



Leader's Life & Work

THEOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS OF LEADERSHIP AND EDUCATION

by Thomas L. Kiedis

November 8, 2008



Theological Foundations of Leadership Development

Theology encompasses every subject, including leadership. As Nancy Pearcey contends, “We must begin by being utterly convinced that there is a biblical perspective on everything—not just spiritual matters” (Pearcey 2004, 44). This portion of the review of precedent literature is concerned with identifying the theological foundations that undergird this research project. It includes theological perspectives on the philosophical matters of metaphysics, epistemology, axiology and teleology. It also includes biblical perspectives of leadership, leadership development, education, ministry effectiveness, and satisfaction in ministry.

Philosophical Presuppositions

Stephen R. Covey writes, “The leader of the future, of the next millennium, will be one who creates a culture or a value system centered upon principles” (Covey 1996, 149). The question one must ask is, “whose principles?” The researcher recognizes that both the literature reviewed in this research endeavor as well as his views, rest on philosophical predispositions (Knight 1998, 7). These metaphysical, epistemological, axiological, and teleological presuppositions will be examined first.

Metaphysical Presuppositions

There is a sharp contrast between biblical and naturalistic metaphysical presuppositions. Burns (1978) as well as Zenger and Folkman (2002) establish a concept of leadership based on metaphysical presuppositions tethered to an earth-bound perspective. Burns ponders the origins of leadership values,

Can we trace the origins of the shaping and sharing of values back to various needs of childhood, or is purpose and influence built into the potential leader by social and political processes only during later years? Is it in some measure independent of psychological need and environmental cause—objectively based in process of mind? How deep are the roots of values held strongly by leaders and the led?. (Burns 1978, 34)

Burns considers whether values are shaped by psychological need (childhood needs) or environmental cause (social and political processes). He makes room for biological, psychological, social and political tributaries to leadership development, but a positivist fence limits his metaphysical boundaries. The same can be said for leadership experts Zenger and Folkman (Zenger and Folkman 2002, xvi, 79-80).



Burns and the Bible are clearly at odds. Whereas Burns argues for a value formation that is psychological, environmental or biological, the Bible presents a value system, the gravitational center of which is rooted in God who is both transcendent and immanent (Matthew 6:9; Isaiah 55:9; Acts 17:24-28), the ultimate reality who is worthy of all praise, honor and glory (Genesis 1:1; Romans 11:36). The Bible presents a coherent universe, providentially governed by an omnipotent God, rather than chaos pulled together through chance occurrence (Palm 148:5; Hebrews 11:3; 1:10-12; Colossians 1:17). It is this metaphysical construct that forms the basis for all leadership development and which makes a tenable epistemology possible.

Epistemological Presuppositions

The literature review that will follow surveys a host of scholars, each of whom makes truth claims. Oden, for example, has taken issue with the prevailing underlying assumption of modernity, namely that all truth claims are equally valid. Oden leaves no doubt as to his thoughts, writing of his own generation of relativists, “who have botched things up pretty absolutely,” and the need “to rescue classic Christianity from the jaws of compulsive novelty” (Oden 1995, 14,15). Messer responded to Oden. In doing so, Messer revealed his desire to establish a synthesis of the great faiths of the world (Messer 1995, 64). Furthermore, Messer speaks of a “search for truth” (Messer 1995, 95).

Theological discussions ultimately betray theological presuppositions. Oden and Messer make truth claims that are at odds with each other and that express their underlying views about knowledge. The researcher acknowledges he enters this research endeavor with certain presuppositions regarding knowledge in general and truth in particular.

The researcher begins with the presupposition that the Bible is the word of God, that God is the ultimate source of knowledge, and that his word is truth (1 Samuel 2:3; Psalm 119; Proverbs 2:6; John 17:17). As truth, it forms the epistemological foundation of study and stands over the one who would inquire of it (Psalm 119:9,11, 130). The researcher recognizes a difference between Truth and truth. The word of God, Truth, governs all other truth claims. Scripture, as Truth, should form and reform all ideas of leadership and leadership theory. Since Truth governs truth, Scripture—as Truth—stands over other truth claims. The researcher tests all ideas and theories against Scripture (Acts 17:11, 22-31; Ephesians 4:11-16; 1 Thessalonians 5:21).



