” Through analysis and reflective practice of this project key insights were provided into the systems and processes that fundamentally defined the PC administration. Some of the systems and processes in place were healthy and some needed to be replaced to support a transition to a BSL model. There needed to be a development and deepening of relationships in knowing the give-and-take of leading and following (Chaleff, 2009). A better process for learning the sensitivities for being a servant motivated by love (Malphurs, 2003), one needs to learn resolve and “brutal honesty” (Collins, 2001, p. 13). This is essential for the pursuit of a life as an authentic follower of Jesus (Irving, 2011; Malphurs, 2003; Sweet, 2012). Finally, one needs to
implement the disciplines of commitment to a journey of transition to a BSL model (Page, 2009).

For the PC administrative team to begin the transition there needed to be a shift from the reality of what was to a preferred future (Covey, 1990; Kuhn, 1996). For the PC team to engage in the journey to transition I needed to be accountable and be an example of that preferred future (Abrashoff, 2002; Irving, 2011). For a team to transition into a true BSL model would be dependent on the ability to follow Jesus as Lord and lead in humility (Collins, 2001; Lencioni, 2012) in order to grow in character (Cooper, Santora, & Sarros, 2007; Page, 2009). As White (1911) states, “from Him flow forth love and compassion, cleansing the soul temple, and making men like Him in character” (p. 23). For in the genuine pursuit of being a biblical servant leader, this is “where your thoughts, your desires, your attitudes, your actions, your character are more and more conformed to His” (Buchanan, 2010, p. Kindle 2492).

Analysis of the RSLP and 360 Degree RSLP

RSLP and 360 Degree RSLP assessments were taken on-line and submitted for scoring by the Leadership Operations Coordinator of Trinity Western University. The RSLP results were e-mailed back to each PC administrative team member (responses to their understanding of their biblical servant leadership) and the 360 Degree RSLP (administrative team perception of the president’s biblical servant leader skills) results were e-mailed to me. Each member was very appreciative of the RSLP, its confidentiality, ease of taking the assessment, and the simplicity and insightfulness of the questions asked.
The questions of both assessments were the same. Taking the RSLP first seemed to help add more clarity to taking the 360 Degree RSLP. This became apparent from the group feedback session.

The goal of taking the 360 Degree RSLP was to understand how the PC administrative team perceived the leadership of the President of the PC in the context of being a biblical servant leader. This provided positive feedback for establishing the environment for transitioning from an AHL model to a BSL model. Because there were only seven members who took this assessment twice, there was not enough information for a valid sampling. However, the perceptions shared, and the comparisons between the two assessments, provided the basis for much of the group feedback session and potential for future growth.

After the first assessment, five of the seven factors demonstrated a strong servant leader (a range of .1 to 1.2 above 5.6); two factors were not seen in the strong category (a range of .1 to .7). The second time the assessment was taken four of seven factors were seen as strong (a difference of 0 to .9) and three were not seen as strong (a range of .2 to 1.4). Of the seven factors six were scored lower (a difference from .2 to .7) and one was scored higher (a difference of .2).

Howard provided six key insights based on an analysis of the two assessments and the group feedback and coaching sessions. His insights included: (a) at the beginning of the project there was not a clear understanding of what it meant to be a biblical servant leader or how this would relate in practical terms to a member of the PC administrative team; (b) definitions of terms (biblical servant leader, power, pride, humility, etc.) should have been clarified at the inception of the project; (c) administrative team members
answered according to their assumptions; (d) due to some fairly intense real time events that took place in the PC during the project time it allowed a higher level of awareness between AHL model and a BSL model; (e) personal issues between some members of the PC administrative team; and (f) the intensity of schedule just before a holiday season when the last seminar took place and the re-taking of the 360 Degree RSLP.

From the group feedback reflections on the 360 Degree RSLP there was valuable commentary regarding leadership models identified with specific situations in the PC. Several courses of action were suggested in order to align more closely to a BSL model. The administrative team also recommend resources that could be helpful, points of communication needed between members of the PC ADCOM team, and encouragement to continue on the journey to create an environment to transition from an AHL model to a BSL model.

Analysis of the Biblical Servant Leader Seminar

The six seminars presented were conducted in three different locations; the PC office, Winter Green Resort just south of the PC office and King’s Mill Resort in Williamsburg, VA. The last two locations were part of a PC administrative team retreat. The different locations provided a different atmosphere and broke up the routine, which seemed to allow for better interaction.

Each seminar included, a devotional, a lecture intermixed with materials from other sources, i.e. video clips that pertained to the topic, and personal experiences or experiences drawn from other sources from within the PC, world church, or national politics. At the conclusion of the lecture, I would give one or two specific issues that the PC administrative team was facing and through reflective practice would analyze the real
time event in light of the material just presented. The administrative team would consider
the leadership model being used in addressing the issue, suggested whether there should
be shifts in the leadership model being used, and whether there was integrity in
connection with the seven characteristics.

The insights received from the coaching and group feedback sessions revealed
that the participants had not understood the BSL model. Each of the members of the PC
administrative team had assumptions, deeply rooted beliefs about themselves and the
world around them (Kegan & Lahey, 2001, p. 46) and about a BSL model. Some of the
assumptions included (a) that any church organization’s leadership model is
automatically biblically based; (b) a BSL model only needs to be followed when it is
convenient; (c) if one has a relationship with Jesus any leadership model will suffice; (d)
that each had the same understanding of how serving, authority, and power coexisted;
and (e) an understanding of mission is not critical to establishing a BSL model. These
assumptions seemed to impact the first taking of the 360 Degree RSLP as well as the
second.

The portion of the seminar that proved to be most helpful for learning was the
reflective practice of the real life incidents that we discussed in light of the material
presented. Within the context of the PC life, there were case studies and learning
opportunities. There was very good engagement from each of the participants and we
generally went past the allotted time. However, this was not seen as a negative, but an
opportunity for open and candid discussion that proved helpful, developed clarity on the
values of the PC (spirituality, integrity, team, service, and excellence), produced a better
understanding of BSL principles, and engaged all of the PC administrative team members.

As I prepared for each of the seminar presentations, my own understanding of a BSL model grew as applications were made to real life scenarios.

Analysis of the Coaching in Connection With the BSL Model

The purpose of the coaching segment for this project was to provide an opportunity to dialogue about the material presented, create clarity on the differences between an AHL model to a BSL model, and by engaging in reflective practice on real time events occurring within the PC that could be instructive to enhance an environment for a BSL model.

Two of the seven participants were reluctant to engage with the coaching: they were concerned with the time commitment, did not see the relevance of coaching, and had never been coached before. At the conclusion of the project and during the group feedback, coaching was stated as one of the most positive aspects of the process to truly understand a BSL model. Each member of the administrative team requested that they be allowed to continue in their relationship with a coach. This was provided.

Analysis and Outcomes of the Information from the Group Feedback Session

The use of the group feedback session was constructed through a conversation with Monte Sahlin, currently with the Ohio Conference of Seventh-day Adventists and an adjunct professor for the Doctor of Ministry program at Andrews University.

The information gleaned from this session provided the greatest collective insights into systems and processes necessary to keep and others, which needed to
change. Prior to the group feedback session Howard and I negotiated the agenda for the
group feedback session. The agenda and questions for the group feedback session are
listed in Appendix C. After the group feedback session the two of us critiqued the seven
hours spent together with the administrative team and Howard later submitted to me a
written summary.

In communicating prior to the group feedback session, Howard (Howard, personal
communication, December 7, 2012) contacted the PC administrative team and stated:

We hope to create a safe environment where we can look candidly and constructively
at the project, exploring in some depth the impact of the seminars, the coaching, and
at Bill's leadership style, in terms of how he fits the biblical servant leader profile,
and ways he can grow as a biblical servant leader. (Howard, personal communication,
2012)

Howard suggested the need for transparent conversation and the “need to be sensitive and
obedient to the Holy Spirit’s promptings” (personal communication, December 7, 2012).

This was very helpful in setting the context of the day’s sessions. Howard started
our session by getting a temperature of the PC administrative team for energy,
engagement in the project, and issues that might be sidetracking us from staying focused
on the issues at hand. This was followed by a season of prayer.

I led out with a “typical” item that the PC administrative team would discuss in an
administrative committee. The intent of this was to observe the interaction of the
administrative team, the leadership issues that could be identified, and potential points of
growth. Howard’s observation was that the interaction was “healthy, robust, and strong”
(Howard, 2013).

I then gave a brief summary of the major issues focused on during the seminars,
which was followed by a brief response to the summary. Again, Howard’s observation
was that “the project appears to have deepened awareness, and catalyzed more and more
of a commitment to be like Jesus in how they [PC administrative team] lead” (Howard, 2013).

For freedom of discussion, I stepped out for most of the rest of the group feedback session. The discussion consisted of reflecting on the RSLP and 360 Degree RSLP, seminars, and coaching. Howard reflected after the group feedback session was completed, that most of the time was spent on understanding the leadership models that were identified in the PC based on the context of the discussions from the seminars. I received several pages of very helpful feedback.

