Bethel University

2017

Biblical Metaphors for Servant Leadership: A Strong Foundation for Leadership Development

Gary A. Runn
Bethel University

Recommended Citation

BETHEL UNIVERSITY

BETHEL SEMINARY ST. PAUL

BIBLICAL METAPHORS FOR SERVANT LEADERSHIP:

A STRONG FOUNDATION FOR LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT

A THESIS PROJECT SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT

OF THE REQUIREMENTS

FOR THE DOCTOR OF MINISTRY DEGREE

IN SERVANT LEADERSHIP FOR ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

BY

GARY A. RUNN

ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA

MAY 2017

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is only fitting that I begin by agreeing with the Apostle Paul in saying, "Thanks be to God for his inexpressible gift" (2 Cor. 9:15). Jesus is the anchor of my soul and my eternal hope—all glory belongs to him alone.

The doctoral journey has been a pursuit with a company of others, without which I would not have arrived. I want to thank my dear wife, Carrie, who cheered me on and supported me in too many ways to count. I also want to thank my children, Courtney and Davis, for extending me understanding when they saw their father too often in his study reading, writing, and editing. And I want to thank my Bethel learning cohort—you have strengthened my soul and made the journey more than memorable.

I want to thank my advisor, Dr. Jeanine Parolini, who coached me and counseled me with honesty and encouragement. Her availability and servant attitude were an inspiration to me and helped me to endure. I want to extend my deep appreciation to Dr. Justin Irving for his tireless hours in leading the program, teaching, and modeling servant leadership up close and from afar.

And finally, I want to thank the staff and leadership of Cru who have given me a gracious platform from which to minister and lead. I have learned much and been abundantly blessed by the camaraderie and friendship of these fellow missionary sojourners.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

This project addresses the lack of a biblically grounded model for servant leadership development at Cru (formerly Campus Crusade for Christ) for current and future leaders in the United States.

Research explored three biblical metaphors as the foundation for a leadership development framework: servant, shepherd, and steward. First, the servant metaphor, through a posture of worship and submission to Jesus, gives expression to servant leadership through representative authority and genuine humility. Second, the shepherd metaphor, through a posture of selfless sacrifice to followers, gives expression to servant leadership through compassion and care. Third, the steward metaphor, through a posture of extreme faithfulness to the Master, gives expression to servant leadership through courage and risk-taking in the mission.

A survey of 110 field team leaders and personal interviews with ten national leaders responsible for leadership development revealed some common needs. There is a desire for a development paradigm that is biblically grounded, addresses unique spiritual disciplines for leaders, provides better equipping for shepherding care of followers, brings clearer focus to role complexity, and aids leaders in experiencing greater fulfillment in their calling to help accomplish the mission of Cru.

The researcher presents a new leadership development paradigm to effectively increase the capacity of servant leaders for the kingdom of God.

CHAPTER ONE: THE NEED FOR A NEW
LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT PARADIGM

The Problem and Its Context

Statement of the Problem

This project addresses the lack of a biblically grounded model for servant leadership development at Cru for current and future leaders. In response to this problem, the researcher took five main steps. First, the researcher examined the biblical and theological foundations of three leadership metaphors (servant, shepherd, and steward) as a potential framework for servant leadership and leadership development. Second, he reviewed the relevant literature regarding the cultural, biblical, and practical applications of these three biblical metaphors for foundational principles of servant leadership and leadership development. Third, he sought relevant insights from a wealth of recent historical data collected through the SLICE survey (6975 respondents over three years) and the Best Christian Workplace Institute staff engagement survey (3955 respondents). Fourth, he surveyed current Cru field leaders, and interviewed select Cru national leaders responsible for leadership development, to determine areas of needed improvement in developing servant-leaders. Fifth, the researcher proposed a servant leadership development paradigm built on the three biblical metaphors (servant, shepherd, and steward), for current and future leader development at Cru.

The research was limited to organizational leaders in Cru who serve as field team leaders and national directors for leadership development within Cru in the United States.

The biblical research was limited to the study of spiritual and strategic leadership as expressed through biblical metaphor, and the resulting implications. The research was limited to the study of current literature pertaining to the specific objectives of this project.

Assumptions

The first assumption is that the Bible is the written word of God and is trustworthy, profitable, and effective in yielding leadership principles. The second assumption is that leaders are necessary for moving God's kingdom forward, as highlighted through the narratives of Scripture and salvation history. The third assumption is the supremacy of leadership development principles revealed in Scripture, which stand above unique cultural expressions of leadership and leadership development. The fourth assumption is that leaders need to be developed holistically, including their inner communion with God, attitudes, character, philosophy, and skills. The fifth assumption is that leaders never cease in the development process—there will always be a need for the continual development of God's leaders. The sixth assumption is that survey and interview participants offered honest responses regarding the assessment of their own leadership and the leadership development of others.

Subproblems

The first subproblem is to examine and analyze the leadership metaphors of servant, shepherd, and steward in Scripture to determine their functionality as an effective paradigm for servant leadership and servant leadership development.

The second subproblem is to discover what current literature reveals about each of these three metaphors and their application toward a leadership development framework.

The third subproblem is to ascertain relevant insights from existing Cru survey results regarding leadership satisfaction and organizational leadership development culture, including the SLICE survey results and the Best Christian Workplace Institute (B.C.W.I.) survey results.

The fourth subproblem is to survey current Cru field team leaders to discern their developmental exposure to key concepts revealed through the metaphors and to interview national level leaders responsible for leadership development in Cru to evaluate current efforts.

The fifth subproblem is to propose a new leadership development paradigm that will emphasize the three biblical metaphors of servant, shepherd, and steward for the effective development of current and future Cru servant leaders.

Setting of the Project

The setting of the research was current organizational leaders at Cru in the United States. It included field team leaders and national leaders responsible for leadership development to obtain a broad perspective on the current effectiveness, satisfaction, and best practices regarding leadership and leadership development.

Leadership development has been highly valued in the organization of Cru since its inception. Bill and Vonette Bright, the founders of Cru, placed great emphasis on the practical training of Cru staff toward the mobilization of hundreds and thousands of Christ-followers into the Great Commission. Since Bill Bright was an entrepreneur at heart, he also fostered a strong, entrepreneurial style of leadership at Cru.

Historically, specific equipping toward leadership development has been reserved for those who have taken on new organizational titles. The priority of that leadership

development process has been the acquisition of new skills required for new roles. This precedent is beginning to change, however, as the organization has grown in size and complexity. Cru has taken steps to refine the function of leadership development, including improving classroom training as well as providing varied leadership experiences for the sake of development. Over time, emphasis has been given to developing greater leadership competencies and skills. An emphasis has also been placed on personal character growth, although not specifically toward the leadership task. The researcher believes that Cru's leadership development efforts have been inadequate in balancing a biblical orientation with competency development and spiritual maturation. There is a window of opportunity to step into the gap and provide a biblically-based framework that can better sustain current leaders and build future servant leaders toward the fulfillment of God's purposes for Cru.

The Importance of the Project

The Importance of the Project to the Researcher

Christ-centered leadership is essential for the advancement of the Church and God's kingdom. This statement is born from the observation of Scripture that God chooses leaders to advance the biblical storyline and build his kingdom. The Bible is replete with leadership principles, as well as leadership biographies, that help to build the foundation for godly, functioning leadership. There are clear examples of both good and bad leadership that provide a solid curriculum for who a leader is to be and what a leader is to do. The biblical narrative is not exhaustive. The researcher believes that all truth has its source in God and can add to the explanation and cultural understanding of biblical leadership capabilities. The researcher would also argue for a strong foundation of a

leadership development paradigm that rests upon the cornerstone of Scripture for blessing, effectiveness, and deep leadership satisfaction.

The researcher has ministered and led in several different contexts at Cru. The researcher has led at the local and regional campus ministry level, has served on a national team in Italy, has led leadership development initiatives for all of Western Europe, and currently serves on a national team for a major division of the U.S. entity of Cru.

The researcher has benefitted greatly from gifted leaders. He has also benefitted from a variety of developmental efforts that have served to strengthen his understanding and expression of leadership. The researcher has witnessed critical leadership failures that have caused great harm to the cause of Christ. The researcher firmly believes that a significant cause of these leadership failures can be traced to a leadership development climate that values competence over character. There is a tendency toward corporate practices at the expense of a deep communion with Christ. The researcher has a passion for unleashing leaders worthy of being followed.

The Importance of the Project to the Immediate Ministry Context

Cru is a 65-year-old organization that comprises approximately 25,000 full and part-time staff with a presence in more than 190 countries around the world. Cru has a historical track record of raising up leaders for the body of Christ. Cru places a high value on leadership development for its staff. And like any other organizational entity, Cru lives or dies based on the quality of its leaders. If Cru's organizational leaders are not continuously growing in their communion with God, their personal character, their ability to live and collaborate in community, and their leadership competencies, it will be

challenging for them to lead the organization into the future of a rapidly changing landscape. A new paradigm is required that will orient leaders toward change while anchoring them in biblical principles that undergird robust servant leadership.

The current leadership development framework has been in place for over 20 years and is used globally. This framework has provided a level of standardization and a common language for the expression of leadership throughout Cru's regional and local chapters around the world. This framework has also provided a pragmatic approach, albeit mainly a Western orientation, to leadership understanding and expression according to the relationships, roles, responsibilities, and results of a leader. Though a longstanding framework, some have called into question the current model's effectiveness for a new generation of emerging leaders who see the expression of leadership, the world, and the mission differently from previous generations. The researcher believes that a construct anchored in Scripture and focused on servant leadership will be more appealing and effective than one built primarily on a pragmatic, corporate approach. The current model was rewritten three years ago to strengthen perceived weaknesses, but the revision entailed no major changes to the overall structure. The researcher made a small contribution to the revision in the form of an article titled, "The Heart of a Leader."

The researcher participated in a global study in 2012 related to the nature and quality of spiritual leadership as expressed and received by Cru staff. Two findings stood out. First, there was the distinct impression that the leader's spirituality was assumed rather than specifically expressed to their followers. The second finding was that most followers communicated that their leadership experience was more corporate than

spiritual in nature. In other words, when they experienced leadership from above they perceived that their leader was primarily wearing their corporate hat rather than their spiritual hat. The overall impression was one that focused on results or production rather than one that pointed followers to Christ. This perceived style of leadership seemed to be a consistent experience regardless of the level of leadership or the culture of the country in which it was reported. The researcher believes these findings reveal a greater need for a framework that emphasizes a more robust and biblically grounded approach over the current model. If Cru is to continue as an effective instrument for God's kingdom purposes and remain a leadership development engine for the body of Christ, there must be an expression of biblical and spiritual leadership that is pronounced and experienced by all who come in contact with the organization.

The Importance of the Project to the Church at Large

In our 21st century leadership climate, there is a dearth of qualified spiritual leaders for the Church. No local church, denomination, parachurch entity, or missionary agency would claim to have all of the leaders they desire or require. In one sense, the researcher believes that God purposefully allows this deficit to keep the body of Christ dependent upon his sufficiency. But in another sense, the researcher also believes that it represents a failure of leadership development to engage and build the next generation of Christ-centered leaders. In particular, the researcher believes that this scarcity often indicates a poor orientation to the nature of biblical leadership as revealed through its metaphors, narratives, and principles.

The complexity of a multicultural, pluralistic, and post-Christian context demands a leadership that is anchored in a secure biblical foundation. This reality is true for the

pastor, the parachurch worker, and the kingdom citizen. The Church is in need of a framework that can orient leaders to a proper posture of godly servant leadership, provide a biblical clarity of the priority functions of godly servant leadership, and propose a model that transcends human culture. That was the aim of this project.

Summary

A biblically grounded leadership framework is a necessity for spiritual leaders who are striving to have an impact for Christ in the 21st century. The ability to lead one's self, lead a team, and lead into the mission requires more than what corporate principles have to offer. God's people long for leaders who are able to point them to Christ, provide spiritual care with authenticity, and appropriately usher them into God's kingdom purposes. The biblical metaphors of servant, shepherd, and steward provide a foundation that addresses the posture, function, and focus of a Christ-centered servant leader.

CHAPTER TWO: A BIBLICAL AND THEOLOGICAL ANALYSIS
OF THREE BIBLICAL METAPHORS OF SERVANT LEADERSHIP

Before going to the cross, Jesus instructed his closest followers about the way leadership was to function within his kingdom. The kind of leadership that Jesus valued stood in direct contrast to that of the first-century experience, a distinction his disciples knew quite well. Jesus understood that if his kingdom enterprise were to succeed, it would require leaders and leadership that were counter-cultural. It would have to be of such a distinguishing quality that all who came in contact with this leadership would be transformed. While other leadership theories call upon leaders to act as servants, it is imperative for Christ-centered leaders to serve.

Jesus was a master of cultural analogies in his teaching. He often used common imagery and metaphor to illustrate his principles more powerfully. Jesus used two different metaphors to describe the desired orientation of kingdom leadership (Matt. 20:20-28). Greatness is tied to being a servant and preeminence is connected to being a slave. It is critical to comprehend the metaphorical images of biblical leadership to understand best how to develop quality leaders. David Bennett illustrates the importance of metaphor when he states, "A metaphor helps us to understand a thing in terms of something with which we are already familiar. With a creative leap of the imagination we can perceive a previously undiscerned similarity, and to open new avenues of insight."[1] This chapter will survey three important biblical metaphors tied to leadership.

---

[1] David W. Bennett, *Metaphors of Ministry: Biblical Images for Leaders and Followers*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1993), 13.

There are many metaphorical images in the Bible, which provide greater insight toward spiritual principles.[2] Metaphor is one means by which biblical writers reveal what an invisible God is like and how he wants us to conduct life on this earth. George Lakoff and Mark Johnson describe the breadth of communication that metaphor usage can accomplish, remarking that "Metaphor is one of the most important tools for trying to comprehend partially what cannot be comprehended totally: our feelings, aesthetic experiences, moral practices, and spiritual awareness."[3] Francis Lyall explains, "Figures of speech only help communication when the person using the figure and the person reading or hearing the words give the words the same content. It is not too much to say that if they do not, they might as well be speaking two different languages."[4] Therefore, it is critical to understand terms and metaphors in their original context to extract relevant meaning for today.

The words *leader* and *leadership* never appear in the Gospels.[5] Also, Paul's writings never directly use the language of leadership to describe pastoral function. Does this indicate that there is nothing to gain from the biblical writers concerning leadership? Derek Tidball observes:

> It is undoubtedly true that Paul never describes pastors as leaders of congregations, presiding over church activities and services and as being the head of a complex organization. It is also true … that he stresses that leaders were

---

[2] Unless otherwise indicated, all Scripture references are from The Holy Bible, English Standard Version , (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2001).

[3] George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980), 193.

[4] Francis Lyall, *Slaves, Citizens, Sons: Legal Metaphors in the Epistles* (Grand Rapids, MI.: Academie Books, 1984), 20-21.

[5] Bennett, 11.

servants. But to draw the implication that leadership, as such, was unimportant or a topic to be avoided in the New Testament would be misleading.[6]

Therefore, leadership from a biblical point of view remains a topic worth understanding. Bennett emphasizes that metaphor is one of the primary ways in which the Bible provides definition and understanding to leadership.

> Imagery becomes especially important, therefore, in our attempts to fathom a God whom we cannot see, and to live in the context of realities that transcend space and time. We need images to help us comprehend the spiritual community of which we are a part, and understand the place of leadership in that community, which, as Jesus taught, often functions quite differently from society as a whole.[7]

The Servant Metaphor

The servant metaphor offers the foundational meaning underlying the other two metaphors under consideration (shepherd and steward) and therefore requires greater investigation. Don Howell states, "Those who stand in Scripture as leaders are designated, first of all, 'servants of the Lord.' The unfolding record of those individuals that God uses to further his saving purposes in the world demonstrates what we call a servanthood pattern of leadership."[8]

God regularly uses the phrase "servant of the Lord" to identify those he uses to move the story of salvation history forward (Deut. 34:5; Judg. 2:8; 1 Sam. 3:9; 2 Sam. 7:5; 1 Kings 3:7; Job 1:8). Therefore, the biblical metaphor of servant is essential in our understanding of leadership.

---

[6] Derek Tidball, "Leaders as Servants: A Resolution of the Tension," *Evangelical Review of Theology* 36, no. 1 (2012): 33.

[7] Bennett, 14.

[8] Don N. Howell, *Servants of the Servant: A Biblical Theology of Leadership* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2003), 4.

Lexical and Cultural Contexts for the Servant Metaphor

The Lexical Context

The use of the word "servant" is not uncommon within the pages of Scripture, nor

is our English translation always the most accurate. Mark Allan Powell explains:

> The word 'servant' is used over 800 times in the Bible, and in the great majority
> of instances where the application is literal the reference is to a slave rather than
> to a hired attendant. Both the Hebrew word (עֶבֶד) *ebed* and the Greek word
> (δοῦλος) *doulos* normally have the literal meaning of "slave." Thus, the chief
> characteristic of a person called a 'servant' in the NRSV (and other English
> translations) is usually that they belong to another and so have no legal rights.[9]

J. P. M. Van Der Ploeg concurs in his explanation of the Old Testament Hebrew *ebed*,

"The most common meaning of *ebed* is 'slave.' The slaves were the possession of their

masters who had captured, bought, or inherited them."[10] Murray Harris helps to

substantiate this point from a New Testament perspective in his important work, *Slave of

Christ: A New Testament Metaphor for Total Devotion to Christ.*

> In twentieth century Christianity we have replaced the expression "total
> surrender" with the word "commitment", and "slave" with "servant." But there is
> an important difference. A servant gives service to someone, but a slave belongs
> to someone. We commit ourselves to do something, but when we surrender
> ourselves to someone, we give ourselves up.[11]

Timothy Cochrell elaborates further when he examines lexical considerations

concerning the use of "slave" in the Old Testament, "A lexical examination of the

semantic range of *ebed* will demonstrate the variety of ways in which this slave language

could be employed including literal chattel bondage, deferential court language, and the

---

[9] Mark Allan Powell, *The HarperCollins Bible Dictionary*, s.v. "servant," (New York: Harper Collins, 2011), 939.

[10] J.P.M. Van Der Ploeg, "Slavery in the Old Testament." Vestus Testamentum Supplement 22 (1972): 75.

[11] Murray J. Harris, *Slave of Christ*, (Downers Grove, IL, Intervarsity Press, 2001), 18.

submission of an inferior to a superior."[12] Harris amplifies the meaning of "slave" behind

the Greek word *doulos*:

> In New Testament Greek there are at least six terms that are often translated or
> could be translated by the English word 'servant.' But only one New Testament
> word—*doulos*—has the distinctive meaning of 'slave', and this word occurs 124
> times in the New Testament and its compound form *syndoulos* ('fellow slave') ten
> times.[13]

Despite the clear indication of both the Hebrew term and the Greek term,

translators continue to hesitate in translating either word as "slave" in most of our English

Bibles. Lyall notes, "the usual meaning we give to the word (*slave*) is significantly

weaker than the reality known to the writers."[14] Murray Harris provides three probable

reasons for omitting this clear meaning of the Greek word *doulos*: first, the horrific

history of modern slavery in the West touches on too many painful memories to make use

of this term; second, translators go out of their way to aid readers in not making modern

connections to ancient terms that might carry different connotations; and third, there are

certain technical aspects surrounding linguistics that might cause a translator to favor the

word *servant* over the word *slave*.[15] E. J. Goodspeed, Professor of Biblical and Patristic

Greek at the University of Chicago from 1923 to 1937, defended this translation.

> English translators of the Bible almost without exception have avoided the
> distasteful word 'slave' in translating the Greek word *doulos*. Yet it means
> nothing else, and their fastidiousness has led readers of the King James, for
> example, far astray; modern political scientists have gained from it the impression
> that Paul says nothing at all about slaves and slavery and cared nothing about
> them.[16]

---

[12] Timothy Robert Cochrell, "Foundations for a Biblical Model of Servant Leadership in the Slave Imagery of Luke-Acts" (PhD diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2015), 22.

[13] Harris, 183.

[14] Lyall, 28.

[15] Harris, 184.

[16] Harris, 185.

Harris concludes his thinking on the translation of the word *doulos* as *slave* in stating that "the area where translators need to be more courageous is in translating the term *doulos* and *syndoulos* as 'slave' and 'fellow slave' in reference to the Christian's relation (a) to Christ or God, and (b) to other believers."[17]

This lexical reality is important for understanding the metaphor in its original setting. Only then can relevant connections be made for leadership today. When the Bible speaks of a *servant* it is describing a *slave*, implying ownership, submission, and surrender.

The Cultural Context

During the historical period in which the Old Testament was written, slavery was an institution permitted by Jewish law. The Jewish legal system, as expressed through the Old Testament law, spoke to two classifications of slavery: indentured servants and foreign chattel slaves. The Mosaic Law declared that Israelites were not to be considered slaves, but rather brothers and servants, for they wholly belong to God (Lev. 25:39-46). The clear connection was made that God was their Master as a result of the redemption he accomplished through their deliverance from Egypt. Israelites were to treat their fellow indentured servants with respect and not rule over them harshly. The indentured servitude was limited to six years of service, while other Near Eastern cultures defined a debt slave period as three years. This same passage prescribed that foreign chattel slavery could be permanent and that an Israelite indentured slave could elect to become a permanent slave (Exod. 21:5-6).

---

[17] Harris, 188.

There were differences, however, between the rights of slaves during the Old

Testament period and those during the New Testament era. During the period of the New

Testament slaves were given the right of ownership (even of other slaves) and the power

to conduct business while they were kept under the master's control.[18]

The Roman legal system made it clear that a slave was usually considered to be a

person (male or female) owned by another, without rights, and like any other form of

personal property.[19] Often, the Roman system trumped Jewish law since Israel was

subject to Roman rule during much of this time period. Lyall explains the dominance of

the Roman legal context for the New Testament period:

> The writers of the New Testament epistles could draw on three main sources for the legal language, analogies, and metaphors they used: Roman law, Jewish law, and the disparate systems which we, for the sake of convenience, call Greek law. Of these the Roman law was the best developed and the most widespread legal system, and we have the best evidence as to its content.[20]

Slaves were acquired in various ways during the reign of Rome. Mary Ann Beavis

explains, "Before the *pax romana,* the slave population was largely drawn from war

captives. After Augustus, other sources of slaves, such as kidnapping, debt enslavement,

self-sale, home breeding, and the rescue of foundlings were more prominent."[21] Lyall

states that under Roman law "The slave was a thing, a res, a commercial asset that could

be owned. The slave was a chattel, a thing that could be bought and sold. The slave

belonged wholly to his master. … The slave was therefore required to do his master's

---

[18] D. R. W. Wood and I. Howard Marshall*, New Bible Dictionary*, 3rd ed. (Leicester, England: InterVarsity Press, 1996), 1110.

[19] Wood and Marshall, 1110.

[20] Lyall, 191.

[21] Mary Ann Beavis, "Ancient Slavery as an Interpretive Context for the New Testament Servant Parables with Special Reference to the Unjust Steward (Luke 16:1-8)." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 111, no. 1 (1992): 39.

will to the fullest extent of his abilities and wholly to serve his master's interests."[22] This

last statement comes closest to the nature of servant leadership in the Bible. Because the

leader belongs wholly to another, the master's will and interests should consume him or

her.

The legal standing and role of a slave during biblical times informs the modern

view of leadership in God's kingdom. The analogy demonstrates a unique master-slave

relationship between God and the leader, both as a master-slave relationship and a

master-patron relationship.

Beyond the legal realities, it is necessary to understand the cultural nuances of the

Ancient Near East to appreciate the servant/slave metaphor. Three unique cultures—

Jewish, Greek, and Roman—together formed the context for how servants and slaves

were defined. It is also important to understand the cultural view of slavery of the nations

surrounding Israel during the Old and New Testament periods. Cochrell identifies at least

four categories of slavery during this period of history:

> There were at least four identifiable categories of slavery in the Ancient Near
> East. First, the domestic slave was a chattel slave, typically a foreigner taken
> captive in war, who became the exclusive property of the master and served in the
> master's house as a part of the larger family unit. Second, the debt slave was not
> usually a foreigner, but rather a fellow countryman who was forced to work for
> his creditor for a limited span of time in order to pay a debt. It is important to note
> that the debt slave was not owned by the master, but was required to work to pay
> off his debt for a period not exceeding three years. Temple slaves were literally
> enslaved to a deity and served in various capacities in the function of the cult.
> Finally, state slavery consisted of large groups of people, typically taken captive
> in war, which became the property of the king and were subject to forced labor,
> often in very hazardous environments.[23]

---

[22] Lyall, 35-36.

[23] Cochrell, 25.

These findings demonstrate heterogeneity in the context and practice of slavery during the biblical era. But there was one commonality—the slave was bound to a master and without rights.

Within Jewish culture, slaves were often treated more humanely than in other cultures. Still, Jewish slaves were considered to be among the socially oppressed and were few in the land of Palestine. They were often sold for as little as one or two minas since the period of service was limited to six years according to Mosaic Law. In contrast, Gentile slaves could fetch as much as 100 minas since their service could be for life.[24] Joachim Jeremias makes careful note that the legal status of a Jewish slave was to be equal to the elder son of the family. They were not to be tasked with the more mundane chores, such as washing the master's feet or putting shoes on the master's feet. They were to enjoy similar food and clothing as the master's household, good seats at the table, and a good bed.[25] This favorable treatment was not the case for Gentile slaves within Jewish culture. In contrast, the social position of Gentile slaves was that they were the absolute property of their master. They could not possess goods, and the master possessed all that the Gentile slave made, found, was given, or received. Everything belonged to the master, including the children of the Gentile slave.[26]

In Greek culture during the same period, slaves were primarily industrial rather than agricultural and therefore included many more skilled workers. It was common in Greek thinking that a slave could be considered half slave and half freedman. This

---

[24] Joachim Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus: An Investigation into Economic and Social Conditions during the New Testament Period* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969), 312.

[25] Jeremias, 314-315.

[26] Jeremias, 348.

pseudo status proved helpful in keeping the possibilities of slave revolts to a minimum.[27]

Howell notes a unique aspect of slavery in Greek culture: "The Greeks placed great value

on personal autonomy, that is, freedom from subjection to the will of someone or

something outside of oneself."[28] Howell explains further that Greek philosophy

considered slavery something to be despised: "To be subject to the will of another is to be

stripped of one's dignity and is thus a condition that is contemptible."[29] The Greek

understanding, centered in human autonomy, plays the least influential role in helping to

define the biblical servant leader.

> Under Roman rule slavery was ubiquitous:
>
> At the end of the first century BC there were some two million slaves in Italy out
> of a total population of five or six million. In Rome itself this 1:3 ratio of slave to
> free may have been higher. There may have been ten to twelve million slaves
> under Roman jurisdiction throughout the Roman Empire.[30]

Beavis observes that Roman slavery was marked by inequality. Even when masters

treated slaves in a humane manner, it was ultimately for the benefit of the master.[31] In

Roman culture, every level of society would likely have slaves. Even those who were

considered poor might have two to three slaves. The wealthy might have as many as 400

slaves. The typical slave under Roman culture could play as many as 120 different roles.

"Slaves, then, did not form a single, homogenous class. At one end of the spectrum were

---

[27] Harris, 31-33.

[28] Howell, 11.

[29] Howell, 11.

[30] Harris, 34.

[31] Beavis, 40.

the penal slaves condemned for life to the mines; at the other, Caesar's slaves, the attendants of the emperor."[32]

> In Roman law, slaves were chattels, mortal objects. A Roman could buy, rent or sell a slave, as he would a piece of property. An owner's right to use and dispose of his slave as he wished was called dominium, the right of absolute ownership. Owners of an estate would classify slaves as articulate equipment as opposed to oxen, which were inarticulate equipment.[33]

Elizabeth Dowling also makes the case that slaves were not a homogenous class when it came to privilege and mobility: "Unskilled slaves involved in production, for instance, had little opportunity to change their situation whereas skilled and educated slaves had more possibilities for improvement."[34]

Under Roman law, a slave could only emerge from slavery in one of two ways: death, or manumission by the owner. Once a freedman, the former slave could enter into a legal relationship with his former owner playing the role of patron. This continued affiliation was unique to Roman law and likely what Paul had in mind when he referred to both the status of a freedman and a slave simultaneously (1 Cor. 7:21-22).[35]

These facts demonstrated how the slave metaphor could be readily understood culturally and applied to leadership biblically. Therefore, the Roman cultural context is paramount when considering the servant/slave metaphor in the Bible, especially during the historical period of the New Testament.

It is important to establish a working definition of the servant/slave metaphor according to the socio-cultural context of Scripture. This historical clarity will allow the

---

[32] Harris, 36.

[33] Harris, 37.

[34] Elizabeth V. Dowling, "Luke-Acts: Good News for Slaves?" *Pacifica* 24 (June 2011): 125.

[35] Lyall, 39-41.

researcher to better exegete critical biblical passages to form a strong foundation for a

developmental framework later in the paper. For this study the researcher will follow in

the footsteps of Harris in using the following definition as the basis of analysis:

> We may define a slave (whether literal or figurative) as someone whose person or
> service belong wholly to another. On this view slavery involves (a)
> absolute ownership and control on the part of the master and the total subjection
> of the slave; and (b) the absence of the slave's freedom to choose his action or
> movement.[36]

Cochrell expands on the researcher's understanding of this definition:

> As a corollary to this fundamental understanding, a slave's status was no longer
> defined by family background, national identity, or social standing for his identity
> was defined exclusively by his relationship to the master. As the master's
> possession, the slave was not autonomous or free to choose his own actions, but
> instead was subject to the master's will and responsible for exclusive obedience to
> the master's commands. Because he belongs exclusively to the master, a slave is
> completely dependent upon the master for provision and direction and the slave's
> primary responsibility is to please the master.[37]

In summary, the lexical, legal, and cultural concepts of slavery were known

fixtures throughout the Ancient Near East during the writings of both the Old and New

Testaments. While variations existed within Jewish, Greek, and Roman thinking, slavery

in one form or another was an accepted status and practice. The core concepts of being

wholly owned, completely dependent, and at the service of the master are critical to

understanding this metaphor for servant leadership. Total obedience and the practice of

representative authority that flow out of this cultural metaphor are necessary for the

proper functioning of biblical servant leadership.

---

[36] Harris, 25-26.

[37] Cochrell, 23-24.

Old Testament Usage

The word for *servant, ebed*, appears 799 times in one form or another in the Old Testament. Dexter Callender writes, "Such language reflects a conscious servant-lord relationship that extends beyond the expression of simple politeness or respect. Indeed the roots of this type of expression must certainly lie in the socio-economic servant-lord relationship."[38] By making this claim, Callender asserts the connection between a cultural understanding of this relationship and the use of the metaphor in the Old Testament.

One of the primary ways this servant-lord relationship is displayed is through individual leaders and the use of the titles "servant of the Lord," "my servant," or simply "servant." The researcher took note of this reality specifically with significant leaders such as Moses, Joshua, Samuel, David, Solomon, and Job. Among this notable list, Moses and David are given this title most often. The term *servant* also is applied to all of the prophets and the priests within the Old Testament. It is applied uniquely to the Servant Songs, five passages in the latter part of Isaiah that take on a messianic tone. The metaphor of slavery is also verbally proclaimed by Hannah in the Old Testament and by Mary, the mother of Jesus, in the New Testament (1 Sam. 1:11, Luke 1:38).

Moses

Robert Lennox discusses the importance of Moses bearing this title: "Certain individuals who have stood out in the history of God's dealings with his people are distinguished by this term. Moses was thus referred to forty times."[39] Five passages

---

[38] Dexter E. Callender, "Servants of God(s) and Servants of Kings in Israel and the Ancient Near East," *Semeia* 83/84 (09/1998): 73.