This view stands in marked contrast to many scholars. Wood stresses that the task of theology is critical inquiry, questioning the validity of Christian witness or tradition (Wood 1985, 26). Wood's critical inquiry harnesses the disciplines of historical study, philosophical study and the study of practice to ferret out the truth (Wood 1985, 49). Systematic theology "receives the results of historical investigation" in order to fashion and transmit the product (Wood 1985, 49-59). Rather than follow a pattern similar to Wood, the researcher embraces a biblically-based epistemology. God, as revealed in the Scriptures, has made himself known and is knowable through his creation, his spoken word, written word and through Jesus who is the Living Word, God in human flesh (Romans 1:20-21; John 17:17; John 1:1,14; 2 Timothy 3:16-17). As Gaebelien has written this truth encompasses all truth,

For Christian education, therefore, to adopt as its unifying principle Christ and the Bible means nothing short of the recognition that *all truth is God's truth*. It is not accident that St. Paul, setting before the Philippian church a charter for Christian thought, wrote: 'Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are true . . . think on these things (Philippians 4:8). He knew that Christian truth embraces all truth, and that nothing true is outside the scope of Christianity. (Gaebelein 1979, 20)

Common grace enables the leader to consider and embrace ideas, inventions, theories and achievements outside of Scripture, though Scripture is the touchstone by which they are evaluated. Educational leaders have a biblical necessity and responsibility to study, learn from, create and dialogue on educational theories. This is an inferential teaching of the cultural mandate (Genesis 1:26-28) and common grace (Acts 14:17, 17:25-28).

Axiological Presuppositions

Returning to the issue of values, Burns asks, "How deep are the roots of values held strong by leaders and the led?" (Burns 1978, 35). The question of Burns goes to the heart of the axiological issue. What is the nature of the soil from which the axiological roots derive their nourishment? Are values relative, shifting with cultural changes, or are they based on a more permanent footing? The researcher holds to an axiology that is rooted in God who is transcendent and immanent, benevolent and just, perfect in his ways and unchanging (Deuteronomy 32:4; Acts 17:24-18; Romans 1:19-20; Colossians 2:6-8). As such his ways and his word form the basis for his views about people and ethics.



People have value and are to be valued because they are created in God's image (Genesis 1:26-28). Since God providentially cares for all people, Christian leadership is not solely "task driven" (Acts 17:25). Christian leadership, instead, recognizes that leadership ultimately is about serving people, all of who are valued by God and should be valued by those who lead them (Mark 10:45; John 13:1-17). At the same time people are marred image bearers (Romans 5:12), therefore, leadership and education will be resisted at times and learning will require work.

Ethics, the ought of life, are value judgments regarding actions and attitudes. Wayne Grudem writes, "The emphasis . . . in Christian ethics is on what God wants us to do and what attitudes he wants us to have. Such a distinction is reflected in the following definition: Christian ethics is any study that answers the question, "What does God require us to do and what attitudes does he require us to have today?" with regard to any given situation" (Grudem 1994, 26). Ethics are that which govern the character that is so important to leadership (1 Timothy 3:1-7). Christian ethics find their source in God who first called things good, and who provides the lens through which we are to make aesthetic judgments (Genesis 1:31; 2 Peter 1:5-11).

Teleological Presuppositions

Teleological proclamations are common in the literature that will be examined below. Hough claims that the "theological school is to be understood as a professional school" (Hough and Cobb 1985, 19). Donald Messer notes three essential purposes for a theological school: First, to equip effective clergy and lay preachers to proclaim the gospel; second, to educate the total people of God for ministry; third, to serve as the intellectual center of the church, with the express purpose of increasing love for God and neighbor (Messer 1995, 22-26). One would be hard-pressed to disagree with Messer, but the question as to the biblical warrant for his claims must be examined. John Leith provided a critical examination of seminary education in general and the Presbyterian Church (USA) in particular. His discussion is predicated on his ardent belief that the role of the seminary is to educate and equip pastors in the church's faith (Leith 1997, 40). Leith writes, "The task of the seminary is not to produce church historians, professional theologians, or technical scholars. The first task is to prepare preachers who use theological and biblical knowledge to proclaim the gospel and to nurture congregations" (Leith 1997, 18).



Precisely what is the teleological foundation for leadership development? The biblical presupposition is that everything ultimately exists for the glory of God (Matthew 22:34-40; Romans 11:36; Colossians 3:17, 23). God is glorified in the reconciliation of his creation to himself through the redemptive work of Jesus Christ on the cross. As believers participate in that work of reconciliation they bring him glory and fulfill their purpose (Genesis 3:15; 12:3; 2 Corinthians 5:17-21). Biblical leadership operates with God—and his purposes—as its ultimate end.