The primary outcomes from this group feedback session and for this project were:
(a) continue the journey to create an environment for a BSL model, (b) continue to develop an on-going curriculum that educates personnel on practical applications of the BSL model (c) continue to emphasize and model at staff meetings, administrative team meetings, Executive Committee, etc. the mission/vision/values of the PC and leadership principles of what it is to be a biblical servant leader, (d) continue to emphasize and model that the PC exists to be a resource and partner with the local churches, schools, and other local institutions, (e) continue to grow in and reflect on the seven factors from the 360 Degree RSLP, (f) establish a systematic way to identify potential personnel for hiring based on a BSL model, (g) establish processes that delegates more responsibility with authority to the different levels of the PC administrative team, departmental directors, and office assistants, and (h) establish healthy ways to celebrate and affirm employees of their growth toward a BSL model.
Reflections of the Intervention and the Next Steps for Research

Peter Drucker (1996) puts into perspective the need for a practice of reflection. He states that one should “follow effective action with quiet reflection. From the quiet reflection will come even more effective action” (p. 57). Several key perceptions from my reflections and continued research were gained from the experience of creating an environment to transition the PC administrative team to a BSL model, what might have been able to have been done differently, and what further research could be helpful.

Reflections of the Intervention

Understanding, creating, and establishing an environment for a functional BSL model for the PC administrative team is still in its beginning organic phases. A seed has been planted in the PC. There is evidence of a seedling, but much must continue for this seed to become a fruit-bearing plant.

At the beginning of the intervention I had no idea as to the expansiveness of what the undertaking truly was—transitioning a culture from an AHL model to a BSL model. However, it has been a deeply rich, humbling experience, and I recognize there is much to be learned on the path to full implementation.

The administrative team began the process with several assumptions. These assumptions were revealed as the different seminars were presented. I realized that the topics left different chasms in which bridges needed to be built so that a clearer picture of a BSL model would emerge. These assumptions were (a) when a BSL model was followed, trust, integrity, and accountability would automatically grow, (b) when a biblical leadership principle was clear leaving the AHL model would be welcomed, and
(c) creating a new administrative culture would be welcomed since it was biblically based.

There are additions I would make to the learning process of creating a transitional environment for a BSL model. I would keep the core elements of the intervention shown in the work of Page (2009) and extend the seminar from six to ten sessions. I would then add the following components:

**Spiritual Development**

In the words of Foster (1988, p. 1), “the desperate need today is not for a greater number of intelligent people, or gifted people, but for deep people.” Also from the thoughts of White (1903, p. 57):

> The greatest want of the world is the want of men—men who will not be bought or sold, men who in their inmost souls are true and honest, men who do not fear to call sin by its right name, men whose conscience is as true to duty as the needle to the pole, men who will stand for the right though the heavens fall.

When spirituality is considered, when a life of holiness, of godliness is pursued, other pitfalls appear which can derail into a life of inappropriate legalism (Miller & Juliani-Miller, 2004). From personal observation, spirituality was a difficult dialogue and some members of the PC administrative team struggled to know how to implement appropriate spiritual development principles in the context of work and life in general and know the perimeters of discussing this topic with peers.

**Biblical Theology of Emotional Intelligence**

Solomon says: “As a man thinketh in his heart, so is he” (Prov 23:7, KJV).

Aristotle said: “Anyone can become angry—that is easy. But to be angry with the right person, to the right degree, at the right time, for the right purpose, and in the right way—
this is not easy” (Aristotle, 2000, p. 19). Emotional illiteracy can be very costly to an organization and to almost any relationship. Research suggests that “emotional learning begins in life’s earliest moments” (Goleman, 1995, p. 195). Because it starts early it is imperative that for an organization to be healthy and to have the capacity to journey on a transformational track, one must understand the emotional intelligence of the group.

**Biblical Theology of Power and Authority**

Although this was part of the second seminar, I did not spend adequate time on establishing a theology and clarity for power and authority in the context of a BSL model and contrasted to an AHL model. Jesus clearly stated, “all authority in heaven and earth has been given to me” (Matt 28:18). The usurpation of power is well documented from the beginning of history by both secular and religious authors. This is especially true in the Christian church (Jankiewics, 2013; Linthicum, 2003). However, the proper use of power and authority is the “hinge upon which swings the doors of mission, by which Christians enter into service for Jesus Christ and governance of His church” (Patterson, 2010, p. 1).

**Creating a Culture for a BSL Model to Thrive**

Cockerell (2008) states from his experience that a culture in the context of an organization is “the system of values and beliefs an organization holds that drives actions and behaviors and influences relationships” (p. 51). However to get from a present culture (AHL model) to a preferred culture (BSL model) often requires a significant change of values (Kegan & Lahey, 2001); Quinn, 2004; Malphurs, 2005). Therefore it is necessary to understand and identify the worldviews of participants and their values, which identifies their culture. This will give insight on how to cast the vision for the
preferred values of the model, define what steps and commitments are necessary to get to the preferred BSL future, and identify strategies and outcomes necessary for the journey of transitioning to this preferred future (culture).

Reflections for More Research

In the course of this intervention many questions have arisen that would suggest that there are other aspects of research to be continued. Can this BSL model for a transitional journey be replicated in another similar and/or dissimilar denominational context? At what point would a transition to a BSL model be recognized and understood? In most scenarios researchers have focused on the character traits of a biblical servant leader (tangibles) but not on the intangibles, i.e. learning to listen and identify the voice of the Father and the Holy Spirit; the impact of quiet; the mystery of a transformed heart into a healthy pursuit of godliness with Jesus as Lord of your life. What are the measurable ingredients of a healthy environment or culture in order to transition successfully to a BSL model? What are the necessary disciplines and biblical lines of accountability necessary for the transitional journey to take place? As one part of an organization transitions, what is the impact if any, on the other parts of the organization and those with which they are associated?

There is also room for more research to establish a theology of biblical servant leadership from each of the gospels, the book of Acts, and the Pauline epistles in relationship to followership. Additionally, while there is considerable research on leadership, there is not as much on followership (Chaleff, 2009; Sweet, 2012).
Effective research will continue to allow for a growing understanding of the impact of a BSL model to the mission and vision that Christ has given the PC. As the transitioning is a journey, so is the research.

**Summary and Conclusions**

The purpose of engaging in this DMin project was for bringing clarity of understanding of a BSL model to the PC. The PC was moving forward, but was somewhat stalled in its mission in the gears of an AHL model. Upon research, it was noted that the most effective leadership model for a faith-based organization was that of BSL model (Page, 2009). Wong and Page (2003) created a contrast by noting that there was no evidence that a denominational organization demonstrated the principles of BSL model, thus the intent of this project.

It became apparent in creating the environment and beginning the journey of this project was more significant than the destination and “being” was more important than “doing” (Batterson, 2011; Blackaby & Blackaby, 2001). The Matthean narrative established that if Jesus is Lord of one’s life, the only leadership model to be considered is that of a BSL model. “The Son of man came not to be served, but to serve and give his life as a ransom for many” (Matt 20:28). As reminded by White (1940, p. 649)

this ideal of ministry God has committed to His Son. Jesus was given to stand at the head of humanity, that by His example He might teach what it means to minister. His whole life was under a law of service. He served all, ministered to all. Thus He lived the law of God . . . .

The Matthean narrative also reminds that if Jesus is Lord of his follower’s lives, they are to follow His mission, maintaining continual communication with the Trinity,
and portray the character qualities necessary for the circumstance that will connect us as his servant. Jesus always led as a servant, and so must we.

The trajectory of most leadership models, however, focuses on outcomes, the bottom-line, the competitive advantage, doing, and the leader (Collins, 2001; Lencioni, 2012). As demonstrated the literature suggests many theories, pathways, and models (Bass & Bass, 2008) to this end. The need for courage seems to be the necessary commodity to address the increased complexity of culture, globalization (Drummond, 2007) and the ever changing environments of the for-profit, not-for profit, and faith-based organizations for “these are extraordinary times” (Heifetz, Grashow, & Linsky, 2009, p. 1).

And so in these “extraordinary times” the PC administrative team is responding by engaging in the journey to transition from an AHL model to a BSL model. The leadership of the PC, called to be faithful followers of Jesus Christ and his mission, has engaged in the necessary components for change. As Blackaby and Blackaby (2001, p. 29) suggest:

If Jesus provides the model for spiritual leadership, then the key is not for leaders to develop visions and to set the direction for their organizations. The key is to obey and to preserve everything the Father reveals to them of his will. . . God does not ask leaders to dream big dreams for him or to solve the problems that confront them. He asks leaders to walk with him so intimately that when he reveals what is on his agenda, they will immediately adjust their lives to his will and the results will bring glory to God.