[39] Robert Lennox, "The Servant of Yahweh in the Old Testament," *Theology Today* (October 1, 1958): 317.

within the Pentateuch use some form of this title to describe Moses. "Both the Old Testament and the New Testament make reference to Mosaic writing activity in connection with the Pentateuch, and both covenants assert that Moses was the primary human author of the Pentateuch."[40] This insight is significant if Moses is claiming the slave metaphor for himself.

Twice Moses referred to himself as "your servant" in his dialogue with Yahweh (Exod. 4:10; Num. 11:11). Once, the text labels Moses as "his servant," referring to the aftermath of the Red Sea experience and how the people of Israel viewed Moses (Exod. 14:31). And twice, Yahweh called Moses "my servant" in response to the opposition of Miriam and Aaron (Num. 12:7-8). Moses was given the full title of "servant of the Lord" at the end of his life (Deut. 34:5). Victor Hamilton notes, "The emphasis that is made in these concluding verses is not on Moses' knowledge of the Lord, but the Lord's knowledge of Moses."[41] This particular proximity implies service in the context of relationship. The biblical servant-leader, though in complete submission to Yahweh, always stands in close relationship to Yahweh.

The double reference to "my servant" in Numbers 12:7-8 is noteworthy for two reasons. First, the writer of Hebrews referred to Numbers 12:7 when he stated, "Now Moses was faithful in all God's house as a servant, to testify to the things that were to be spoken later, but Christ is faithful over God's house as a son. And we are his house if indeed we hold fast our confidence and our boasting in our hope" (Heb. 3:5-6). The New Testament passage validates the servant metaphor used in Exodus in reference to Moses'

---

[40] Andrew E. Hill and John H. Walton, *A Survey of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1991), 75.

[41] Victor P. Hamilton, *Handbook on the Pentateuch: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1982), 473.

leadership role within salvation history. Second, the context of the Exodus passage communicates an important aspect of Moses' character that demonstrates another aspect of the servant metaphor. "Now the man Moses was very meek, more than all people who are on the face of the earth" (Exod. 12:3)." Concerning the word *meek* Gordon Wenham comments:

> It is a word that elsewhere is used only in poetry. It sometimes refers to those in real poverty, or those who are weak and liable to be exploited. But more frequently the word seems to denote an attitude of mind, more characteristic of the poor than of the rich, one of humility and dependence upon God.[42]

This very notion of humility and dependence speaks directly to the nature of the servant-lord relationship and a primary trait of servant-leaders. The language, "He is faithful in all my house," (Num. 12:7) is interesting in connection with the steward metaphor. Wenham combines the steward-slave reality with the knowledge that comes from close relationship: "He is God's servant entrusted with looking after all his estate, i.e. Israel, and like other men in his position he has immediate access to the owner of the estate."[43] This right (or ability) to approach the master is a distinct characteristic of a servant-steward.

Equally significant are the five references to Moses in Joshua 1:1-15. This narrative revealed the commissioning of Joshua in succeeding Moses. Verses one through nine involved direct communication from Yahweh to Joshua. The final six verses highlighted Joshua's exhortation to the leaders and people of Israel. In each of the five references to Moses he is referred to as "the servant of the Lord" or "my servant." Marten Woudstra remarked that "Joshua will not receive this significant title until the end of the

---

[42] Gordon J. Wenham, *Numbers: An Introduction and Commentary, vol. 4 of Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries* (Nottingham, England: InterVarsity Press, 2008), 126.

[43] Wenham, 127.

book" (Josh. 24:29).[44] Verse seven, in particular, added to the explanation of the servant metaphor, "Only be strong and very courageous, being careful to do according to all the law that Moses my servant commanded you. Do not turn from it to the right hand or to the left, that you may have good success wherever you go" (Josh. 1:7). An important trait of the servant-lord relationship is complete obedience.

Joshua

Joshua, who was labeled "Moses' assistant" at the beginning of his service (Josh. 1:1), became "the servant of the Lord" at his death (Josh. 24:29). Concerning the death of this leader, Woudstra makes the case that this title keeps Joshua as a leader in parallel with Moses and marks him as one of the key figures in God's redemptive history.[45] Richard Nelson describes the leadership legacy of Joshua in these words: "As his name seems to signify, Joshua was the ideal 'savior,' who not only won battles and secured possession of the land, but he was able to hold the people to perfect loyalty his entire life."[46] The Hebrew word, which is translated *assistant* in the ESV, is *sharat*. This word appears 96 times in the Old Testament. On 20 of those occasions it is found in the participial form and becomes the noun *minister*.[47] One connotation of this word is "the personal service rendered to an important personage."[48] This word is used in reference to Joshua's serving Moses (Exod. 24:13, 33:11; Num. 11:28). This word is used also in

---

[44] Marten H. Woudstra, *The Book of Joshua*, New International Commentary on the Old Testament (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1981), 57.

[45] Woudstra, 359.

[46] Richard D. Nelson, *Joshua: A Commentary*, The Old Testament Library (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1997), 22.

[47] R Laird Harris, Gleason L. Archer, and Bruce K. Waltke, *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1980), 958.

[48] Harris, Archer, and Waltke, 958.

reference to Joseph serving Potiphar (Gen. 39:4) and applied to the personal servant of

the prophet Elisha (2 Kings 4:43, 6:15). In the case of both the servant of Elisha and

Joshua they eventually succeeded their masters. This "assistant" role or "apprenticeship"

points to a significant developmental aspect in effective servant leadership succession.

Samuel

Samuel encounters the Lord in a unique way through his calling into service.

Samuel is a transitional leadership figure that covers the period of the judges through the

establishment of the monarchy within Israel.[49] His direct calling (1 Sam. 31:21)

established him as a prophet, but he also wore the linen ephod, which established him as

a priest (1 Sam. 2:18).[50] Eli, the high priest of Israel at that time, exhorted Samuel to

respond to the Lord's calling with these words, "Speak, Lord, for your servant hears" (1

Sam. 3:9). Robert Jamieson explains, "The three successive calls addressed to the boy

convinced Eli of the divine character of the speaker, and he therefore exhorted the child

to give a reverential attention to the message."[51] Three elements stand out in this short

response. First, the second person pronoun (your) is a mark of possession or submission.

Second, the word for *servant* is the same one that the researcher has been reporting on,

ebed. And finally, the use of the verb "to hear" is the Hebrew word *shama*. This is

significant in that the verb, which is used some 1050 times in the Old Testament, carries

the basic meaning "to hear and obey."[52] The most famous use of the verb is found in

---

[49] Hill and Walton, 187.

[50] Hill and Walton, 188.

[51] Robert Jamieson, A. R. Fausset, and David Brown, *A Commentary on the Old and New Testaments* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1997), 177.

[52] Harris, Archer, and Waltke, 938.

Deuteronomy 6:4-9, in which verses four to six state, "Hear O Israel: The Lord our God, the Lord is one. You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your might. And these words that I command you today shall be on your heart." This passage acknowledged Jehovah "as the one absolute God, as king over all the earth."[53] John Peter Lange reminds us, "But as, and just because, Jehovah is one, His demand generally upon Israel, thus the whole law, with all its variety of commands, must have a unity (John 17:21 sq.), just as law and promise are also one (Gal. 3:21)."[54] Lange shows continuity between the Testaments and goes on to note that it is the unity of God that places a unity on the demands of the Law, thus creating a special emphasis on *shama* and the servant-lord relationship.[55] Yoon Jong Yoo makes the lexical connection between Deuteronomy 6:4-9, 1 Samuel 3:9, and 1 Samuel 15:22-23, which adds to our understanding of *shama* in 1 Samuel 1-15.[56]

> On the positive form of the first commandment expressed in the command to "love" (Deut 6:5), Olson interprets: Israel's "love" of God in Deuteronomy involves both "obeying" and "holding fast". According to the definition of Olson, it is suggested that 1 Samuel 15:22 clarifies the meaning of "obeying" whereas 1 Samuel 15:23 clarifies "holding fast."[57]

If *shama* can be expressed in this holistic way, then there are clear implications for the servant-lord relationship, and Samuel both exhibits and proclaims this expression

---

[53] C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, *Keil and Delitzsch: Commentary on the Old Testament* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1996), 1:884.

[54] John Peter Lange, *Lange's Commentary on the Holy Scriptures 12 Double Volumes*. (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1960), 1:94.

[55] Lange, 94.

[56] Yoon Jong Yoo, "The Shema (Deut. 6:4-5) in the Story of Samuel (1 Samuel 1-15)," *Expository Times* (123/3): 119.

[57] Yoo, 120.

of *shama* as he serves the Lord. Attentiveness, obedience, and abiding are three core traits of the leader who is a "servant of the Lord."

David

King David stands as a prominent character in the Bible who carries the title "servant of the Lord." There are over seventy references where the "servant" title is attached to his name.[58] 2 Samuel 7 is a critical text in understanding the servant-lord relationship between Yahweh and David. This chapter contains the covenant promise of God to establish an eternal throne through the line of David and David's response of gratitude.[59] In verses one through three, David declared to Nathan the Prophet that he intended to build a house for the ark of the covenant, the symbol of God's very presence in Israel. Nathan affirmed David's desire. In verses 4-17, Yahweh responded to David. Twice within this response, God referred to David as "my servant" (2 Sam. 7:5, 8).

God established the divine nature of his kingship over David when he declared, "Thus says the Lord of hosts, 'I took you from the pasture, from following the sheep, that you would be prince over my people Israel'" (2 Sam. 7:8). W. J. Dumbrell explains, "Davidic kingship was witness to the further fact of divine kingship, and the function of the Davidic king was to implement in Israel the policy and the directions of Yahweh, the divine King."[60] David responded ten different times with "your servant" (2 Sam. 7:19, 20, 21, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29), in every instance using the Hebrew word *ebed*. David, though an earthly king, is seen as subservient to Yahweh, the King of kings. Verse 28 captured

---

[58] Chad Brand, Charles Draper, and Archie England, *Holman Illustrated Bible Dictionary* (Nashville, TN: Holman Bible Publishers, 2003), 1465.

[59] W. J. Dumbrell, "The Content and Significance of the Books of Samuel: Their Place and Purpose within the Former Prophets," *JETS* 33/1 (1990): 58.

[60] Dumbrell, 59.

well David's attitude of submission in the servant-lord relationship, "And now, O Lord God, you are God, and your words are true, and you have promised this good thing to your servant."

The book of 2 Samuel reveals the nature of an imperfect servant-leader who must rely on God's wisdom and instruction. David desired to build a temple for God, but God had other plans that involved a lineage that would lead to a divine kingship, which would ultimately be fulfilled in Messiah.[61] The servant-leader understands his imperfections, the greatness of God, and the absolute need to demonstrate reliance upon him. The servant-leader also understands that God's grace allows him or her to fully participate in the promises and plans of the divine king.

Many of the Psalms were penned by David and exemplify the above traits. The Hebrew term *ebed* appears 56 times in the Psalms. A primary metaphorical meaning for this word in the Psalms is "worship." When this meaning is tied to Yahweh as a divine king, it carries the connotation of deference, loyalty, and trust.[62] When connected to deity the verb form can be extended to mean "to give allegiance to" or "give worship to."[63] Edward J. Bridge highlights the connection between the metaphor and the posture of a servant leader: "The metaphorical use of *ebed* in Psalms is built on the literal meaning of the term 'to serve' (verb) and 'slave/servant' (noun). In most cases, the term carries the idea of dependency and loyalty."[64] Bridge elaborates, "In the verb form, the nations are

---

[61] Dumbrell, 60.

[62] Edward J. Bridge, "Loyalty, Dependence, and Status with YHWH: The Use of 'bd' in the Psalms," *Vetus Testamentum* 59 (2009): 362.

[63] Bridge, 364.

[64] Bridge, 376.

pictured as subject to the Israelite king and worshippers are in effect subject to

Yahweh."[65] Often the noun form is found in psalms of supplication. The types of

supplication where the term *ebed* is found indicate that the word carries the meaning of

submission and dependency such as a slave owes his or her master.[66] The abject

dependency of a slave toward his master has been turned into a rich illustration of trust

between the supplicant and Yahweh.

One Psalm worth noting in regard to David is Psalm 78. The last three verses (vss.

70-72) read, "He chose David his servant and took him from the sheepfolds; from

following the nursing ewes he brought him to shepherd Jacob his people, Israel his

inheritance. With upright heart he shepherded them and guided them with skillful hands."

This Psalm is attributed to Asaph, who was a Levite that King David placed in charge of

choral worship (1 Chron. 16:4-5). Asaph also wrote various Psalms during the reign of

Hezekiah.[67] These three verses not only represent the active work of Yahweh in the

servant-lord relationship but also combine the shepherd metaphor with the servant

metaphor. Psalm 78 is considered a historical psalm that recounts the great mercies of

God toward Israel for her many sins.[68] Verse 70 states, "He chose David his servant and

took him from among the sheepfolds." Once again, the Hebrew term *ebed* is used to

describe the servant-lord relationship between David and Yahweh. Matthew Henry

reflects on the initiating actions of God and his motives:

---

[65] Bridge, 376.

[66] Bridge, 376.

[67] Woods and Marshall, 91.

[68] Matthew Henry, *Matthew Henry's Commentary On the Whole Bible: Complete and Unabridged in One Vo* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1991), 855.

His extraction indeed was great, for he descended from the prince of the tribe of Judah, but his education was poor. He was bred not a scholar, not a soldier, but a shepherd. He was *taken from the sheep-folds,* as Moses was; for God delights to put honor upon the humble and diligent, to raise the poor out of the dust and to set them among princes; and sometimes he finds those most fit for public action that have spent the beginning of their time in solitude and contemplation.[69]

God's purpose was that David might shepherd Israel.

The Servant Songs of Isaiah

Finally, the researcher considered the "servant of the Lord" title beautifully depicted in the servant songs of Isaiah. "In a class all by itself, and, for our purpose of the greatest significance, is the 'suffering servant' of Deutero-Isaiah who is depicted in a series of passages (Isa. 42:1-4, 49:1-6, 50:4-9, 52:13-53:12)."[70] The songs describe the purpose and function of the servant. The first song portrays the servant's mission of justice. The second sets forth the double nature of the task to preserve Israel and to be a light to the nations. The third song describes the servant's suffering that will take place. And the fourth song provides us with a picture of the willing, pure, sacrificial death of the servant, which will secure forgiveness for all people.[71]

Cochrell sums up well the characteristics of the "servant of the Lord" that are outlined through the servant songs:

A final and pivotal use of the slave metaphor is Isaiah's anticipation of the advent of an unidentified "*ebed* of the Lord" who would bring about justice (Isa. 42:4), endure frustration in his restorative task (Isa. 49:4), remain obedient in the face of violent opposition (Isa. 50:5-6), and ultimately bear the sins of the people through his death (Isa. 53:1-12). The identity and significance of this "suffering servant" has been widely and hotly debated. But for the purpose of this study it is sufficient to affirm the conclusion of Jeremias that this anticipated a messianic figure who

---

[69] Henry, 858-859.

[70] Lennox, 318.

[71] Lennox, 320.

would act as God's agent for the restoration of His people at some point in the future.[72]

Cochrell goes on to say:

> This use of the slave metaphor, translated παῖς Θεοῦ in the LXX, depicts the messiah as the fulfillment of God's ideal king, God's faithful messenger, and God's exemplary slave who eternally exists in right relationship with God so that he perfectly represents his character to God's people as his royal representative. The prophets anticipate that the work of the messianic *ebed* will be exemplary and restorative, returning Israel and the nations to right relationship with God so that they might serve as his royal representatives upon the earth. [73]

One noteworthy aspect of the above quote is the connection between "the slave who eternally exists in right relationship" to the character that the servant-leader portrays or reflects towards those he or she leads.

In Isaiah 42:1, this messianic figure is referred to as "My servant, whom I uphold, my chosen, in whom my soul delights." J. A. Motyer breaks down the passage in this way: "In verses one through four the Lord speaks of his servant, describing his task; in verses five through nine he speaks to his servant, confirming his task."[74] Isaiah 42:1-3 is quoted in Matthew 12:18-20 in direct application to Jesus. While "my servant" is applied to the whole nation of Israel in certain parts of the Scripture (five times in Isaiah 40-55), it surely points to the Greater Deliverer in Isaiah 42. Lennox makes the case that it is common in Semitic thought to combine the collective with the individual and move in a reductionist way from the many toward the one, "from the whole of creation the course runs to man, from many to the people of Israel, from the people of Israel to the remnant,

---

[72] Cochrell, 64-65.

[73] Cochrell, 65-66.

[74] J. A. Motyer, *The Prophecy of Isaiah: An Introduction and Commentary* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1993), 318.

from the remnant to the one, Jesus."[75] "Without any qualifying proper name," Motyer

notes, "It suggests here 'my preeminent servant,' one who embodies true servanthood."[76]

He further comments regarding the *servant*, "He is the Lord's man for the job and the

Lord's man for himself."[77] The first song identifies the nature of the servant and the

source of his calling and care.

Twice in Isaiah 49:1-6 we find the title "my servant" (Isa. 49:3, 49:6). Once

within this pericope, we find the term "his servant" (Isa. 49:5). The focus of this song is

the double task of the servant toward both Israel and the world (Isa. 49:1). "The Servant

is a covenant figure with a covenant ministry to the world (Isa. 42:6) and to Israel (Isa.

49:8)."[78] Through this metaphor, the servant's identity is anchored in his or her calling

and God's creative work. The second song highlights the scope and purpose of the

servant's activity. These revelations are particularly meaningful for any leader facing

tasks of great scope and complexity. The servant was created for a specific work. Motyer

summarizes in this way, "Despondency arises through listening to ourselves and our self-

assessment, instead of looking to God, recalling his purposes, living according to our

dignity in him and rediscovering in him our source of power."[79]

Isaiah 50:4-9 displays the third servant song. The term "servant" appears nowhere

within this text. The referent point comes in verse ten, "Who among you fears the Lord

and obeys the voice of his servant?" The emphasis of this song is the suffering the servant

---

[75] Lennox, 320.

[76] Motyer, 319.

[77] Motyer, 320.

[78] Motyer, 384.

[79] Motyer, 387.

experiences and the obedience that caused that suffering.[80] Once again, this song highlights God's direct activity in preparing the servant for this season and God's sustaining presence throughout the ordeal.[81]

Galen Jones makes note of some of the characteristics of this type of servant-leader: "The notion of one who is called God's servant is based on that person's singular love, faith, obedience and devotion to the Lord."[82] There are strong implications for the servant-leader in this song. Every leader will suffer unjustly at some point for doing what is right. It is the helping presence of the Lord that will sustain his leaders amidst unjust treatment. This song also indicates the normal learning process that every leader must undergo to become an effective and mature leader, able to receive and give instruction. There can be no doubt from the explicit description in verse six that this song points to the coming servant, Jesus Christ. Verses ten and eleven serve as an exhortation to all who would listen and respond to this divine servant as a model. There are only two options, those who walk in self-sufficiency and those who model their leadership and lives after the messianic servant described in this song.[83]

The final servant song is recorded in Isaiah 52:13-53:12. The phrase "my servant" appears twice within this fourth song (Isa. 52:13, 53:11). This song portrays the consummation of the servant's mission to Israel and the world. The servant bears the sins of those deserving of punishment that they might be brought into covenant relationship

---

[80] Motyer, 398.

[81] Motyer, 398.

[82] Galen Wendell Jones, "A Theological Comparison between Social Science Models and a Biblical Perspective of Servant Leadership" (PhD diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2012), 14.

[83] Motyer, 400.

with God. The *servant* metaphor is prominent in verses 52:13 and 53:11. They reflect the heart of a servant-leader, one who acts wisely, resulting in sacrifice for the benefit of those they are trying to influence. The very nature of the word *wisely* in 52:13 also carries the connotation "to act successfully."[84] There are twelve different words used in this passage to describe simultaneous suffering. The servant's suffering will result in a manifold impact, bringing blessing to many. Ultimately there is exaltation through suffering and sacrifice. The greatest benefit to the many lies in the suffering and sacrifice of the servant.[85]

There is much in Isaiah for the servant-leader to consider. There is the leadership principle of leverage, the acts of the one directly affecting the lives of many. There is the very heart of servant leadership revealed in willing suffering and sacrifice on behalf of those he or she leads. There is finding exaltation, not through grandiosity and self-sufficiency, but through dependence upon the Lord, experientially identifying oneself with those they lead, and through great personal humility. Servant leadership is not built on celebrity, but on sacrifice. In referring to the *servant* of the passage, Motyer concludes, "The Servant dealt with every aspect of our need. His work of suffering fulfilled the will of God. In his Servant, the Lord was dealing with all that merited his wrath. The Servant is the lamb of God."[86]

---

[84] Motyer, 424.

[85] Motyer, 423.

[86] Motyer, 429.

New Testament Usage

Within the New Testament, we see the continuation of the use of this metaphor applied to leadership. *Doulos* is the primary Greek word under consideration. But the term *diakonos* is also worthy of consideration as an ancillary factor for the understanding of servant leadership. *Diakonos* usually is translated as *servant* in most English texts. As noted earlier, the word *doulos* should be translated *slave* to be faithful to its intended meaning. The focus of a *diakonos* is the work done or the service rendered. The emphasis that rests upon *doulos* is the subservient relationship between the master and the slave. The lexical emphasis is on the dependent relationship of someone who is wholly owned and without rights. Harris delineates the distinction when he states, "A *doulos* gives service (*diakonia*), as is illustrated by the sequence *doulon … diakonei* in Luke 17:7-8. Yet not all those who give service are 'slaves.' All *douloi* are *diakonoi*, but not all *diakonoi* are *douloi*; *diakonos* is the broader term."[87] The true servant-leader is to live and lead in regard to both terms, with the dependent posture of a *doulos* and the service orientation of a *diakonos*.

Four New Testament authors referred to themselves as "slaves of Christ" or "slaves of God": Paul (Rom. 1:1; Gal. 1:10; Phil. 1:1; Tit. 1:1), James (James 1:1), Peter (2 Pet. 1:1) and Jude (Jude 1). All used the Greek word *doulos*. It was unusual during the New Testament era for any follower of a deity to be called a slave of that deity. As was noted, these four human authors of the New Testament did just that. Harris provides the reason for this:

> The answer lies . . . in the nature of the Master they were serving and in the
> example of slavery to God he himself afforded. The nature of any slavery is

---

[87] Harris, 179.

determined by the nature of the master. Who and what the master is, determines the status of the slave, the attitude of the slave, and the significance of slave's work.[88]

To better understand the principles that flow from the New Testament use of this metaphor, the researcher will examine its reference in six passages.

Matthew 20:20-28

In this passage Jesus exhorted his closest followers about the very nature of leadership in his kingdom. This passage is often considered in parallel with Mark 10:35-45 and Luke 22:24-27. The researcher will consider the Matthean passage for its richness of detail and setting.[89] This passage also acts in concert with the prophecies recorded in the Servant Songs that were considered earlier. Leon Morris helps to make the connection between Old Testament and New Testament usage of this metaphor in describing the nature of the first Gospel: "Matthew shared many features with the other Gospels, but some of them are especially characteristic of the first Gospel. The writer seems concerned throughout to show that Christianity is the true continuation of the Old Testament—the true Judaism."[90]

The setting of this pericope is Jesus and the twelve moving toward Jerusalem and the consummation of Jesus' life and mission. This passage is preceded by the fourth announcement in the gospel of the impending suffering and death of Jesus (Matt. 20:17-19).[91] Up to this point in the narrative, Jesus taught consistently about the nature and

---

[88] Harris, 135.

[89] Leon Morris, *The Gospel According to Matthew*, The Pillar New Testament Commentary. (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1992), 15.

[90] Morris, 2.

[91] Morris, 506.

coming reality of the kingdom of God (in particular, Matt. 5-7; Matt. 13; Matt. 18). This passage is significant since it highlights the disciples' lack of understanding concerning life and leadership in the kingdom of God. It is at this very moment in the narrative that James and John, two of Jesus' closest followers, will make a request through their mother for the second and third most important positions within the kingdom. Within Jewish culture of the time, older women held a place of respect not afforded to younger women. Jewish women could also make more stringent requests that Jewish men would dare not try before a superior.[92] D. A. Carson notes, "Despite Jesus' repeated predictions of his passion, two disciples and their mother are still thinking about privilege, status, and power."[93] Morris highlights one of the strongest tenets of this episode: "Consistently Jesus taught his followers that there is no place for pride and self-seeking of any sort in the life to which he called them."[94] Pride and self-seeking are deadly motives for kingdom leadership.

Jesus laid out three important considerations concerning the very essence of biblical leadership as reflected through the servant metaphor: attendant judgment and suffering, God's calling, and a paradoxical posture and practice.

Jesus replied to the two brothers who made their audacious request through their mother: "You do not know what you are asking. Are you able to drink the cup that I am to drink?" (Matt. 20:22). In Greek, the response begins with the adversative *but*. Jesus set

---

[92] Craig S. Keener, *Matthew,* vol. 1 of *Ivp New Testament Commentary Series*, vol. 1, (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2011), https://www.biblegateway.com/resources/commentaries/IVP-NT/Matt/Reign-Suffering-Servant (accessed September 3, 2016).

[93] D. A. Carson, *The Expositor's Bible Commentary: with the New International Version of the Holy Bible* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1984), 8:430.

[94] Morris, 508.

up a contrast to their request for grandeur by pointing them to the reality of suffering.

Morris notes, "Despite all the teaching Jesus had given, they had still not realized that the

kingdom meant lowliness, sacrifice, and rejection in this world."[95] Jesus did not seek

immediately to define "the cup" which is used most often in the Old Testament as a

metaphor for suffering, judgment, and retribution.[96] The two disciples responded

enthusiastically as to their readiness. Jesus affirmed that they certainly will "drink my

cup" (Matt. 20:23), but he also instructed them that the positional power they seek is not

his to give. Only God the Father has authority to give those positions to anyone. This

granting and preparation by the Father reflect a unique invitation or calling extended to

the twelve. The role of leadership calling was reserved for the Father alone. Carson

explains that Jesus is demonstrating here the type of authority the twelve are to express:

"Jesus makes it clear that his authority is a derived authority."[97] Derived or representative

authority, expressed in service, is a hallmark of the servant metaphor tied to leadership.

In commenting on the effects of this encounter, Morris notes, "In the end they would be

ready to eschew self-seeking and be ready to endure whatever suffering was required of

them as humble members of the kingdom."[98] Jesus' use of the word *cup* certainly referred

to his imminent suffering on the cross. He had already referenced this impending event.

(20:17-19). Jesus reminded these two disciples that a similar "cup" awaited them.

Ultimately, James became the first apostolic martyr (Acts 12:2) and John suffered exile

---

[95] Morris, 510.

[96] Carson, 431.

[97] Carson, 432.

[98] Morris, 510.

(Rev. 1:9).[99] Jesus was speaking to his twelve disciples (Matt. 20:24), who were in the process of becoming future leaders in carrying out his Great Commission (Matt. 28:18-20). He clearly stated that suffering and judgment are attendant circumstances that await every leader who leads in his kingdom. Therefore, the surety of God's calling and placement of any leader will be a foundational element to enduring such suffering. This has bearing on today's servant-leader.

Jesus revealed a paradoxical descent into greatness, which also disclosed an appropriate leadership posture and practice (Matt. 20:25-28). This is where the servant/slave metaphor is clearly placed on display. Jesus set up a contrast between the Gentile culture and the nature of his kingdom (Matt. 20:25-28). He referenced a scenario that would have been very familiar to the twelve—the way leadership power was abused under Roman rule. Harris comments, "The words 'great' and 'first' reflect the woman's request for the 'right-hand' and 'left-hand' positions for her sons, and are starkly contrasted with the terms 'servant' and 'slave', virtual opposites in the estimation of the twelve disciples."[100] Jesus immediately referred to "the rulers of the Gentiles" (or alternately, "the rulers of the nations") and "their great ones." This comparison sets up the contrast that will make use of the servant metaphor. Morris points out the dominant tendency among leaders in the world: "It is the way of the world to look for the highest possible place and to take delight in making full use of the authority that that place gives. In political life the world over and the centuries through, humility is seen as a handicap, not a virtue."[101] These two unique Greek verbs, "to lord it over" and "to exercise

---

[99] Carson, 432.

[100] Harris, 102.

[101] Morris, 511.

authority over," carry the lexical meaning of exercising dominion over someone for one's personal gain[102] and with oppression.[103] Jesus' antidote to these two ruling verbs is the metaphor of a *diakonos* and a *doulos*. True "greatness" is measured by service for the benefit of others. Preeminence, prominence, and status are measured by a posture of total dependence and humility—the position of a slave. "Jesus was teaching that greatness in the community of his followers is marked by humble, self-effacing servanthood, or slavery, modeled on his own selfless devotion to the highest good of others."[104] Jesus is the supreme exemplar of the contrast: "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). The language of "the Son of Man" is a clear reference to Daniel 7:13-14. This title serves as a Christological one, pointing to Jesus as the Messiah.[105] This messiah figure came to "serve" and "give his life as a ransom for many." The Greek word for *ransom* (*lytron*) denotes not only deliverance but also the price paid for that deliverance or release. It usually implies the giving of one's life.[106] The Greek conjunction at the beginning of verse 28 makes it clear that Jesus placed himself as the supreme example of what it ultimately means to be a *diakonos* and a *doulos* leader in his kingdom. It would cost Jesus his life upon the cross.

For the would-be follower of Christ, it is important to ask the question, "What price am I willing to pay to set other people free?" The descent into greatness involves

---

[102] Gerhard Kittel and G W. Bromiley, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1964-99), 3:1098.

[103] Kittel and Bromiley, 2:575.

[104] Harris, 102.

[105] Carson, 212.

[106] William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 2nd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979), 482.

sacrificial service for the benefit of others, through the humbling of oneself in a posture of total dependence, so that others might truly be delivered. It will require total commitment in leading many according to God's purposes.

Luke 17:7-10

Jesus mentioned slaves no fewer than 13 times in his parables. Harris points out the cultural reality of these teachings: "These parables accurately reflect the circumstances under which slavery operated in the first century."[107] One that bears mention is the story of the dutiful servant (Luke 17:7-10). The audience included the Twelve (Luke 17:5) and possibly other disciples (Luke 17:1). That people of some societal influence were present seems to be indicated by the words "any one of you who has a servant (*doulos*)" (Luke 17:10). Marshall rightly sees that the Twelve and their leadership were the focus of this teaching: "In its present context, however, the parable is addressed to the disciples, more specifically the apostles, and it may well be understood as a warning against the attitude of church leaders who think that their service in the church entitles them to some reward and they can be proud of what they have done."[108]

In this parable Jesus stated a widely accepted cultural reality and turned it on its head. He posed three questions through the parable to all who owned slaves:

> Will anyone of you who has a servant plowing or keeping sheep say to him when he has come in from the field, "Come at once and recline at the table?" Will he not rather say to him, "Prepare supper for me, and dress properly, and serve me while I eat and drink?" Does he thank the servant because he did what was commanded? (Luke 17:7-9)

---

[107] Harris, 47.

[108] I Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, vol. 3 of *The New International Greek Testament Commentary*, American ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1978), 645.

It is possible that there is leadership meaning in the three verbs used in the second question of the parable. Jesus stated it would be proper for a slave owner to expect the slave to come in from the field and "prepare," "dress properly," and "serve" the master. The lexical meaning of *prepare* points to a readiness for action. In the New Testament, *readiness* is required in three aspects: to do good works, to bear witness to the gospel, and for the return of Christ.[109] To "dress properly" is to be girded up, to tie up one's tunic with a belt, or other type of cord, for the purpose of service. The Greek verb for "to serve" in this passage is an imperative and in the present tense, signifying a command and an ongoing action. This verb is *diakoneo*, part of the word group surrounding *diakonos*. The true servant-leader must be ready for action, prepared accordingly, and maintain an ongoing service orientation toward those she reports to and leads.