Summary

Philosophical presuppositions undergird the literature regarding leadership development training models (Holmes 1985, 12-13; Noll 1994; Pearcey 2004, 21; Sire 2004, 10; Newell 2006). This research will be accomplished using a biblically-based metaphysics, epistemology, axiology, and teleology. Max Stackhouse provides an apt description of both the presuppositional reality and the challenges that occur when such assumptions are not grounded in the sure Word of God.

But *theological* education is ultimately based upon something else. It is based upon the presupposition that there are, in the final analysis, some reliable criteria whereby we can know and talk about what is and what is not divine, true, and just. If there are no such criteria, or if we could not know them even if they did exist, or if they cannot be discussed in reasonable discourse even where they are intuited, theological education is a pretense—at worst, the rationalization, of ideologization, of privileged insight or group interest; at best, the poetry of personal or communal imaginings. (Stackhouse 1988, 9)

Mulder and Wyatt (1992) demonstrate the change that occurs as a result of shifting presuppositions. The authors survey Presbyterian seminaries since 1920. In doing so Mulder and Wyatt trace the movement from creed to credo (I believe), from Old School Calvinism to neo-orthodoxy, from theology to psychology, from “salvation” to “reconciliation” (to emphasize the social dimension), and from making a cultural impact to leaving a cultural imprint (Mulder and Wyatt 1992, 37-70). Assumptions matter. They impact planning, processes and outcomes.



Theological Perspectives of Leadership

Leadership as a discipline is a sophisticated, varied and often misunderstood concept (Stogdill 1974; Bennis and Nanus 1986; Rost 1993; Kouzes and Posner 2003). Stogdill catalogs a variety of leadership theories including great man theories, personal-situational theories, interaction-expectation theories, humanistic theories, exchange theories, and trait theories (Stogdill 1974, 17-35). Burns introduces transactional, transformational and moral leadership (Burns 1978, 4). In light of the abundant and varied information about leadership, it is not surprising that Burns observes, “Leadership is one of the most observed and least understood phenomena on earth” (Burns 1978, 2). Such a diverse understanding warrants a biblical perspective on leadership.

Leadership is a biblical given. The cultural mandate requires it (Genesis 1:26-28). How is the human race to exercise their God-given call to “rule” and “subdue” apart from leadership? The biblical record teems with leaders of all sorts: military leaders (Joshua 1:1-6), political and governmental leaders (1 Kings 1:28-30; Romans 13), religious or spiritual leaders (1 Samuel 2:27-36), family leaders (Genesis 49:1; Ephesians 6:), and church leaders (Titus 1:5; Hebrews 13:7). Jesus modeled leadership (John 13:14-15) and leadership development (Mark 10:45; Luke 10:1-3, 17). The necessity of leadership and leadership development is also in keeping with responsible stewarding of spiritual gifts (Romans 12:3-8; 1 Corinthians 12-14). This portion of the paper will outline a biblical perspective of leadership that includes the elements of role, relationship, modeling, mission and service.

Leadership Is Role

Leadership as a role is both implicit and explicit in the Biblical narrative. Genesis displays the activity of a triune Creator, synergistically working within himself to bring about the creation of the world. The cultural mandate (Genesis 1:27-28) presupposes leadership from practically any perspective. Leadership is predicated on the basis of civilization, cultures, and governments, all of which would not exist without the exercise of leadership. The same implicit view of the role of leadership is present in the biblical admonition to submit to governing authorities whose influence is meant to do good for society (Romans 13:1-4). Leadership, however, is not just implicit in the biblical text, it is explicitly stated as well.



God defines the term, identifies the position, and clarifies the role when it comes to leadership. Leadership (προΐστημι) is “to put oneself at the head,” “to preside” in the sense of “to lead, conduct, direct, govern,” and contextually it always shows a sense of “to care” (Kittel and Friedrich 1968, 700-01). The picture Paul presents in Romans 12:8 is one of a person called to a role of standing in the front. It is spoken of as both a position (Exodus 15:1, 18:25; Numbers 1:16) and an activity (Numbers 33:1; Acts 1:20; Romans 12:8). It is used of leaders of nations (Exodus 15:15), of communities (Exodus 16:22), of tribes (Numbers 1:16), of political leaders (Micah 3:1), of military leaders (1 Samuel 14:38), of pastoral and church leaders (Hebrews 13:7; Acts 15:22). It is a role and an activity, both of which are to be tempered with zeal (Romans 12:8) and a servant spirit (Mark 10:45).