As the Apostle John reminds us, “as the Father has sent me (Jesus), even so, I send you” (John 20:21). And from the Apostle Matthew (28:20): “Lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the age.”
APPENDIX A
A: BIBLICAL SERVANT LEADERSHIP SEMINAR

Appendix A comprises a more detailed scope of the Biblical Servant Leadership Seminar that was provided for the administrative team of the PC. It contains the outline of each of the six seminars presented and topics covered. The material was adapted from Dr. Page’s work (2009) and contextualized for the PC.

The first document is an overview of the schedule and topics; the second document suggests the purpose and objectives of the seminar; the third document will be the detailed outline of the topics covered; the handouts for each seminar will be placed at the conclusion of that particular seminar’s outline.
**Biblical Servant Leadership Seminar Outline**

**Instructor:** William K. Miller, B.A.; MDiv  
billm@pcsda.org  
540-886-0771

April 10  
RSLP and the 360 Degree RSLP were administered at the beginning of the seminar.

1) A Brief Chronological History of Leadership Practices and Stages of Leadership Development.
2) Power and Authority, and Why the PC Team Should Consider a BSL Model.

May 1  
1) Five Basic Leadership Models  
2) Mission and Vision, the Church as the Body of Christ, and Their Importance in Creating an Environment to Transition to a BSL Model

June 4  
1) Communication--Adding Clarity to the Vision and Mission of God  
2) Integrating Values into the Implementation of Mission and Vision

August 3  
1) Building a BSL Team and the Environment for Change to a BSL Model  
2) Conflict Resolution in the Context of a BSL Team

September 11  
1) Leading Change Through a BSL Team and How What Pitfalls to Avoid

October 2  
1) Changes Necessary for the PC to Transition to a BSL Model  
2) Staying Strong as a Biblical Servant Leader

November 7  
1) Re-administering the RSLP and the 360 Degree RSLP and Overall Review of Major Points

December 13  
1) Time with Dr. Nick Howard for Group Feedback Session
Purpose of Seminar

The Seventh-day Adventist Church has been called to serve and take an eternal message to the world (Matthew 28:18-20; Revelation 14:6, 7). The Potomac Conference exists to serve and take this message to its defined territory. However, there has been evidence of power struggles, misunderstanding of the uses of authority, and the Potomac Conferences relationship to the different structural levels of the World Church (Assessments 2007 and 2011).

In the Potomac Conference there has not been a clearly defined leadership model. It seems to have been functioning on the charisma, skills, and influence of each conference president and/or vice-presidents and departmental directors with varying results.

It is the intent of this course to begin the groundwork to establish a BSL model that will create an environment that will function as a biblical servant leadership team. The model biblical servant leader is Jesus (Matthew 20:25-28). Therefore the core of this course is the continual reflection on the life of Jesus and the principals that he established in order to create an environment to transition the administrative team in the Potomac Conference to be successful biblical servant leaders.

Seminar Objectives

The objectives of this seminar for the administrative team are as follows:

1) To understand different leadership models and to discern most specifically between an AHL model and a BSL model

2) Understand the character traits of BSL

3) To create the necessary environment to begin the process of transitioning to a biblical servant leadership model

4) Provide feedback to the president to direct the different administrative team members in how to grow as a BSL

5) What tools to use in order to train other associates of the administrative team

6) Identify tools that will continue to be effective in establishing an effective transition to a BSL Model

7) Identify other areas of research and components necessary to be able to transition to a BSL model
SEMINAR I (April 10, 2012):

Course Introduction: An overview of the seminar and the objectives of the seminar.

Content: RSLP and the 360 Degree RSLP were administered at the beginning of the seminar.

Part 1—A Brief Chronological History of Leadership Practices and Stages of Leadership Development
1) Defining leadership from the sixteenth century to the present
2) Video Clip—“Leadership of the Dancing Guy” (this may be found on YouTube: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fW8amMCVAJQ
3) Six Stages of Leadership Development
4) Difference between managers and leaders

Part 2—Power and Authority, and Why the PC Team Should Consider a BSL Model.
1) Understanding power and authority and authoritarian hierarchical leadership
2) Defining Biblical Servant Leadership in the context of Matthew 20:20-28
3) Four general styles of leadership and the application to the Potomac Conference Team

Biblical Servant Leadership Definition:

“A biblical servant leader is one who serves as an authentic follower of Jesus and His mission, who engages others in a life of holiness, and takes the initiative to equip others for His mission and growth of His kingdom.” William Miller
Six Stages of Leadership

(Adapted from Servant Empowered Leadership, Page, p. 32, 33)

• Stage One: Positional Leadership

• Stage Two: Systems and Processes

• Stage Three: Developing Interpersonal Relationships

• Stage Four: Production of Results; Outcomes

• Stage Five: Development of People

• Stage Six: Servant Leadership and Loyal Collaboration
**Managers**

* (Taken from *Servant Empowered Leadership*, Page, p. 32)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Managers Action</th>
<th>Leaders Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do things right</td>
<td>Do the right things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are interested in efficiency</td>
<td>Are interested in effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administer</td>
<td>Innovate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain</td>
<td>Develop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on systems and structure</td>
<td>Focus on people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rely on control</td>
<td>Rely on trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organize and staff</td>
<td>Align people with a direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasize tactics, structure, and systems</td>
<td>Emphasize philosophy, core values, and shared goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a short-term view</td>
<td>Have a long-term view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask how and when</td>
<td>Ask what and why</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept the status quo</td>
<td>Challenge the status quo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on the present</td>
<td>Focus on the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have their eyes on the bottom line</td>
<td>Have their eyes on the horizon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop detailed steps and timetables</td>
<td>Develop visions and strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seek predictability and order</td>
<td>Seek change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid risks</td>
<td>Take risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivate people to comply with standards</td>
<td>Inspire people to change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use position-to-position (superior-to-subordinate) influence</td>
<td>Use person-to-person influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require others to comply</td>
<td>Inspire others to follow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operate with organizational rules, regulations, policies, and procedures</td>
<td>Operate outside of organizational rules, regulations, policies and procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are given a position</td>
<td>Take initiative to lead</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## FOUR GENERAL STYLES OF LEADERSHIP