Jesus went on to express that this servant orientation was expected of a slave. "Does he thank the servant because he did what was commanded?" (Luke 17:9). The lord or master would not be expected to thank the slave for that which was expected. Jesus reversed the natural line of thought and applied this parable to his hearers. "So you also, when you have done all that you were commanded, say, 'We are unworthy servants; we have only done what was our duty'" (Luke 17:10). Joseph Fitzmyer makes clear the distinction between the teaching of the parable and its application: "In distinguishing the parable in verses seven through nine from its application in verse ten, we can see that the former concentrates on the master, whereas the latter explains the attitude of the servant."[110] The apostles, and the disciples at large, are to see themselves in the posture of

---

[109] Kittle and Bromiley, 2:706.

[110] Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*, vol. 28-28A in *The Anchor Bible* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1981-1985), 1145.

a slave that they might never consider themselves superior to any other. The evaluative

lens through which the servant-leader looks is made clear in Cochrell's analysis:

> The apostles, like slaves, should not imagine that their service was an indication of self-sufficiency or an occasion for self-confidence. Because the slave is dependent upon the master and expected to carry out his will, faithful service does not exalt the worthiness of the slave but rather the supreme authority and worthiness of the master.[111]

The application of the parable lies with the posture of the servant-leader. Cochrell

goes on to explain, "The apostles were not to view their leadership as a sign of status,

power, or prestige, but rather as a reminder of their indebtedness to the grace of the

Master who allowed them the privilege of serving Him through obedience to His will."[112]

The metaphor, through its cultural implications, guides servant-leaders to a proper

perspective on the source and nature of their leadership.

John 13:1-17

John 13:1-17 provides another foundational narrative from the life of Jesus for a

more complete understanding of servant leadership. While Matthew 20:20-28 serves as

an exhortation from Jesus to the twelve about the profound difference between the

world's expression of leadership and leadership in his kingdom, John 13:1-17 stands as a

powerful illustration of servant leadership. This episode takes place after his triumphal

entry and another prediction of his sacrificial death. It is an introduction to the longest

teaching of Jesus directly instructing the twelve disciples.[113] This larger section of

teaching is often referred to as The Farewell Discourse or The Upper Room Discourse, as

---

[111] Cochrell, 182.

[112] Cochrell, 183.

[113] Andreas J. Köstenberger, *John*, Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2004), 399.

it takes place immediately before Jesus goes to the cross and in the upper room where

Jesus and the twelve were to celebrate Passover. The emphasis in this passage is the

cleansing of the community. Cleansing is reflected in both the removal of Judas from the

community as a traitor and Jesus' demonstration of the need for continual spiritual

cleansing through the foot washing.[114] The foot washing also serves another purpose.

> Jesus, knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands, and that he had come from God and was going back to God, rose from supper. He laid aside his outer garments, and taking a towel, tied it around his waist. Then he poured water into a basin and began to wash the disciples' feet and to wipe them with the towel that was wrapped around him. (John 13:3-5)

Andreas Köstenberger ties spiritual cleansing to humility and service: "The practice of

foot washing, which has a long Old Testament tradition, usually was performed by

slaves. Jesus stoops to perform this role, not in order to institute a permanent rite, but to

teach his followers on the importance of humble, loving service."[115] Jesus lowered

himself to the status of a slave to illustrate a point. The word "servant/slave" is not even

mentioned in these few verses, but the lesson was not lost on any of the twelve. The

researcher also believes that the point of cleansing extends to the removal of any worldly

orientation toward leadership principles. The cultural relevance made the illustration

powerful, as demonstrated by Peter's response.

> He came to Simon Peter who said to him, "Lord, do you wash my feet?" Jesus answered him, "What I am doing you do not understand now, but afterward you will understand." Peter said to him, "You shall never wash my feet." Jesus answered him, "If I do not wash you, you have no share with me." (John 13:6-8)

Peter was appalled that Jesus, his Lord, would take on the role of a slave and perform

such a menial task. Jesus made clear what he was illustrating through the foot washing.

---

[114] Köstenberger, 399.

[115] Köstenberger, 400.

> When he had washed their feet and put on his outer garments and resumed his place, he said to them, "Do you understand what I have done to you? You call me Teacher and Lord, and you are right, for so I am. If I then, your Lord and Teacher, have washed your feet, you also ought to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example, that you also should do just as I have done to you. Truly, truly, I say to you, a servant is not greater than his master, nor is a messenger greater than the one who sent him. If you know these things, blessed are you if you do them." (John 13:12-17)

By focusing on the servant metaphor, Jesus at once made clear that cleansing is necessary. He also explains that this live illustration is an *example*. This Greek word carries the connotation that this is a pattern or prototype to be imitated.[116] "In this episode Jesus makes it quite clear to his disciples that His office as He sees it consists in His being a *doulos* rather than in striving for power of glory."[117] If it is perfectly fine for the Lord and Teacher to wash feet, then it is perfectly fine for the slave and the student to do likewise. Carson sounds a leadership note from this passage that bears notice today: "Little becomes Jesus' followers more than humility. Christian zeal divorced from transparent humility sounds hollow, even pathetic."[118] Christian leaders would do well to "wash some feet."

Jesus introduced two new comparisons to complete the teaching: slave/master and messenger/superior (John 13:16). Again, Jesus lifted up the servant metaphor to draw a sharp contrast. "The Greek term *doulos* and the Latin term *servus* were associated with the lowest class of society, even degradation or abuse."[119] This conception stands in strong contrast to world's way of expressing leadership. Carson expands the application:

---

[116] Kittle and Bromiley, 2:33.

[117] Kittle and Bromiley, 2:277.

[118] D A. Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, Pillar New Testament Commentary (Leicester, England: InterVarsity Press, 1991), 468.

[119] John C. Hutchison, "Servanthood: Jesus' Countercultural Call to Christian Leaders," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 166 (January-March 2009): 67.

"The point of the aphorism in this context is in any case painfully clear: no emissary has the right to think he is exempt from the tasks cheerfully undertaken by the one who sent him, and no slave has the right to judge any menial task beneath him after his master has already performed it."[120] As the emissaries of Jesus, these men were emerging leaders. Something more shocking than Jesus taking the role of a slave would soon take place. The very idea that the Messiah would go to the cross was also scandalous. Leaders in God's kingdom must be in a state of continual cleansing and embrace the lower position of a slave and an emissary. Köstenberger explains, "The major difference between Jesus and the Greco-Roman world on this point was not the concept of leaving an example but the nature of this example: whereas Greeks and Romans prized virtues such as courage or military prowess, Jesus exemplified humility, self-sacrifice, and love."[121] Today, being proactive and intentional are often held up as markers of great leadership, but these traits are only truly effective if founded upon humility, self-sacrifice, and love.

The Apostle Paul provided further insights regarding the use of the servant metaphor in understanding biblical leadership. D. Michael Martin substantiates Paul's use of metaphor, stating, "Of the multitude of metaphors used by Paul, a number were used with reference to a particular Christian leader or more generally to Christian leadership."[122] Paul identified himself as "your servants for Jesus' sake" (2 Cor. 4:5). Paul then depicted Christ Jesus as "taking the form of a servant" (Phil. 2:7) in his letter to the Philippians. Paul referred to one of his emissaries, Epaphras, as "our beloved fellow

---

[120] Carson, 468.

[121] Köstenberger, 408.

[122] D. Michael Martin, "Pauline Metaphors Describing Christian Leadership." (PhD diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1980), 98.

servant" (Col. 1:7). "The term which Paul usually preferred when referring to himself as God's servant was *doulos*."[123] Remarkably, all three of the following passages use the Greek word *doulos,* whether Paul was referring to himself, to the incarnation of Jesus Christ, or to one of those on his missionary team.

2 Corinthians 4:1-6

First century Corinth was a leading commercial hub in Southern Greece and, as a seaport, carried an international reputation for mixed nationalities, customs, and languages.[124] Acts 18:1-11 provides the biblical backdrop for the formation of the church in that city. Donald Guthrie supplies further background to this storied letter and it's setting:

> The Corinthian church was bound to be troubled with many problems arising from the impact of Christianity on its pagan environment. Many of the Christians were as yet undisciplined extremists and needed strong handling. None of the apostle's churches seems to have given him such grave cause for concern as this, for these Christians were setting a poor example to their pagan neighbors. They also did not take kindly to the apostle's authority, either because of the false estimate of their own importance or because of the claims of false apostles among them. These two letters which have been preserved as our 1 and 2 Corinthians are invaluable for the light they throw, not only on the practical problems of a primitive community, but also on the personality of the great apostle.[125]

The very context of 2 Corinthians highlighted Paul's posture as a servant leader. Paul responded to the challenge of the nature and superiority of his gospel message and his

---

[123] Martin, 136.

[124] Ralph P. Martin, *2 Corinthians*, vol. 40 of *Word Biblical Commentary* (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1985), xxviii.

[125] Donald Guthrie, *New Testament Introduction*, 4th ed., [the Master Reference Collection] (Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 1990), 433.

authority as a genuine apostle (2 Cor. 3-4).[126] In 2 Corinthians 4:1 Paul referred to

"having this ministry," indicating the service (*diakonia*) he described in 2:14-3:13.[127]

More importantly, Paul stated his foundation for this service as one who "possesses and

exercises this commission as someone who received mercy, and who experienced this

mercy at some particular point in the past."[128] Paul was not upholding his apostolic

authority as a foundation for leadership but his experience of mercy from the Lord Jesus

as the place from which his leadership was derived. This realization led Paul to

distinguish his ethical style of leadership as one who had "renounced disgraceful,

underhanded ways" and refused "to practice cunning" (2 Cor. 4:2). The heart of Paul's

posture concerning his leadership is found in verse five, "For what we proclaim is not

ourselves, but Jesus Christ as Lord, with ourselves as your servants for Jesus sake." Paul

highlighted that Christ-centered servant leadership is opposed to self-promotion or any

attempt to gain power over people.[129] This antithesis is because Paul proclaimed "Jesus

Christ as Lord." Victor Furnish expands on this understanding of the servant leadership

posture remarking, "In Paul's view, those whom Christ has 'set free' are free to be

'slaves to one another' through love. It is because he himself is a slave of Christ that he is

free to be their slave for Jesus sake."[130] The servant metaphor in 2 Corinthians is critical

to an understanding of Paul's posture as a leader. It supplies the grounding for Paul's

---

[126] Margaret E. Thrall, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, vol. 34 in *The International Critical Commentary On the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments*, (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1994-2000), 297.

[127] Thrall, 298.

[128] Thrall, 298.

[129] Thrall, 313.

[130] Victor Paul Furnish, *II Corinthians* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1984), 250.

service to this audience. Paul's reference point for his servant leadership was Jesus himself, not his title as an apostle. The freedom a Christian servant-leader enjoys is freedom from titles as the source of his identity, a freedom grounded in the spiritual freedom Christ supplies to serve one another.

Philippians 2:1-11

Paul began his letter to the Philippians with these words, "Paul and Timothy, servants (*douloi*) of Christ Jesus " (Phil. 1:1). Paul again equated himself to a slave of Christ and applied this designation to his close missionary associate, Timothy. This letter finds its historical roots in Acts 16 and marks the establishment of the first church in Europe.[131] Paul penned this letter as preparation for the return of Epaphroditus, a fellow saint who was a part of the Philippian Christian community. It also represented another occasion to thank the Philippians for the generosity they had shown toward Paul, which came through the hands of Epaphroditus.[132] Finally, Paul wrote to correct a problem of some form of disunity within the church.

In the midst of these purposes Paul recounted a beautiful description of the incarnation of Jesus Christ in Philippians 2:5-11. P. T. O'Brien sums up well the heart of this description:

> This magnificent passage is an early Christian hymn in honor of Christ. It is the most important section of the letter to the Philippians and provides a marvelous description of Christ's self-humbling in his incarnation and death, together with his subsequent exaltation by God to the place of highest honor.[133]

---

[131] Guthrie, 541.

[132] Guthrie, 544.

[133] Peter Thomas O'Brien. *The Epistle to the Philippians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Grand Rapids, MI: W. B. Eerdmans, 1991),186-87.

The orientation described in this section is already outward-looking: "Let each of you look not only to his own interests, but also to the interests of others" (2:4). This instruction fits well with a servant leadership mentality. Paul appealed to his readers to be like Jesus, who chose to become a human being in order to become the perfect sacrifice for all mankind. O'Brien enumerates the specific character traits that this passage brings out: "The Christ-hymn presents Jesus as the ultimate model for Christian behavior and action, the supreme example of the humble, self-sacrificing, self-giving service that Paul has just been urging the Philippians to practice in their relations one toward another."[134] Jesus did not see his equality with God as something to be used for his own advantage but as a divine means of giving (2:6).[135] Harris adds further understanding in stating:

> "The form of a servant" in Philippians 2:7 does not mean simply "the human form" as opposed to "the form of God" seen as "the divine form", as if Paul were saying that Christ emptied himself merely by assuming humanity. Rather, Christ's self-emptying was by assuming a slave's status (deprivation of rights) and role (humble, obedient service).[136]

Harris categorizes the idea of both a status and a role for the slave of Christ. This connects well for the purpose of servant leadership. Paul indicated the pathway for Jesus from incarnation as a humble slave, to sacrifice on the cross, and finally to supreme exaltation where all will acknowledge his lordship (2:8-11). Paul held up Jesus Christ as the supreme example of the fact that the path of exaltation comes by way of a status without rights, great personal sacrifice, and humble service. Paul also declared Jesus as rightful Lord to whom every person will one day give allegiance (2:9-11). Paul framed his leadership, and the leadership of Timothy, as servants (*douloi*) of the Servant

---

[134] O'Brien, 205.

[135] O'Brien, 206.

[136] Harris, 83.

(*doulos*), looking to Jesus as the quintessential model of leadership. That model continues to reiterate a leadership without rights, embodies self-sacrifice, and demonstrates humility of service that reflects the character of Jesus.

Colossians 1:7-8

In Paul's letter to the Colossians, there is a unique example of the servant metaphor in reference to leadership. Paul opened his letter by telling his audience of his unending thanksgiving for their active faith in Christ Jesus. This gospel, which they embraced, was proclaimed to them by way of one of Paul's trusted co-laborers, "Epaphras our beloved fellow servant. He is a faithful minister of Christ on your behalf and has made known to us your love in the spirit" (Col. 1:7-8). Scholars note that the name Epaphras is a shortened form for Epaphroditus, but should not be considered as the same person listed in Philippians 2.[137] Paul called Epaphras a *sundoulos* in verse seven. Later in the letter, Paul also referred to Epaphras as "a servant of Christ Jesus," using the root word *doulos* (Col. 4:12). In using *sundoulos* the meaning of "fellow slave" is evident.[138] Harris makes the connection that, "Epaphras, like Paul, was a bondslave of Christ."[139] This term carried the added benefit of Paul's validation of the message that Epaphras brought to the church at Colossae.[140] Paul could use the servant metaphor to refer to one of his emissaries as easily as he could use it to refer to himself. Paul saw himself as a slave of Christ. He also saw those he led and his co-laborers as slaves of Christ. His leading of leaders was not from above but from beside.

---

[137] Wood and Marshall, 325.

[138] Arndt and Gingrich, 785.

[139] Murray J. Harris. *Colossians and Philemon*. (Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans, 1991), 21.

[140] Peter Thomas O'Brien. *Colossians, Philemon*. (Waco, TX: Word, 1982), 15.

"The aim of Paul is not to dominate the Church. He seeks rather to edify it as one who, set in the service of Christ, discharges his office in the place appointed," observes Kittle, who makes a careful distinction between domination and edification. [141] The servant leader's purpose must be building up, not manipulation for personal gain.

Paul strongly communicated his subservient role when he made use of the word *doulos*. For Paul, a Christian leader is one who is in submission to and under the absolute authority of Jesus Christ. This derived authority is for the purpose of living out God's calling to serve a people and creating a place for their genuine edification.

<div style="text-align:center">Summary of Servant Metaphor Principles</div>

The servant metaphor in reference to leadership is about relationship. The servant metaphor is about the leader's vertical relationship with God as his or her Savior, Lord, and Master. The developmental aspect is to aid the leader in his intimacy with God as his primary source of leadership influence. This metaphor is foundational for the expression of the other two metaphors. The servant metaphor implies a sense of total dependence through a strong sense of belonging. It implies absolute obedience through the posture of complete subjection. It maintains representative or derived authority through the knowledge of a complete absence of personal freedom—all with the desire to please the Master. This vertical aspect is characterized by an abiding relationship—remaining in continual fellowship with the One who called the leader into service. This abiding is marked by attentiveness, deference, loyalty, and trust. It is expressed through prayer and worship. It yields a clear sense of a sustaining presence to endure the requisite suffering

---

[141] Kittel and Bromiley, 2:276.

that comes with leadership. It produces a profound humility on the part of the servant-leader with an outward focus of ready service.

The servant metaphor for leadership comes down to a status and a role—the status is that of a slave without rights and the role of humble, obedient service with Jesus as the model. The developmental task is to usher the leader into this kind of sustainable relationship with God, showing all of the beauty and benefits for himself and his servant leadership. This necessary posture will allow the leader to express a powerful presence in service to others.

The Shepherd Metaphor

The shepherd metaphor is the most prevalent in the Bible applied to leadership.

Lexical and Cultural Contexts for the Shepherd Metaphor

The shepherd metaphor was familiar to the understanding of everyday people in the Ancient Near East. The occupation of shepherd is considered one of the oldest in the world, having been documented as a legitimate profession some 10,000 years ago in Central Asia.[142] Leaders were pictured as shepherds in the Ancient Near East. Phillip Carnes amplifies the use of the metaphor tied to kingship: "Shepherds and sheep were so fundamentally a part of Ancient Near Eastern cultures that they often referred to their kings as shepherds of the people."[143]

Abel was the first shepherd mentioned in the Bible (Gen. 4:2). Most of the early patriarchs in the Bible, including Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, were shepherds. Carnes

---

[142] Sheep 101, "Sheep in History," Sheep 101.info, http://www.sheep101.info/history.html., (accessed September 28, 2016).

[143] Phillip Gene Carnes, "Like Sheep Without a Shepherd: The Shepherd Metaphor and Its Primary for Biblical Leadership" (master's thesis, Reformed Theological Seminary, 2007), 2.

notes the connection between the metaphor and actual biblical history in the life of

Moses: "Interestingly, although Moses was highly placed in Egyptian society for most of

his early life, it wasn't until he had spent time as a shepherd that God called him to

shepherd God's people."[144] King David, the greatest king in Israel's history, was also

taken from the sheep fields to fulfill his calling (1 Sam. 16:10-12). Carnes states that God

himself is pictured as a shepherd within the Bible (e.g., Gen. 49:24; Ps. 23; Isa. 40:11;

Ezek. 34:11-24). He also points out that Jesus declared himself the shepherd of God's

people in two of the Gospels (Matt. 9:6; John 10:1-18).[145]

Qualifications for actual shepherds in the Ancient Near East varied. Carnes

reports from his research on cultural customs:

> Although there are many references in the Bible to men, young or otherwise, engaged in herding, not all shepherds were men. Among the Bedouin, a young girl of eight to ten years old might begin herding as a trainee, and continue to herd until fifteen or sixteen by which time she would usually be married and begin housekeeping and childbearing.[146]

Not every shepherd was the owner of the sheep. "Large herds often required

multiple leaders who would be hired by the owner under a contract which provided a

salary, some clothing, food, and sometimes a grant of livestock from the herd's increase

each year."[147] The primary products obtained from the sheep were milk, meat, and

wool.[148] Goats and sheep were also considered some of the most common sacrifices in

---

[144] Carnes, 1.

[145] Carnes, 2.

[146] Carnes, 21.

[147] Carnes, 21.

[148] Timothy S. Laniak, *Shepherds after My Own Heart: Pastoral Traditions and Leadership in the Bible,* vol. 20 in *New Studies in Biblical Theology* (Leicester, England: Apollos, 2006), 50.

the ancient world and were raised for this purpose.[149] A competent shepherd could handle a herd of some 500 sheep in the open pasture.[150]

Timothy Laniak makes an important observation about the well-being of sheep: "The condition and growth of a flock depends greatly on the care, attentiveness, and skill of the shepherd."[151] This reality has great implications for the function and development of servant leaders. Care, attentiveness, and skill are necessary elements for any leader who seeks to empower others by focusing on their best interest. The functions of a shepherd are delineated through the connotations of the verb *poimaino*, "to shepherd." This verb covers the breadth of shepherding tasks including feeding, leading, and tending.[152] To lead is to take sheep where they will ultimately have water, food, and rest. This caretaking was no small feat in the arid terrains of Palestine. In this setting, sheep must have daily water or be at risk for dehydration and death. "Successful shepherds needed to understand the needs and characteristics of their animals as well as have an intimate knowledge of the area in which they lived. Otherwise the flock would not survive."[153]

To lead also meant to change pastures, sometimes several times a day to avoid overgrazing or to ensure a balanced diet for the sheep.[154] To tend is to provide general oversight, including rest and protection from prey. This idea of tending also included the

---

[149] Laniak, 52.

[150] Laniak, 51.

[151] Laniak, 53.

[152] Laniak, 53.

[153] Thomas A. Golding, "The Imagery of Shepherd-Part 2," *Bibliotecha Sacra* 163 (April-June 2006): 164-65.

[154] Laniak, 54.

function of gathering those sheep that were lost and in need of rescue.[155] Laniak expands

the lexical understanding of "rest" tied to shepherding, stating that, "Rest is not only a

function of being well provided for. It is a state of security that comes from the

shepherd's protective presence."[156] "It is important to note that the shepherd-sheep image

is a highly relational one. The words of the psalmist in Psalm 23 beautifully reflect both

the relational and the emotional aspects implicit in the image."[157] In summary, the

primary functions of an Ancient Near Eastern shepherd—leading, providing, and

protecting—also make for essential elements of a 21st century servant leader.

Carnes highlights the fact that shepherding could be a dangerous occupation.

Predators and thieves were reasons for great vigilance on the part of the shepherd.[158] The

shepherd's response sometimes depended upon whether they were owners or hirelings.

This distinction becomes important when looking at John 10. Hired shepherds were

notorious for their dishonesty in selling milk, meat, or wool for their own gain.

The shepherd typically had two implements available as helping tools, a rod and a

staff. The Hebrew word *makkale* can mean both "rod" and "staff."[159] This instrument

functioned as a tool for counting sheep. It could also function as a weapon for protection.

Sometimes this Hebrew word can be translated *scepter* and be seen as an instrument of

discipline in the hands of a king in the biblical narrative.[160] This word is most often

---

[155] Thomas A. Golding, "The Imagery of Shepherd-Part 1," *Bibliotecha Sacra* 163 (January-March 2006): 22.

[156] Laniak, 55.

[157] Golding, 26.

[158] Carnes, 21.

[159] Harris, Archer, and Waltke, 1:524.

[160] Golding, 168.

translated as *rod* in English translations. A separate Hebrew word, *matteh*, is more commonly translated as *staff* as it was typically a longer, slender stick that the shepherd used for walking in difficult terrain.[161] It was not uncommon for a shepherd to carry a pouch and sling. The pouch was a multipurpose bag that could carry food and stones for the sling. The sling was a hand instrument for warding off predators.[162] We see these tools in play when the shepherd David faces Goliath in battle (1 Sam. 17). The use of the metaphor implies the necessity and importance of tools that also can aid the servant-leader in his task of serving and protecting those entrusted to him. Practical tools are not to be shunned, but should be used wisely to help others succeed.

Psalm 78:70-72 reads, "He chose David his servant and took him from the sheepfolds; from following the nursing ewes he brought him to shepherd Jacob his people, Israel his inheritance. With upright heart he shepherded them and guided them with his skillful hands." This passage is significant in that it combines the servant and shepherd metaphors. The psalmist declared that Yahweh saw David as both a slave and a shepherd. Yahweh chose David to lead his people, the nation of Israel. "Shepherd" becomes a term that the psalmist used to describe David's leadership of Israel. Psalm 78 could be understood as a historical psalm, but it also reminds us of the cost of disobedience and the consequences of that faithlessness for Israel.[163] This reality necessitates good leadership.

---

[161] Golding, 169.

[162] Golding, 169-70.

[163] Nancy L. DeClaissé-Walford, Rolf A. Jacobson, and Beth LaNeel Tanner, *The Book of Psalms*, The New International Commentary on the Old Testament (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2014), 617.

The writer of the Proverbs made reference to the pastoral setting concerning wisdom toward leadership.

> Know well the condition of your flocks, and give attention to your herds, for riches do not last forever; and does a crown endure to all generations? When the grass is gone and the new growth appears and the vegetation of the mountains is gathered, the lambs will provide your clothing, and the goats the price of a field. There will be enough goats' milk for your food, for the food of your household and maintenance for your girls (27:23-27).

Taking care of those entrusted to you will be a blessing to you and your household, just as a shepherd nurtures his or her flock. This attentiveness indicates the desire a servant-leader should have to understand well the makeup, condition, and potential of each person they lead. There will be blessing for the leader as well as those led. Derek Kidner concludes, "This country scene is not designed to make farmers of everybody, but to show the proper interplay of man's labor and God's nurture, which a sophisticated society neglects at its peril."[164]

<center>*Old Testament Usage*</center>

The researcher will examine two Old Testament passages as examples of the shepherd metaphor in reference to servant leadership. One will focus on the leadership of God over his chosen leader, and the other will expose the nature of failed servant leadership.

Psalm 23

In describing Psalm 23 Laniak observes, "The direct personal reign of God over his people and his king is affirmed most eloquently in Psalm 23. Here the psalmist

---

[164] Derek Kidner, *Proverbs: An Introduction and Commentary*, vol. 17 in *Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries* (Nottingham, England: InterVarsity Press, 2008), 161.

expresses trust in the provision, protection, and guidance of the divine Shepherd."[165] This

psalm of trust is attributed to King David, the paradigm of a shepherd ruler for Israel.

David uses rich pastoral imagery to describe his relationship to Yahweh the Shepherd.

The opening verse acts as a summation of David's perspective when he considers God as

his ultimate shepherd, "The Lord is my shepherd; I shall not want" (Ps. 23:1). As

previously mentioned, throughout the Ancient Near East the shepherd was a royal

metaphor. To portray Yahweh as a shepherd was to portray him as a royal figure.[166]

The metaphor of shepherd is seen as communal throughout much of the Old

Testament and certainly within the Psalms. In Psalm 23 it is communal at a deeply

personal level.[167] God, the creator of the universe, and the one who has declared his

shepherding role over all of Israel, also cares for the individual. The rest of verses one to

four act as commentary for this extraordinary opening statement.[168] Deep care is

expressed through these verses. David made clear that it was Yahweh, his shepherd, who

took the initiative to cause him to rest, to eat, to drink, to be restored, and to remain on

the path of righteousness. Verse four also showed Yahweh as a protective shepherd who

dissolved fear. The two primary tools of a shepherd were referenced, the rod and the

staff, as a source of protective comfort.

Verse five presented Yahweh in another unique role. "What is undeniable is that

the Lord is a hospitable host, who provides plenteous nourishment and honor for the

---

[165] Laniak, 110.

[166] deClaisse-Walford, Jacobson, and Tanner, 240.

[167] deClaisse-Walford, Jacobson, and Tanner, 240.

[168] deClaisse-Walford, Jacobson, and Tanner, 241.

psalmist in the face of hostile foes."[169] Philip Nel makes the case that this psalm is

primarily about provision and presence: "Verses one and six form an inclusion; whereas

verse one is a statement of confidence, expressing the psalmist's view of Yahweh as his

'shepherd' who will provide, verse six reemphasizes that confidence in the presence of

Yahweh, where goodness and love will follow him continually."[170]

This psalm is profound in its use of the shepherd metaphor. At once, it depicts the

human leader as a truly dependent being in need of provision, protection, guidance, and

presence. The Christian servant-leader sees Yahweh as her primary source to lead others.

Psalm 23 reflects well the primary functions of the Ancient Near Eastern shepherd as

provision, protection, and guidance. This realization is where the metaphor is rich with

meaning for the servant-leader today. How can the servant-leader provide, protect, and

guide those he or she leads toward God's calling and purposes for their lives? This psalm

also adds the powerful element of presence. Yahweh's intimate presence is a necessity

for David as he leads. So it is for the Christian servant-leader. But it also depicts the

power of presence for any servant-leader among his or her followers. Presence implies

relationship in its manifold expressions.

Ezekiel 34:1-16

The prophet Ezekiel addressed the Israelites who were in exile in Babylon, which

began in 597 BC.[171] It is evident from the biblical prophecy that Ezekiel lived among the

---

[169] deClaisse-Walford, Jacobson, and Tanner, 244.

[170] Philip J. Nel, "Yahweh is a Shepherd: Conceptual Metaphor in Psalm 23," *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 27 (December 2005): 86-87.

[171] C Hassell Bullock, *An Introduction to the Old Testament Prophetic Books* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1986), 228.

exiles during this time.[172] The first 24 chapters of Ezekiel are "filled with unspeakable

judgments against Yahweh's people . . . they predict, justify, and announce the end of the

kingdom of Judah."[173] Chapters 25-32 constitute the second major section of the book

and emphasize the divine wrath that will fall upon the unrepentant at the great Day of the

Lord.[174] The final section of the book turns to Israel's restoration and comfort.[175]

"Yahweh, the covenant keeping God of Abraham, would once again restore the fortunes

of Israel and Judah by joining them into a single nation under one messianic king—the

Davidic prince who will rule forever."[176]

Ezekiel 34 began a fresh prophetic oracle, marked by the opening words in verse

one: "The word of the Lord came to me: 'Son of man, prophesy against the shepherds of

Israel." Yahweh, through the prophet, had some harsh things to say to the spiritual

leaders of Israel at that time. Golding states, "The primary emotions associated with the

shepherd and the sheep images are, negatively, fear, and positively, a sense of peace and

well-being."[177] Andrew Mein sums up the heart of the prophetic indictment:

> The prophet casts "Israel's shepherds" as greedy hirelings who have taken
> advantage of the flock they were suppose to nurture and protect (34:2-8). The
> oracle contrasts the failed human shepherds with Yahweh the divine shepherd,
> who cares for his sheep, rescuing them from the rulers who have brought about
> their exile and returning them to a land of peace, blessing, and security (34:10-
> 16).[178]

---

[172] Bullock, 230.

[173] Bullock, 239.

[174] Bullock, 243.

[175] Bullock, 246.

[176] Hill and Walton, 343.

[177] Golding, Part 1, 22.

[178] Andrew Mein, "Profitable and Unprofitable Shepherds: Economic and Theological
Perspectives on Ezekiel 34," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* Vol. 31.4 (2007): 494.

Mein goes on to observe, in agreement with most scholars, that the "shepherds" that

Ezekiel referenced were Judah's Davidic monarchs of the time.[179] Certainly a strong

aspect of what held the exiles together as a unique people was the leadership that existed

among them, those political and spiritual leaders who helped to maintain the covenant

requirements before God. The exiles would have consisted of a displaced people who

were physically, emotionally, and spiritually overwhelmed. They were also a people who

had become increasingly disobedient to God, and, even in exile, had apparently taken on

an even greater expression of idolatry. They were a people in great need of correction and

comfort from their leaders. The overall judgment of Ezekiel 34 was that these leaders had

forsaken the very orientation of a "shepherd." There actions were completely contrary to

the nature of a true servant-leader. "The well-being of the sheep is of prime importance

and the royal shepherds' failing is to have acted selfishly when they should have looked

after the interests of the sheep."[180] The very opportunity they were afforded as shepherd

leaders was service. This passage has great resonance with John 10 and the declaration of

Jesus as the Good Shepherd who "lays down his life for the sheep (John 10:11).