Leadership Is Relationship

The Bible presents leadership as a relationship—with God and with others. Leaders of the Bible are called by God and live in relationship with him (Genesis 12:1-3; Genesis 17:1-8; Exodus 3:1-18; Judges 6:11-27; Psalm 72:1-19; Mark 3:14; Acts 9:1-6). The general tenor of Scripture, specific examples of biblical leaders as well as specific admonitions to those who lead demonstrate that leadership is to be exercised in community (Ecclesiastes 4:9-10; Romans 12:10; Luke 10:1-4; Acts 13:1-3, 13-14; Acts 15:1-6). Leadership in the Old Testament is carried out in community. Point leaders had trusted “seconds” (Exodus 17:12; Exodus 24:12-13; 1 Samuel 14:1-7); leaders leaned on advisors (1 Samuel 16-17); leaders had friends (1 Chronicles 27:33); and leaders took care of their followers (1 Samuel 30:24-25; 2 Samuel 23:14-17).

Leadership in the New Testament was virtually always carried out in partnership. This is the practice of Jesus who called twelve to be “with him” (Mark 3:14) and who sent out his disciples “two by two” (Luke 10:1). Paul ministered in partnership. The Scriptures are replete with examples: “Paul and Barnabas” (Acts 13:46); “Paul and Silas” (Acts 16:19); Paul, Priscilla and Aquila (Acts 18:1-3, 18); Paul and Sosthenes (1 Corinthians 1:1); Paul and Timothy (2 Corinthians 1:1); “Paul . . . and all the brothers with me” (Galatians 1:2); Paul and his traveling companions (Romans 16:3-23). Decisions of the early leaders of the church were carried out in community, not unilaterally (Acts 13:1-3, 15:1-22). The practice of a plurality of elders in churches of the New Testament also demonstrates the communal nature of biblical leadership (Acts 20:17; Philippians 1:1; Titus 1:5). It was that lack of partnership that bothered Paul when he languished in a Roman prison (2 Timothy 4:9-17). Scripture presents leadership as a relationship, it calls leaders to partnership and service, and it sets forth leadership as a communal activity (John 13:14-15).



Biblical leadership is a partnership with people and with God. Understanding the role of the Holy Spirit is significant to the work of leadership. In the Old Testament the Holy Spirit was given for leadership (1 Samuel 16:13-14; Psalm 51:11). In the New Testament the Holy Spirit was promised, in part, to help the early disciples who were the leaders (John 14:26). The leader has power when operating in step with the Spirit; without that help, the impact of the leader is diminished at best; dismissed at worst (Acts 1:8; 4:8, 31; Ephesians 4:30). Jesus left his followers with the Holy Spirit, who was given to them to help them know truth and discern error (John 14; 16). Christian leaders, understanding the great significance of the work of the Holy Spirit for promoting truth and avoiding danger of false educational theories, must follow the admonition of Paul to Timothy and “guard the Spirit” (2 Timothy 1:14). Christian leaders lean on the Spirit in dependence when evaluating curriculum or educational theory or organizational decisions. Leaders ignore the Spirit at great peril to themselves, their institution and the people they serve.

Leadership Is Modeling

God expects more from his leaders. This is evident in biblical admonitions (1 Timothy 4:16), and in biblical examples of great leaders (Psalm 78:72; 1 Corinthians 11:1; 1 Thessalonians 2; 2 Thessalonians 3). It is also evident when observing the punishment meted out on leaders of the Bible who failed to exhibit it (Numbers 12; 1 Samuel 2; 2 Samuel 12; 1 Kings 18; 1 Timothy 1:20). Leadership and character walk hand-in-hand in the leadership literature (Burns 1978; Graham 1997; Collins 2001; Hybels 2002; Zenger and Folkman 2002; Kouzes and Posner 2003b) and in the Scriptures (1 Samuel 16:7; Acts 6:1-4; 1 Timothy 3:8-12; Titus 1:7-9).