(Adapted from *Servant Empowered Leadership*, Don Page, pp. 75 – 82. Biblical servant is my addition and bracketed comments are mine).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PURPOSE</th>
<th>SELFISH, AUTOCRATIC, DOMINEERING</th>
<th>BENEVOLENT DICTATOR, PATERNALISTIC</th>
<th>TRANSFORMATIONAL</th>
<th>SERVANT</th>
<th>BIBLICAL SERVANT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The leader is to be served by the followers.</td>
<td>The leader expects that the followers will willingly serve the leader in the advancement of the organization.</td>
<td>The leader serves the followers for transforming the organization.</td>
<td>The leader serves the follower for their benefit.</td>
<td>The leader serves the mission of the Father, which becomes a benefit to the follower.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The leader’s interests are indistinguishable from that of the organization.</td>
<td>Leaders lead because they alone know what is best for the organization and their followers.</td>
<td>The leader serves the interests of the followers primarily for the benefit of the organization.</td>
<td>The leader serves the interests of the followers above selfish interests.</td>
<td>The leader serves the interests of the followers in relationship to mission.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entitlements of the position are more important than responsibilities.</td>
<td>Position entitles one to rewards that followers accept because of who the leader is.</td>
<td>Responsibilities to the organization are more important than the perks of positional entitlement.</td>
<td>Responsibilities to followers are more important than any positional entitlements.</td>
<td>Responsibilities to followers are more important than any positional entitlements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTITUDE</td>
<td>Based on the leader’s position and external controls or rules that are maintained by force or sanctions.</td>
<td>Based on the leader’s position and external controls or rules that are maintained by force or sanctions.</td>
<td>Based on respect for followers and maintained through internal influencing means such as encouragement, inspiration, and persuasion.</td>
<td>Based on respect and love for followers. Maintained through internal influencing.</td>
<td>Based on respect and love for followers. Maintained through internal influencing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on the leader’s position and external controls or rules that are maintained by force or sanctions.</td>
<td>The leader expects that followers will respect his/her position and accept the power that goes with it.</td>
<td>The leader recognizes that power comes only from the followers who serve the organization.</td>
<td>The leader is willing to step aside for someone more qualified to lead. The position is held lightly.</td>
<td>The leader is willing to step aside for someone more qualified to lead. The position is held lightly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTHORITY</td>
<td>Pulls rank to get his/her own way.</td>
<td>May pull rank behind the scenes to get his/her own way for what is deemed to be the best interests of the organization.</td>
<td>Never pulls rank to get own way, as that would be harmful to the organization.</td>
<td>Never pulls rank to get own way, as that would be harmful to colleagues.</td>
<td>Never pulls rank to get own way, as that would be harmful to colleagues, and destroy trust and integrity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SELFISH, AUTOCRATIC, DOMINATING</strong></td>
<td><strong>BENEVOLENT DICTATOR, PATERNALISTIC</strong></td>
<td><strong>TRANSFORMATIONAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>SERVANT</strong></td>
<td><strong>BIBLICAL SERVANT</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only to superiors when absolutely demanded.</td>
<td>Only to some higher authority out of reach to the followers.</td>
<td>To the entire organization.</td>
<td>To everyone in the organization and outside constituencies as well.</td>
<td>To everyone in the organization and outside constituencies as well.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuns personal evaluations as unnecessary interference with their leadership.</td>
<td>Shuns personal evaluations as an affront to the leaders' credibility before his/her followers.</td>
<td>Welcomes regular personal evaluations as a means of improving performance of the entire organization.</td>
<td>Welcomes regular personal evaluations as a means of improving their followers.</td>
<td>Welcomes regular personal evaluations as a means of improving their followers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty of followers is commanded through external pressures or autocratic means. Usually a high turnover rate.</td>
<td>Loyalty is asked for as a sign of friendship. Psychological manipulation of people to secure loyalty is common. Have a low turnover rate because most people believe in the leader and are loyal followers.</td>
<td>Loyalty is to the organization and not its leader. Everyone is regularly reminded of this. Have a low turnover rate because people want to stay with the organization.</td>
<td>Loyalty comes through the inspiration in the heart and soul of the followers. Have a low turnover rate because people are valued for their contribution to the mission and to each other.</td>
<td>Loyalty comes through the inspiration in the heart and soul of the followers. Have a low turnover rate because people are valued for their contribution to the mission and to each other.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Initiates change when it benefits ego, control, or position in the organization.)</td>
<td>(Initiates change based on evaluations that will grow the organization and employees.)</td>
<td>(Initiates change because it is the right thing to do for the mission, which in turn is the right thing for the followers.)</td>
<td>(Initiates change because it is the right thing to do for the mission, which in turn is the right thing for the followers.)</td>
<td>(Initiates change because it is the right thing to do for the mission, which in turn is the right thing for the followers.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>VALUES</strong></th>
<th><strong>SELFISH, AUTOCRATIC, DOMINATING</strong></th>
<th><strong>BENEVOLENT DICTATOR, PATERNALISTIC</strong></th>
<th><strong>TRANSFORMATIONAL</strong></th>
<th><strong>SERVANT</strong></th>
<th><strong>BIBLICAL SERVANT</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interested primarily in their personal image and advancement through self-adulation and preservation. Feeds on the personal aspect of the spotlight.ego and self-esteem are very important and self-worth is based on performance. To give something away is to take away from self. Comparisons with others breeds envy and jealousy. Ego may be a problem, as the ego has to be stroked by others.</td>
<td>Interested primarily in the advancement of the mission of the organization as well as their personal image and standing before followers. The spotlight is turned on the organisation but always includes them as well.</td>
<td>Primary interest is in the well-being of the organisation that the followers are serving. Shares the spotlight with others.</td>
<td>Primary interest is in the well-being of their followers for their own sake. Puts the spotlight on others.</td>
<td>Primary interest is in the practical achievement of the mission of the Father and in the well-being of their followers. Puts the spotlight on the Father and mission.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has faith only in self.</td>
<td>Has faith only in self and his/her channel to God.</td>
<td>Has faith in the transformed organization.</td>
<td>Has faith in the people.</td>
<td>Has faith in the mission and people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility and expediency are the keys rather than any overarching values. Values are seldom stated apart from what they leader says they are.</td>
<td>Flexibility and expediency are the keys exercised in personal values.</td>
<td>Maintaining the values of the organisation is uppermost.</td>
<td>Valuing the well-being of the followers is uppermost.</td>
<td>Valuing the well-being of the followers is uppermost.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Values are what the organisation says they are.</td>
<td>Values are what the followers determine they are for their wellbeing.</td>
<td>Values are the behaviors necessary for the completion of the mission.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELFISH, AUTOCRATIC, DOMINATING</td>
<td>benevolent dictator, paternalistic</td>
<td>transformational</td>
<td>servant</td>
<td>biblical servant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DECISIONMAKING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure is the main criteria for making unalterable decisions in secret.</td>
<td>The followers' best interests are served by the leaders making unalterable decisions for them.</td>
<td>Principles are the main criteria for making decisions for the interests of the organization.</td>
<td>Principles are the main criteria for making decisions for the interests of those being served.</td>
<td>Principles are the main criteria for making decisions for the interests of those being served.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condemn others for mistakes and see his/her acceptance of responsibility as a sign of weakness.</td>
<td>Shifts blame for mistakes to others or the system to retain their best self-image.</td>
<td>Mistakes are means for improving the organization through learned lessons. Failure is okay if you learn their lessons. If there is blame attached it is on the leader not the followers.</td>
<td>Mistakes are lessons in how we can work better together. Blaming is not the issue. If there is blame attached, it is on the leader not the followers.</td>
<td>Mistakes are lessons in how we can work better together. Blaming is not the issue. If there is blame attached, it is on the leader not the followers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses intimidation, force, threats, and manipulation to ensure compliance and to silence potential critics.</td>
<td>Uses shaming and threats to ensure compliance and silencing of potential critics that cannot be tolerated for the sake of the organization. Critics are gradually removed through manipulation or sacrificed at not recognizing the wisdom of the leader. Mavericks are shunned until they leave the organization.</td>
<td>Welcomes open discussion on the means for improving the organization. Mavericks are accepted and listened to.</td>
<td>Welcomes open discussion on the means of improving the group’s performance. There is an openness to learn from anyone.</td>
<td>Welcomes open discussion on the means of improving the group’s performance. There is an openness to learn from anyone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making does not require the sharing of information unless the leader chooses to do so.</td>
<td>Decision-making is based on only the information the leader thinks is good for the organization.</td>
<td>Information is made as widely available as possible to facilitate mutual decision-making. Credit is always shared with followers.</td>
<td>Information is made as widely available as possible to facilitate mutual decision-making. Credit is always shared with followers.</td>
<td>Information is made as widely available as possible to facilitate mutual decision-making. Credit is always shared with followers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes personal credit for all good decisions.</td>
<td>Ensures that the followers know who made the right decision.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SELFISH, AUTOCRATIC, DOMINATING</th>
<th>benevolent dictator, paternalistic</th>
<th>transformational</th>
<th>servant</th>
<th>biblical servant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RELATIONSHIPS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers are seen and treated as inferiors who serve the leader for his/her purposes.</td>
<td>Co-workers are there to advance what the leader wants for the organization.</td>
<td>Co-workers are treated with respect as part of a team working for the organization.</td>
<td>Co-workers are treated with respect as partners in teamwork who together accomplish tasks.</td>
<td>Co-workers are treated with respect as partners in teamwork who together accomplish tasks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinates are expendable.</td>
<td>Subordinates are expendable for the sake of the organization but are removed quietly.</td>
<td>Subordinates are important for the transformation of the organization.</td>
<td>Subordinates are colleagues of individual value.</td>
<td>Subordinates are colleagues of individual value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders are accessible to only their closest lieutenants.</td>
<td>Leaders are accessible only when the leader chooses that it is in the best interests of the organization.</td>
<td>Leaders strive to have open doors and are seen interacting with followers.</td>
<td>Often seen interacting with followers and maintaining an open-door policy.</td>
<td>Often seen interacting with followers and maintaining an open-door policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates an atmosphere of dependence on the leader for decisions and favors.</td>
<td>Creates an atmosphere that leads to adulation and admiration of the leader as the organization succeeds.</td>
<td>Creates an atmosphere for developing the potential of others to serve the organization.</td>
<td>Creates an atmosphere for developing the potential of others for their mission and advancement.</td>
<td>Creates an atmosphere for developing the potential of others for mission, their wellbeing, and advancement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotes or recognizes those who follow without questioning or are pliable.</td>
<td>Promotes those whom they feel good about when it will be good for the organization.</td>
<td>Promotes those who contribute to the success of the organization.</td>
<td>Promotes those who demonstrate a serving attitude towards others.</td>
<td>Promotes those who demonstrate active participation in the mission and have a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SELFISH, AUTOCRATIC, DOMINEERING</th>
<th>BENEVOLENT DICTATOR, PATERNALISTIC</th>
<th>TRANSFORMATIONAL</th>
<th>SERVANT</th>
<th>BIBLICAL SERVANT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMUNICATIONS</strong></td>
<td>Primary importance is listening to the leader. Seeks first to be understood rather than to understand others. Advice is sought selectively.</td>
<td>Listens to others in order to learn how to manipulate them into the leader's desired actions for the sake of the organization. Advice is therefore sought selectively.</td>
<td>Wants to listen to followers before engaging them in a decision. Seeks first to understand and then to be understood.</td>
<td>Wants to listen, understand, and engage followers before a decision is made with their input.</td>
<td>Wants to listen, understand, and engage followers before a decision is made with their input.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEEK FROM A CHRISTIAN PERSPECTIVE</strong></td>
<td>This kind of leadership is a total anathema to Christian leadership because of its selfish motives and value-system.</td>
<td>This kind of leadership is often seen in Christian organizations as attempts are made to have a charismatic, controlling leader serve the Christian values of the organization. Ultimately, the leader knows what is best for the organization because of his/her connection with God.</td>
<td>This kind of leadership is found in Christian organizations, which follow recent trends in leadership development just because they appear to work in honoring employees and producing results. Most often this happens when a biblical foundation of leadership is not fully understood and therefore cannot be practiced.</td>
<td>Serving leadership is Jesus' model for leadership that should be followed by all Christian organizations and people who seek to serve for God's glory. It is better to serve than to be served. But understand you are serving the mission of Heaven. In serving others we find greatness.</td>
<td>Serving leadership is Jesus' model for leadership that should be followed by all Christian organizations and people who seek to serve for God's glory. It is better to serve than to be served. But understand you are serving the mission of Heaven. In serving others we find greatness.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SEMINAR II (May 1, 2012):

Course Review: An overview of the major points of the previous session and review of the definition of a biblical servant leader.