"Thus says the Lord God: Ah, shepherds of Israel who have been feeding

yourselves! Should not shepherds feed the sheep" (Ezek. 34:2). This verse was an

indictment on the leaders of the people who were not fulfilling one of the primary

functions of a shepherd, that of provision. "As I live, declares the Lord God, surely

because my sheep have become a prey … and my shepherds have not searched for my

sheep … I am against the shepherds" (Ezek. 34:8-10). These shepherd-leaders also failed

---

[179] Mein, 494.

[180] Mein, 494-495.

to protect the sheep. Implied in both of these indictments is that the shepherds were also not providing guidance for the sheep. Otherwise, they would be led to "good pasture" and protected from their "predators." In verse ten these shepherd-leaders found themselves in direct opposition to God. The researcher also makes note of the fact that Yahweh claimed these sheep as his own. Shepherd-leaders always realize that they tend another's flock, not their own. Finally, in verses 11 to 16, it is clear that Yahweh will take action where the shepherds of Israel have failed. Phrases like, "I myself will search for my sheep," "so will I seek out my sheep," and "I will bring them out … and gather them" demonstrated Yahweh's care and compassion for those he claimed as his own. "So just as Yahweh was the true king of his people, he also was the true shepherd. The flock that was scattered, in part because of the failure of its human shepherds, would have to be supernaturally re-gathered."[181] God established himself as the consummate shepherd.

> Laniak notes:
>
> Ezekiel's most theologically developed leadership exposé is his māšāl on sheep and shepherds in chapter 34. In this extended metaphor we find a summary of the themes and perspectives that dominate the prophetic understanding of leadership. The passage begins with a vivid—and tragically ironic—picture of sheep that are abused by those charged to care for them.[182]

There are two critical aspects worth noting: one, the shepherd leader serves the sheep who actually belong to another and two, failure to provide, protect, or guide, is tantamount to abuse from God's perspective. God takes seriously the leadership of those whom he has called to lead. Laniak blends all three leadership metaphors in his summary of this passage, "As undershepherds Israel's leaders were servants of their heavenly

---

[181] Mark J. Boda and J. G. McConville, *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Prophets*, vol. 4 in *Ivp Bible Dictionary Series* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2012), 291.

[182] Laniak, 151.

Master, stewards of God's flock, not their own." That is to be the perspective of every Christ-centered servant-leader. The development of such leaders must take direct aim at this understanding and posture. The shepherd-leader as a servant-leader shows that God expected and encouraged human agency, but with derived authority and accountable to God himself.

<div align="center">New Testament Usage</div>

The researcher will analyze two New Testament passages on the shepherd metaphor and examine how they inform the development of servant leadership. One passage will examine the Good Shepherd as expressed through Jesus Christ in John 10. The other passage will focus on leader-to-leader communication using the shepherd metaphor and the posture of a servant-leader as expressed through the Apostle Peter in his first epistle. Laniak highlights, "One of the primary metaphors by which biblical authors conceptualized leadership is shepherding. This is quite consistent throughout the Old and New Testaments."[183]

John 10:1-18

Jesus declared, "I am the good shepherd. The good shepherd lays down his life for the sheep" (John 10:11). Joel Green and Scot McKnight point out the primacy of John 10 in stating, "The idea of Messiah as shepherd is most fully developed in John 10:1-18."[184] "Among the Gospels, John provides the richest example of pastoral imagery. The famous tenth chapter is a comprehensive māšāl on the model shepherd who lays down his life for

---

[183] Laniak, 21.

[184] Joel B. Green and Scot McKnight, *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels,* vol. 6 in *The IVP Bible Dictionary Series* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1992), 752.

the flock."[185] Laniak also explains, "The most obvious source of inspiration for John 10 is

Ezekiel 34. … John sees in Jesus both the fulfillment of God's promise to shepherd his

people personally and the fulfillment of his promise to appoint a Davidic shepherd

ruler."[186] The Greek word *kalos* can mean an attractive quality, something that is noble

and ideal. In this context, the word implies that Jesus, as the Good Shepherd, is a good

model to be emulated.[187] In combining "good" and "shepherd," we also understand

something of the nature that Jesus claimed in this verse. Quentin Kinnison makes this

plain: "Jesus' self-proclamation to be shepherd is indicative of his claim to be Yahweh

incarnate."[188]

Jesus also claimed to be "the door." In verse seven he states, "Truly, truly, I say to

you, I am the door to the sheep." "As the door he is the exclusive means of entrance into

the protected fold. As the shepherd he is the one who leads the flock to pastures

(abundant life)."[189]

There are two "I am the good shepherd" statements and these highlight the critical

points of what Jesus modeled regarding shepherd leadership. In verse eleven, Jesus

championed sacrifice through the metaphor. "The good shepherd is sacrificial. He is

willing to ignore his own needs in order to meet the needs of the sheep."[190] Mary Beth

---

[185] Laniak, 207.

[186] Laniak, 210-211.

[187] Laniak, 211.

[188] Quentin P. Kinnison, "Shepherd or One of the Sheep: Revisiting the Biblical Metaphor of the Pastorate," *Journal of Religious Leadership* 9, no. 1 (Spring 2010): 82.

[189] Laniak, 214.

[190] Mary Beth Gladwell, "The Shepherd Motif in the Old and New Testaments," Xenos Christian Fellowship, http://www.xenos.org/essays/shepherd-motif-old-and-new-testament (accessed September 29, 2016) 3.

Gladwell illustrates how Jesus uses the metaphorical illustration of the sheep pen to bring home the nature of sacrifice:

> When sheep were penned in at night outside the city, the shepherd himself would often construct a makeshift fold. He would take brush and bushes and construct them in a "u" shape or some other formation depending on what was already at hand. He would then place thorny branches on top of the brush to both inhibit the sheep from jumping out and from wild animals and thieves jumping into the enclosure to hurt or kill the sheep. The only way in and out of the fold was through a space he would leave open. The shepherd himself would actually lie across the opening, becoming the door in and out of the sheepfold. The shepherd's own comfort and sleep were secondary to the comfort and safety of the sheep.[191]

Jesus championed relationship as a critical element of shepherding leadership. "I am the good shepherd. I know my own and my own know me" (John 10:14). Köstenberger further emphasizes the relational aspect of the shepherd metaphor:

> The present verse continues the contrast between the shepherd and the hireling . . . Jesus' sacrificial death will institute a reciprocal relationship between believers and himself. Jesus' relationship with his followers is portrayed as an intimate, trusting relationship in which Jesus, the good shepherd, cares deeply for those in his charge.[192]

"In the Good Shepherd story great emphasis is laid on the fact that there is knowing relationship between the sheep and the Shepherd."[193] Carson elaborates in describing this relational knowledge as experiential in nature: "This mutual recognition, or better, mutual knowledge, is clearly experiential, and is analogous to the mutual knowledge of the Father and the Son (John 10:15)."[194] Finally, verse 16 highlights the fact that Jesus saw there are others who need to be a part of his "flock." "If Jesus has other sheep that are not

---

[191] Gladwell, 3.

[192] Köstenberger, 306.

[193] Donald L. Fowler, "The Background to the Good Shepherd Discourse in John 10," *Digital Commons@Liberty University* (1991): 11.

[194] Carson, 387.

of this sheep pen, the reference must be to Gentiles."[195] Once again, as shown in Ezekiel 34, there is a gathering aspect to being a good shepherd-leader.

In what ways does Jesus serve as a model through this metaphor to be emulated towards servant leadership? The servant-leader who sacrifices for the good of those he leads takes the time to get to know those whom he leads at an intimate level. They will also make every effort to continue to gather others and emulate well the very nature of Jesus as the Good Shepherd.

1 Peter 5:1-5

The Apostle Peter wrote his first epistle from the city of Rome around 62-64 AD.[196] This letter was a circular letter intended for Christians throughout Asia Minor who were suffering in some way, possibly due to persecution.[197] Most of the letter is addressed to the body of churches at large. Alan Stibbs makes a strong case that the leaders of these house churches are the focused audience of chapter five, "Peter here addresses those responsible in the local churches for the pastoral care of God's flock."[198]

The *presbyteroi* in verse one undoubtedly referred to the community of leaders within the church, rather than simply those who were chronologically older in the church.[199] It could also indicate those leaders within the church who had obtained honor

---

[195] Carson, 388.

[196] Wayne A. Grudem, *The First Epistle of Peter: An Introduction and* Commentary, vol. 17 in *Tyndale New Testament Commentaries* (Leicester, England: InterVarsity Press, 1988), 34-35.

[197] Grudem, 38-39.

[198] Alan M. Stibbs and A. F. Walls, *The First Epistle General of Peter: a Commentary*, vol. 17 in *The Tyndale New Testament Commentaries* (Leicester: Inter-Varsity, 1983), 164.

[199] Chloe Lynch, "In 1 Peter 5:1-5, who are the πρεσβύτεροι and what is said about their role?" *The Expository Times* 123, no. 11 (2012): 530.

and were older in the faith than some.[200] There is leader-to-leader communication here as

Peter exhorted the house church elders. Peter does so from a posture of humility. The

letter opens with, "Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ" (1 Pet. 1:1). Wayne Grudem

appreciates the positional authority apostles could wield: "Those who held this office had

authority at least equal to the Old Testament prophets, for the apostles could speak and

write God's very words."[201] This very title placed Peter in a position over the house

church leaders he addressed in chapter five. But as Peter addressed these leaders he used

a unique term, *sympresbyteros*, which means "fellow elder." Grudem takes note that

Peter chose a different posture in addressing these leaders, "This lets the elders know that

he thinks of himself as one of those with whom judgment will begin (see 1 Peter 4:17)—

even he, an apostle, is not exempt, nor should any among his readers think themselves too

important or too sanctified to be exempt."[202] To illustrate this posture of humility, Peter

referenced a particular episode in his life that could be counted as his greatest failure

when he stated that he was "a witness of the sufferings of Christ." This acknowledgement

"bluntly recalls … the most painful episode in Peter's life … whose courage failed and

who three times denied that he even knew Christ (Matt. 26:69-75)."[203] Grudem points to

an authentic leadership posture that resided in Peter, "an elder who has sinned, repented,

and been restored, and will share with Christ in glory."[204] This is a posture well worth

---

[200] R. Alastair Campbell, "Review of 'The Elder and the Overseer: One Office in the Early Church' by Benjamin L. Merkle,' *Evangelical Quarterly* 77, no. 3(2005): 281-282.

[201] Grudem, 47.

[202] Grudem, 186.

[203] Grudem, 186.

[204] Grudem, 187.

considering for any servant leader. It is the ability to come alongside instead of leading from above, knowing that he or she has failed too.

In verse two Peter charged the church leaders with the task of shepherding God's flock. This commission surely recalls Peter's restoration in John 21 when Jesus charged him three times: "Feed my lambs," "Tend my sheep," and "Feed my sheep."[205] The verb "to shepherd" refers to the primary functions of a shepherd that the researcher noted previously. They are to guide, provide, and protect those they are to tend. "These shepherds are reminded that the flock is God's, not theirs, and that they are only under-shepherds."[206] The use of "flock" also indicates "this is a defined group of persons under a leader."[207] These leaders were to fulfill their functions as spiritual shepherds by giving careful oversight, with the understanding that they do so with humility and the knowledge that they too are under the authority and accountability of God.

Peter went on to provide these church leaders with three sets of contrasting motives for carrying out their stated task. The first set of contrasting motives was to carry out their task "willingly" and not "under compulsion." Lynch notes that this necessity may have arisen from the fact that these churches were under persecution, and thus these elders might have been reluctant to lead under these circumstances. However, they must lead from a true desire and not out of obligation, for this is the will of God.[208]

---

[205] Simon Kistemaker, *Exposition of the Epistles of Peter and of the Epistle of Jude*, vol. 26 in *New Testament Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1987), 190.

[206] Stibbs and Walls, 167.

[207] Lynch, 534.

[208] Lynch, 536.

The second set of motives focuses on the fact that leadership should not result from a desire for monetary gain. Money is not to be the motivator for shepherding leadership. This instruction is not to say that elders were not paid or not worthy of being compensated. Historical evidence indicates that they were compensated for their labor. But Peter is clear that money was not to be their foundational motive. Instead, these leaders were to serve enthusiastically, "eager to meet the needs of others."[209] They were to give and serve without the expectation of return. This attitude accords well with the very essence of servant leadership.

The third, and final, set of motives reveals the need for serving as examples, and not out of a love for power.[210] According to Peter, money and power were two primary stumbling blocks to the servant-leader as shepherd. The Greek verb for "domineering over" also shows up in Mark 10:42-45 where Jesus strongly contrasted domineering leadership with servant leadership for the twelve disciples as emerging leaders. Simply, Peter taught that servant-leaders, as shepherds, were not to lead others in a domineering way. Instead, "the elders were to fulfill their roles by being models whom the flock could imitate."[211] This directive is a powerful form of servant leadership as it places the onus on the servant-leaders to live out what they are exhorting others to do. The servant-leaders' authority springs from their teaching and lifestyle, not their title.[212]

Peter referenced the foundational motive for shepherding well in verse four, "And when the chief Shepherd appears, you will receive the unfading crown of glory." This

---

[209] Lynch, 536.

[210] Lynch, 537.

[211] Lynch, 537.

[212] Lynch, 537.

reference to the return of Christ reminded the elders that they were people under authority and that there was a sure reward for those who carry out the task faithfully to the end. Simon Kistemaker presses the nature of a leader's calling: "The elders serve God's people not because of natural leadership capabilities or because Peter ordained them as presbyters. They serve because Jesus the Chief Shepherd called them to this task."[213]

As Peter provided one final exhortation to humility in verse five, Lynch states the task of shepherding leadership like this, "Elders, then, must depend not on position in a social hierarchy but operate as equals within God's household."[214] There is a practice of mutual submission that goes hand in hand with shepherding leadership.

Summary of Shepherd Metaphor Principles

The shepherd metaphor is horizontal in nature. The primary function of the shepherd is to guide, provide, and protect those entrusted to him. This instruction means that servant-leaders are fundamentally oriented toward those they lead—the "flock." The developmental task is to aid the shepherd-leaders to understand in practical ways how to care for those they lead. This directive, like the servant metaphor, requires great attentiveness on the part of the servant-leader. Under the rubric of the servant metaphor, that attentiveness was directed vertically to understand best the will of God in their leadership. This level of attentiveness is directed horizontally to understand the needs, hopes, and dreams of those they have been called to lead. This focus implies depth of relationship with those they lead. The developmental task includes learning key competencies in order to guide, provide, and protect those entrusted to them. The

---

[213] Kistemaker, 192.

[214] Lynch, 538.

acquisition of quality tools is necessary to help the servant-leader live out these

shepherding competencies. Development of an attitude of personal sacrifice is

foundational to the outward orientation of the shepherd-leader. Finally, there is the need

for the development over time of proper motives through the use of this metaphor. The

servant-leader as shepherd must lead willingly, not looking primarily for monetary gain

or power. The Christ-centered servant-leader would do well to remember that God

himself cares for his sheep and he takes this aspect of the leader's role very seriously.

The Steward Metaphor

The final biblical metaphor under consideration for a developmental construct is

that of *steward*. As was true with the shepherd metaphor, the image of a steward is

founded upon the servant metaphor.

Lexical and Cultural Contexts for the Steward Metaphor

R. Scott Rodin concretely states the nature of a steward as a servant: "Christian

leadership, which I define as the work of the steward leader, requires nothing less than a

complete, wholesale submission of your life in service to God and God only."[215] Bennett

makes the case that the biblical steward was almost always a slave (*doulos*). "That is, he

occupies a position of authority, but he also remains under authority. The 'manager'

(*oikonomos*) fulfills a particular function within the larger category of 'servant'

(*doulos*)."[216] When we compile all of the biblical data, we see that a steward is one who

makes good use of another's resources (people and possessions) in light of the coming

---

[215] R Scott Rodin, *The Steward Leader: Transforming People, Organizations and Communities* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2010), 14.

[216] Bennett, 44.

judgment.[217] Judgment implies urgency. The overall mission of Jesus implies wisdom and faithfulness—proper stewardship.

Old Testament Usage

There are nine instances where the English translation of *steward* is used in the Old Testament. Four of those uses are found in the Joseph narrative in the book of Genesis (Gen. 35-50). Joseph himself was placed in this role when he was under the mastery of Potiphar in Egypt (Gen. 39). The specific use of the word is found in the story after Joseph became a leader of influence in Egypt (Gen. 41-50). The actual "steward" in this narrative was the slave who served Joseph within his house. It can also be confidently said that Joseph played the role of steward at the behest of Pharaoh when Pharaoh stated, "You shall be over my house" (Gen. 41:40).

Two references are related to the stewards possessed by King David (1 Chron. 27:31; 28:1). The other three references are found in the prophetic literature of the Old Testament (Isa. 22:15; Dan. 1:11, 16). In each case, the same basic meaning is maintained, "being over another's house" or "being over another's possessions." The *steward* in the Old Testament could be over a house, over an estate, or even over a royal realm.[218] The obligation seems clear that the steward was to manage the owner/master's resources to the expectations of the owner/master. Though slaves, stewards did have leadership influence over others and the use of the owner's resources.

---

[217] Bennett, 43-44.

[218] Scott C. Layton, "The Steward in Ancient Israel: A Study of Hebrew (ĂŠER) AL-HABBAYIT in its Near Eastern Setting," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 109, no. 4 (1990): 641.

New Testament Usage

There are two words in the Greek that can be translated *steward*. The first is *epitropos*, which carries the connotation of a manager, foreman, or steward and is used ony three times in the New Testament.[219] The second, and more common Greek word, is *oikonomos*, which is most commonly translated as "house manager," "house steward," or simply "steward."[220] The verb or noun form is found nine times in the New Testament.[221] There are also seven occurrences of the related noun *oikonomia*, which is most often translated "stewardship" in the ESV. Of all of the usage in the New Testament, the greatest number of occurrences is found in Paul's writings.

We see in the New Testament that most often the steward was also a slave. This particular slave would be placed in charge over a whole household and would superintend the other slaves.[222] The steward was typically one who was owned and without rights. This paradox made the steward both a slave and a ruler. He had authority over other slaves and servants, yet he was accountable to the master for the wise use of his resources. One other connotation that bears consideration is the fact that often the *oikonomos* is pictured in the New Testament as carrying out his leadership task while the master is away.[223] This fact has implications for the Christ-centered servant-leaders as

---

[219] Arndt and Gingrich, 303.

[220] Arndt and Gingrich, 560.

[221] Robert L. Thomas, *New American Standard Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible: Including Hebrew-Aramaic and Greek Dictionaries* (Nashville, Tennessee: Holman, 1981), 1174.

[222] Kittel and Bromiley, 5:150.

[223] Harris, 96.

they lead in anticipation of Christ's return. This understanding places a premium on faithfulness.

The Gospels

Jesus made use of the steward metaphor primarily in his teaching through parables to illustrate important lessons regarding stewardship principles.

The parable of the talents is one of the richest parables that Jesus used regarding leadership principles from the steward metaphor (Matt. 25:14-30). The characters of the parable included the owner/master and three stewards of various talent levels. Most scholars agree that this parable is about the kingdom of heaven and the requirement of readiness in anticipation of that kingdom.[224] Essentially, the parable highlights two good stewards who take what is entrusted to them and make a profit. The contrast is with the third steward who takes what is entrusted to him and gains nothing while the master is away. The master praises and rewards the first two stewards but condemns the third steward, calling him a "wicked and slothful servant" (Matt. 25:26). The first two stewards are called "good and faithful" servants. Each time the word *servant* is used it is the Greek word *doulos*. This translation (of the Greek) strengthens the idea that a steward was a slave first, owning nothing, but entrusted with the master's resources.

The praise that the master accorded the first two stewards in the parable points to the primary character trait of good stewards—faithful in growing the resources entrusted to them. Morris notes that the expression of "good and faithful" "approves both his character and his diligence."[225] The ultimate reward in the story is that the good stewards

---

[224] Morris, 626.

[225] Morris, 629.

will be given even greater scope of responsibility. This compensation also serves to demonstrate the generosity of the master. Morris states, "It clearly means that the servant has received the warm approval of the master and that his future is one in which joy will be prominent."[226]

In response to a question from Peter, Jesus made use of another parable about the nature of stewards (Luke 12:41-43). At the heart of the application is the idea that a steward is a leader. He is placed in charge of other servants and is blessed if the master of the house finds him faithfully doing what he is supposed to do. Faithfulness is a characteristic quality of an *oikonomos*.[227] Luke's use of *oikonomos* indicates that he sees Jesus addressing the twelve as future leaders of his church.

Through another parable, Jesus provided an additional layer of understanding about his use of the steward metaphor (Luke 16:1-13). In verse one, we have three critical elements surrounding the meaning behind the steward metaphor. There are two characters: the "rich man" who is obviously the owner/master of the estate, and the "manager" (*oikonomos*). It is obvious that this manager was wasting the master's resources, which would be a violation of the vital characteristic of real stewardship. This parable is difficult to interpret, and many commentators have tried to make sense of that which seems nonsensical. The overall meaning of this parable is beyond the scope of this paper, but the surrounding details and use of the steward metaphor is profitable for the discussion at hand. Verses ten through twelve help to inform the metaphor described in verses one and two. Paul Bretscher explains, "In verses ten to twelve the theme is

---

[226] Morris, 629.

[227] Marshall, 540-541.

faithfulness to one's trust, clearly showing that theme of stewardship in verses one and two is by no means to be regarded as purely incidental to the theme of wisdom."[228] In verses ten through thirteen, we see the secondary application that provides the researcher with some principles of leadership related to the steward metaphor. Marshall sees the first application as faithfulness in stewardship. He sees the unfaithfulness of the unjust steward in the story in contrast to the faithfulness required by the disciples. The second application is the notion that a servant cannot serve two masters—personal wealth and the human owner of the resources entrusted to the steward.[229]

Pauline Literature

While the steward metaphor in the Gospel accounts explains the nature of this role, Paul and Peter's usage of the metaphor provides particular Christian resources that are to be wisely managed. The Apostle Paul is the primary writer in the New Testament who turns the function of the metaphor toward the mission of the Church. The researcher will use the following passages to highlight those precious resources that find their source in God but have been entrusted to people as servants of the Most High.

Paul stated, "This is how one should regard us, as servants of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God. Moreover, it is required of stewards that they be found trustworthy" (1 Cor. 4:1-2). Paul freely mixed the servant and steward metaphors, opening with a declarative statement that his apostleship is to be counted as servant leadership. This statement is phenomenal since Paul could have asserted his rightful

---

[228] Paul G. Bretscher, "The Parable of the Unjust Steward: A New Approach to Luke 16:1-9," *Concordia Theological Monthly* 22, no. 10 (October 1951): 760.

[229] Marshall, 622.

authority as an apostle. But he chose not to do so.[230] Paul made it clear that although he

"belongs to them, he is not accountable to them."[231] Paul labeled himself as a "servant

(*hypēretēs*) of Christ." This was a new term that was closely akin to *diakonos* and simply

meant "a person who renders service." This word carries the connotation of "ministering

the affairs of another." This meaning is verified by Paul's use of *oikonomos* in the rest of

the sentence.[232] Being "servants of Christ" also references Paul and his companion's

humble position in expressing their leadership. Certainly "the mysteries of God" refer to

the revelation of the gospel itself that Paul came to proclaim to the Corinthians.[233] As

servants of Christ, and as accountable to God, we are to faithfully steward the gospel

message with all humility. Paul also emphasized the stewardship of the gospel that must

take place (Eph. 3:1-3). This imperative is a sacred trust that has the expectation of being

carried out. The gospel in all of its fullness is one of the critical resources that every

Christ-centered steward-leader must manage well.

Paul addressed one of his protégés and made plain the qualifications for

leadership within God's Church (Titus 1:7). "For an overseer as God's steward, must be

above reproach." The word *overseer* is a clear leadership term that designates one who

exercises oversight of others.[234] Paul equated the overseer as God's *oikonomos*, a

steward. This understanding at once shows that the spiritual leader belongs to God, in

---

[230] Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, The New International Commentary On the New Testament (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1987), 158.

[231] Fee, 158.

[232] Fee, 159.

[233] Fee, 160.

[234] George W. Knight, *The Pastoral Epistles: A Commentary On the Greek Text*, The New International Greek Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids, Mich.: W.B. Eerdmans, 1999), 291.

keeping with the slave aspect of the derivation of *oikonomos*.[235] But it also states that the steward must be "above reproach." George Knight notes that being above reproach— being blameless—not only shows the character of the steward, but to the ability to display God's transforming grace.[236] How we steward matters as much as what we steward.

Petrine Literature

Finally, within Peter's writings we find one more resource that is to be stewarded well: "As each has received a gift, use it to serve one another, as good stewards of God's varied grace" (1 Pet. 4:10). Peter spoke about spiritual gifts, which each believer in Christ receives at the moment of spiritual birth (Rom. 12; 1 Cor. 12; Eph. 4). The focus here is on individuals in the church, and thus leaders are also obligated to steward well the gift(s) entrusted to them. The very use of the term *steward* shows that the gifts have their source in God and are meant to benefit of others.[237] The spiritual gifts God has entrusted to every believer, and certainly the leader within God's Church, are to be stewarded well in an effort to serve one another.

Summary of the Steward Metaphor

The steward metaphor places a leadership emphasis on the faithful management of precious resources in carrying out the mission. The steward was almost always a slave who had exhibited great faithfulness and therefore could be trusted by the master, even in

---

[235] Gordon D. Fee, *1 and 2 Timothy, Titus*, vol. 13 in *New International Biblical Commentary* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1988), 174.

[236] Knight, 291.

[237] J. Ramsey Michaels, *1 Peter*, vol. 49 of *Word Biblical Commentary:* (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1982), 249.

the master's absence. The steward was often placed over the other slaves as well as the other resources that the master owned. In that regard, a good steward could be placed over a whole estate. The expectation of the master is that the steward would create a profit for the master and manage the master's resources according to his expectations.

In line with the biblical exhortations, the developmental task is to help Christ-centered servant-leaders steward well the spiritual gifts they have received from God and the totality of the gospel itself. It is important that developmental consideration be given to the inner life of the steward-leader. The steward-leader is to be a person of high character who can faithfully carry out the will of the master. Steward-leaders must also be anchored in their calling so that they do not lose sight of the strategic nature of what they do. Beyond these specifics, servant-leaders as stewards should be developed in the management and strategic skills necessary to make wise use of all of the resources entrusted to them in fulfilling their portion of the mission. Steward-leaders graciously receive the resources entrusted to them by the Master and manage them wisely toward the fulfillment of Kingdom purposes, that which is the will of the Master.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the biblical metaphors of servant, shepherd, and steward have been proven to be effective images for drawing out developmental principles for the 21st century servant leader. They lay a biblical foundation and provide a developmental path of necessary character traits, attitudes, and skills for godly leadership in the Church.

The servant metaphor speaks to the leader's vertical relationship with God and defines the posture of a humble slave abiding in intimate relationship with the One who redeemed him.

The shepherd metaphor articulates the leader's horizontal relationships with those that he leads. The shepherd never forgets that his posture is still one of a dependent slave. The shepherd seeks to serve through guiding, providing, and protecting those entrusted to his care.

The steward metaphor looks out to the mission. The steward metaphor tasks the leader with the wise management of the Master's people and resources to the effective accomplishment of the mission.

In each case, the orientation is upward in dependence, inward in posture and character, and outward in its expression of sacrifice and service for leading those entrusted to them. This alignment provides a solid foundation for a developmental construct for Christ-centered servant leadership.

CHAPTER THREE: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

At the core of this research is the biblical data. By definition, this construct for servant leadership development flows from the pages of Scripture. Yet, it is incumbent upon the researcher to evaluate the contributions of others as they reflect on these biblical metaphors toward practical application. From the broader literature, the researcher will look at each metaphor through the lenses of cultural application, biblically drawn application, and practical application. Metaphors carry meaning in their historical and cultural context for the audience of that day. The Scriptures take that meaning and add theological value for the covenant community in the form of timeless truths. The modern reader then must draw out practical applications for today. To allow these applications to have their intended impact the researcher will first highlight the dynamics of shifting leadership, propose a definition of leadership and leadership development, and emphasize the need for a more holistic approach. This framework matters because the modern-day setting is vastly different from that of the Bible. These reflections will take note of the complexity of the leadership landscape and what is required of the leader in character and skills.

The tension for the researcher lies in understanding that this topic is grounded in the biblical data and that chapters two and three both reflect that same data. The tension is resolved through the emphasis of each chapter. Chapter two focuses on the biblical and theological reflection to establish the leadership metaphors as legitimate. Chapter three

will focus on the leadership application of those metaphors as it arises from the reflection and evaluation of others.

The 21st Century Leadership Challenge

Deborah Rowland writes that too many leaders are out of touch with those they lead—this despite the fact that billions of dollars are spent each year on leadership development. She notes, "Our primary method of developing leaders is antithetical to the type of leadership we need."[1] Most development programs are focused on the individual, classroom oriented, and separated from the workplace. Rowland states, "study after study, including my own, tells us the qualities that leaders in today's world need are intuitive, dynamic, collaborative, and grounded in here-and-now emotional intelligence."[2] The Church is not immune to this reality. The pressure on church leaders and specialized ministry leaders is great. In a climate of religious confusion and an increasing variety of ministry models, Christian leaders must possess strong character and effective competencies to navigate the complexities. In the midst of great cultural change, there have been some significant leadership shifts. These shifts reflect the need for change in how leaders lead and are developed, and why this research is important.

Richard Daft and Patricia Lane highlight six significant paradigm shifts in leadership thinking in Table 1. These cultural shifts in leadership point to the need for new paradigms in both leadership style and in how we develop leaders. For leaders to lead in fresh ways they must be developed differently.

---

[1] Deborah Rowland, "Why Leadership Development Isn't Developing Leaders," *Harvard Business Review* October 14, 2016, accessed October 14, 2016, https://hbr.org/2016/10/why-leadership-development-isnt-developing-leaders.

[2] Rowland.

Table 1. The New Reality for Leadership[3]

Old Paradigm	New Paradigm
Stability	Change & Crisis Management
Control	Empowerment
Competition	Collaboration
Uniformity	Diversity
Self-centered	Higher Purpose
Hero	Humble

Source: Adapted from Richard L. Daft and Patricia G. Lane, *The Leadership Experience*, 3rd ed. (Mason, Ohio: Thomson/Southwestern, 2005), 8.

What type of leadership will satisfy the demands of these new realities as corroborated by Daft and Lane? What form of development will help leaders meet these needs and place them on a pathway of learning? There are many definitions of leadership. Daft and Lane define it as involving "the influence of people to bring about change toward a desirable future."[4] Peter Northouse defines leadership as "a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal."[5] Both definitions include the idea of influence, which is fundamental to the task of leadership. While Northouse emphasizes process, implying that leadership is not an event but happens over time, Daft and Lane bring focus to the idea of change. By combining these elements, a more substantial definition is that leadership is the process of influencing others toward achieving desirable change.

---

[3] Daft and Lane, 8.

[4] Daft and Lane, 5.

[5] Peter Guy Northouse, *Leadership: Theory and Practice*, 6th ed. (Thousand Oaks: SAGE, 2013), 5.