The biblical leader leads an exemplary life worthy of emulation (1 Corinthians 11:1; 1 Thessalonians 2:4-10; 2 Thessalonians 3:7-10). The biblical perspective, however, differs from most popular and research literature at the point of the foundational motivation for such character. The underlying base for biblical character is a morality based on God himself who is holy and who calls both his people and his leaders to exhibit the same (Leviticus 11:44; 1 Peter 1:15-16; Psalm 78:72; 1 Timothy 4:16). God holds his leaders accountable for both character and conduct (2 Corinthians 5:9-11; Hebrews 13:17). Not only is leadership morality based on God, but the leader also finds in God the strength to be a model for him. Christian leaders follow the model of God himself who took time to pause in purposeful rest (Genesis 2:1-3; Exodus 31:17), and in Jesus who regularly took times to withdraw and find the strength for the leadership journey (Mark 4:1-11; Luke 6:12; Matthew 4:13; 14:23; Mark 1:35, 6:31; Luke 5:16).



Those who practice biblical leadership recognize the significance of living in relationship with God. They desire to know God and serve him well and are, therefore, vigilant in their efforts to maintain that relationship (Psalm 78:72; 1 Timothy 4:16). This intimate relationship with God is essential to modeling a life of Godly character, but the relationship is not the sum of biblical leadership. The leader must also be aware of and strive toward the accomplishment of the mission.

Leadership Is Attention to Mission

All leadership moves toward something. The cause of leadership is the finish line toward which the leader drives (Romans 11:36; 1 Corinthians 9:24-27; Philippians 3:12-14). For Abraham the cause was a promise (Genesis 12); for Moses the land of promise (Exodus 3); for David it was a nation to lead (1 Samuel 16); for the disciples it was commission to fulfill (Matthew 28:18-20). Christian leadership is unique in that its end is otherworldly. It has a metaphysical focus; it “proclaims that we have come from God, that we find meaning in life by being disciples of Jesus Christ, that we find purpose in his service, and our destiny is to be in his presence permanently” (Root 1985, 144). As the writer of Hebrews has shown, Christians live for the glory of One whom they never see, but not seeing still believe (Hebrews 11-12). This is an essential biblical perspective.

The Christian mission is driven by the ultimate Christian cause, that of glorifying God (Romans 11:36) which, for the Christian leader, is expressed in every facet of life (1 Corinthians 6:9; Colossians 3:17, 23), and especially in the reconciling work of Christ. This theme of reconciliation is evident throughout Scripture, from the protevangelium (Genesis 3:15), to the great commission (Matthew 28:18-20), to the missiological mandate (Acts 1:8), to Paul’s soteriological focus (2 Corinthians 5:11-21), to the culminating visions of Christ in the Revelation (Revelation 5:9-10).

The significance of ultimate cause is a distinguishing mark when examining precedent literature. Leadership texts are driven by a variety of teleological presuppositions. The biblical view is echoed by many (Wilhoit and Dettoni 1995, 7; Pazmino 1997; Richards and Bredfeldt 1998, 14; Thrall, McNicol, and McElrath 1999, 146; Habermas 2001, 8). For others, leadership is best measured in a financial bottom line (Collins 2001, 192), or by the vision of the organization (Kouzes and Posner 2003, 109), the behavioral whims of the leader or constituents (Zenger and Folkman 2002), or it may be lacking in a moral base altogether (Rost 1993). No matter what that cause might be leadership operates with an end in sight.



Leadership Is Service

The biblical record contains many metaphors for how the leader functions, and consequently how leadership acts. Biblical leadership is like a father (1 Corinthians 4:14-15; 2 Corinthians 12:14; 1 Thessalonians 2:11); a mother (Galatians 4:19; 1 Thessalonians 2:7); a shepherd (Ezekiel 34:23); a builder (1 Corinthians 3:6-9); and a farmer (1 Corinthians 3:6-9), but it is the servant nature of leadership that stands out (Mark 10:45; Titus 1:1). Leadership is ultimately an act of service. Frederick G. Gaiser writes, “Is there anything the church knows about leadership that nobody else knows? Only one thing, I think: ‘Whoever wants to be first must be last of all and servant of all’” (Gaiser 1993, 3). When a biblical theology drives ideas about leadership, images of CEO and manager are replaced with those of a father, shepherd and servant (Root 1985, 162). Leadership becomes pastoral care (1 Thessalonians 2:8,11). This care is held in tension. Biblical leadership is not service or power; it is service in power; it is not caring or leading; it is caring and leading a cause (Root 1985, 160).