Content:

Part 1—Structural Models of Leadership and Assessing the Potomac Conference Model
1) Five structural models of leadership
   d. Body
2) How mission, vision, major goals, values of the organization, decision making, and non-compliance function in these five models
3) Models of leadership in the Potomac Conference (specific examples)

Part 2—The Need for an Effective Mission/Vision/Values for the PC
1) Understanding mission/vision/values
2) Understanding the mission and vision of our heavenly Father and its relationship to our leadership model
3) Understanding the life-cycle of an organization
LEADERSHIP MODELS:

Exodus 18:17-26

PYRAMID

INVERTED PYRAMID

CIRCLE

DIAMOND

(Taken from Servant Empowered Leadership, Page, p. 95)

(These graphics adapted from Servant Empowered Leadership, Page, pp. 89-119)
A healthy organization must address each of the following issues in the context of its leadership model:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VISION</th>
<th>MISSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR GOALS</td>
<td>VALUES OF THE ORGANIZATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECISION MAKING</td>
<td>MEANING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-COMPLIANCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIFE-CYCLE OF AN ORGANIZATION

(Taken from Servant Empowered Leadership, Page, p. 129)
The Life Cycle and Stages of Congregational Development

Phase One: Early Growth

Infancy (VRpm)

Birth (Vrpm)

Phase Two: Late Growth

Adolescence (VRPm)

Childhood (VrPm)

Phase Three: Prime/Plateau

Prime

Maturity (vRPM)

Empty Nest (vRPM)

Phase Four: Early Aging

Retirement (vRPm)

Old Age (vRpM)

Phase Five: Late Aging

Aging

Death (m)

V: Vision/Leadership/Mission/Purpose/Core Values
R: Relationships/Experiences/Discipleship
P: Programs/Events/Ministries/Services/Activities
M: Management/Accountability/Systems/Resources

Copyright 2001, Rev. George Bullard, D.Min.
The Potomac Conference of Seventh-day Adventists is committed to partner with Heaven to fulfill the gospel commission (Matthew 28:19 – 20), take a message of salvation to each individual in our mission field through the power of the Holy Spirit, and, understanding our prophetic role, we will proclaim the Three Angels Messages (Revelation 14). We believe that God has called us for this specific time as we look forward to the soon return of Jesus Christ. It is our desire, by His grace, to be faithful to this calling.
**Mission:**

The Potomac Conference Exists to:

**Grow Healthy Disciple Making Churches**

**2020 Vision:**

1. By 2020 our membership (or) attendance will double in size one precious soul at a time
2. By 2020 70% of our congregations will be healthy disciple making churches through community focus, pastors equipped as servant leaders, members equipped and empowered to do the work of ministry, and churches reproducing themselves in other localities
3. By 2020 each community or people group of 20,000 or more will have a Seventh-day Adventist presence
4. By 2020 each school will be strong spiritually and academically; will be disciple making; will be one of the greatest assets to the local church constituency.

**Values:**

**Integrity**—Living a life of transparency

**Spirituality**—Living a life “in Christ.”

**Service**—Living a life of servant leadership

**Team**—Living a life for a common cause

**Excellence**—Living a life exceeding others expectations.
2020 Vision:

1. **By 2020 our membership will double in size one precious individual at a time** (Acts 2:41,42—Those who believed what Peter said were baptized and added to the church? about three thousand in all. They joined with the other believers and devoted themselves to the apostles’ teaching and fellowship, sharing in the Lord’s Supper and in prayer,; MH 143—Christ’s method alone will give true success in reaching the people. The Saviour mingled with men as one who desired their good. He showed His sympathy for them, ministered to their needs, and won their confidence. Then He bade them, "Follow Me." COL 229—To every soul Christ’s invitation will be given. Further study—Acts 2:47; 5:14; Mt 3:10; John 15:1 - 10; COL pp 33-94).

2. **By 2020 70% of our congregations will be healthy disciple making churches through community focus, pastors equipped as servant leaders, members equipped and empowered to do the work of ministry, and churches reproducing themselves in other localities.** (Acts 6:7—And the word of God increased; and the number of the disciples multiplied greatly in Jerusalem, and a great many of the priests were obedient to the faith. RSV; DA 523—The joy of seeing souls redeemed, souls eternally saved, is the reward of all that put their feet in the footprints of Him who said, "Follow Me." Further study—Ephesians 4:8-12; 1 Cor. 12; Romans 12; COL 325-364; 376-389).

3. **By 2020 each community or people group of 20,000 or more will have a Seventh-day Adventist presence** (Acts 1:8 But when the Holy Spirit has come upon you, you will receive power and will tell people about me everywhere — in Jerusalem, throughout Judea, in Samaria, and to the ends of the earth; COL 229—We are not to wait for the souls to come to us; we must seek them out where they are. Further study— COL 212-242

4. **By 2020 each school will be strong spiritually and academically; will be disciple making; will be one of the greatest assets to the local church constituency.** (Mt 18:4 Anyone who becomes as humble as this little child is the greatest in the Kingdom of Heaven. ED 271— With such an army of workers as our youth, rightly trained, might furnish, how soon the message of a crucified, risen, and soon-coming Saviour might be carried to the whole world! Further study—Ed pp 1-50; FE 202)
VALUES FOR THE
POTOMAC CONFERENCE

**Integrity—Living a life of transparency**
“A fine sense of one’s obligations.” “The courage to meet the demands of reality.”

**Honesty**—*Telling the truth and leaving the right impression;* (Prov 11:1—“The Lord hates cheating, but he delights in honesty).

**Congruence**—*No gap between intent and behavior;* (1 Tim 6:14—Obey his commands with all purity. Then no one can find fault with you from now until our Lord Jesus Christ returns).

**Humility**—*More concerned about what is right rather than about being right, about acting on good ideas than having the ideas, about embracing new truth than defending outdated position, about building the team than exalting self;* (Phil 2:3—Don't be selfish; don't live to make a good impression on others. Be humble, thinking of others as better than yourself).

**Courage**—*Doing the right thing even when it is hard;* (1 Thess 2:2—We had courage in our God to declare to you the gospel of God in the face of great opposition).

**Spirituality—Living a life “in Christ.”**

**Kingdom principles as foundation for direction and decisions:** (Mt. 6:33—He will give you all you need from day to day if you live for him and make the Kingdom of God your primary concern).

**Involved consistently with spiritual disciplines:** (1 Tim. 4:7—Exercise daily in God—no spiritual flabbiness, please! MSG)

**Living a lifestyle of discipleship:** (James 1:22—Do not merely listen to the word, and so deceive yourselves. Do what it says).

**Readiness to change as He directs:** (Ps 139:23-24—Search me, O God, and know my heart; test me and know my thoughts. Point out anything in me that offends you, and lead me along the path of everlasting life).

**Accepting of each other as we are accepted by God:** (Eph. 1:6—So we praise God for the glorious grace he has poured out on us who belong to his dear Son).
Service—Living a life of servant leadership

Understanding what it means to “Go…” and living it out: (Mat. 28:19—Therefore, go and make disciples of all the nations...).

Working within spiritual giftedness: (1 Peter 4:10-11—God has given gifts to each of you from his great variety of spiritual gifts. Manage them well so that God’s generosity can flow through you).

Equipping: (Eph 4:12—Their responsibility is to equip God's people to do his work and build up the church, the body of Christ).

Take initiative to meet relevant needs: (Mt 7:12—Do for others what you would like them to do for you...; John 13:4,5—So he got up from the table, took off his robe, wrapped a towel around his waist, and poured water into a basin. Then he began to wash the disciples feet and to wipe them with the towel he had around him).

Team—Living a life for a common cause

Togetherness in Purpose: (Acts 4:32—All the believers were united in heart and mind. John 17:20,21—I am praying not only for these disciples but also for all who will ever believe in me through their message. I pray that they will all be one, just as you and I are one—as you are in me, Father, and I am in you. And may they be in us so that the world will believe you sent me).