After highlighting the dynamics of shifting leadership and proposing a better definition, it is important to define and provide some description of the leadership development process. There are few well-honed definitions to consider. The Center for Creative Leadership defines leader development as "the expansion of a person's capacity to be effective in leadership roles and processes."[6] This definition places an emphasis on the development of individual leaders and their capacity, on the attempt to equip leaders with a variety of roles (formal or informal) and processes (instead of a focus on the development of certain key traits), and on the belief that leader capacity can be expanded.[7] This thinking aligns well with the biblical metaphor construct.

Gina Hernez-Broome and Richard Hughes point to the increase of interest in leadership development in recent years: "The last two decades have witnessed something of an explosion in leadership development in organizations."[8] They also acknowledge that modern leadership development thinking has broadened to include development of the whole person.[9] There is the current need to understand better the nature of leadership and what practices will best develop leaders for this dynamic reality.[10] This insight is equally true for Christ-centered servant-leaders.

In considering the Christian dynamic for leadership development, The Lausanne Committee for World Evangelization put out a clarion call and some potential pathways

---

[6] Cynthia D. McCauley and Ellen Van Velsor, *The Center for Creative Leadership Handbook of Leadership Development*, 2nd ed. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2004), 2.

[7] McCauley and Van Velsor, 2-3.

[8] Gina Hernez-Broome and Richard L. Hughes, "Leadership Development: Past, Present, and Future," *Human Resource Planning* 27, no. 1(January 2004): 25.

[9] Hernez-Broome and Hughes, 27.

[10] Hernez-Broome and Hughes, 31.

in their 2004 paper, "A Call to Develop Christ-like Leaders." In defining the problem,

Lausanne stated seven barriers to the above goal: a lack of models, a lack of time, a lack

of patience, a lack of development opportunities, a lack of intentionality, a lack of willing

and able learners, and a lack of cooperation.[11] The Committee cited great missional

opportunity, great danger, and a lack of developmental constructs and training for

keeping pace with the current reality.[12]

The current state of both the Church and culture exposes the need for a biblical

and holistic approach to servant leadership. The necessity of Christ-centered leaders has

never been greater. Leaders of a certain kind will be required to navigate the realities of

dynamic change, increasing pressure on the Church in a post-Christian era, and the

complexity of culture. Fresh leader development constructs are essential to help facilitate

leadership capacity. It is this understanding of current realities and leadership needs that

will give greater meaning to the evaluated contributions of others toward the biblical

metaphors. "A Scripture-centered theology provides perceptions of leadership within

universal truths that transform people and culture and inform the definition of

leadership."[13] The leadership metaphor construct proposed in this thesis seeks uniquely to

meet the challenges of today's leadership reality, to provide clarity and hope for leaders

determined to lead well, and to do so from a biblical foundation.

---

[11] David W. Bennett, "A Call to Develop Christ-like Leaders," Lausanne Occasional Paper No. 41, prepared for the Lausanne Committee for World Evangelization, Pattaya, Thailand, September 29-October 5, 2004.

[12] Bennett, section 2.1.

[13] Skip Bell, *Servants and Friends: A Biblical Theology of Leadership* (Berrien Springs, Michigan: Andrews University Press, 2014), 5.

The Servant Metaphor Critiqued

The servant metaphor in the Bible has been proposed by the researcher as foundational to the development construct for Christ-centered servant-leaders. This metaphor undergirds the shepherd and steward metaphors—and ultimately every aspect of biblical servant leadership.

Cultural Applications

The researcher has followed the path of Harris and Cochrell in defining the servant metaphor according to its cultural connotation. The servant represents a person and service that is wholly owned. The servant is under total subjection with the absence of freedom to choose.[14] The servant's identity is defined by his relationship to the master. He is completely subject to the master's will and completely dependent upon his provision and direction. The primary responsibility of the servant is to please the master.[15]

When considering the confluence of both Greek and Roman cultures, Cochrell makes a case for a distinct view of truly spiritual servant leadership in light of slave imagery:

> Slave leadership in Luke-Acts was rooted in both Hebrew and Greco-Roman understandings of slavery in which Christians generally, and leaders particularly, were to understand their salvation as placing them in subordination to God as Master with clear ethical implications for the manner in which leadership was to be carried out.[16]

---

[14] Harris, 25-26.

[15] Cochrell, 23-24.

[16] Cochrell, 5.

Even within the overall scope of the Ancient Near East, Cochrell affirms,

> In spite of the fact that slavery was minimally practiced in the Ancient Near East compared to Greco-Roman society, slavery as a metaphor was frequently employed to express humble submission to a human or divine authority with nuances of complete dependence, exclusive obedience, and representative authority.[17]

John Hutchison points out a critical aspect of Jewish and Greco-Roman culture that impacts how leadership would have been viewed then and today. The concepts of kinship, patronage, and honor were rooted in these cultures and came to bear in the narrative involving Jesus and two of his disciples, James and John. In Mark's account (Mark 10:35-45) James and John asked Jesus for the right and left hand of the throne. These two positions would have been the second and third most significant leadership roles in Jesus' kingdom.

In Matthew's account of the same episode, the mother of James and John, Salome, was also present to enhance the request. Salome, Mary (the mother of Jesus), James, John, and Jesus were related, and therefore family. Hutchison notes, "Kinship identity carried much influence in both Greco-Roman and Jewish society. A person's merits begin with the merits of their lineage, the reputation of their ancestral house. Greeks and Romans receive a basic identity from their larger family . . . This is even more pronounced in Jewish culture."[18] James and John were acting as natural kin would in seeking greater honor. Hutchison explains that people of power and wealth in biblical times served as patrons or benefactors to others, providing them with access to goods, protection, debt relief, or opportunities for employment and advancement to a position in

---

[17] Cochrell, 30.

[18] Hutchison, 61.

government.[19] Certainly James and John, as affirmed by the presence of their mother, were making use of this kinship patronage system. But Jesus turned this system on its head and declared that greatness was in serving those around you, not in seeking a place of honor through kinship relationships. It was a blow against the "it's not what you know, but who you know" attitude that embodied a kinship society.

Another aspect of culture that influenced the leadership of the Ancient Near East was the Stoic philosophical influence of self-glory. It was believed that the winning of glory was the only true reward for merit in life. Therefore, it became a prime objective for public figures to enshrine themselves by defining their own glory into posterity. This thinking was so dominant that self-magnification became a feature of Hellenic education. "The quest for glory represented the greatest goal of all public life."[20] This pursuit can still bring a public Christian leader to ruin. Jesus countered, "Whoever would be great among you must be your servant and whoever would be first among you must be your slave" (Matt. 20:26-27). This biblical truth is a paradox to the honor-seeking nature of cultural leadership. Hutchison concludes:

> Most models of leadership in secular settings reward those who are self-promoting and 'climbers' on the ladder of success. Many leaders instinctively seek out positions of control over others and try to avoid showing weakness or vulnerability. Not surprisingly, this pattern has influenced many church leaders. By contrast Jesus is the greater example of servanthood and powerful leadership. Servanthood does not avoid leadership. It is a different kind of leadership, one committed to meeting the needs of others.[21]

The imagery of a servant tied to leadership was a clear cultural feature of the biblical era. The identity, function, and motivation of the servant revealed in ancient

---

[19] Hutchison, 61.

[20] Hutchison, 64.

[21] Hutchison, 69.

culture helps to define the same aspects for God's servant-leader today. A clear sense of being wholly owned, totally dependent, subject to the master's will, with representative authority, and bent on pleasing the one who redeemed him, should be the growing understanding of every Christian servant-leader.

Biblical Applications

In speaking to the weight of biblical evidence, Jones points out, "The Hebrew concept of the *ebed Yahweh*, or 'servant of the Lord,' introduces a unique design for leadership; biblical leadership is synonymous with slave leadership."[22] Harris has noted that the terms "slave(s) of God" and "slave(s) of Christ" can be found 35 times in the New Testament, with 18 of those usages being applied directly to leaders.[23] Harris sees this terminology extending beyond the apostolic leadership of the New Testament and being applied by derivative to all believers in general, particularly Christian leaders.[24] These conclusions give weight to the idea of applying this metaphor to spiritual leaders today. Every Christ-centered leader should strive to be a slave of Christ.

Cochrell, when speaking about King David in the Old Testament, connects the cultural connotation of a shepherd-king with the use of *ebed*: "The Israelites were the slaves of God and their king was a fellow slave, a 'first among equals,' whose authority was rooted in his willingness to yield to God's ultimate authority through obedience and dependence."[25] God's imperfect servant-leaders are to be truly cognizant of their calling by God, the divine King. The proper response is one of deference, loyalty, and trust,

---

[22] Jones, 16.

[23] Harris, 133.

[24] Harris, 128.

[25] Cochrell, 61.

which flow from worship of and submission to a great God. This authority that comes

through being totally yielded is a critical part of understanding power. Practically,

worship of God and submission to God keep a leader from overly inflating their own

sense of importance—a slave of slaves.

Hutchison takes note of the theme of servanthood that runs throughout the book

of Mark. In reference to Mark 10:35-45, the parallel passage to Matthew 20:20-28

discussed earlier in this paper, Hutchison ties the theme of servanthood and suffering to

leadership:

> His (Jesus) use of this motif in His teaching modeled for His followers the need
> for them to demonstrate servanthood and sacrifice. In Mark 10:42-45 Jesus
> challenged His disciples to a radical and paradoxical form of leadership and
> showed that He Himself would provide the ultimate example through his
> suffering and death.[26]

Like the account in the book of Matthew, Jesus made use of the servant, slave, and

ransom metaphors in declaring what he expected of Christian leaders. He also powerfully

demonstrated this through his own sacrifice on the cross. Hutchison explains, "Jesus'

words about leadership are paradoxical and would have sounded absurd when compared

with Jewish and Gentile societal norms."[27] Hutchison goes on to explain that this absurd,

paradoxical view of leadership was to alert his disciples that a new order was coming,

one in which leadership and greatness were to be viewed very differently from societal

norms.[28] In Mark and Matthew, the paradox of servant leadership was presented

alongside the paradox of a suffering and dying Messiah. By way of application,

---

[26] Hutchison, 54-55.

[27] Hutchison, 55.

[28] Hutchison, 56.

Hutchison notes, "Spiritual authority and leadership are demonstrated through servanthood, selflessness, and sacrifice for others."[29]

Jack Niewold, in referring to Philippians 2:5-11, suggests that powerful servant leadership must be rooted in Christ's divinity as well as his humanity. He argues that current leadership thinking has made too much of Christ's humanity at the expense of his divinity, leaving the imitation of Jesus' leadership too powerless. Niewold's concept of *martyria* (witness, testimony) leadership claims that Christ's humility was primarily expressed toward God, the Father—while boldly challenging the religious and secular cultures of his day. Servanthood for Niewold is rooted in boldness that flows from humility. *Martyria* leadership expresses itself in bold proclamation of Jesus, while also suffering for Jesus. Servant leadership for Niewold is witness and servanthood walking side-by-side: "It is precisely in the context of Christian proclamation that servanthood can reclaim its rightful biblical place. It is there that the servant will partake in the redemptive work of Christ on earth."[30] The researcher can certainly appreciate Niewold's emphasis of boldness flowing out of a deep humility tied to the servant metaphor. It is this metaphor that is claimed for Jesus Christ as part of his incarnational identity in Philippians 2:5-11. The researcher also appreciates that the servant metaphor can express a profound servanthood in conjunction with a verbal proclamation. The storyline of the whole Bible points in the direction of redemption, both personally and in society. For the Christian leader, serving and witness to the work of Jesus flow from the servant metaphor as this reflects well the heart of the Master.

---

[29] Hutchison, 64.

[30] Jack Niewold, "Beyond Servant Leadership," *Journal of Biblical Perspectives in Leadership* 1, No. 2 (Summer 2007):132-133.

Earlier, 1 Corinthians 4 was addressed regarding Paul's posture as a servant and steward-leader. D. A. Carson captures the problem of the Corinthian church related to leadership when he states:

> Paul found it necessary to address several Corinthian misconceptions regarding the nature of genuine Christian leadership. These believers were adopting too many models from their surrounding world. They were infatuated with Sophist teachers, many of whom prized form above content, prestige above humility, stoicism above passion, and organizing philosophy above frank confessions of ignorance of the limitations of human knowledge, rhetoric above truth, money above people, and reputation above integrity. He also had to disabuse his readers of the evil in their tendency to lionize certain Christian leaders and ignore others.[31]

Remarkably, the above quote could be stated with today's culture in mind. In making the connection to the Corinthian problem and the essence of the servant metaphor, Carson states, "Christian leaders are servants of Christ and are not to be accorded allegiance reserved for God alone. Indeed, as servants, they are accountable to God for the kind of ministry they exercise."[32] It is worth noting one more observation by Carson. In assessing Paul's admonition in 1 Corinthians 4:1, tied to the servant metaphor, Carson prescribes application for every Christian servant-leader: "Christian leaders do not try and be independent gurus, all-wise teachers. They see themselves simply as servants and want other Christians to see them that way, too. But they are servants of one particular Master: they serve Jesus Christ."[33]

The real paradox of servant leadership is laid bare by Howell, as he reflects on Paul's exhortation in 1 Corinthians 4: "Servant leadership for Paul means humble status

---

[31] D. A. Carson, *The Cross and Christian Ministry: An Exposition of Passages from 1 Corinthians* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1993), 93.

[32] Carson, *The Cross and Christian Ministry*, 93.

[33] Carson, *The Cross and Christian Ministry*, 94.

and privileged stewardship. To one of lowly position has been committed a sacred trust"[34] Tidball also reveals a tension in Christ-centered servant leadership: "the one serving is in a subordinate position to the one he serves and subject to his authority, and yet, as a representative of the one he serves, he carries the responsibility and authority that derives from the one he serves."[35] Tidball's point rightly squares the tension of a servant-leader—he is under authority and carries representative authority. His mandate is to carry out the will of the one who rules over him and sends him.

Howell summarizes the mandate for 21st century Christian leaders in stating, "New covenant servant-leaders learn, by imitating their servant-Lord, to abandon their own agendas and preferences in order to seek the good of their fellow servants. Through such imitation they become servants of the great Servant."[36]

Practical Applications

Michael Martin draws Paul's use of the servant metaphor back to a relational level, not merely a cultural or legal one: "The slave image related to the Christian leader is overall to be understood as a positive statement of his relationship to God."[37] Martin goes on to explain, "An overview of the images used by Paul in his description of Christian leadership reveals several elements which all or most have in common … the images chosen by Paul were of individuals actively engaged in a task."[38] Martin also notes three key characteristics of Christian leaders posited by Pauline metaphors:

---

[34] Howell, 16.

[35] Tidball, 37.

[36] Howell, 19.

[37] Martin, 138.

[38] Martin, 155.

submissive, always seeing themselves under the authority of a superior; interactive, cooperating through joint participation with others to accomplish the task; responsible, with inherent faithfulness to complete the task or communicate the message.[39] Martin sees the intended result of Paul's teaching as edification: "The purpose of the authority of the minister, according to Paul's metaphorical messages, was to build up the church."[40] The posture of the servant metaphor is vertical, seeing oneself in right relationship to God as a leader. But the impact of the servant metaphor is outward, leading to the benefit of others and their maturation in Christ.

The servant metaphor is fundamentally about one's identity as a leader—whose we are. This sense of self reveals itself in three aspects of one's identity: character, motive, and agenda. Who the leader is, and is becoming in one's essential being, speaks to character. Why a leader takes a particular course of action indicates motive. What the leader pursues in the mission points to agenda.[41] When one truly sees himself as a slave of Christ, his core identity is established and his character, motives, and agenda for leadership become purified. The servant metaphor, biblically, and affirmed by other scholars and contributors, is fundamentally concerned with the leader's relationship with God and the resulting leadership posture expressed toward those they lead.

The Shepherd Metaphor Critiqued

The shepherd metaphor in the Bible is the most dominant one applied to leadership. The researcher has surveyed cultural concepts and key passages which speak

---

[39] Martin, 156-58.

[40] Martin, 164.

[41] Howell, 296.

to the nature of a shepherd-leader. Others have weighed in concerning the relevance and application of this metaphor to leadership.

<center>*Cultural Applications*</center>

The shepherd metaphor has a rich cultural context in the Ancient Near East. The very function of shepherds during that time, and even today, reveals the function of spiritual leaders.

Mary Beth Gladwell states, "It may be most noteworthy to realize that leaders and rulers being called shepherds was not exclusive to the Bible or for that matter to the nation of Israel. King Hammurabi of Babylon called himself a shepherd, and Homer regularly styles the Greek chiefs as shepherds of their people."[42] It was common for people of the Ancient Near East to associate shepherds and leadership. It permeated every aspect of society. This understanding articulates an oversight function that leaders carried then and express today. Through the imagery of the shepherd metaphor, kings and other rulers of that day were expected to demonstrate a just leadership, military protection, and abundant provision. The king's staff was a ubiquitous symbol for ruling and derived its meaning from the shepherd metaphor.[43]

During the Classical Greek period, Plato provided one of the more insightful portrayals of leadership. In his work *Republic*, Plato captured a dialogue between Thrasymachus and Socrates. "Thrasymachus assumed 'sheep' were meant to be exploited by their 'shepherds.' Socrates argued that the essence of a shepherd's art is selfless concern for the flock; otherwise, he is no shepherd at all. Worse, careless shepherds are

---

[42] Gladwell, 1.

[43] Laniak, 66-67.

like the wolves from which they are expected to protect the sheep."[44] This understanding

from Socrates is akin to the words of Yahweh in Ezekiel 34 that were considered earlier.

The shepherd-leader does not exist to care for himself, or to consume those entrusted to

him. He exists to care diligently for those he is called to lead.

A good shepherd during biblical times hoped for an 80 percent birthing rate, and

therefore had the opportunity to see growth sufficient enough to provide all of the milk,

meat, and wool needed for the season ahead. Laniak makes the connection to spiritual

leadership of a community through good shepherding: "Figuratively, the health and

multiplication of a community was a sign of good leadership."[45] He also notes that the

primary roles of an ancient shepherd were to feed, lead, and tend. This equates well with

the primary roles of a shepherd-leader today. Shepherd-leaders are to provide for, give

direction to, and protect those entrusted to their care.[46] Shepherds in the Ancient Near

East were known for their breadth of knowledge and skill. They were resourceful,

adaptable, and vigilant. Laniak points out the fact that the very nature of shepherding in

that day cultivated a capacity for attentiveness, self-sacrifice, and compassion. He

affirms, "For these and other reasons, the shepherd naturally became an icon of

leadership."[47]

Golding explains that bad shepherds brought a sense of fear to the sheep, while

good ones cultivated a sense of peace and well-being. He adds, "When shepherd-leaders

fail to perform their expected functions, there is shock, outrage, and a sense of

---

[44] Laniak, 73.

[45] Laniak, 51.

[46] Laniak, 53-54.

[47] Laniak, 57.

betrayal."[48] This fall-out is still true today. While there may be a sense of forgiveness that follows a failed leader over time, the initial response to failed shepherd leadership today is the same. But Golding also explicates the traits of a good shepherd—one that would be diligent about knowing the nature of his animals, their current needs, and the terrain in which they were grazing. He could never be too far from sources of water or good pasture. Successful shepherd-leaders must understand the needs and characteristics of their people and the place in which they live. Golding particularly notes that a good shepherd is aware of the things that sheep lack. This alertness bears importance for the shepherd-leader of today as well.[49] The good shepherd-leader knows when guidance is needed instead of provision. Or when protection is the need of the hour, whether from sin or false teaching. They are keenly attuned to those entrusted to them.

Biblical Applications

Gerald Aranoff highlights Abel, the first shepherd mentioned in Scripture, as a paradigm leader in light of the metaphor. We discover early in the storyline that Abel, the second born of Adam and Eve, was a shepherd by trade (Gen. 4:1-7). It is also revealed that Abel's sacrifice of a lamb was an acceptable offering to Yahweh. Aranoff sees Abel's meat offering becoming the main form of sacrificial service throughout the Old Testament. The offering of a shepherd became the accepted form of sacrifice and worship. Aranoff sees this offering as both validation for the occupation as applied to leadership and as declaration of the holiness of Israel's future leaders.[50] There is an

---

[48] Golding, Part 1, 28.

[49] Golding, Part 2, 174.

[50] Gerald Aranoff, "Shepherding as a Metaphor," *Jewish Bible Quarterly* vol. 42, no. 1(2014): 38.

important element here for today's shepherd-leader. The biblical metaphor of shepherd not only reveals the roles and functions of a leader, but also points to leader validation through offering, sacrifice, and worship. The leader, as a shepherd, offers herself or himself completely in surrender to the Lord as a form of acceptable sacrifice and worship—validating the call to shepherd God's people.

John Paul Heil writes to the strength of the imagery when he states, "The use of the metaphor shepherd and sheep for the leaders and their people embraces the entire gospel of Matthew."[51] In the book of Matthew, Jesus is the shepherd struck by God with suffering and death, but raised to continue as the shepherd who brings together his scattered sheep to send them out again—as shepherds to all peoples. Heil concludes that leaders are to identify both as shepherd and sheep. This recognition aids them greatly in being able to relate authentically to the needs of people. In particular for Heil, shepherd-leaders are to seek out the straying and scattered "sheep" to bring them back into the fold. This rescuing function of leadership is accompanied by the mandate of Jesus to make disciples (Matt. 28:19)—teaching all that Jesus commanded and baptizing the new "sheep" into the covenant community. Heil sees this shepherding imagery as the primary leadership function played out in the pages of Matthew.[52]

John 21 is one of the few places in the Gospels where Jesus made a direct reference to those other than himself being shepherds. Three times Jesus exhorted Peter to either feed or tend his sheep. This episode stood not only as a future calling but also as

---

[51] John Paul Heil, "Ezekiel 34 and the Narrative Strategy of the Shepherd and Sheep Metaphor in Matthew," *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 55 (1993): 698.

[52] Heil, 707-708.

a restoration from Peter's failings in the courtyard (Matt. 26; Mark 14; Luke 22; John

18). Bennett comments in reference to John 21 and the restoration of Peter:

> Notice that Jesus refers all three times to 'my lambs', 'my sheep.' The sheep
> belong to Jesus, not to Peter. The disciple, even as shepherd, remains a servant,
> caring for the property of another. The emphasis is not on the authority of the
> shepherd, or the leadership of the shepherd, but on the loving care rendered by the
> shepherd, and on the accountability of the shepherd to the owner of the sheep.[53]

The proper emphasis for the leader is to recognize that even as a shepherd, he is

also a servant. The sheep, those under his care, belong to another. He holds no ownership

or authority over them. But he is accountable to the owner for their proper care. A proper

understanding of this role informs the shepherd-leader concerning his motives, authority,

and focus in ministry. This knowledge also serves as an encouragement to the leader that

failure is never final, for every servant-leader is also a part of the sheep and in need of

shepherding.

Lynch, in her study of 1 Peter 5, emphasizes that the "elders" who were exhorted

to "shepherd the flock of God that is among you" (1 Peter 5:2) were men of distinction or

honor in the community. Their overall leadership purpose did not flow only from the

example of the synagogue, but from their standing in the community.[54] This broader

standing as leaders in the community, as well as the church, would accord well with the

use of a metaphor that is drawn from the culture at large. Lynch also comments that the

primary function of a shepherd, in the context of this passage, was to "watch out for

people."[55] This function stood in biblical continuity with Moses, David, and even God

himself, in looking after people as God's own possession. The nature of the modifier (*in*

---

[53] Bennett, 48-49.

[54] Lynch, 530-531.

[55] Lynch, 533.

you or *among you*) in verse two (1 Pet. 5:2) also communicates that these people were those in proximity to the leader/elder and likely in relationship with the leader/elder. Nearness, physically and relationally, is a necessity in expressing the shepherding role.[56] "The elder's role here is to lead. Yet, Peter seeks to describe clearly the duties and style of such leadership. Not for Christian elders a leadership which benefits leader and not followers: they must be shepherd leaders who nurture, protect and guide God's people without gaining great worldly advantage."[57]

Laniak, in making connections to Christian leadership from 1 Peter 5, emphasizes the quality of humility: "Like Jesus, good shepherd elders can say, 'Follow me as I lay down my life for you.' Those who lead the flock of marginalized suffering members are to be exemplars in self-sacrifice. Humility is the distinguishing mark of their service."[58] Humility lays the foundation for imitation.

Practical Applications

In making his concluding observations, Laniak takes note of seven features of 21st century shepherding leadership from the imagery of the metaphor. First, shepherd leadership is comprehensive in scope. Shepherd-leaders protect, guide, and provide. Pastors are generalists who do whatever is required by the current circumstances. Their decisions always benefit the flock. This ability requires a benevolent authority. Laniak explains, "Authority without compassion leads to harsh authoritarianism. Compassion without authority leads to social chaos. Shepherds must be able to express their

---

[56] Lynch, 534.

[57] Lynch, 538.

[58] Laniak, 234.

leadership in a variety of ways."[59] Second, bad shepherd leaders use their position to

serve their own needs. They must be ever diligent never to forget whose flock they serve.

Third, every shepherd-leader is first and always a sheep who relates and reports to God as

"my Shepherd." Leaders are appointed by God and are effective to the degree they are

empowered by his Holy Spirit. "Shepherd leadership … resists pretense, posturing, and

privilege."[60] Fourth, biblical leadership can only be fully understood through a

comprehensive pastoral theology. The root of the metaphor of both *shepherd* and *sheep*

demonstrate the vulnerability and dependence of God's people faced with bad leadership.

They are prone to wander, become scattered, and get lost. This implication can be true

theologically and practically. Therefore, shepherd-leaders must be even more accountable

for the potential of neglect and abuse. Fifth, leaders lead in the context of God's

redemptive-historical narrative that depicts his leadership against the backdrop of a

wilderness motif. This earth is not our home. We are aliens and sojourners. The

wilderness is filled with many difficulties, and good under-shepherds provide diligent

oversight and guidance to help insure that every member of the flock makes it home

safe.[61] Sixth, no one metaphor can fully depict the divine Shepherd. The Bible uses many

metaphorical images to express the dynamic and inexpressible nature of God, our eternal

Shepherd. Leaders must respond to him in his fullness. And finally, seventh, the Bible

uses common metaphors as images to mediate meaning to us. Common occupations can

carry meaning as a way to explain important leadership functions. Laniak concludes:

"Any person in pastoral ministry is heir to a remarkable heritage that stretches back more

---

[59] Laniak, 247.

[60] Laniak, 248-249.

[61] Laniak, 250.

than four thousand years. . . . We affirm that the Great Shepherd 'pitched his tent' among us and showed us how to live and die for those sheep who recognize his name."[62]

The shepherd metaphor, as revealed in Scripture and through the extra-biblical literature, is servant leadership lived out horizontally, focused on guiding, providing for, and protecting the people entrusted to its care. The metaphor is grounded in surrender toward and worship of the good Shepherd. The metaphor informs the leader he is still one of the sheep.

The Steward Metaphor Critiqued

The steward is the third biblical metaphor considered as a necessary aspect of the developmental construct. It is illustrated through Old Testament narratives as a leadership image and taught by New Testament writers as an important element of leadership as applied to the mission. There is less extra-biblical literature dedicated to this metaphor but important applications can be made from what is readily available.

Cultural Applications

Culturally, the steward of any estate was almost always a slave. Beavis makes this clear in stating, "It is important to note that a Greco-Roman reader would probably assume that the *oikonomos* of the parable was a slave."[63] Layton notes, "The position of household manager or steward was … an integral part of the social structure of the Ancient Near East from Egypt to Mesopotamia."[64] The steward in ancient times could be in private service over a house or estate or serve in a high governmental position. In each

---

[62] Laniak, 251.

[63] Beavis, 45.

[64] Layton, 635.

case, they would be subject to another, managing the resources of the master toward the master's desires and for the master's benefit.[65] A royal steward was known to be a senior administrator with great responsibility, one of the highest officials of the state.[66] This status gives weight to the understanding of seeing the steward metaphor tied to leadership. Whether the slave served as a private steward or as a royal steward he would have representative authority to manage the resources entrusted to him on behalf of another.

Bennett makes the case that the steward was always a person with a position of responsibility, either in charge of people, possessions, or both. Being a slave, he held a position of authority but was always under authority. "The *oikonomos* fulfills a particular function within the larger category of *servant* (*doulos*)."[67] Rodin makes the connection that a steward-leader must come to the point of understanding that "ownership" is bondage. It is only the lordship of Christ in the life of a leader that will free him from that bondage and allow him to function as a faithful steward.[68] At a principled level, these observations accord well with Christ-centered servant leadership and offer a healthy perspective that transcends culture and time. Acting responsibly toward the desires of the Master, using representative authority to accomplish those desires, and doing so to the benefit of the Master helps the modern-day leader to maintain a proper posture and a singular focus.

---

[65] Layton, 635.

[66] Layton, 641.

[67] Bennett, 44.

[68] Rodin, 64.

Biblical Applications

Julien C. H. Smith and T. Lane Scales anchor the image of a steward-leader in

creation and the doctrine of the *imago Dei*. As created beings, we were created in the

image of God, and we were created with a ruling and stewarding function over the rest of

creation.[69]

> Creation exists for God's glory, not merely for human benefit. Indeed, it is
> precisely a persistent misreading of Genesis 1:26-28 that has earned Christians a
> share of the blame for the present ecological crisis. Once again, however,
> Christians are realizing that stewardship, not exploitation, is the essence of the
> divine mandate to humankind.[70]

The leadership implications of this view of stewardship are emphasized well by Smith

and Scales. First, our stewardship task mirrors God's creative task. As God brings order

from chaos, we too must consider how our function as a steward-leader might bring order

to chaos. Second, all of God's creation has been entrusted to our care. Having dominion

does not mean that we stand over creation, but that we seek God's glory through our

stewardship activities of creation, rather than seeking merely our own benefit.[71] Our God-

given ability to create and redeem order out of chaos, for God's glory, should embolden

our leadership efforts as stewards. Laying the foundation of the steward metaphor within

the act of creation and the creation mandate also aids our ability to highly value all of the

resources that God has entrusted to us as leaders. We must value what God values if we

are to treat resources as precious and manage them well toward his intended purposes.

---

[69] Julien C. H. Smith, and T. Lane Scales, "Stewardship: A Biblical Metaphor for the Formation of Christian Scholars," *Journal of Education and Christian Belief.* 17, no.1 (2013): 84.

[70] Smith and Scales, 85-86.

[71] Smith and Scales, 86.

The researcher sees the steward metaphor, as taught by Jesus, primarily through the lens of the parables. From these parables, Bennett explains several traits that are important elements for the servant-leader today. The steward-leader is responsible to God and held accountable for the wise investments of God's resources. The steward-leader, like the characters in the parables, is considered shrewd for the use of material possessions applied to the accomplishment of intended goals (Luke 16). Readiness or preparedness is another leadership qualification that is drawn from the metaphor of the steward in Scripture. Faithfulness and wisdom are considered primary character traits in governing the ability to be prepared (Luke 12).[72]

Smith and Scales, in their examination of Luke 19 and Matthew 25, point to the fact that steward-leaders are to invest and take risks. The idea is not to hoard and save, but to risk and invest wisely, aiming for a greater return.[73] The perception of the nature of the master makes all the difference. In Matthew 25, the master is depicted as expecting a return, but also as incredibly generous in his rewards. Servant-leaders should view God in the same way. Risk and investment are expected because the Master is good, expectant, and generous. Peter Jones takes the application one step further in commenting on this parable: "Stewardship involved the necessity of action. To play it safe and not act is to lose existence. Stewardship is a call to risky action."[74] In a day and time where being proactive as a Christian leader is sometimes considered presumptuous or arrogant, the

---

[72] Bennett, 44.