Authority and Service

Christian leadership is comprised of those who are in authority acting in service (Koenig 1993, 26; Root 1985,161). Paul speaks of “the authority which the Lord has given me” (2 Corinthians 13:10). Paul acts with authority. He threatens to discipline the church on one occasion (2 Corinthians 13:2), and establishes rules on another occasion (1 Corinthians 7:17). Biblical leadership is authoritative leadership. Perhaps this is part of the reason the Scriptures do not fault one for wanting to be in a position of ecclesiastical authority. Paul writes, “If anyone sets his heart on being an overseer, he desires a noble task” (1 Timothy 3:1). This is not self-aggrandizement, but an authority for service in and for the church. It is a service in which one is often led into the prominence of service (Koenig 1993, 27). Leadership that is at the same time authority and service is a leadership that lives with a biblical tension, a tension that is present in the pages of Scripture: authority and service, aspirations and invitation, dependence and community (Root 1985, 165). Paul had authority, but he was still collegial. He worked with more than forty traveling companions in ministry. Rather than assert his authority, “Listen to me!,” which was not beyond Paul, he encouraged people to “Imitate me.”



More verbs are used than nouns when referring to leadership, which may insinuate that leadership is more action than position. This truth also sets biblical leadership apart from other models. Biblical leadership is service-oriented and humble, but it is a humility that is cloaked in boldness (Joshua 1:1-9; Number 12:3; Acts 4:29-30; Acts 16; 2 Timothy 1:7-8; 2:24-26).

Competent service

God expects competency among those who would exercise the gift of leadership. God commends King David in the Psalms for a heart of integrity *and* “skillful hands” (Psalm 78:72). Paul says to the one who would lead, “let him govern diligently” (Romans 12:8). Leadership from a biblical perspective is marked by discipline, proficiency, excellence, and perseverance (Psalm 78:72; 1 Corinthians 9:24-27; 2 Timothy 1:6; 4:7). Effective leadership focuses efforts on strengths, not weaknesses (Romans 12; 1 Corinthians 12; Ephesians 4; 1 Peter 4). This is a point at which popular leadership and management literature coincides with the teaching of Scripture. Marcus Buckingham summarizes such thoughts with the term, the “manager’s mantra”: “People don’t change that much. Don’t waste time trying to put in what was left out. Try to draw out what was left in. That is hard enough” (Buckingham and Clifton 1999, 79).

The Bible presents a competent leadership, though the specifics as to which competencies are essential vary by context. On a macro level biblical leadership mirrors competencies found in popular research literature such as Kouzes and Posner (2003). On the micro level, however, relative to a variety of ecclesiastical concerns, the competencies required look different as Root and others have noted (Root 1985; Koenig 1993; Gaiser 1993). Understandably, the New Testament does not give us a totally normative pattern for ministerial leadership (Root 1985, 157) or of ministerial competencies. This is quite understandable when one considers that the people of God have been constantly in transition (Boos 1985, 43). Competencies vary for a nation on the move. Moses saw the challenge of transition in Exodus 18, the apostles in Acts 6, and growing churches are confronted with it today. Growth and size dictate some leadership competencies. In that sense leadership is somewhat, if not to a great deal, subjective (Ramsey 1982, 102) and situational (Hersey, Blanchard and Johnson 2000, 107).



The situational aspect of ministerial competencies is illustrated when comparing various ideas as to the major tasks of leadership. Hough writes that the practical theologian is called to four tasks, which includes counseling (Hough 1984, 80). Driscoll, on the other hand, is adamant that the leader is not a therapist, but a missionary (Driscoll 2006, 27). If necessary competencies were dynamic rather than static, one would expect to find competencies both varied and contextual when examining the Scriptures. This is the case in the biblical record. Moses needed speaking skills at one point (Exodus 3), and organizational skills at a different point (Exodus 18). The leadership of David is summed up as character and competency (Psalm 78:72). The New Testament pastoral epistles isolate some skills that may be different from those necessary to the apostolic work of Peter and Paul. At the same time there are some competencies that seem normative throughout the pages of Scripture: teaching (1 Timothy 3:2), working with and through people (Exodus 18:23), equipping the people of God to serve (Ephesians 4:11-12), and growing other leaders (2 Timothy 2:2).