Energized by God's Spirit: (2 Peter 1:3—As we know Jesus better, his divine power gives us everything we need for living a godly life. Acts 2:32,22—“God raised Jesus from the dead, and we are all witnesses of this. 33 Now he is exalted to the place of highest honor in heaven, at God’s right hand. And the Father, as he had promised, gave him the Holy Spirit to pour out upon us, just as you see and hear today).

Accepting of each other as we are accepted by God: (Acts 15:8—God knows people's hearts, and he confirmed that he accepts Gentiles by giving them the Holy Spirit, just as he did to us. Rom. 14:1—Accept other believers who are weak in faith, and don’t argue with them about what they think is right or wrong).

Shared Vision Mission is championed by all and above all: (Phil. 1:27—Above all, you must live as citizens of heaven, conducting yourselves in a manner worthy of the Good News about Christ. Then, whether I come and see you again or only hear about you, I will know that you are standing together with one spirit and one purpose, fighting together for the faith, which is the Good News.)
Excellence—Living a life exceeding others expectations.

**Quality**—*We strive to do everything for the glory of God.* (1 Cor. 3:13 But on the judgment day, fire will reveal what kind of work each builder has done. The fire will show if a person’s work has any value. Phil. 4:8—Think about things that are excellent and worthy of praise).

**Leadership**—*We must influence others to fulfill the Great Commission.* Mt. 20:25-28—You know that in this world kings are tyrants, and officials lord it over the people beneath them. But among you it should be quite different. Whoever wants to be a leader among you must be your servant, and whoever wants to be first must become your slave. For even I, the Son of Man, came here not to be served but to serve others, and to give my life as a ransom for many).

**Holy Spirit**—*We are dependent upon the Holy Spirit for significant success.* (Acts 1:8—But when the Holy Spirit has come upon you, you will receive power and will tell people about me everywhere - in Jerusalem, throughout Judea, in Samaria, and to the ends of the earth. Zech 4:6—It is not by force nor by strength, but by my Spirit, says the Lord of Heaven’s Armies).

**Continuous Improvement**—*We commit ourselves to personal and professional growth.* (2 Cor. 3:18—And as the Spirit of the Lord works within us, we become more and more like him and reflect his glory even more. Luke 2:52—Jesus grew in wisdom and in stature and in favor with God and all the people).

Voted by the Potomac Conference Executive Committee Oct. 23, 2007

Unless otherwise noted all scriptures are quoted from the New Living Translation.
BIBLICAL SERVANT LEADERSHIP
SEMINAR – III

SEMINAR III: (June 4, 2012)

Course Review: An overview of the major points of the previous session and review of the definition of a biblical servant leader.

Content:

1) The importance of effective communication and styles of communication from smoke signals to e-mail and social media

2) Communication that enhances mission
   a. Effective communication from the Old Testament
   b. Effective communication from the New Testament
   c. Mark Sanborn’s statements of communication between “others” and “leaders”

3) Effective communication for leaders of the Potomac Conference
   a. Where and how are we called to communicate
   b. Meetings, web-page, e-mails, Columbia Union paper, conference newsletter, preaching—establishing protocols for effective communication
   c. Best practices of communicating and evaluating our communication effectiveness
   d. PC’s communication in relationship to our values
**Mark Sanborn**
(Adapted from *Servant Empowered Leadership*, Page, p. 162; Biblical Servant Leaders is my addition)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTHERS</th>
<th>LEADERS</th>
<th>BIBLICAL SERVANT LEADERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SELL</td>
<td>TELL</td>
<td>DIALOGUE, LISTEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPRESS</td>
<td>INFLUENCE</td>
<td>ENGAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRY TO BE HEARD</td>
<td>STRIVE TO BE UNDERSTOOD</td>
<td>HELP OTHERS TO UNDERSTAND M/V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPLAIN</td>
<td>ENERGIZE</td>
<td>COLLABORATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORM</td>
<td>INSPIRE</td>
<td>INSPIRE FOR M/V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELY ON FACTS/INFO/GOSSIP</td>
<td>TELLS STORIES</td>
<td>TELLS STORIES TO FOCUS ON M/V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SEMINAR IV: (August 3, 2012)

Course Review: An overview of the major points of the previous session and review of the definition of a biblical servant leader.

Content:

Part 1
1) Review of main points of Seminars 1 – 3
2) A look at different teams
   a. Secular  b. Religious  c. Trinity
3) Leadership styles of different team models
4) Advantages of working in a team
5) Definition of a team

Part 2
1) 13 critical characteristics of a team
2) Why teams fail
3) A look at effective team members
4) A look at effective team leaders
5) Effective servant-empowered team leaders
6) When conflict arises in the team
7) Spiritual dimensions of a biblical servant leadership team in dealing with conflict
8) Evaluation tool done for each team member
CRITICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF A BIBLICAL SERVANT LED TEAM

Scale of 1 – 5; 1 Very Poor and 5 Excellent

(Adapted from Servant Empowered Leadership, Page, pp. 242, 243; Number 13 are my additions)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>CLEAR PURPOSE</strong> — The vision, mission, goal, or task of the team has been defined and is accepted by everyone. There is an action plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>INFORMALITY</strong> — The climate tends to be informal, comfortable, and relaxed. There are no obvious tensions or signs of boredom.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>PARTICIPATION</strong> — There is much discussion and everyone is encouraged to participate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>LISTENING</strong> — The members use effective listening techniques such as questioning, paraphrasing, and summarizing to get out ideas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>CIVILIZED DISAGREEMENT</strong> — There is disagreement, but the team is comfortable with this and shows no signs of avoiding, smoothing over, or suppressing conflict.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. <strong>CONSENSUS DECISIONS</strong> — For important decisions, the goal is substantial but not necessarily unanimous agreement through open discussion of everyone’s ideas, avoidance of easy compromises.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. <strong>OPEN COMMUNICATION</strong> — Team members feel free to express their feelings on the tasks as well as on the group’s operation. There are few hidden agendas. Communication takes place outside of meetings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. <strong>CLEAR ROLES AND WORK ASSIGNMENTS</strong> — There are clear expectations about the roles played by each team member. When action is taken clear assignments are made, accepted, and carried out.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. <strong>SHARED LEADERSHIP</strong> — While the team has a formal leader, leadership functions may shift from time to time depending on the circumstances, the needs of the group, and the skills of the members. The formal leader models the appropriate behavior and helps establish positive norms.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. <strong>EXTERNAL RELATIONS</strong> — The team spends time developing key outside relationships, mobilizing resources, and building credibility with important players in the other parts of the organization.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. <strong>STYLE DIVERSITY</strong>—The team has a broad spectrum of team-player types including members who emphasize attention to task, goal setting, focus on process, and questions about how the team is functioning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. <strong>SELF-ASSESSMENT</strong>—Periodically, the team stops to examine how well it is functioning and what may be interfering with its effectiveness.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. <strong>SPIRITUALITY</strong>—Evidence of principles and behaviors of biblical servant leadership.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TEAMS FAIL BECAUSE:

(Adapted from Servant Empowered Leadership, Page, pp. 242, 243; Numbers 1 & 2 are my additions)

1. Spiritually not connected and not maintaining a daily relationship with Jesus.

2. Resort back to old leadership styles and forgets what it is to be a biblical servant leader.

3. Too much like you. Need diversity of thought, leadership styles, and strengths that will encourage creativity.

4. There for the sole purpose of being someone’s spy, usually a superior or auxiliary organization, on the team’s activities instead of being a contributing member.

5. Resistant to joining the team. Resister will require too much attention and will never contribute fully to the team. No matter how many great skills and talents they may have, their unhappy attitude will infect other team members and tend to destroy team morale and enthusiasm. The deflate energy, whine, also complain and toxic.

6. Unable to see, support, and contribute positively to what the team is trying to accomplish.

7. Unwilling to give leadership to the team in the areas of their strengths.

8. Wanting to tell the team how it should go about its business instead of listening to input from all team members in order to find the best path.

9. Utilizes job titles and positional authority into team meetings that places them above, instead of equal to.

10. Wants to be the star.

11. Unwilling to respect, abide by, follow through on things the team agrees too.

12. Unwilling to learn from mistakes or take the time to learn.

13. Unable to see that good teamwork is more than results, it is also about processes and relationships.

14. Not really proud of being on the team…Undermines team morale, by throwing in unsuspecting doubt, criticism, and undermines in public.
EFFECTIVE BIBLICAL SERVANT 
LEADERSHIP TEAM MEMBERS 
(Adapted from Servant Empowered Leadership, Page, pp. 262, 263)

1. Spiritually connected vertically (with God) and horizontally (with co-workers).
2. Evidence of spirituality in decisions and character.
3. Willing to support enthusiastically all team decisions.
4. Supportive of the team leader and their leadership.
5. Willing to listen to other team members and to incorporate their views when developing ideas or solving problems.
6. Willing to see more than one perspective.
7. Recognizes that teams are more than their results, they are also about processes and ongoing interpersonal relationships.
8. Know how the team fits into the overall organization and its larger objectives. Takes initiative if not clear.
9. Contributes to honest and accurate information transmission and research.
10. Willing to share the credit of accomplishments with the entire team.
11. Willing to accept failure as a collective team problem without casting blame on individual team members.
12. See their strengths as a complement to the entire team.
13. Always act in a positive and constructive manner for the benefit of the team by being a can do rather than I can’t kind of contributor.
14. Willing to provide open and constructive feedback on all team activities by placing team functioning problems onto the table for discussion and resolution.
15. Help the team to think outside of the box and avoid “group think.”
16. Willing to serve as a team leader when required to do so.
17. Recognize that to lead is to serve and to serve is to lead.