[73] Smith and Scales, 86.

[74] Peter Rhea Jones, "Biblical Teachings on Stewardship" *Review and Expositor* 70, no. 2 (1973):142.

steward metaphor requires movement based on unknown outcomes. This initiative

requires an element of faith in a benevolent and purposeful Master.

The parable in Luke 19 also depicts the master as expectant and generous. The

parable is foundationally about the kingdom of God. Jesus tells the parable because his

followers thought that God's kingdom was imminent. The reality was that the kingdom of

God was about to be inaugurated but was not yet coming to fulfillment. This

eschatological tension is an important realization for the steward-leader today. God

expects his leaders to invest and take risks for the sake of building the kingdom of God

because he is good, expectant, and generous.[75] The character and effort of the steward-

leader are in direct proportion to his view of the Master and his allegiance to the Master's

plan. Jones moves the application forward by stressing that the steward metaphor leaps

from illustrative material to being squarely focused on the purposes of God in every age.

He explains: "Stewardship is partnership with Christ, through the Holy Spirit, in fulfilling

the purpose of God in the world. From this vantage point stewardship may be seen as

supporting with all of one's being the purposes of God revealed in Jesus Christ."[76]

Mary Jo Burchard makes some important points regarding the metaphor of

steward as used by Paul in 1 Corinthians 4:1-2. Paul stated that he and his missionary

band should be regarded "as servants of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of the God"

(1 Cor. 4:1). "The significance of Paul's identification with the roles of servant and

steward are lost in contemporary language and culture, but to the Corinthian mind, this

---

[75] Smith and Scales, 86.

[76] P. Jones, 142.

was a radical move."[77] In a culture that gave status to those who could garner it through

oration skills or superior wisdom, Paul chose to refer to himself as a farmhand and a

household servant. Burchard highlights the cultural importance of these identities by

stating, "As a prototypical leader, Paul modeled for the Corinthians how to disassociate

from this element of their cultural and social identity, helping them to reshape the rules of

engagement with one another."[78] Paul applied the identity of servant and steward to all

leaders within the church, and thus removed the tendency toward cultural values of

authority, power, and status (1 Cor. 4:6). Paul correctly pointed out that if one is a

receiver of leadership responsibility, which the steward metaphor clearly indicated, then

one has nothing in which to boast (1 Cor. 4:7). To go even further, Burchard states, "Paul

stripped all Christian members of the elite of their right to create factions to elicit power,

followership, and material dependence within the church. Like Paul and Apollos, no

matter their standing outside the church, Corinthian believers could not claim that any

position or power within the body of Christ came from grasping, competition, or personal

merit."[79] Paul reinterpreted the social norms of Corinth away from status identity for the

church. There is no less temptation today for God's leaders.

Cullen Story takes up Pauline stewardship as represented in the Corinthian

correspondence too. He notes, "Paul is a responsible steward. The gospel is his

stewardship, a gospel which he had received and which brought God's saving work to

---

[77] Mary Jo Burchard, "'This Is How One Should Regard Us': An Exegetical Study on Paul's Treatise to the Corinthians Regarding His Relational Expectations with His Spiritual Children," *Journal of Biblical Perspectives on Leadership* 5, no. 1 (2013): 70.

[78] Burchard, 72.

[79] Burchard, 73.

those who believed."[80] Paul's example points to the nature of a leader's specific mission.

Story sees Paul's apostleship tied to his stewardship. Paul was called to preach the gospel

to the Gentiles. That was what he was responsible for to God, his great commission.[81]

Story reveals the implications for the servant-leader of today. The call to steward the

gospel is something specific. It is a calling that is worthy of every Christian servant-

leader's wise stewardship. The call to steward the gospel usually includes a people and a

place, as well as the resources of the Master in conjunction with that people and location.

The steward metaphor implies that resources are to be invested to this end, including

money, strategies, tools, people, and one's spiritual gifts.

Practical Applications

Rodin makes an important practical consideration applied to the steward

metaphor: "The steward leader does not derive her identity from being a leader, even

being a steward-leader, but from solely being a godly and faithful steward. The steward-

leader starts with the call to be a godly steward and ends with the heart of the godly

steward, open to transformation, called to lead."[82] The steward is a slave first and then

called to manage other's resources toward kingdom purposes. Jones adds that the steward

metaphor lived out in the life of a leader works against greed, covetousness, abuse of

power and authority, sloth, social injustice, and hoarding. A true steward serves one

Master and gives of himself and the resources at his disposal to the glory of that Master.[83]

---

[80] Cullen I. K. Story, "The Nature of Paul's Stewardship with Special Reference to 1 and 2 Corinthians," *The Evangelical Quarterly* 48 (Oct-Dec 1976): 217.

[81] Story, 228.

[82] Rodin, 76.

[83] P. Jones, 144-145.

Jones notes that when a steward-leader rightly sees God and comprehends God's love for him, he will love the things that God loves and value the things that God values. This comprehension drives good stewardship.[84]

Leslie Pollard, in reflecting upon the Apostle Paul's approach to the mission, makes a case for increasing self-awareness in living out the steward metaphor. Increasing self-awareness allows a leader to comprehend better what they bring to the mission through their leadership. Pollard explains, "In Paul's thinking, everything that he had inherited or acquired was a part of his leadership resource bank for the execution of the mission."[85] Pollard goes on to list some of Paul's assets as recorded in 1 Corinthians 9:19-23: his talents, the Jewish markers of his birth, race, ethnicity, education, class, and status. Pollard adds a note of perspective: "For Paul these are clearly resources to be stewarded; they are not possessions to be worshipped or protected."[86] The good steward-leader must have a keen sense of understanding that they always influence through all of who God has made them to be. That knowledge is the first application of resources for the leader toward the mission.

Howell summarizes well the nature and function of the modern-day servant-leader as steward: "Servant-leaders are not visionaries who devise a brilliant plan, then by dint of personal charisma draw others to fulfill those ambitions. Rather they are faithful stewards of the divine mandate—to fish and to feed, to evangelize and to teach, to pioneer and to pastor."[87] Stanley Patterson highlights the main priority of a steward-

---

[84] P. Jones, 146.

[85] Bell, 315.

[86] Bell, 315-316.

[87] Howell, 301.

leader: "If the model of Jesus was about developing leaders to engage in the revision and expansion of the kingdom of God, then it stands to reason that the primary function of Christian leaders is the stewardship of developing leaders."[88]

Ken Blanchard sums up the application of the steward metaphor well when he states, "Leaders who are servants will assume leadership only if they see it as the best way to serve. They are called to lead, rather than driven, because they naturally want to be helpful. They aren't possessive about their position. They view it as an act of stewardship, rather than ownership."[89]

Conclusion

The consensus of scholars and other contributors is that the servant metaphor is foundational to the shepherd and steward metaphors. The servant metaphor informs the servant-leader that he is wholly owned by God and totally dependent upon God. The leader's will is subjected to the will of God as he lives out his leadership life. Yet, this servant/slave posture is sourced in the context of a rich relationship with God. The very identity of the Christ-centered servant-leader is that of a beloved slave. This understanding sustains the leader's posture of humility and leadership expression of representative authority. The primary trait is one of complete submission.

The shepherd metaphor is the aspect of leadership most discussed and evaluated by scholars. There is agreement that shepherd-leaders exhibit selfless concern to guide, provide for, and protect those they are called to lead. Guiding includes leading with clear direction and with a keen understanding of God's purposes for his flock. Provision

---

[88] Bell, 360.

[89] Kenneth H. Blanchard, Bill Hybels, and Phil Hodges, *Leadership by the Book: Tools to Transform Your Workplace* (Colorado Springs, CO: WaterBrook Press, 1999), 42.

includes feeding followers from the Word of God and creating environments of true

biblical community for the purpose of formation and sanctification. Protection includes

keeping followers from habitual sin and false teaching. The result of good shepherding

leadership is growth for the individual and the covenant community. The good shepherd-

leader understands of the needs of his followers and attends to those needs. This care

requires physical and relational proximity. The motives of the shepherd-leader must not

flow from self-indulgence, material gain, or power. Only the Spirit empowered motives

of willingness, eagerness, and authentic modeling will allow people to move toward the

leader and Jesus Christ. The primary trait of the shepherd-leader is humility. The

shepherd-leader also understands that he leads in gratitude to the Good Shepherd and is

accountable to the Chief Shepherd for his effective leadership efforts.

The steward metaphor is less discussed than the other two. It seems to have been

somewhat overlooked as a leadership metaphor, yet it is featured consistently in the

narratives and teaching of the Bible. The steward-leader understands first that he is a

slave. He is one with representative authority to manage the precious resources of

another, while still being one who is under the authority of the Master. How well the

steward-leader carries out his task completely depends upon his view of the Master. If he

sees the Master as purposeful, loving, and generous, he will risk wisely and expect the

increase. The primary trait of a steward-leader is faithfulness. His faithful efforts are

focused on the management of God's resources entrusted to him for the furtherance of the

kingdom.

It is evident to the researcher that no one has studied and brought these three

metaphors together to create a developmental construct for Christian servant leadership.

The pursuit is ripe with possibilities for fruitful application toward the benefit of any

Christian leader.

CHAPTER FOUR: PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND RESEARCH METHODS

Data and Methodology

The Purpose of the Research Project

The problem this project addressed was the lack of a biblically grounded model for servant leadership development within Cru for current and future leaders. The purpose of this paper was designed to begin with Scripture as the foundation for a fresh leadership development approach. The biblical and theological analysis revealed that there is strong support for the leadership metaphor construct of servant, shepherd, and steward being proposed. Indeed, the Bible has much to say on leadership through its principles, narratives, and metaphors. The literature review revealed that little had been written concerning a biblical metaphor construct for leader development. Only the shepherd metaphor has received much treatment tied to leadership and leadership development. This reality demonstrates the value of this work. The field research is all the more necessary to determine the current state of leadership development in Cru and how well those efforts are developing servant leaders for Cru.

Subproblems

This project was executed by tackling four subproblems. Subproblems one and two, previously addressed in chapters two and three in this paper, were examined during the spring, summer, and fall of 2016 through a biblical and theological analysis and a literary review of religious and secular publications. As each of the three biblical

metaphors was considered, specific traits were revealed through the analysis of Scripture and other literature. These traits form the essence of the leadership development construct being proposed for the development of Christ-centered servant-leaders for Cru. The analysis of subproblem three, the secondary data from the SLICE survey and the BCWI survey, and subproblem four, the primary data from the local field leader survey and the national leader interviews, revealed not only the overall environment for leader development within Cru, but also the discrepancies of current leader development efforts compared to the traits being proposed.

Subproblem three was completed in the fall of 2016 by analyzing secondary data from Cru's 2013, 2014, and 2015 SLICE surveys. The SLICE survey was an in-house instrument consisting of 108 questions given to every Cru staff member in the United States to better determine the health and ministry effectiveness of the organization. Secondary data was also analyzed from the Best Christian Workplace Institute (BCWI) survey given to Cru in 2016. Subproblem four was addressed by surveying and interviewing selected Cru leaders during the fall of 2016. The tools for this primary research were phone interviews and an online survey. Field study leading to grounded theory was the main research method employed.

Paul Leedy and Jeanne Ormrod define the purpose of grounded theory as "to begin with the data and use them to develop a theory."[1] Leedy and Ormrod go on to explain the philosophy behind grounded theory: "The term grounded refers to the idea that the theory that emerges from the study is derived from and rooted in data that have

---

[1] Paul D. Leedy and Jeanne Ellis Ormrod, *Practical Research: Planning and Design*, 10th ed. (Boston, MA: Pearson, 2013), 146.

been collected in the field rather than taken from the research literature."[2] Grounded

theory, as a qualitative research method, is broad and flexible in its approach. Leedy and

Ormrod cite the only restriction as being "the data must include the perspectives and

voices of the people being studied."[3]

From the secondary and primary research data for this project, theories emerged

as to the current experience of Cru leaders and their development. The primary data also

surfaced themes regarding the leader development efforts of Cru by those who provide

such development. These grounded theories inform how to strengthen leadership

development within Cru toward a servant leadership approach, by way of the biblical

metaphor construct of servant, shepherd, and steward being proposed.

Subproblem Three

The third subproblem was analyzed through secondary data from the SLICE

culture survey[4] and the Best Christian Workplace Institute (BCWI) staff engagement

survey.[5]

The SLICE survey was given annually and sent to all United States Cru staff

through the online tool Survey Monkey. The researcher was given access to three years

of data covering 2013-2015. This particular survey tool was discontinued after 2015 in

favor of the BCWI staff engagement survey. The SLICE survey consisted of 108

---

[2] Leedy and Ormrod, 146.

[3] Leedy and Ormrod, 147.

[4] SLICE was a survey created by Cru as an internal tool to assess staff well-being. The word "SLICE" does not stand as an acronym and merely reflects the desire and ability to "slice" up the data in various ways for effective analysis and usage.

[5] "About," Best Christian Workplace Institute, accessed December 12, 2016. http://www.bcwinstitute.com/about.html.

questions divided into 17 categories. The same questions were used each of the three years under consideration. The 17 categories included were: biographical data, ministry location, spiritual life and growth, personal and professional development, team environment, ministry direction, recruiting, Cru branding, ministry assignment, evangelism, launching movements, lifetime laborers, ministry status, biblical and theological training, ministry partner development, marital status, and mothers.

In 2013 there were 2089 respondents. In 2014 there were 2364 respondents. And in 2015 there were 2522 respondents. The growth in participation over the three-year period being analyzed resulted in a total of 6975 total responses. This data allowed the researcher to analyze both a composite view of the results and three-year trends. As of December 2016, there were 6139 full-time staff, part-time staff, and interns in the United States. Therefore, the participation size for each year of the survey being considered was deemed worthy for producing an accurate reflection of attitudes and behaviors.

This researcher did not design the SLICE survey questions, and the survey was not focused on organizational leaders specifically. Eleven questions in particular, which related to personal, spiritual, and professional development, were analyzed by the researcher for this study. Overall results for the three-year period will be considered, as well as trend analysis over the course of the three years. The relevance was determined by the survey results that reflected the overall developmental environment for Cru staff. A list of the questions analyzed is located in Table 2.

Table 2. SLICE Survey Questions Analyzed

Spiritual Life and Growth

25. My walk with God reflects a strong dependence upon Christ.
(Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Somewhat Disagree, Neither Agree or Disagree, Somewhat Agree, Agree, Strongly Agree)

27. I experience intimacy in my relationship with Christ.
(Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Somewhat Disagree, Neither Agree or Disagree, Somewhat Agree, Agree, Strongly Agree)

Personal and Professional Development

32. I am taking healthy responsibility for my own growth-spiritually, personally, and professionally.
(Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Somewhat Disagree, Neither Agree or Disagree, Somewhat Agree, Agree, Strongly Agree)

33. During this season of my life, I feel that my Cru leadership is partnering with me to help me develop and grow personally.
(Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Somewhat Disagree, Neither Agree or Disagree, Somewhat Agree, Agree, Strongly Agree)

34. I feel equipped to fulfill my role and responsibilities.
(Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Somewhat Disagree, Neither Agree or Disagree, Somewhat Agree, Agree, Strongly Agree)

37. I have a written job description that adequately describes expectations for my job.
(Yes or No)

38. I have a Position Focus (that includes part of my Personal Development Plan) that I have reviewed with my supervisor or coach.
(Yes or No)

39. In the past year, I have received formal feedback from my supervisor or coach (face to face or virtual)
(Yes or No)

41. I am satisfied with the frequency of the coaching I receive from my supervisor or coach (face-to-face or virtual)
(Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neither Agree or Disagree, Agree, Strongly Agree)

42. I received quality coaching from my supervisor or coach.
(Very Poor, Poor, Fair, Good, Excellent)

43. I have received adequate feedback in the past year regarding my personal and professional development.
(Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Somewhat Disagree, Neither Agree or Disagree, Somewhat Agree, Agree, Strongly Agree)

The BCWI staff engagement survey was applied to Cru in early 2016 as a tool to

measure workplace flourishing. BCWI lists eight categories critical to a flourishing

organizational culture: fantastic teams, life-giving work, outstanding talent, uplifting

growth and development, rewarding compensation, inspirational leadership, sustainable

strategy, and healthy communication. Each of these categories begins with a letter to

form the acronym F.L.O.U.R.I.S.H.[6] BCWI connects a flourishing organizational culture

with the enhancement of employee engagement. BCWI defines *engagement* as: "An

employee's willingness and ability to contribute to organizational success. Put another

way, engagement is the extent in which employees 'go the extra mile' and put

discretionary effort into their work, contributing more of their energy, creativity, and

passion on the job."[7] The eight characteristics of the flourish model are seen to be the

prime drivers of employee engagement. BCWI lists *Inspirational Leadership* as the

number one driver of employee engagement for para-church and missions organizations

like Cru. The BCWI survey tool consists of 58 questions to measure the strength of the

eight traits of the flourish model. BCWI distributed 6753 surveys; 3955 were completed,

a 52.7 percent completion rate. Cru's overall score was 3.97, which is deemed slightly

below the designation of "Healthy," which is scored at 4.00.

The researcher focused on the categories of "Uplifting Growth and Development"

and "Inspirational Leadership" as the most relevant factors for this study. While the

overall survey measures employee engagement by addressing eight categories, the

researcher saw these two categories as the most directly related to leadership culture and

leader development. As with the SLICE survey, the BCWI survey was not addressed to

---

[6] "8 Factors of a Flourishing Workplace," Free Resources, accessed December 14, 2016, http://blog.bcwinstitute.org/free-resources/.

[7] "The Flourish Model for Para-church/Missions Organizations" was provided by BCWI as a portion of the results report given to Cru after the survey was completed in the spring of 2016. This definition was included in the report.

organizational leaders specifically, but to Cru staff overall. The relevance was determined

by the survey results that reflected the overall developmental environment for Cru staff.

Since the BCWI survey was implemented in the spring of 2016, only one year of data

was available for analysis. A list of the questions analyzed is located in Table 3.

Table 3. BCWI Staff Engagement Survey Questions Analyzed (in order reported)

Uplifting Growth and Development
31. Someone in Cru encourages my development.

17. My supervisor cares about me as a person.

18. My supervisor helps me solve work related problems.

27. In the last six months, someone has talked to me about my progress.

30. In the past year, I have had opportunities at work to learn and grow.

29. I am satisfied with the recognition I receive for doing a good job.

25. I receive the training needed to carry out my current assignment.

Inspirational Leadership
11. Leaders in Cru exhibit the fruit of the Holy Spirit.

15. Leaders in Cru model humility.

13. Leaders in Cru keep a focus on putting Christ first in daily decision-making.

19. Leaders in Cru model fairness and integrity.

20. Leaders in Cru demonstrate compassion for people at all levels.

16. There is a high level of trust between leaders and staff/employees in Cru.

14. Cru reflects Christ to the world.

12. Overall, I am very satisfied with the level of Christian fellowship and spirituality in Cru.

37. Cru conducts its activities openly and honestly.

7. Over the past year, Cru has improved for the better.

6. Cru provides good job security to staff/employees that perform well.

33. Cru is well managed.

Subproblem Four

Subproblem four was approached in two ways. The first approach was to survey local level team leaders within Cru in the United States. The second approach was to interview ten national level leaders who have responsibility for leadership development for Cru in the United States. John W. Creswell highlights the importance of participant selection when considering data collection procedures: "The idea behind qualitative research is to purposefully select participants or sites (or documents or visual material) that will best help the researcher understand the problem and the research question."[8] The researcher was intentional to survey a quality sample size of field leaders who receive leadership development and to interview a quality sample size of those who provide leadership development. The overall purpose was to discover and analyze theories that emerged from the data regarding strengths and weaknesses of the current efforts and to discover discrepancies between current efforts and the construct being proposed. This search required careful selection of participants who could represent the breadth of Cru on both sides of the equation.

The survey that was implemented consisted of 17 questions and was distributed through the online tool Survey Monkey. The researcher designed specific questions for the survey to determine the degree local level leaders feel knowledgeable in and equipped to live out key traits related to the three-metaphor construct. The survey was conducted between December 6th and December 12th of 2016. Originally, the researcher set out to survey all local level field leaders in Cru within the United States. That original request

---

[8] John W. Creswell, *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*, 4th ed. (Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, 2014), 189.

was denied by Cru. A representative sample size of local level field leaders was sought

by the researcher and agreed upon by Cru. The survey was sent to 160 local level team

leaders, with 110 leaders responding. This sampling was deemed a representative sample

size (greater than 10 percent) of U.S. field leaders within Cru. Local team leaders across

the three major field ministries of Athletes in Action, Campus, and City comprised the

participant list. The researcher intentionally included participants who were men and

women, majority culture leaders, and ethnic minority leaders. The participants were

evenly distributed according to geography within the U.S., and participants were selected

with a broad range of ministry leadership experience. The survey questions were

designed to elicit both positive and negative data regarding the current leadership

development efforts of Cru. The questions were also designed to gather data relevant to

the key traits of the biblical metaphor construct being proposed in this paper. A list of the

survey questions with the corresponding metaphor and trait is located in Appendix A.

Leedy and Ormrod provide a refined definition of *survey research*: "Survey

research involves acquiring information about one or more groups of people—perhaps

about their characteristics, opinions, attitudes, or previous experiences—by asking them

questions and tabulating answers."[9] Survey research captures a moment in time during a

specific season of activity. Generalizations are made about the culture or state of affairs

from that moment in time toward a longer time period.[10] Leedy and Ormrod suggest 12

guidelines for developing a quality questionnaire for participant engagement.[11] All 12

were considered by the researcher and adhered to as much as possible. Creswell's design

---

[9] Leedy and Ormrod, 189.

[10] Leedy and Ormrod, 190.

[11] Leedy and Ormrod, 196-200.

procedures were also used as a guideline for the survey design, data collection, analysis, and write-up.[12]

The qualitative interviews were conducted with ten different national level leaders and consisted of 14 questions. They were all done over the phone. Each interview was recorded and transcribed. Nancy Jean Vyhmeister notes, "Interviews permit a deeper and fuller understanding of the attitudes of a respondent. Whereas the survey may have room only for 'agree' or 'disagree' answers, an interview can tell the researcher why the person disagrees or agrees."[13] The researcher designed specific questions for the interview to determine the degree current leadership development in Cru addresses key traits related to the three-metaphor contrast. The question guide for the individual interviews is located in Appendix B, with a summary of coded responses listed in Appendix C.

The researcher used a semi-structured interview approach as described by Karin Klenke:

> In semi-structured interviewing, the researcher combines the use of closed-ended and open-ended questions. The content of the interview is focused on issues that are central to the research question, but this type of questioning and discussion allows for greater flexibility than the structured interview. This leaves the interviewer free to rephrase the questions and add further inquiries … based on the interviewee's answers and conversation flow.[14]

Klenke notes that there are some advantages and disadvantages to the semi-structured interview. The researcher observed that one advantage is the allowance for addressing and clarifying complex issues raised in the interview. Another advantage of this approach

---

[12] Creswell, 155-166.

[13] Nancy J. Vyhmeister, *Quality Research Papers: For Students of Religion and Theology*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2008), 161.

[14] Karin Klenke, *Qualitative Research in the Study of Leadership*, 2nd ed. (Bingley, United Kingdom: Emerald Publishing, 2015), 131.

is the ability to reduce some of the prejudgment on the part of the interviewer as to what the interviewee might say. One challenge that the researcher took note of was the weight placed on the interviewer to form quality follow up questions in dialogue and for the interviewee to articulate quality answers in response. One other disadvantage was the depth of information a semi-structured approach produced and the challenge to analyze that amount of data well.[15]

Creswell's qualitative design procedures provided a guideline for the interview design, data collection, coding, analysis, interpretation, and write-up.[16] In particular, Creswell's comments on the researcher's role in the qualitative research process proved helpful in acknowledging and protecting against potential bias. The researcher has served in various leader development efforts for Cru over his 36-year career. From 2011-2014 the researcher carried the title of Executive Director for Leadership Development for the City division of Cru. During those years the researcher reported to the Vice President for Leadership Development for all of Cru in the United States in a matrix structure. This Vice President served as one of the ten interview participants for this study. The other nine interview participants served Cru as peers along with the researcher in leadership development.

Therefore, the researcher took great measures to communicate and insure that the survey results from the local level field leaders remained anonymous. The researcher was intentional to select a broad representation of those who are responsible for leader development with Cru for the interview research. The researcher also took measures to

---

[15] Klenke, 132.

[16] Creswell, 183-213.

structure the phone interviews around open-ended questions that pertained directly to the biblical metaphor construct of servant, shepherd, and steward. The interviewee's anonymity was communicated and insured by the researcher throughout the process. The Vice President for Leadership Development of Cru served as a sponsor for the primary and secondary research, providing permission and access to all that was required.

The recorded and transcribed interviews also served to prepare the data for coding. In defining coding, Leedy and Ormrod state, "The data are divided into segments and then scrutinized for commonalities that reflect categories of themes. In general, open coding is a process of reducing the data to a small set of themes that appear to describe the phenomena under investigation."[17] This definition served the researcher in preparing the content analysis. Creswell provides a helpful template for understanding three categories codes may fall into: codes on topics that readers would expect to find, based on the past literature and common sense; codes that are surprising and that were not anticipated at the beginning of the study; codes that are unusual, and that are, in and of themselves, of conceptual interest to the reader.[18] This delineation was a helpful construct for the researcher in designing codes for this study. The researcher served as the primary and secondary coder in coding the data, defining descriptions, surfacing themes, and analyzing and interpreting those themes for meaning. Emerging information codes and some predetermined codes were used for this qualitative study. Coding analysis was done through the online research tool Dedoose.[19]

---

[17] Leedy and Ormrod, 147.

[18] Creswell, 198-199.

[19] "History," About, accessed December 15, 2016, http://www.dedoose.com/about/history.

Creswell lists eight criteria for validating qualitative research strategies and results, suggesting that more than one be used in the validation process.[20] The researcher made use of three of those criteria, including prolonged time in the field, peer debriefing, and the presentation of negative or discrepant information.

The researcher conducted interviews during November and December of 2016. Ten national level leaders who are currently, or recently, responsible for leadership development in Cru were interviewed, including six women and four men. One participant recently left Cru staff but has not yet been replaced. That participant is still considered the most knowledgeable and respected person in their former scope of responsibility. The researcher was intentional to include leaders responsible for leadership development across the three major divisions of field ministry with Cru: Athletes in Action, Campus, and City. The researcher was intentional to include at least one participant not from the majority culture. This participant was an Asian American woman responsible for leadership development within Epic, the Asian American student ministry of Cru. All of the participants are viewed as well-respected leaders within their spheres of influence in Cru. The interview questions were open-ended in nature and formed to elicit both positive and negative data regarding the current state of leadership development efforts in Cru. The questions were also designed to gather data relevant to the key traits of the biblical metaphor construct being proposed in this paper.

Table 4 summarizes the primary field research methodology, time frame, and participation related to subproblem four.

---

[20] Creswell, 201-202.

Table 4. Summary of Field Research Participation

Type of Research	Research Period	Participants
Online Survey	December 6th-12th, 2016	110 local level team leaders Three divisions: Athletes in Action, Campus, City 34% women, 66% men Varied levels of leadership experience Varied geography Varied ethnicity
Individual Phone Interviews	November-December 2016	Ten national level leaders-leadership development Six women and four men Three divisions: Athletes in Action, Campus, City Nine majority culture leaders, one ethnic minority leader

Conclusion

The purpose of this research project was to gain insight on the leadership development environment of Cru, allowing theories to emerge that would reveal congruence with or divergence from the three biblical metaphor construct of servant, shepherd, and steward. Secondary data was ascertained and used from existing surveys to determine the current state and trends of leadership development efforts in Cru. The survey inquiry allowed field team leaders to express their self-evaluation against traits from the three-metaphor construct. The interview inquiry allowed national leaders of leadership development to express their analysis of Cru's efforts to develop leaders according to the three-metaphor construct. The questions were open ended to allow these

leaders freedom to express their expert opinions on this topic. The interviews were also semi-structured to allow the researcher the opportunity for follow-up questions to gain greater understanding and clarity. The results of the secondary and primary data will be discussed in the next chapter.

CHAPTER FIVE: ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

Subproblem Three

Analysis of SLICE Culture Survey

The SLICE survey was created in 2005 and provided Cru with many years of valuable data on the behavior and attitudes of its staff in the United States. The researcher was given permission to analyze the data that was produced in the final three years of its usage. The researcher's intent in analyzing the SLICE data from 2013-2015 was to determine the current overall development environment for Cru staff. The researcher sought to identify relevant information from the data that would either support or contradict the primary data from the field research. The data from the SLICE survey helped to convey a clear picture of the overall culture of leader development in Cru, revealing its deficiencies and its effective elements. This provided the researcher with the ability to assess how the three metaphors of servant, shepherd, and steward would serve to strengthen the Cru leadership culture and its leader development efforts. The SLICE survey measured 17 different facets of staff life and work. The desire was to inform top organizational leaders about the overall health of Cru staff. The researcher analyzed two particular categories seen as pertinent to the topic of this paper: spiritual life and growth, and personal and professional development. The category of spiritual life and growth directly relates to the servant metaphor and its correlation to the leader's vertical relationship with God. The category of personal and professional development correlates

with the shepherd and steward metaphor as they inform a leader's expression of his

leadership toward those he leads and toward the mission. The analysis surfaced four

topics from these two categories that proved relevant to the themes that emerged from

this project's biblical review and the literature review. The SLICE survey question topics,

scores, trends, and implications are listed in Table 5.

Table 5. SLICE Survey Analysis

Survey Topic	3 Year Score	Mean	3 Year Trend	Implications
Q. 25-Dependence upon Christ Q. 27-Intimacy with Christ	83% A, SA[a] 73% A, SA	6.09 of 7 5.89 of 7	No change SA >1.1%	Staff feel confident in their relationship with the Lord
Q. 33-Cru helps me grow personally Q. 34-Feel equipped for role and responsibilities Q. 37-Have a written job description Q. 38-Have a Position Focus and a Personal Development Plan	54% A, SA 69% A, SA 70% Yes 67% Yes	5.28 of 7 5.68 of 7 1.30 of 2 1.39 of 2	No change SA >1% Yes >5% Yes >8%	Strong correlation between feeling equipped for the role and the tools and processes used to clarify expectations of the role (PF, PDP, Feedback[d])(Good progress in use of tools)
Q. 39-I received formal feedback Q. 41-Satisfied with frequency of feedback Q. 42-I received quality coaching Q. 43-I received adequate feedback	62% Yes 89%D, NO[b] 73% G, E[c] 49% A, SA	1.38 of 2 2.91 of 5 3.84 of 5 5.05 of 7	Yes > 9% No change E >2% A > 3%	Staff like the quality of coaching received, but deem the feedback they are receiving as inadequate. (Good progress overall in use of formal feedback)
Q. 32-Taking personal responsibility for growth	82% A, SA	6.07 of 7	SA > 3%	This is a strong and growing attitude among staff

[a] A=Agree, SA=Strongly Agree
[b] D=Disagree, NO=Neither Agree Or Disagree
[c] G=Good, E=Excellent
[d] PF=Position Focus, PDP=Personal Development Plan, Feedback=360 Feedback Tool

Analysis

According to the SLICE survey, Cru staff have a strong sense of confidence in their overall walk with Christ. This confidence is reflected in their view of their personal intimacy with Christ and their dependency on him for their staff role. While there was very little change in the three-year trend, the overall score for the three-year period was very high—the intimacy score was the highest by mean average of all the questions that were analyzed. The researcher believes that a sense of intimacy with Christ and dependence upon Christ have always been cultural values of Cru. From Cru's beginnings, Bill and Vonette Bright taught and modeled these values throughout their lives. These scores accord well with the servant metaphor as revealed in the biblical and theological reflection, which focus on a person's relationship with Christ as shown through intimacy and dependence.