Genuine Service

Biblical leadership is marked by a genuineness of life. The biblical record presents “real people.” Biblical leadership is being honest before God and with God. Moses illustrates this in his hesitant response to God’s call (Exodus 3), Job in his frustrations over his suffering (Job), Jonah in his anger over the mercy of God (Jonah 4). Biblical leadership is expressing real emotions (Psalms). Biblical leadership is being real about the doubts and struggles of faith. John the Baptist, the forerunner to Christ was not sure if Jesus was really the one (Luke 7:20) and was not afraid to express that hesitancy. Biblical leadership is being both present and real with people. Jesus was found at the parties and social gatherings; he did not hide in an ivory tower. Biblical leadership expresses real passion for Christ and his kingdom as Paul did (Romans 9:3; Philippians 3:11-14; 1 Corinthians 9:24-27). Biblical leadership is real in response to sin. The confession of David was open, full and evident (2 Samuel 12; Psalm 51). Biblical leadership is being genuine, authentic, and real!

Leadership Conclusions

Leadership as a role is both explicitly taught and implicitly implied throughout the Scriptures. Biblical leadership is a relationship, the leader in relationship with God and with the people of God. The leader models life in Christ and sets an example for the people he leads. Leaders function with a mission, a mission to glorify God and help reconcile the world to Christ. There are many metaphors that describe leadership in the New Testament, but the predominant metaphor is that of a servant. Authority and service



mark biblical servant leadership. Competency and genuineness of character are normative. Biblical leadership is focused on multiplying itself to achieve the ultimate mission and those lesser missions that contribute to it. Biblical leadership could be summarized as the skillful initiative taken by one or more people in a synergistic partnership to influence others toward the accomplishment of a shared goal.

REFERENCE LIST

Banks, Robert. 1999. *Reenvisioning theological education: Exploring a missional alternative to current models*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Banks, Robert J., and Bernice M. Ledbetter. 2004. *Reviewing leadership: A Christian evaluation of current approaches*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

Barker, Lance R., and B. Edmon Martin. 2000. Alternatives in theological education: An examination of the characteristics and outcomes of denominational judicatory study programs which prepare person for commissioned, licensed, ordained or otherwise authorized ministries. New Brighton, MN: United Theological Seminary of the Twin Cities.

Belenky, Mary Field, and Ann V. Stanton. 2000. Inequality, development, and connected knowing. In *Learning as transformation*, ed. Jack Mezirow, 71-102. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bennis, Warren, and Bert Nanus. 1986. *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York, NY: Harper and Row.

Bredfeldt, Gary J. 2006. *Great leader, great teacher: Recovering the biblical vision for leadership*. Chicago, IL: Moody Publishers.

Buckingham, Marcus & Coffman, Curt. 1999. *First, break all the rules*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

Burgess, William Harold. 2001. *Models of religious education: Theory and practice in historical and contemporary perspective*. Wheaton, IL: Victor Books.



Burns, James MacGregor. 1978. *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper and Row. Collins, Jim. 2001. *Good to great: Why some companies make the leap...and others*

don't. New York, NY: Harper Business.

Covey, Stephen R. 1996. Three roles of the leader in the new paradigm. In *The leader of the future*, ed. Frances Hesselbein, Marshall Goldsmith and Richard Beckhard, 161- 73. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Driscoll, Mark. 2006. *Confessions of a reformission Rev.: Hard lessons from an emerging missional church*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

Eisner, Elliot W. 2002. *The educational imagination*. 3rd ed. Upper Saddle, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Farley, Edward. 1983. *Theologia: the fragmentation and unity of theological education*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press.

Frankena, William K. 1965. *Philosophy of education*. New York, NY: Macmillan. Theological Foundations of Leadership.doc Tommy Kiedis, D.Min., Ph.D. Page 17 of 20

Gaebelein, Frank E. 1979. *The pattern of God's truth*. Chicago, IL: Moody Press.

Gaiser, Frederick G. 1993. To lead or to serve. *Word & World* 13 (1): 3-5.

Gangel, Kenneth O. 1970. *Leadership for church education*. Chicago, IL: Moody Press.

Graham, Billy. 1997. *Just as I am: the autobiography of Billy Graham*. New York, NY: Harper San Francisco.

Grudem, Wayne. 1994. *Systematic theology*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House.

Habermas, Ron. 2001. *Teaching for reconciliation: foundations and practice of Christian education ministry*. 10th anniversary edition. Eugene OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers.



Harris, Robert Laird, Gleason Leonard Archer, Bruce K. Waltke. 1980. 'Aleph, Mem, Vol.1, *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*. Chicago, IL: The Moody Bible Institute of Chicago.