18. Maintain confidentiality when required to do so.

19. Work to enhance the contributions of other team members.

20. Be willing to go the extra mile for the sake of the team.

21. View personal and team criticism as opportunities to learn.

22. Critically evaluate ideas, nor individuals, by asking questions.

23. Confront fellow team members, including the team leader, when that person’s behavior is detrimental to the team’s functioning.

24. Willingly adhere to the team’s covenant of operating guidelines.

25. Always thinks “we” before “I” and measure the team’s success before their own.

26. Seek to be a value added member of the team.

27. Desire to be on a winning or productive team.
### Effective Biblical Servant Team Leaders

Team Member: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale of 1-5</th>
<th>1=Very Poor</th>
<th>5=Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Excellent communicator in both written and oral forms to individuals, the entire team, and with those people with whom the team must engage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Superb listener who knows how to lead through asking questions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Committed to the team’s mission, goals and values.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Known for being open, accessible, honest and fair.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Master at seeking input from others and incorporating feedback into the making of decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Consistent in how they act and treat people with respect, as valuable members of the team.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sharers of all information, including relevant financial information team members need to know in order to function well as a team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Able to keep themselves and others focused on achieving the goals of the team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Always loyal to the team and its members through representation and practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Willing to sacrifice personally for the well-being of the team.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Encourages and motivates through recognition of others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Seekers of how to do things better and never satisfied with the status quo because they are life-long learners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Creative, big-picture thinkers, or able to call upon those with their visionary skill, because the whole is always bigger than the sum of its parts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Able to change and lead change with tolerance and flexibility.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Able to instill ownership of team decisions and adherence to the team’s charter of operations or covenant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Coaches and mentors other team members by bringing out the best in people and empowering them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Upholders of measurable standards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18. Concerned as much about processes and relationships as they are about results. Friendly to all team members because they genuinely care for their well-being.

19. Biblical servant leadership attributes are evident of being spiritually connected, character development, and interpersonal relationships strengthening.

SEMinar V: (September 11, 2012)

Course Review: An overview of the major points of the previous session and review of the definition of a biblical servant leader.

Content:

Part 1
1) Three characteristics of real greatness—DA 436
2) Organizational settings for change
3) Biblical perspective of change
4) Leading organizational change through teams
   a. Six factors why change fails
   b. Review institutional life-cycle

Part 2
1) When is there too much bureaucracy
2) Questions an organization should ask to determine if change is needed
3) Organizational change from a biblical servant leadership model
4) Creating an environment and culture for change
ORGANIZATIONAL SETTINGS FOR CHANGE

(Adapted from Servant Empowered Leadership, Page, p. 334)

- Strategic - Position advantage
- Structural - Reorganization for efficiency
- Cultural - Ethos needs to be changed
- Technological - Means for communicating or business
- Merger - Joining forces
- Down-sizing - Efficiencies driven by finances
- Expansion - Growth
- Personnel - Finding for “the right seat on the bus”
- Leadership - Leadership changes
WHEN IS THERE TOO MUCH BUREAUCRACY

(Adapted from Servant Empowered Leadership, Page, pp. 341, 342)

1. Preservation of the organization becomes more important than the well being of the people in the organization.

2. People feel as though they are there to serve the organization, rather than engaged in a mission.

3. People begin to feel like they have become mere cogs in the operational machinery, rather than functioning as interconnected parts of a bigger whole.

4. There is a loss of creativity or originality and a form of “group think” is prescribed for everyone.

5. People are afraid to ask the hard questions about the organization, its purposes, methods, and finances. The atmosphere becomes oppressive.

6. The structure becomes so inflexible that the status quo is better than a seemingly fruitless striving for efficiency.

7. Important information is no longer shared in a timely manner with those who most need to know it in order to do their jobs well.

8. Regulations multiply so as to restrict what people can do rather than encouraging them in doing their jobs. Work to rule becomes the order of the day.

9. Departments, groups or individuals start to compete with each other rather than working as part of the bigger organization.

10. Criticism of the leadership abounds to the point that people are too discouraged to suggest or initiate change. The organization operates on a “we” versus “they” culture. Respect for leaders no longer exists and people follow out of duty or rear, rather than wholehearted support and endorsement. In short, the leader has lost the confidence of those being led for taking the organization forward.
STEPS NECESSARY TO CHANGE TO A BSL MODEL

(Adapted from Servant Empowered Leadership, Page, pp. 358-389)

1. Build Relationships
2. Prepare
3. Model the Changes
4. Create Urgency
5. Right Team Members
6. Shared Mission
7. Vision is Clear
8. Values are Lived
9. Communicates
10. Benchmarks
11. Empower
12. Celebrate
13. Learning Organization
14. Anchor Changes
15. Evaluate Process
SEMINAR VI: (October 2, 2012)

Course Review: An overview of the major points of the previous session and review of the definition of a biblical servant leader.

Content:

1) Staying strong as a servant leader
   a. A view of BSL from the New Testament
   b. A view of BSL from the Old Testament
   c. Leadership in the PC—how is it viewed in relationship to a BSL model

2) Why do leaders fail

3) Seven pitfalls for the failure of BSL

4) Why leaders choose not to lead anymore

5) Why BSL are successful

A biblical servant leader is one who serves as an authentic follower of Jesus and His mission, who engages others in a life of holiness, and takes the initiative to equip others for His mission and growth of His kingdom. *William Miller*
WHY DO LEADERS FAIL
(Adapted from Servant Empowered Leadership, Page, p. 392)

1. Lack of vision
2. Poor listening skills
3. Autocratic decision-making
4. Lack of integrity in what they do
5. Blaming others for their mistakes
6. Egomaniacs of pride
7. Inability to work as a team player
8. Placing their selfish interests above the interests of others

SEVEN PITFALLS FOR THE FAILURE OF SERVANT LEADERS
(Adapted from Servant Empowered Leadership, Page, pp. 242, 243; Number 13 are my additions)

1. Burnout
2. Guilt
3. Serving may lead to an exalted self-worth
4. Dependent on human accolades
5. Fear of failing
6. Lose broader perspective of the vision
7. Serving becomes self-centered
WHY LEADERS CHOOSE NOT TO LEAD ANYMORE
(Adapted from Servant Empowered Leadership, Page, pp. 398-401)

1. Sheer exhaustion
2. Lack of encouragement
3. Onset of self-doubt
4. When other let you down
5. Have not learned to grow from failures
6. People no longer want to follow your leadership

WHY BIBLICAL SERVANT LEADERS ARE SUCCESSFUL
(Adapted from definition of a Biblical servant leader)

1. BSLs are called to understand His mission
2. BSLs are called to serve
3. BSLs engage in a life of holiness
4. BSLs engage others in a life of holiness
5. BSLs are called to equip others/disciple
BIBLICAL SERVANT LEADERS

The world—yours, mine and beyond—desperately needs true Christian servant-empowered leaders;

—who understand what it means to serve others before self;
—whose real greatness is found in selflessly and humbly serving others;
    —whose primary reason for leading is to serve others for their benefit and not the leader’s own
—whose charisma is found in making others feel good about themselves;
—who learned how to lead by first being a follower;
—whose power is found in the power to forgive and love;
—who considers processes relationships as important as results;
—who cannot be bought or manipulated;
—whose word is their bond of commitment;
—who put character above reputation;
—who genuinely and openly seek out the opinions and ideas of others;
—who practice the fine art of listening as well as speaking;
—whose character is larger than their positions;
—who do not hesitate to take chances and make sacrifices that will better some part of mankind;
—who will not lose their individuality in a crowd;
    —who will be as honest and upright when the lights are out as when they are on;
—who will make no compromise with wrong
    —who will stand against all odds for what is right and true, regardless of the consequences;
    —who are true to those they serve regardless of their status, wealth or power;
—who see themselves as trustees for those whom they are called to serve;
—who can firmly say “no” when all the rest of the world says “yes”, or vice versa;
—who invest their lives in developing the potential of other serving leaders;
—who find in Jesus Christ the supreme model for all time of a serving leader and await his acclaim, “Well done thou good and faithful servant.”
B: REVISED SERVANT LEADERSHIP PROFILE AND THE 360 DEGREE
REVISED SERVANT LEADERSHIP PROFILE

This appendix contains the Revised Servant Leadership Profile (RSLP) as researched and produced by Wong and Page (2003). The 360 degree RSLP is the same instrument, but when scored the information is given to the leader. The cumulative information is sent to the leader for reflection. Both instruments are available on-line and for a minimal fee will be scored by Trinity Western University and returned to the individuals and leader. The instruments can be found at:

**RSLP:**


**360-RSLP—Supervisor:**

Servant Leadership Profile – Revised

© Paul T. P. Wong, Ph.D. & Don Page, Ph.D.