The two lowest reported scores related to the category of personal and professional development. The lowest composite and mean average score was found under the topic of adequate feedback. This is an important marker as feedback is crucial to ongoing leader development in every way. If feedback is inadequate, then it will be difficult for a leader to grow in their ability to relate to God and their expression of leadership through their roles.

The second lowest composite and average mean score related to the sense Cru staff had in how well the organization partnered with them toward their personal growth. *Personal growth* is distinguished from *professional growth* on the SLICE tool. *Professional growth* is marked by those traits that staff and leaders are developed in according to their organizational job description. These are the common organizational

elements of development that match each staff person's title. *Personal growth* relates to the staff leader's unique gifts and abilities that add personal expression to the common job description and leadership role. Cru staff do not have a great sense of confidence in the organization's desire or ability (or both) to provide development in this realm.

The SLICE tool never defines the term *adequate* related to the staff's desire for feedback. The survey indicated that 62 percent of staff did receive formal feedback on a yearly basis. This score demonstrated a 9 percent growth rate over the three years that were analyzed. Cru staff stated at a rate of 73 percent that they received good to excellent coaching, which is a category that relates to professional development. Therefore, the researcher believes that the issue of adequacy is directed more at frequency of feedback, rather than the quality of feedback. The researcher also observed that Cru has been using the same 360 feedback tool, largely unchanged, for over 20 years. Another possible factor for the topic of feedback getting lower scores is that the tool provides the same feedback year after year, and therefore is seen as inadequate. Staff may not be receiving feedback in a timely way to aid them in their professional development, or they may feel as if the yearly feedback they are receiving is redundant and therefore not helpful. Both of these realities could be true.

The scores related to professional growth and development revealed a high correlation between feeling equipped for their staff roles and the tools and processes used to clarify those roles. Of all the staff surveyed, 69 percent stated that they felt equipped to carry out their Cru roles and 70 percent stated that they had a written job description that helped to define that role. Both scores showed upward growth trends over the three years that were analyzed. Fully 67 percent of the staff stated that they had a written personal

development plan. This score showed the second greatest growth rate over the three-year period. Conversely, nearly a third of the staff could not state that they felt positively equipped for their roles. This uncertainty reveals work yet to be done in helping staff to utilize better the tools that are currently available.

Finally, it must be noted that 82 percent of Cru staff believe that they are taking greater responsibility for their own growth. This is one of the stated desires for the personal development plan tool and implementation. The researcher believes that this is a good and growing trend for Cru leaders toward leadership viability and longevity. To only rely on the organization for personal and professional development is to always feel inadequately prepared.

Summary

The SLICE survey revealed three key observations related to spiritual life and personal and professional development. Cru staff are confident in their intimacy and dependency upon Christ for life and ministry. This spiritual security correlates well to the same traits represented by the servant metaphor. While Cru staff feel equipped for their ministry roles, they would prefer more frequent feedback and possibly would be bettered by the introduction of a new feedback tool. Adequate feedback, and potentially a new feedback tool, would strengthen the expressions of the shepherd and steward metaphors for field leaders in caring for their teams and leading their teams into the mission. Finally, Cru staff are growing in their desire and attitude toward self-leadership, taking more responsibility for their own growth and development.

Analysis of BCWI Staff Engagement Survey

The Best Christian Workplace Institute staff engagement survey was implemented for Cru in early 2016 and took the place of the SLICE survey, which had been in place for 11 years. The researcher was given permission to analyze the executive summary that was provided to Cru's national leadership body by BCWI. As with the SLICE survey, the researcher sought to identify relevant information from the data that would either support or contradict the primary data from the field research. The BCWI instrument measures eight factors considered important for meaningful staff engagement that lead to a flourishing organizational culture. The researcher focused on two factors that were relevant to this project: inspirational leadership and uplifting growth and development. Some factors are seen as more determinative to staff engagement and a flourishing culture than others. Cru was measured against other organizations of like kind—para-church and mission organizations. The scores reflect this comparison. For organizations like Cru, BCWI lists inspirational leadership as the single most important factor contributing to good employee engagement that leads to a flourishing organizational culture. BCWI sees uplifting growth and development as sixth in order of importance for staff engagement that leads to a flourishing organizational culture. BCWI defines inspirational leadership with this descriptive sentence: "Imagine a leader who leads with the fruit of the Holy Spirit, demonstrates compassion toward employees, and also manages well."[1] BCWI defines uplifting growth and development in this way: "This

---

[1] "The Flourish Model for Para-church/Missions Organizations" was provided by BCWI as a portion of the results report given to Cru after the survey was completed in the spring of 2016. This definition was included in the report.

element measures supervisory competence and compassion, the quality of performance feedback, and recognition and the opportunity to learn and grow."[2]

Analysis

Overall, Cru obtained a score of 3.97, which lies below the baseline for a healthy organizational culture, measured at 4.00. BCWI determined that 52 percent of Cru staff are truly engaged. This score falls below the average of other organizations like Cru that typically have an average of 54.6 percent of staff engagement. Engagement towards a flourishing culture is defined as, "An employee's willingness and ability to contribute to organizational success … engagement is the extent in which employees 'go the extra mile' and put discretionary effort into their work, contributing more of their energy, creativity, and passion on the job."[3] The researcher noted that seven of the eight factors that drive engagement scored below the average for organizations like Cru. Only inspirational leadership scored higher than the average for organizations like Cru, and only by a factor of .01. Uplifting growth and development fell short of the industry average by a factor of .06, which placed it fourth in needed areas of improvement.

Inspirational leadership ranked as the highest factor for Cru, according to the BCWI indicator. This is significant since BCWI values this as the most important factor driving employee engagement for organizations like Cru. Seven of the twelve questions used in the survey to gauge inspirational leadership scored above average for Cru as compared to similar organizations. Fully 25 percent of the questions used to appraise inspirational leadership scored higher than 4.00, signifying that Cru was considered

---

[2] "The Flourish Model," BCWI.

[3] "The Flourish Model," BCWI.

categorically better than "healthy" regarding these specific areas. Two of these traits are especially important to the researcher as they measure leadership humility and integrity. Another specific factor that related to inspirational leadership, which also scored in the top ten, was leadership trust. While it scored 3.71 and was seen as slightly below healthy, it registered in the top ten. This data shows the researcher that there is a good baseline for leadership trust, and yet room to improve. The researcher took specific note of the fact that inspirational leadership, according to BCWI, is built on humility, integrity, and trust. These traits distinctly speak to the character of a leader and directly relate to the servant metaphor.

Of the ten lowest ranked items in the report, the category of fantastic teams was ranked at the bottom and scored below the industry average by a factor of .16. The researcher sees a discrepancy between the score that was attributed to the character of leaders in Cru and the potential ability for that leader to create and sustain quality team environments. This inconsistency may inform some competency issues related to leading teams. It demonstrates to the researcher that both character and competency matter in leading teams into the mission. The potential competency issue relates to the category of uplifting growth and development, at least for leadership development. The ability to lead teams well connects to both the shepherd and steward metaphor within the proposed construct. The shepherd metaphor informs the ability a leader possesses to demonstrate care and provide a nurturing environment for a team. Shepherding care takes the form of guiding team members toward spiritual nourishment through the practice of individual and corporate spiritual disciplines. Care includes helping team members in their dealing with sin, doubt, and doctrinal issues. The leader does not have to be personally

responsible for every care issue, but they take responsibility for creating a caring and correcting team environment where team members live and serve in healthy ways. The steward metaphor informs the ability a leader possesses to lead teams into the mission with excellence. The steward-leader sees his team as his greatest resource. Therefore, it is important for the steward-leader to provide his team with clear strategic direction, adequate funding, and helpful ministry tools and strategies for the accomplishment of the mission. Teams that feel cared for and resourced for the mission will be sustainable and effective.

One aspect of uplifting growth and development rated among the lowest scored items was employee recognition for doing a good job. To the researcher's understanding, this is a critical element for faith-based organizations that rely heavily on a volunteer spirit. Recognition for a job well done is a meaningful component of employee engagement when material rewards are few. The shepherd metaphor would inform the function of employee recognition as an aspect of care. Shepherding care is not only about correcting what's wrong but also about affirmation and praise for a job well done. Shepherd-leaders look for opportune moments to communicate praise to their team members privately and publically. Leader recognition helps a team member to endure and discover personal strengths for greater growth.

One other aspect of the BCWI executive summary that the researcher found to be important was a series of five measurements for Christian leadership. Two leadership measurements, "culture of character" and "commitment to learning," scored above the 4.00 "healthy" threshold. Three leadership measurements, "capability and competence," "compensation," and "climate for action" all scored below the 4.00 "health" threshold.

The researcher believes that this reveals that staff hold their leaders in high esteem and trust their leaders, but do not see their leaders as possessing a high enough level of capability and competence to lead at a high level.

Table 6 highlights the highest and lowest ranked themes from the survey comparing Cru to the industry average of other para-church and mission organizations. These themes took into consideration a compilation of survey questions that comprised the theme category. The researcher has provided a description of those compilations and the variation of the average score between Cru and the rest of the industry.

Table 6. BCWI Staff Engagement Survey-Highest and Lowest Ranked Themes

Survey Topic (Highest Ranked Themes)	Description	Cru vs Industry Average (Para-church/Mission Agencies)
Leadership	Seven of the twelve Leadership questions rated above average and among the top thirteen overall questions.	Cru rated .03-.09 above the industry average for these questions.
Overall Engagement	The highest three survey questions correlated to staff engagement were in Cru's top ten questions.	Cru rated .08-.10 above the industry average for these questions.
Survey Topic (Lowest Ranked Themes)	Description	Cru vs Industry Average (Para-church/Mission Agencies)
Teamwork	Three of the four Teamwork survey questions rated in Cru's bottom ten survey questions.	Cru rated .09-.11 below the industry average for these questions.
Recognition & Reward	Both rewards and staff satisfaction/recognition were rated significantly below average.	Cru rated .22 below the industry average for these questions.
Strategy	Five of the six Strategy survey questions rated below average—especially among leaders.	Cru rated .12-.17 below the industry average for these questions.
Communication	Eight of the nine Communication survey questions rated below average.	Cru rated .03-.19 below the industry average for the questions.

Source: Adapted from the *Cru Executive Summary 2016 Debrief* provided by BCWI to Cru, dated April, 2016.

Summary

The BCWI staff engagement survey is an improvement over the SLICE instrument in determining key leadership measurements. A primary reason is that it counts inspirational leadership as the most important factor in driving healthy employee engagement. This metric provides specific input on leadership and intentionally indicates organizational culture. It is evident that Cru staff have an elevated level of respect and trust in their leaders because they see their leaders demonstrating high levels of humility and integrity. That bodes well for moving forward and addressing needed issues, such as raising leadership competencies toward better team leadership and employee recognition. Both the healthy leadership traits revealed and those that are in deficit connect well to the three-metaphor construct of servant, shepherd, and steward as a pathway for sustaining and improving leadership development. Humility and integrity flow from the servant metaphor emphasis on the leader's vertical relationship with Christ. Seeing oneself as a slave of Christ, yet deeply loved by Christ, will provide fertile ground for the growth of leadership humility and integrity. As mentioned earlier, team leadership and employee recognition are extensions of a leader's desire to provide shepherding care through leading a team into spiritual nourishment, authentic community, and affirmation. The researcher also strongly believes that organizational culture is critical to the recruitment, establishment, and development of leaders. BCWI takes aim at helping organizations create a flourishing culture. The intentionality of senior leaders to act on the results of this survey could go far toward improving Cru culture and leadership development.

Subproblem Four

Analysis of the Field Team Leader Survey

The field team leader survey yielded several data points that aligned with the

SLICE survey and the BCWI staff engagement survey. These results provided

congruence and depth of understanding for some of the strengths of staff leadership

development, as well as some areas of needed improvement. The survey was given to 160

Cru field team leaders with 110 leaders responding. The leaders ranged in age from 23

years old to over 60 years old. The gender make up consisted of 34 percent women and

66 percent men. The largest age grouping was from 30-39 years of age. Fully 50 percent

of the leaders who responded had 10 or more years of leadership experience with Cru.

The leaders surveyed varied by ministry focus, geographical locations, and ethnicity.

Table 7 provides an analysis of the most critical data. This data, combined with the

results of the SLICE survey and the BCWI staff engagement survey, surfaced important

themes related to the stated purpose of this project.

Table 7. Field Team Leader Survey Analysis

Survey Topics: 3 Highest Rated and 3 Lowest Rated	Overall Score/ Weighted Average	Comments
Q.12-The ability to articulate one's call to ministry	93% FC/VA[a] 4.40 out of 5.00	There was a significant drop in ability to articulate one's call and the current sense of fulfillment of one's call
Q.11-Personal knowledge of strengths, spiritual gifts, and abilities	84% FK/VK[b] 4.16 out of 5.00	There seems to be a healthy sense of self-awareness regarding personal leadership abilities
Q.5 & Q.7-Dependence upon Christ and Desire to lead (tied with same score)	79/80% 4.00 out of 5.00	This seems to point to a healthy balance of humility and desire
Q.15-Equipped to utilize all of the resources around you	47% FC/VE[c] 3.41 out of 5.00	This relates to awareness of additional resources and ability to make use of them in the mission
Q.8-Equipped to deal with follower issues (sin, doctrinal error, emotional challenges, etc.)	63% FC/VE 3.65 out of 5.00	This ranged from a lack of desire to deal with issues to a lack of competency to deal with issues
Q.6-Equipped to care for those you lead	65% FC/VE 3.78 out of 5.00	This included the ability to create a sense of spiritual community as well as a sense of team

[a] FC=Fairly Confident, VA=Very Able
[b] FK=Fairly Knowledgeable, VK=Very Knowledgeable
[c] FC=Feel Confident, VE=Very Well Equipped

Themes from the Online Survey

There were several themes that emerged from the field team leader survey that

were in agreement with the secondary data and the biblical and literature reviews.

Leader Credibility

One theme that was congruent with the BCWI survey was how leaders were

perceived in Cru and how leaders viewed themselves. The BCWI survey noted that staff

saw their leaders as leading from a foundation of humility and a great sense of integrity,

both resulting in a good sense of trust between follower and leader. This survey finding

could be summed up as leader credibility. The field team leader survey demonstrated that

leaders viewed themselves as having and maintaining a strong sense of intimacy with

Christ and a strong sense of dependence upon Christ for their leadership lives. Credibility

is the power to inspire belief or confidence. The connection between the credibility of a

leader and the spiritual life of a leader is found in the servant metaphor. The field team

leader survey also noted that the leaders expressed a strong desire to lead. Of the 110

participants, 79 percent indicated that their desire to lead others was true most days or

every day. The researcher believes that this sense of desire is attributable to the spiritual

intimacy and dependence on Christ expressed by these leaders. The desire to lead,

combined with a healthy sense of dependence on Christ for their leadership lives,

produces a proper tension that can be tangibly experienced by followers. This leadership

aspiration, combined with dependence, likely helped to fuel the humility and integrity of

these leaders that was noticed by their followers. One other factor that the researcher

believes contributed to leader credibility is the keen understanding the field team leaders

seemed to have concerning their strengths, gifts, and abilities. This aspect of leader self-

awareness, surrounding their abilities and gifting, provides a sense of who they are and

who they are not. This self-perception also may have aided their ability to express

humility and integrity.

Leader Care

Two of the lowest scores from the survey recognized the challenge these leaders

feel in caring for those entrusted to them. Field leaders felt unequipped to demonstrate

care for their teams, and in particular, they felt ill equipped to deal with specific follower

issues, such as personal sin, doctrinal error, or emotional challenges. These inadequacies

may also provide understanding as to why Cru staff overall cited "fantastic teams," one

of the eight key factors for a flourishing organizational culture by BCWI, as a weakness

in Cru. The researcher believes that the deficiency these leaders feel contributes in one way or another to the overall team and organization environment. Frank LaFasto and Carl Larson note, "Organization environment … has an enormous impact on teamwork. It can encompass and saturate everything we do: how we communicate; how we make decisions; how we interact with one another; what we celebrate; and what discourages us."[4] The competence and confidence a team leader exhibits in caring for his team will certainly affect the team culture and environment. If a team is not experiencing some sense of nurturing, community, and care, it will almost certainly be less engaged in the mission of the team. One survey participant stated, "I do not feel equipped or knowledgeable enough to deal with issues people face—depression, pornography addiction, low motivation, same sex attraction, anxiety, and other things that seem more prevalent today than 20 or 30 years ago." Another participant expressed his discouragement in this area when he said, "There have been multiple times that our staff have mentioned that they want our team to feel more like a family. I don't know how to do that, and I don't even know if it is even fair to place that expectation on me that I will lead us toward this family feel." The shepherd metaphor tied to leadership development informs this competency. The three primary functions of a shepherd-leader are guidance, provision, and protection. A shepherd-leader is concerned about follower issues and pointing his followers toward a rich relationship with Christ. He does this by equipping his team in various spiritual disciplines and striving to create spiritual community. He does not allow follower challenges resulting from sin, false teaching, or doubt to go

---

[4] Frank LaFasto and Carl Larson, *When Teams Work* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2002), 157-158.

unchecked and disrupt team unity. He communicates care and models authenticity willingly and eagerly.

Leader Management

The lowest rated score from the survey related to the leader's ability to utilize all of the resources available to him toward the mission. This question was derived from a trait associated with the steward metaphor. The steward-leader must be able to manage well the resources entrusted to him toward the pleasure and purpose of the master. In the comments section where a leader could state one trait in which they would like to receive more training, the ability to manage resources was rightly attributed to such things as funding, partnership, and time management. This question revealed that only 47 percent of the leaders felt fairly confident or very well equipped to carry out this leadership task. One participant commented on his desire: "I wish I had connections with large donors—I don't know how to get into those types of networks and fund-raising is one thing holding our team back from a much bigger impact." Another participant saw time as his greatest resource that needed attention:

> I would like to be better developed in time management—not necessarily in how to do it, but just in accountability—am I being the most strategic in my use of time? I need to ask questions like, 'What are you doing that others can do?' 'What, if you took it off your plate, would dramatically increase your impact?'

The last comment highlights the essence of this theme. This field leader clearly senses the weight of complexity and business of the ministry. He is expressing a desire for needed skills and feedback that would help him focus and be strategic in his role. The questions this respondent is asking are one of leadership leverage. He understands that there are certain things that only he can and should do as a leader—and he seems to long for clarity to make the best contribution possible as a steward-leader.

Leader Calling and Fulfillment

One surprising aspect that stood out to the researcher from the survey was the gap between the ability to articulate ministry calling and the sense of calling fulfillment. The ability to articulate one's calling was the highest rated element in the survey, with 93 percent of respondents being "fairly confident" or "very able." Yet, when the question changed to the degree of fulfillment a leader feels in his or her current ministry, the score at the highest end of the continuum dropped by 20 percent. In other words, Cru team leaders feel very confident in their ability to articulate their ministry or leadership calling, but much less confident in the sense that they are actually fulfilling that calling on a regular basis or feel fulfilled in living out their leadership calling. The researcher could not discover an apparent correlation with other elements revealed in the SLICE survey or the BCWI survey. One potential issue might be a leadership glut within Cru. This survey revealed that there are a number of leaders who have served ten years or longer and are 50 years old or older. It may be possible that leaders are becoming stale in their current roles with nothing new on the horizon to challenge them. This longevity also limits the number of new roles younger leaders can take.

Another indicator might be what the leaders expressed in the final question of the field team leader survey—in what one trait would you appreciate more training? The answers grouped around four distinct needs. First, Cru field leaders are challenged by the need to deal with the complexity of the mission and the care of their people. Second, they want to be better equipped to lead their teams spiritually and create better team community. Third, they want to be better equipped in resource management—particularly in organizational fund development, partnering, and in the recruitment and use of

volunteers. Finally, it was mentioned several times that these leaders desire to be better equipped in personal growth habits and ongoing development for their own leadership lives. The researcher could understand that if any one of these developmental issues, or all of these issues, went unaddressed over time the leader would sense some disconnect between their aspiration of calling and the fulfillment of that calling on a daily basis.

Summary

Participants in the field team leader survey revealed four themes that were noteworthy to the researcher and complied with the secondary data, the biblical review, and the literature review. The most positive aspect was leader credibility. This discovery supported the findings of the BCWI survey and provided even further strength as to why Cru staff see their leaders exhibiting humility, integrity, and trust—it is built on the foundation of intimacy with Christ and dependence on Christ. Three areas that need attention arose in the form of leadership care, leadership management, and leadership calling and fulfillment. All three of these factors certainly contributed to the low BCWI score on teams in Cru. If a leader can become more proficient in caring for his followers, managing the resources around him better, and doing so with a consistent sense of fulfillment, then an improved team environment and a move toward a flourishing organizational culture are within reach.

Analysis of the National Leader Interviews

The national leader interviews provided valuable data from the perspective of those who are responsible for leadership development on a national level for Cru. This data continued to undergird many of the findings from the SLICE survey, the BCWI staff engagement survey, and the field leader survey. The data from the interviews revealed

findings that were systemic in nature to the whole of the organization, as well as specific findings that related to the metaphor construct (servant, shepherd, and steward) being proposed. The data also exposed some divisional and regional differences in how leadership development is approached and the results that have been gained.

The interviews were conducted with ten national level leaders during November and December of 2016. The participants consisted of six women and four men. Two of the participants represented the City division, one represented the division of Athletes in Action, six represented the Campus division, and one of the participants is the Vice President for Leadership Development for Cru in the United States. The participant representation aligns with the current size (by number of total staff) of each division in Cru. Nine of the participants are from the majority culture, and one participant is Asian American serving with Epic, the Asian American student ministry of Cru.

From the qualitative research, 33 codes were revealed and applied to the interview data for analysis. Of the 33 codes applied, seven were labeled root codes, and 26 were labeled child codes. A summary list of the codes may be found in Appendix C. Table 8 shows the code co-occurrence of the top three code applications. The only child codes included were those that had an occurrence of ten times (in application) or more. This analysis reveals the importance of these three metaphors and the developmental traits that support them.

Table 8. National Leader Interview Code Co-Occurrence

Code (# of times applied)	Code Co-Occurrence (# of times applied)	Comments
Shepherd (77)	Care (28) Spiritual Health (26) Personal Guidance (14) Emotional Health (14) Modeling (11)	The shepherd function of leadership was valued most. Four traits of a shepherd leader were deemed most relevant. Modeling was seen as one of the primary ways to help develop a shepherd leader.
Steward (60)	Competencies (25) Strategic Direction (20) Complexity (15) Equipping Others (15) Resources (13)	The steward function of leadership was valued second highest. Four traits of a steward leader were deemed most relevant. Complexity was seen as one of the greatest barriers to the function of steward leadership.
Servant (57)	Humility (23) Connecting to Jesus (21) Authority (18)	The servant function of leadership was valued third highest. Three traits were deemed most relevant to this function.

Themes from the National Leader Interviews

The national leader interviews were conducted to gain the perspective of those who are organizationally responsible for recruiting, assessing, onboarding, and developing leaders for the mission of Cru. This input was a critical contribution to the secondary data that evaluated the staff health and effectiveness of Cru. The interviews also played a significant role in combination with the field team leader survey conducted by the researcher in determining where leader development was effective and where change was necessary. Several themes arose from the coding process and analysis that proved helpful in aiding Cru towards a more effective leadership development effort.

A Better Developmental Paradigm

Questions one and five of the national leader interview guide focused on Cru's ability to develop servant leaders. Eight out of the ten leaders interviewed expressed some desire to see a stronger approach to Cru's current leadership developmental efforts. While the current leadership development framework, which has been in existence for over twenty years, was regularly credited for improving the quality of leaders within Cru, there was an expressed desire for a stronger biblical foundation and more specific teaching and training toward a servant leadership model. Four of the interviewees stated their desires this way:

> I think we are good at talking about the heart and good at talking about the character of leadership. But at times I think we assume servanthood. I don't know if we always use that as a term in common language. I think we assume it more than talk about it.

> Part of being a Christian is being a servant, but I don't think that there is specific training or development related to servant leadership.

> I wish we would take every opportunity to teach servant leadership.

> I think we talk about biblical leadership as servant leadership. I think our leadership framework lacks a robust biblical and theological grounding. Sadly, I would have to say we don't do a very good job.

The current framework for developing leaders was considered by several of the respondents to be either outdated in its ability to address 21st century leader needs or deemed too corporate for a mission organization in its initial approach. The expressed desire was for a biblically grounded framework that would help develop adaptive leaders for the 21st century reality and be simple enough to both guide leaders in their daily function and provide clear categories for ongoing development.

The Challenges of Shepherding Care

Questions related to the biblical metaphor of shepherd received the most coded responses among all ten interviews. Questions six, seven, eight, and ten focused on the shepherding function of leadership through the aspects of defining what it means to shepherd, overall follower care, specific follower issues, and the ability to lead others into personal intimacy with Christ and spiritual community.

The researcher discovered three developmental needs that arose from the interviews. First, there was the expressed need to define better the shepherding responsibility of a field team leader. Should the leader feel solely accountable for all follower issues on a team? What part does the local church play in caring for staff needs? Does the shepherding function take away from Cru's primary call to help fulfill the Great Commission for a field team leader? One national leader described the issue in terms of a personal tension: "What is the expectation? It can be quite overwhelming. Either it seems too overwhelming to touch, or they make a sacrifice and other priorities get shifted away from what they should be." One of the interviewees summarized the issue as an organizational tension: "I think it would be good to have more of an emphasis on devotional life, soul care, and spiritual formation. But that's the tension of being a mission-driven organization and what we miss out on."

A second developmental need related to the shepherding role and care was the sense of complexity. The word complexity was used so often in the responses to several of the interview questions that the researcher made it a separate code. Regarding care, one aspect of the complexity seemed to lie in the myriad of follower issues faced today by leaders. One national leader described a specific challenge this way:

>When I was on campus as a leader the issue of human sexuality was everywhere. It's what I dealt with everyday—porn addiction, sexual identity struggles, same-sex attraction. When I moved into the leadership development job one of things I wanted to see was that as an organization we would do a better job of equipping our staff to deal with these issues.

Often, the issue of complexity was described as a tension between the reality of addressing staff team needs and fulfilling the organizational calling and mission. One interviewee stated the tension as, "I think we counted up and there are 36 things they are responsible for and that's not realistic. That's why I think leaders don't think about servant leadership. They see the job as very big and complex." The national leader responsible for leader development in the City division of Cru summarized what she would desire for every field leader:

>I think a true shepherd feeds and tends and cares for the sheep. They have an other-centeredness. They care about those under their care and not just the overall goal or vision. If you take it literally, a shepherd would have a vision of getting his sheep where they need to go but with a sense of tending and caring all along the way.

The third developmental need related to shepherding care was the equipping issue. The field team leader survey revealed that most team leaders do not feel equipped to handle follower issues. National leaders highlighted the same need. One national leader connected the equipping deficiency to the way Cru evaluates leaders: "When I think about some of the ways we evaluate leaders we focus on dynamic determination, perseverance, being resourceful, being a self-starter—we track those things well. But in developing people—the gaps would be more along the line of shepherding." Most of the national leaders agreed that Cru equips its leaders well in the basics of leading—providing direction, casting vision, strategic planning, and problem-solving. Another interviewee noted that Cru equips to what is deemed important or valuable. She also

believed that the tension surrounding staff care versus the mission is not a new one,

remembering that this was a national conversation 20 years ago. She stated her desire in

light of current challenges while acknowledging the debate, "I would say we need

shepherd leadership, but there is always a tension here." This same leader took note of

Cru's strengths in equipping, while seeing the need for change:

> I think we are good at developing leaders for the mission. We are good at creating confident and competent leaders in those things that are clear and that we know we are good at. But our leaders don't know how to use those skills elsewhere. They are not adaptable—adaptability is an important role for a leader because nothing is the same.

The consensus among the national leaders is that Cru needs to equip team leaders to lead

better spiritually (from Scripture with grace and truth), equip team leaders in practical

ways to better know the staff on their team (personal history, strengths and weaknesses,

and desires), and to equip these leaders in how to create strong environments of spiritual

community.

The Need to Strengthen the Steward Role

Questions related to the biblical metaphor of steward received the second most

coded responses among all ten interviews. Question nine and questions eleven through

fourteen focused on the steward function of leadership, focusing on the core issues of

strategic direction, day-to-day team leading skills, the management of available resources

toward the mission, and overall leadership competency.

The researcher discerned four developmental needs through the coded responses

of the interviewees. The first developmental need is in the arena of providing strategic

direction. While all of the respondents agreed that the steward function is the strongest

aspect of Cru leadership (over the shepherd or servant roles), systemic and personal

deficiencies were noted regarding the ability of field team leaders to provide ongoing strategic direction for their teams. One national leader, referring to this developmental need from a systemic perspective, stated, "Strategic direction? I think that is a huge gap nationally. We don't know what our long-term goals are. We don't get this from our U.S. leadership team—it doesn't cascade down." This lack of direction was also noted in the BCWI staff engagement survey. While staff held their leaders in high esteem as having great integrity and character, they also pointed out that strategic direction from the top of the organization was a weakness. This gap in overall organizational strategic direction could explain some of the complexity that field team leaders feel. The complexity child code was applied twelve times to the questions referencing the steward function of leadership, more than any other parent code. This lack of clear direction from the top of the organization may also be hampering the ability of a field team leader to communicate well-defined direction to his or her team. One interviewee addressed another systemic view concerning the deficiency of providing strategic direction when he stated, "We mostly go for inspirational [leaders]; we don't go for a very highly directive [style]." In stating an overall consequence related to this systemic reality, this same leader said, "We tend to have a high view of our leaders and a tend toward a low view of leadership." Another consequence of low strategic direction is a lack of strategy execution. In commenting on some or Cru's developmental weaknesses, one of the respondents stated, "Strategy formulation execution is the weakest. There is this inability to put together a strategy that involves all stakeholders and to execute it—this is what we tend to be weakest in."

A second developmental need that emerged from the interviews was advantageous use of available resources by a field team leader. These resources might consist of strategies, tools, volunteers, churches, funding—anything that might accelerate the accomplishment of the mission in that setting. There was an acknowledgment that field leaders have a difficult time seeing and utilizing all of the resources around them outside the organization, but there was also the feeling that there was not a great sense of internal partnership and taking full advantage of resources within Cru between divisions. One national leader stated, "I don't think inside the organization we share resources or learning very well. Somehow we remain in silos and do not figure out a way to use the resources beyond us [in our own setting]." This issue would be a problem best solved at the national level where internal partnerships could be formed and resources promoted from one division to another.

One national leader saw the inability to tap outside resources as a pride issue: "It goes back to a significance issue or a pride issue in saying, 'I can do it better.' Oh, my gosh, there is amazing stuff out there. Why are we not using it? I don't think we do that well." Not only might this represent a heart issue that needs correction on the part of the field leader, but it might also be a perspective issue that needs to be corrected to understand better how the body of Christ might work together to create a greater impact.

Another respondent wondered if the problem was the inability to see what was available in any local setting or the failure to know how to utilize what was seen. Two suggestions were provided through the interviews as a way to correct these deficiencies. One suggestion was to expose the field team leader to outside coaching. One national leader referenced this idea in stating, "When you get coaching from a business man you

are opened up to resources and places to get help. I received that in my coaching" The second suggestion was that necessity, in the form of outside challenges, is the mother of invention. One of the interviewees related a story about a campus field team getting kicked off campus by the university administration. This setback forced that leader and team to become creative, turning to a local church as a gathering point and for meeting room facilities.