Hersey, Paul, Kenneth H. Blanchard, and Dewey E. Johnson. 2000. *Management of organizational behavior*. 8th ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Hodgson, Peter C. A. 1999. *God's wisdom: Toward a theology of education*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press.

Hoekema, Anthony A. 1994. *Created in God's image*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Holmes, Arthur F., ed. 1985. *The making of a Christian mind: A Christian world view and the academic enterprise*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.

Hough, Joseph. and Joseph Cobb. 1985. *Christian identity and theological education*. Chico, CA: Scholars Press.

Hudson, Frederic M. 1999. *The adult years: Mastering the art of self-renewal*. Rev. ed. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Hutchins, Robert M. 1995. The conflict in education. In *Selected writings on philosophy and adult education*. 2nd ed., ed. Sharan B. Merriam, 7-11. Malabar, FL; Krieger Publishing Company.

Hybels, Bill. 2002. *Courageous leadership*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

Kittel, Gerhard, and Gerhard Friedrich, eds. 1968. *Theological dictionary of the New Testament*. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Vol. 6. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Knight, George R. 1998. *Philosophy and education*. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press.

Koenig, John. 1993. Hierarchy transfigured: Perspectives on leadership in the New Testament. *Word & World* 13 (1): 26-33.

Kouzes, James M., and Barry Z. Posner. 2003. *The leadership challenge*. 3rd ed. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.



Lee, James Michael. 1971. *The shape of religious instruction: A social science approach*. Dayton, OH: Pflaum.

Leith, John H. 1997. *Crisis in the church: The plight of theological education*. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press.

McKenzie, Leon. 1995. Adult education and worldview construction. In *Selected writings on philosophy and adult education*. 2nd ed., ed. Sharan B. Merriam, 93-108. Malabar, FL; Krieger Publishing Company.

Messer, Donald E. 1995. *Calling church and seminary into the 21st Century*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press.

Mezirow, Jack. 2000. *Learning as transformation: Critical perspectives on a theory in progress*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Mulder, John M., and Lee A. Wyatt. 1992. The predicament of pluralism: The study of theology in Presbyterian seminaries since the 1920s. In *The pluralistic vision: Presbyterians and mainstream protestant education and leadership*, ed. Milton J. Coalter, John M. Mulder and Louis B. Weeks, 37-70. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press.

Newell, Edward J. 2006. *Education has nothing to do with theology: James Michael Lee's social science religious instruction*. Princeton Theological Monograph Series 61. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock.

Noll, Mark A. 1994. *Scandal of the evangelical mind*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Oden, Thomas C. 1995. *Requiem: A lament in three movements*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press.

Pazmino, Robert W. 1997. *Foundational issues in Christian education*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books.

_____. 2001. *God our teacher: Theological basics in Christian education*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.

Pearcey, Nancy. 2004. *Total truth: Liberating Christianity from its cultural captivity*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books.



Ramsey, Duane. 1982. Our call to set-apart ministry. *Brethren Life and Thought* 27 (September): 101-105.

Richards, Lawrence O., and Gary J. Bredfeldt. 1998. *Creative Bible teaching*. Chicago, IL: Moody Press.

Rost, Joseph. 1993. *Leadership in the twenty-first century*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

Root, Michael. 1985. Called to the office of ministry: the New Testament and today. *Currents in Theology and Mission* 12 June: 157-66.

Simpson, Mark Edward. 1992. A taxonomic profile analysis of cognitive educational objectives in theological education. Ed.D. diss., Trinity Evangelical Divinity School.

Sire, James W. 2004. *The universe next door: A basic worldview catalog*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.

Spender, D. 1982. *Invisible women. The schooling scandal*. London: Writers and Readers Publishing Cooperative.

Stackhouse, Max. 1988. *Apologia: Contextualization, globalization, and mission in theological education*. Grand Rapids, MI: William. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Stogdill, Ralph M. 1974. *Handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research*. New York, NY: The Free Press.

Thrall, Bill, Bruce McNicol, and Ken McElrath. 1999. *The ascent of a leader*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Whitehead, Alfred North. 1929. *The aims of education and other essays*. New York, NY: The Macmillan Company.

Wilhoit, James C. and John M. Dettoni. eds. 1995. *Nurture that is Christian: developmental perspectives on Christian education*. Grand Rapids, NY: Baker Books.

Wood, Charles M. 1985. *Vision and discernment: An orientation in theological study*. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.

Zenger, John H. and Joseph Folkman. 2002. *The extraordinary leader: Turning good managers into great leaders*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