Leadership matters a great deal in the success or failure of any organization. This instrument was designed to measure both positive and negative leadership characteristics.

Please use the following scale to indicate your agreement or disagreement with each of the statements in describing your own attitudes and practices as a leader. If you have not held any leadership position in an organization, then answer the questions as if you were in a position of authority and responsibility. There are no right or wrong answers. Simply rate each question in terms of what you really believe or normally do in leadership situations.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Strongly Disagree Undecided Strongly Agree

(SD) (SA)

For example, if you strongly agree, you may circle 7, if you mildly disagree, you may circle 3. If you are undecided, circle 4, but use this category sparingly.

1. To inspire team spirit, I communicate enthusiasm and confidence.

2. I listen actively and receptively to what others have to say, even when they disagree with me.


4. I always keep my promises and commitments to others.

5. I grant all my workers a fair amount of responsibility and latitude in carrying out their tasks.

6. I am genuine and honest with people, even when such transparency is politically unwise.

7. I am willing to accept other people’s ideas, whenever they are better than mine.
8. I promote tolerance, kindness, and honesty in the workplace.

9. To be a leader, I should be front and center in every function in which I am involved.

10. I create a climate of trust and openness to facilitate participation in decision making.

11. My leadership effectiveness is improved through empowering others.

12. I want to build trust through honesty and empathy.

13. I am able to bring out the best in others.

14. I want to make sure that everyone follows orders without questioning my authority.

15. As a leader, my name must be associated with every initiative.

16. I consistently delegate responsibility to others and empower them to do their job.

17. I seek to serve rather than be served.

18. To be a strong leader, I need to have the power to do whatever I want without being questioned.

19. I am able to inspire others with my enthusiasm and confidence in what can be accomplished.

20. I am able to transform an ordinary group of individuals into a winning team.

21. I try to remove all organizational barriers so that others can freely participate in decision-making.

22. I devote a lot of energy to promoting trust, mutual understanding and team spirit.

23. I derive a great deal of satisfaction in helping others succeed.

24. I have the moral courage to do the right thing, even when it hurts me politically.

25. I am able to rally people around me and inspire them to achieve a common goal.

26. I am able to present a vision that is readily and enthusiastically embraced by others.

27. I invest considerable time and energy in helping others overcome their weaknesses and develop their potential.
28. I want to have the final say on everything, even areas where I don’t have the competence. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
29. I don’t want to share power with others, because they may use it against me. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
30. I practice what I preach. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
31. I am willing to risk mistakes by empowering others to “carry the ball.” 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
32. I have the courage to assume full responsibility for my mistakes and acknowledge my own limitations. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
33. I have the courage and determination to do what is right in spite of difficulty or opposition. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
34. Whenever possible, I give credits to others. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
35. I am willing to share my power and authority with others in the decision making process. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
36. I genuinely care about the welfare of people working with me. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
37. I invest considerable time and energy equipping others. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
38. I make it a high priority to cultivate good relationships among group members. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
39. I am always looking for hidden talents in my workers. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
40. My leadership is based on a strong sense of mission. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
41. I am able to articulate a clear sense of purpose and direction for my organization’s future. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
42. My leadership contributes to my employees/colleagues’ personal growth. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
43. I have a good understanding of what is happening inside the organization. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
44. I set an example of placing group interests above self interests. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
45. I work for the best interests of others rather than self. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
46. I consistently appreciate, recognize, and encourage the work of others. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
47. I always place team success above personal success. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
48. I willingly share my power with others, but I do not abdicate my authority and responsibility. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
49. I consistently appreciate and validate others for their
contributions.

50. When I serve others, I do not expect any return. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
51. I am willing to make personal sacrifices in serving others. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
52. I regularly celebrate special occasions and events to foster a group spirit. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
53. I consistently encourage others to take initiative. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
54. I am usually dissatisfied with the status quo and know how things can be improved. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
55. I take proactive actions rather than waiting for events to happen to me. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
56. To be a strong leader, I need to keep all my subordinates under control. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
57. I find enjoyment in serving others in whatever role or capacity. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
58. I have a heart to serve others. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
59. I have great satisfaction in bringing out the best in others. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
60. It is important that I am seen as superior to my subordinates in everything. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
61. I often identify talented people and give them opportunities to grow and shine. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
62. My ambition focuses on finding better ways of serving others and making them successful. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
APPENDIX C
C: GROUP FEEDBACK SESSION

This appendix contains the questions developed for the PC group feedback session as led out by Dr. Nick Howard.
Questions for Group Feedback Session for the

Biblical Servant Leadership Seminar

I. Biblical Servant Leadership (BSL):

A. Definition of a Biblical Servant Leader:

“A biblical servant leader is one who serves as an authentic follower of Jesus and His mission, who engages others in a life of holiness, and takes the initiative to equip others for His mission and growth of His kingdom.”

Bill Miller

1. How would you say the team has grown in understanding and engagement with Biblical Servant Leadership in relationship to the definition?

2. What are we struggling with in regard to the prior?

3. Can this style of leader be effective in the Seventh-day Adventist System? What are the strengths drawbacks of this leadership in Seventh-day Adventist systems?

4. What is clear/not clear about this definition of a Biblical Servant Leader?

B. The practices of a BSL:

1. Is it clear for this team what being an authentic follower of Jesus is?

2. Is it clear what the mission of Jesus is for the ADCOM Team of the PC?

3. Are you being engaged in a life of holiness? If so how?

4. Are you being equipped for His Mission?

5. Are you being equipped to grow His kingdom?

II. Summary of Seminar:

A. Overall impact of Seminar time:

1. What were the richest learnings from the training?

2. Which seminar was the most valuable? Why?
3. What is the most compelling thing about being a BSL?

4. Least compelling?

5. How are you growing as a BSL?

6. What was most beneficial from the time focusing on Biblical Servant Leadership?

7. What could have been done better in the seminar time?

8. What was your experience of the material? Excellent, above average, OK?

B. Seminar Summary

1. Seminar 1
   a. Styles of Leadership
   b. 6 stages of leadership
   c. John 13 and BSL

2. Seminar 2
   a. Models of Leadership—pyramid, inverted pyramid, circle, diamond, body
   b. Mission/vision/values
   c. Life-cycle of institutions

3. Seminar 3
   a. How to communicate as BSL
   b. How to communicate through meetings, e-mails, one-on-one, phone calls
   c. Are we communicating in relationship with our values?

4. Seminar 4
   a. Are we (PC) hitting our stride?
   b. What is TEAM and the definitions of TEAM.
   c. Why do TEAMs fail and why do they succeed.
   d. How to work through conflict in a TEAM.
   e. Evaluation of each other as a BSL TEAM member

5. Seminar 5
   a. How to create change through the TEAM for the organization
   b. Organizational settings for change
   c. 6 factors why change fails
   d. Thought Questions for change

6. Seminar 6
   a. How to stay strong as a servant leader
   b. Biblically some rulers did what was right in the eyes of God and some did what was evil. What is the difference?
   c. Why Leaders fail
   d. Pitfalls of BSL
   e. Why leaders choose not to lead anymore
   f. Why BSL’s are successful
III. Coaching time:

A. Coaching
   1. Was the coaching helpful?
   2. What was the most helpful about the coaching?
   3. How did the coaching add value to your work in ministry?
   4. What didn’t go as you expected or what could have been better?
   5. Was content of coaching for BSL significant?

B. Future:
   1. Is there value in continuing coaching for becoming a BSL?
   2. Did the coaching give you a new perspective different from the Seminar for BSL?
   3. Do you want to continue in a coaching relationship?

IV. Review of President’s BSL (in my absence):

A. Review of ADCOM’s SL evaluation:
   1. Was the instrument used insightful/helpful for evaluating BSL’s?
   2. How did you evaluate yourself—stronger the first time—less the second time; vice versa; or about the same?
   3. What was the difference in evaluation from one to the other? Pressure to make one better, grew more, better understanding of BSL?
   4. Where can president help you grow more in being a BSL? Do you want to be a BSL? Is it too much effort?
   5. What are the hardest aspects of being a BSL?
   6. What challenges to you foresee for the PC in pursuing a BSL model?

B. Review of President’s 360
   1. As a group you rated the president much lower as a BSL the second time?
      What can I share that can help him grow?
2. What are his greatest strengths in being a BSL? Where can he become stronger?

3. Are you committed as a TEAM in moving forward as BSL’s?

4. Where are you with committing to the definition of being a BSL?
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