A third developmental need that was raised was accountability to results. It was acknowledged that while Cru is a mission-driven organization, Cru is not always strong on holding leaders accountable for what they can control. One interviewee tied this shortcoming to a lack of clear direction on the one hand and the natural role of stewardship on the other hand: "We need everybody [staff] to be able to articulate our five priorities of strategic focus on a campus and what it means for them. What would help with that is measuring results and accountability. I think those two go hand in hand." Another national leader commented on the same topic: "We are really deficient in accountability for leaders. This is the stewardship piece where we realize that this isn't a game, it's a job, and we have resources entrusted to us. Leaders need to know that they are accountable and what they are accountable for."

A fourth developmental need that was raised in one way or another was for the leader to be a better steward of self. National leaders communicated that many field leaders feel exhausted and overwhelmed. Certainly, part of the reason was attributed to the current complexity of the role, as was stated earlier. But another aspect was the lack of self-leadership on the part of the field leader. This exhaustion led to a dumbing down of the leadership role. Field leaders would shrink the role to what they could control in

their tiredness. This capacity was seen as a stewardship issue. One interviewee stated, "I see many of our leaders as overstretched and exhausted because they feel they need to do it all themselves. They need to steward their time, steward their lives—not say 'yes' to everything."

Better Define and Apply the Servant Role

Questions related to the biblical metaphor of servant received the third most coded responses among all ten interviews. Questions two through five of the interview guide were focused on the servant metaphor. The biblical metaphor of servant is characterized by a leader's vertical relationship with God and the expression of leadership that flows from that relationship. The common code co-occurrences associated with this metaphor were connecting with Jesus, humility, and authority. These three traits also stood out as defining elements for this aspect of leadership.

It was commonly noted among the national leaders interviewed that Cru does a good job of equipping new staff in the basics of spiritual disciplines for connecting well with Jesus. But when asked how Cru does at equipping leaders who connect well with Jesus, a developmental need surfaced. One national leader summarized well that need:

> I think it is definitely an aspiration that we want ministry to be an overflow out of one's relationship the Lord … but because we are mission-driven and effectiveness is a high value, which can lead to a performance orientation … it can crowd out the devotional aspect of a leader's life.

There is a need for developmental efforts to aid leaders in what it means to connect with Jesus as a leader. Another national leader attributed part of this dichotomy between aspiration and reality to organizational culture: "We sometimes send a mixed message. The leadership examples we tend to hold up are the ones who are most fruitful in ministry—we overlook a lot in a leader's life in seeing how they live out the mission."

Another developmental need related to a leader's vertical relationship with God was the expression of leadership authority. In responding to the interview question one national leader noted the importance of the issue: "How we use authority is probably where most damaging leadership problems come from—that inability to actually lead out of a proper sense of power and authority. It's easy to feel entitled and manipulate people." Yet, several national leaders believed that Cru did not teach enough on this topic: "I don't think we do a good job in training leaders in that." Another leader responded with, "I haven't heard too many people talk about it [authority]. Organizationally I don't know that we have talked about it, what is it, what are the limits, where does it stop." Several leaders recognize that Cru assesses leadership character, but fails to provide specific feedback on the expression of and response to leadership authority. This gap reveals a practical leadership development opportunity.

The final developmental need related to the servant metaphor concerned the character trait of humility. Both the SLICE staff survey and the BCWI staff engagement survey recognized that staff believe that their leaders demonstrate true humility. There was a strong consensus among the national leader responses that this was a trait to be modeled throughout the organization from the top down. Three areas where humility was seen as being occasionally absent were in the areas of entitlement, a disregard for authority over a leader, and a sense of superiority. While these issues were not seen as being widespread, they were seen as antithetical to the very understanding of humility and worthy of being a regular development topic for leaders.

One national leader summed up well the servant aspect of leadership, "It's not your job that connects you to Jesus, but Jesus who connects you to your job."

A More Comprehensive Methodology

One final development issue that was presented by the national leaders through the interview process was the need for a more thorough and comprehensive leader development process. So many comments were made concerning development methodological issues that the researcher added a parent code, which received 35 attributions. While this topic is beyond the scope of this research, its dominance bears further study in the future.

A summary of themes that arose on this topic was the need to provide training beyond venues and new titles and the need to equip beyond a classroom style that would incorporate more reading, writing, reflection, and experiential learning. There was also the expressed desire to see more specific leadership training provided for mature leaders. It was noted by two leaders that a coaching approach might be the most effective way to develop shepherding skills within Cru leaders, in order that specific needs might be addressed. It was also noted again that a coach or mentor approach might yield good results in helping leaders better see, understand, and utilize all the resources around them from the steward role. One interviewee summarized the feelings of many national leaders: "I think we have incredible training. Sometimes I think it is too theoretical and classroom oriented. Maybe you do more in a coaching group or cohort. You engage in more case studies and write more. We need to take our training to the next level."

Summary

The ten national leader interviews helped substantiate the results of the field team leader survey. Both the leaders and those that contribute to leadership development raised several common developmental issues, notably shepherding care, better management of

available resources, and leader satisfaction and fulfillment in light of complexity. The interviews added a more holistic perspective to the quantifiable data of the field leader survey and provided a more thorough understanding of the Cru context for leadership development. The additional themes of the need for a new development paradigm and a more comprehensive methodology uniquely came from the perspective of a developer. While there was some variation between geographic regions and between Cru divisions, the themes reported in this research were common across the organization.

Conclusion

The secondary data supplied by the SLICE staff survey and the BCWI staff engagement survey reveal the overall attitude towards Cru leadership and the environment for development. These sources substantiated a desire among all Cru staff for more intentional development and a greater frequency of personal feedback. The staff also want the organization to play a strong partnering role in providing personal and professional development. There was a high view of organizational leadership communicated through the survey regarding character and trust. But there was also a longing expressed for more direct and frequent communication from organizational leaders relating to the direction of the organization and its strategic goals. The team experience rated quite low for the majority of staff, primarily reflecting a deficiency in staff care issues and in experiencing a real sense of community.

The primary research data revealed four expressed development themes from the field leader survey: leader credibility, leader care, leader management, and leader calling and fulfillment. The national leader interviews revealed five developmental areas crying out for greater attention: a better developmental paradigm, addressing the challenges of

shepherding care, the need to strengthen the steward-leader role, the need to define better and apply the servant role, and the need to create a more comprehensive development methodology. These developmental issues remained largely consistent across all of the research data. As the researcher engaged in field research, the focus was narrowed to leaders and developers of leaders. This restriction only served to sharpen the developmental needs within the organization and provided a backdrop for how the biblical metaphors of servant, shepherd, and steward could provide an important dimension to the overall process.

CHAPTER SIX: IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Implications of the Research Data

This research project included four sources of data: timeless principles taken from the Bible, additional wisdom from related literature, existing survey data related to Cru development culture, and qualitative field research drawn from 110 local level team leaders and ten national level leaders responsible for leadership development. These four sources supplied a number of foundational themes and principles for building a Christ-centered servant leadership development framework. The biblical metaphors of servant, shepherd, and steward have been shown to be a developmental framework that can honor those themes and principles. The metaphors are comprehensive in addressing the leader's vertical relationship with God, his horizontal leadership relationship to those he leads, and his outward focus of managing all of the resources entrusted to him for the mission. The metaphors shape the posture and presence of a leader as he gives expression to all of his leadership functions. The metaphors also provide a simple, yet ready context for any number of leadership competencies that need to be developed.

Implications for Cru

This project utilized existing relevant data, an extensive survey, and a thorough interview process to stimulate discovery and discussion within Cru. The ministry of Cru has a long history of ministry innovation and adaptation. Its founders were entrepreneurial in their thinking, deeply devoted to God and his leading, and committed

to helping fulfill the Great Commission. The discovery journey of this project has already

begun to stimulate fresh thinking about how Cru develops its leaders for a new reality.

There is resonance toward an improved leadership development framework to better form

missional leaders for Cru and the Church at large. In the face of cultural and

organizational complexity, there is a need for a framework that is biblical in its

conception, simple in its understanding, and flexible in its execution beyond gender,

ethnicity, generations, venues, styles, and titles. If leader development is primarily about

expanding a person's capacity for effectiveness in leadership roles and processes, then

two questions must be answered. McCauley and Van Velsor highlight these two

questions as core to determining a good development process: "How do people acquire

and improve their capacity for leadership? How do organizations help them in this

process?"[1]

It is clear that Cru field leaders desire to be effective in the roles they have been

given. They also desire a robust partnership with the organization to help expand their

leadership capacity. And because Cru is a Christian organization, the development of the

inner life of its leaders—their intimacy with Jesus and their character—and the godly

expression of that inner life through one's leadership, deeply matters. Cru staff long for a

team experience that enables an authentic spiritual community. Field leaders desire to be

equipped in how to care for their teams and create spiritual community. The

competencies necessary for staff care are addressed within the context of the shepherd

metaphor through its emphasis on personal guidance, provision, and protection.

---

[1] McCauley and Van Velsor, 3.

Field leaders want to reduce personal and organizational complexity so that they can focus on leading into the mission. These competencies require an intimacy and dependence upon Christ that match the weight of team leadership. The abilities to address role complexity from an inner life vantage point and a competency vantage point lie within the leadership metaphors of servant and steward. The servant metaphor points the field leader to his posture of dependence to meet complex aspects of the role. The steward metaphor allows the field leader to press into a deeper level of self-awareness by looking at personal strengths, weaknesses, and emotional presence. Self-stewardship allows a leader to express his or her abilities in a more focused way by maximizing personal contribution and reducing complexity through the empowerment of others.

The three-metaphor framework addresses each of these developmental issues by providing focus to the internal life of a leader, the attitude and ability to lead others, and the posture and competency to manage well those resources entrusted to them toward the mission.

It is also evident that those responsible for leadership development within Cru at the highest levels desire for field leaders to thrive and be effective in fulfilling their calling. Because they see many of the challenges associated with living out the field leadership calling, national leaders require a developmental framework that clearly addresses field leadership challenges. These leaders also want a structure that provides growth-related pathways to serve field leaders in reducing complexity and expanding personal capacity. The proposed three-metaphor framework honors these desires and offers simple, clear pathways for character and competency development that can be applied in a number of ways.

Throughout this process, the researcher has had many staff, either as consultants or participants, express their gratitude and interest toward the result. Several of the field leaders who participated in the survey communicated their appreciation for being asked questions directly related to their leadership experience—questions they had never been asked before. This larger dialogue is valuable and needs to continue. First, and foremost, it is valuable because those being served, the field team leaders, must be regularly addressed to fully understand their felt and real needs. Development strategies that are concocted in a vacuum will never fully hit the target. Second, this ongoing dialogue is worthy because it keeps organizational values and priorities squarely in front of the field team leaders so that they never lose sight of their organizational contribution. There is validity to national leaders of development determining new needed competencies for field team leaders that match organizational calling. Finally, this dialogue is beneficial because collaboration is necessary between field leaders and national leaders of development to determine the most strategic pathways for meaningful development. Through the implementation of this project, the researcher has already been invited by field and national leaders to engage in further thinking, consultation, and delivery of its findings. This opportunity to present will allow for a greater impact beyond the pages of this report.

This project represents an opportune moment for Cru to consider the effectiveness of its current development paradigms and methods by listening to its leaders and making a commitment to either replace or refine the existing framework. The organizational capacity of Cru to fulfill its calling and mission depends upon the capacity of its leaders.

Implications Beyond Cru

It is the researcher's observation that little leader development takes place for the average pastor beyond seminary. Most pastors, Christian leaders, and volunteer leaders are left to themselves to best determine their developmental pathway. The same pressures of cultural and organizational complexity that Cru leaders are facing confront these leaders as well. There is a need for a leader development framework that can serve the broader body of Christ that is biblically based, simple to understand, flexible for a variety of settings, and can inform the whole person. These leaders need a framework that goes beyond competency and style. They need a construct that can speak to their inner life as a Christian leader in such a way that their posture and presence informs their every leadership interaction and expression.

A New Leadership Development Paradigm

The research project sought to provide a biblically based leadership development framework for the development of servant leaders.

The biblical research revealed that the Bible has much to say about the nature and function of servant leadership. The use of metaphorical language adds a layer of richness and depth that cannot be obtained through the biblical narratives and stated principles alone. Three biblical metaphors stand apart to aid the 21st century leader in fulfilling his calling to serve those around him in a God-honoring way. The servant metaphor in Scripture relates to the leader's vertical relationship with God, cultivating an intimacy that finds its expression through a godly posture and presence. The shepherd metaphor in the Bible relates to the leader's horizontal relationships with those he leads, demonstrating godly care through guidance, provision, and protection. The biblical

metaphor of steward relates to the leader's relationship to the mission, managing well all of the resources entrusted to him for the purpose and pleasure of the Master.

These metaphors speak to both the inner spiritual life of a leader, as well as the outward function of a leader. Though the metaphors may seem antiquated, they transcend time with their upward, inward, and outward approach to addressing leadership needs. While the truth may be found wherever God chooses to reveal it, we often launch Christian leadership development efforts with corporate and cultural insights rather than God's revealed word. This approach can result in a truncated expression of spiritual leadership that neither fully glorifies God nor fully blesses the follower. The Christ-centered servant-leader leads from a posture of total dependence expressed through an authentic presence of humility and derived authority. He comes alongside those he leads in genuine care and compassion to meet needs, with no regard for title or cost. He sees himself as owning nothing but entrusted with much, for the sake of advancing the kingdom of God through the proclamation of good news and the doing of good deeds.

Field research supported the desire and need for a biblically grounded framework that would be simple and flexible to meet the developmental needs of leaders in the midst of an increasingly complex cultural and organizational context. For example, field team leaders expressed their desire to understand better how to lead their teams into spiritual community and demonstrate shepherding care. This competency requires an approach grounded in Scripture. National leaders expressed their desire for a framework that did not assume the spirituality of field leaders but sought to directly minister to the inner life of all Cru leaders. This too requires an approach that is grounded in Scripture. The need

for a biblically grounded framework was also recognized by the research respondents because Cru is a Christian entity at its core.

Field research supported the necessity of a framework that would emphasize the inner life of a leader as more than an aspirational value. The need calls for a framework that uniquely addresses the spiritual life of a leader regarding intimacy, community, and self-awareness. It was noted first by the national leader respondents in the research that Cru tends to assume the spirituality of its leaders rather than be proactive about inner life development. This lack of intentionality was seen as a deficit that led to greater problems down the road in the form of weary field leaders and team dysfunction.

Field research supported the need for a framework that would address the value of shepherding leadership in the midst of the mission. Specifically, field leader respondents called for a framework that would equip them in addressing individual follower issues, as well as skills to help create spiritual community for a team.

Field research also supported the need for a framework that championed the posture of a steward. Specifically, field leaders desired guidance toward the faithful management of people, funding, tools, strategies, and partnerships. The biblical component of stewardship carries the prerequisite of relinquishing the prerogative of ownership and submitting to the purposes of the Master. This unconventional road to effective stewardship happens by understanding the generosity of the Master. Field leaders made this developmental need known through their communication of weariness with the complexity of the job. They expressed a desire for a number of steward-leader skills, such as time management skills, priority thinking skills, major donor relationship

skills, and planning skills. A proper stewardship will create people-honoring value and God-honoring courage.

Field research supported the need for a framework that would allow multiple modes of delivering development over time through multiple means. It was noted by the field leaders that intentional development by the organization ceased after receiving the last leadership title. They expressed a desire for ongoing character development and skill acquisition. National leaders interviewed observed current developmental venues as good, but insufficient in meeting all of the needs required today for leader development. The demand is for a framework that is flexible enough to address character and competency needs regardless of gender, ethnicity, stage of life, or season of leadership life.

Table nine summarizes the new paradigm for the development of Christ-centered servant leaders. This construct could stand as a refinement or replacement to the existing Cru framework. The researcher's hope is that it would tangibly inform and influence the current approach.

Table 9. A New Paradigm for Christ-Centered Servant-Leader Development

Metaphor	Profile and Developmental Characteristics
Servant	Primary View of God: Lord and Master Personal Identity: Slave of Christ Key Attitude: Worship and Submission Leadership Expression: Servant Leadership expressed through Representative Authority and Genuine Humility Critical Competencies: (to maintain a godly presence and posture before God and people) • Growing in Spiritual Disciplines for Leaders • Understanding Power and Authority • Learning the Pathway of Genuine Humility • Knowing the Contributors and Consequences of Leadership Presence
Shepherd	Primary View of God: The Good Shepherd/Chief Shepherd Personal Identity: Under-shepherd (Fellow Elder) Key Attitude: Selfless Sacrifice Leadership Expression: Servant Leadership expressed through Compassion and Care Critical Competencies: (to provide personal guidance, provision, and protection for those they lead) • Assessing and Knowing Your Followers and Their Needs • Developing Spiritual Community • Addressing Follower Issues: personal sin, doctrinal error, emotional issues • Monitoring Your Motives: shepherd willingly, eagerly, and as one who is an authentic model
Steward	Primary View of God: Purposeful and Generous Master Personal Identity: Slave of Slaves Key Attitude: Faithfulness Leadership Expression: Servant Leadership expressed through Courage and Risk Taking for the Purposes and Pleasure of the Master Critical Competencies: (to accomplish the mission) • Vision Casting • Overall Direction and Strategic Planning • Problem Solving • Resource Acquisition and Management • Partnership • Self-Awareness and Self-Leadership

Recommendations

The researcher offers eight specific recommendations for consideration as next steps in the development of Christ-centered servant-leaders for Cru, or any other part of the body of Christ.

First, teach servant leadership from the Scriptures. It is important for the Christian community to lay a foundation of biblical principles for kingdom leadership. This foundation will facilitate a proper understanding and use of other leadership wisdom to be applied as helpful and needed. The metaphor construct of servant, shepherd, and steward offers one curriculum alternative, which can be richly illustrated through various biblical leadership narratives and supported by stated biblical leadership principles.

Second, aim for learning over teaching. Cru tends to educate its leaders whenever they receive a new title and primarily in conference settings. This method lends itself to a classroom teaching style where content is disseminated through experts with little participant reflection, processing, or discussion. This approach limits those with different learning styles. It also reduces formal leader development to the next title or position within the organization. One bright spot mentioned by most of the national leaders was the Senior Leadership Initiative (SLI). This program is a two-year modular approach to leader development that incorporates several styles of learning and brings together emerging leaders from across the spectrum of Cru. The researcher would suggest a robust analysis of SLI to determine best practices for learning and long-term results of those who have graduated out of the training.

Third, update or replace the organization's current leadership framework so that it better emphasizes a servant leadership approach, promotes a biblical foundation, and better equips the whole leader. The three metaphor construct (servant, shepherd, and steward) could be built into the current framework or serve as a replacement for the current framework. Many of the competencies within the current structure could be matched to the metaphor construct so that the best of the existing framework is not lost.

Fourth, develop a resource base that will promote ongoing leader development beyond venues and between titles. This resource base should include voluntary self-leadership components as well as structured offerings that strive to keep leaders fresh in their learning and application. In particular, these resources should also emphasize a servant leadership approach, promote a biblical foundation to leadership, and aim to equip the whole leader. These resources could easily be broken down under the headings of servant, shepherd, and steward.

Fifth, promote other methods of delivering leader development within Cru. These methods should take into account leadership experience, season of life, unique ethnic leadership expressions, and generational differences. Executive coaching, mentoring, and cohort learning should be especially considered for ongoing leader development that is tailored to a leader's unique experience, season of leadership life, and personal needs.

Sixth, new venues could also be utilized beyond role titles for emerging and senior leader development. In particular, a "School of Servant Leadership" should be taken into consideration that is virtually accessible and ongoing in its developmental expression. This type of approach would be advantageous in addressing specific, but common leadership needs across the organization. It would also serve as a development venue for grounded leaders who would benefit greatly from being exposed to outside thought leaders and a variety of perspectives within the body of Christ, other non-profits, and corporate entities.

Seventh, promote greater organizational dialogue toward leader development. Improve the dialogue between field leaders and national leaders responsible for leadership development within Cru. Each audience has a unique vantage point and should

be heard. Improve the dialogue between those who organize and lead different development offerings across Cru. This communication could serve to streamline and broaden leader development for common organizational needs and increase shared learning. It would also provide a potential opportunity to structure around a common adaptable framework, like the three-metaphor construct proposed in this project.

Eighth, make a concerted effort to learn from the combined streams of data already available to Cru to discern developmental history, developmental needs, developmental effectiveness, and to provide a hopeful developmental future for Cru leaders. There is much to be gained from the input Cru staff and leaders have provided over time. It is the researcher's hope that this project could also inform that extended learning.

Conclusion

This project addressed the lack of a biblically grounded model for servant leadership development at Cru for current and future leaders. The researcher proposed several specific recommendations to strengthen Cru's approach to leadership development toward a more robust biblical foundation for servant leadership. The changing nature of the cultural context and ministry landscape demands a framework that is biblical, simple, and flexible to develop leaders holistically for effective and sustainable kingdom ministry.

Strengths and Weaknesses of the Study

There are three strengths that mark this study. The first is its uniqueness. There has been relatively little study and research done on leadership or leadership development from the aspect of biblical metaphors. Much has been written on the description of a

Christian leader and leadership functionality from the perspective of a shepherd. Almost nothing has been written on the biblical metaphors of servant, shepherd, and steward working in combination to form a developmental construct for Christian leaders. This study will extend the stream of research in considering biblical foundations for Christ-centered servant leadership.

The second strength of this study is the bringing together of two necessary viewpoints in one research project. The researcher engaged 110 field leaders as well as ten national leaders responsible for leadership development. This collaboration allowed the researcher to ascertain the developmental needs from both vantage points to gain a more fully formed perspective toward developing servant-leaders. There is great value in hearing from those who look at development from an organizational perspective as well as an end user perspective.

The third strength of this study is the holistic approach that is suggested by the three-metaphor framework of servant, shepherd, and steward. It purposefully addresses the inner life of the leader as well as the outward expression of leadership. In actuality, this framework places a strong emphasis on the posture and presence of a leader in every realm of leadership. The implications of the servant metaphor show up biblically in the expression of the shepherd and steward metaphor—to view oneself as a slave of Christ properly affects how one shepherds others and stewards the resources entrusted to them.

The primary weakness of this study is that it does not attempt to define in detail the necessary developmental aspects of the metaphor profiles and characteristic traits. There is work to be done in making these traits more concrete so that they can be inculcated into a practical development process.

A second weakness noted by the researcher is the need for more open-ended questions within the team leader survey. Twelve of the fourteen questions used were based on a continuum response. This approach gave the respondents defined options from which to choose and a more precise set of data for the researcher to analyze. Two questions allowed the respondents to freely voice their opinions regarding the best and worst developmental practices. A greater range of free response questions may have yielded broader results and a fuller picture of the team leader experience regarding development efforts by Cru.

Modifications

The main modification in the project was the inability to survey a broader number and cross section of field leaders. The researcher had the original intent of surveying at least 300 field leaders across the three major divisions of Cru. When it was communicated that the researcher would not be given access to that sample size, modifications were made to survey a smaller number of leaders that would remain statistically significant and sufficiently representative of the overall audience of field leaders within Cru.

Suggestions for Further Research

This study provides a helpful biblical framework for the development of Christian servant-leaders. The field research was carried out in a specific organizational context and is limited within and by that context. One suggestion for further study is to determine better if this biblical metaphor framework proves effective in shaping Christ-centered servant leaders over time. Do leaders lead better because of the implications and

application of this approach? A sample group needs to be studied with appropriate measures applied to determine the overall effectiveness of this approach.

A second aspect that requires further study is to determine if this construct can prove meaningful and effective across different ethnicities and generational divides. The needs of these unique audiences may speak more to how the framework is applied than to the nature of the framework itself. Survey respondents included leaders of different ethnicities and generations, which revealed developmental needs. But the application of the proposed framework, as a potential solution, requires further testing to determine its timeless nature and adaptability to those needs.

A third aspect that requires further study is in the realm of leader development methodology. Much is changing in our virtual world. The ability to deliver content in a multitude of ways has never been greater. Much about the digital delivery of information reinforces isolation. Leaders, by nature of their role and weight of responsibility, already exist in various forms of isolation. From the researcher's perspective, leader development utilizing any construct needs to take place in community, over time, in a confessional space of safety and vulnerability. More research remains to be done on best practices for the setting, form, and delivery of leader development.

CHAPTER SEVEN: PERSONAL REFLECTION

I have enjoyed my doctoral studies immensely. This journey has served to anchor and refresh me during a season of reflection and transition. I will be forever grateful to God for the lessons he has taught me through this endeavor. Some of those lessons have come by way of expert instruction, some through exposure to gifted and humble leaders, and some by way of challenging study in the midst of a busy time of life and ministry. Four particular aspects of positive learning and growth stand out.

First, I am grateful for the learning on leadership itself. Helping leaders lead well is a personal, God-given passion. This doctoral journey has exposed me to a treasury of leadership learning through better understanding the history of leadership theory, uncovering critical leadership topics, being exposed to a variety of leadership educators and practitioners, and personal application through reflection and writing.

Second, three topics have risen to the top of my interest to pursue for further leadership learning. The first is self-leadership. Self-leadership is a critical attitude, perspective, and skill for every leader. Leaders must take personal responsibility for addressing their own character gaps and competency needs. Too often leaders rely solely on the organization for meeting those needs. This attitude toward self-leadership contributes to leadership cynicism, stunted leadership growth, and a premature exit from being qualified to lead. Leaders must choose to engage on a path of development that includes organizational efforts as well as the personal pursuit of unique leadership needs. I must maintain, by God's grace, a humble posture of self-leadership to remain effective

and make my best contribution to kingdom work. The second topic of importance is finishing well. At this stage of my leadership life, finishing well has become a prominent pursuit for me. Most leaders give this topic little thought in the midst of their vigor and busyness toward the ministry. For many leaders, the die is cast early for how they will finish. A unique pathway of choices exists for the leader who wants to finish well. I hope to apply these concepts vigorously to my own life, as well as be used of God to aid others. The third topic is organizational culture. This project, as well as some previous work I have completed through the doctoral program, has allowed me to gain insight on the critical importance of organizational culture. Every leader helps to shape, sustain, or damage organizational culture. All but founding leaders enter into an organizational history that precedes them. Each has an opportunity to make his or her mark on whether that culture will aid or hinder the purpose of the organization. I want my leadership presence always to be a benefit and a blessing to the culture in which I am embedded. And I want to help others do the same. I am convinced all the more that everything rises or falls based on leaders and the quality of their leadership.

Third, this has been one of the most humbling experiences of my life. I have come to realize for the millionth time that I am not omni anything. The doctoral challenge of making a contribution to the stream of leadership learning has exposed me again to my deep need for others and the daily grace of an all-sufficient God. I have experienced seasons of personal doubt and moments of great frustration. I have tasted times of profound discovery and joy, while also contemplating how God might use this new foundation of learning. I am grateful for my fellow cohort members, program director, and thesis advisor who have kept me in the game and hopeful.

Finally, I am excited for the foundation of leadership learning on which I can build. Some questions have been answered, and many more remain that are worth chasing. I know I am equipped better for the pursuit of unleashing leaders worthy of being followed and fulfilling that for which I am called—for the glory of the King of kings and Lord of lords. Amen.

APPENDIX A

FIELD TEAM LEADER SURVEY QUESTIONS

Survey Question	Relevant Metaphor	Metaphor Trait
1. What is your gender?	None	None
2. What is your age range?	None	None
3. I have been serving in a formal leadership role with Cru for? (# of years)	None	None
4. How would you rate your current level of intimacy in your relationship with Jesus?	Servant	Intimacy
5. How would you rate your current level of dependence upon God for your leadership life?	Servant	Dependence
6. How well do you feel equipped to care for those you lead?	Shepherd	Care
7. How would you rate your desire for leading on a daily basis?	Shepherd	Desire
8. How equipped do you feel in dealing with follower issues (sin, false doctrine, emotional issues, etc.)?	Shepherd	Protect
9. How equipped do you feel to lead those you lead into a rich relationship with Christ?	Shepherd	Provide
10. How equipped do you feel in creating a good spiritual community for those you lead?	Shepherd	Provide
11. How would you rate your knowledge of your innate strengths, spiritual gifting, and your abilities to lead others?	Steward	Self-Awareness
12. To what degree are you able to articulate your calling to ministry?	Steward	Calling
13. To what degree do you feel you are currently fulfilling your call to ministry?	Steward	Calling
14. How equipped do you feel in providing clear direction into the mission for those you lead?	Steward	Strategic Direction
15. How equipped do you feel in utilizing all of the resources (people, funding, strategies, tools) around you to lead into the mission of Cru?	Steward	Resource Management
16. How competent do you feel in your leadership and management skills to carry out the mission?	Steward	Mission
17. If you could be further developed in one aspect of your leadership, what would it be?	Steward	Competency

APPENDIX B

NATIONAL LEADER INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Describe to what degree you believe Cru develops servant leaders?

2. How well (or in what ways) does Cru develop leaders that connect well with Jesus in their leadership lives?

3. To what degree do you believe Cru leaders lead from a foundation of humility?

4. How well do you believe Cru develops leaders in godly or right use of leadership authority?

5. What is one aspect you would change about Cru's leadership development efforts related to developing servant leaders?

6. How would you characterize a shepherd leader? What do they need to be equipped to do?

7. How well do you believe Cru equips leaders to lead others into personal intimacy with Christ?

8. How well do you believe Cru equips leaders to deal with follower issues? (sin, doctrinal error, emotional issues, etc.)

9. How well do you believe Cru equips leaders to articulate clear, ongoing direction for those they lead?

10. What is one aspect you would change about Cru's leadership development efforts related to developing shepherd leaders?

11. How well do you believe Cru equips leaders in day-to-day skills to lead others into the mission and calling of Cru? Where does Cru do well? Where are the gaps?

12. How well does Cru develop leaders to best utilize all of the resources available to them to lead others into the mission of Cru?

13. What is one leadership competency you believe Cru is very good at in developing leaders?

14. What is one leadership competency you believe Cru is deficient in toward developing leaders?

APPENDIX C

SUMMARY OF CODED RESPONSES

Question 1: Describe to what degree you believe Cru develops servant leaders?
Coded Responses to Question 1

Codes	Number of Times Applied
[servant leader]	(12)
[servant leadership]	(9)
[leadership]	(2)
[venues]	(1)
[complexity]	(1)
[shepherd]	(1)
[methods]	(1)
[modeling]	(1)

Question 2: How well (or in what ways) does Cru develop leaders that connect well with Jesus in their leadership lives?
Coded Responses to Question 2

Codes	Number of Times Applied
[connecting to Jesus]	(15)
[servant]	(13)
[modeling]	(3)
[methods]	(2)
[steward]	(1)
[equipping others]	(1)
[venues]	(1)
[complexity]	(1)

Question 3: To what degree do you believe Cru leaders lead from a foundation of humility?
Coded Responses to Question 3

Codes	Number of Times Applied
[servant]	(16)
[humility]	(15)
[connecting to Jesus]	(2)
[methods]	(1)
[modeling]	(1)

Question 4: How well do you believe Cru develops leaders in godly or right use of leadership authority?

Coded Responses to Question 4

Codes	Number of Times Applied
[servant]	(13)
[authority]	(13)
[expression]	(6)
[humility]	(3)
[methods]	(3)
[influence]	(3)
[hierarchal/position]	(2)
[servant leadership]	(1)
[power]	(1)
[mentoring]	(1)
[coaching]	(1)
[venues]	(1)
[accountability]	(1)
[character]	(1)
[modeling]	(1)

Question 5: What is one aspect you would change about Cru's leadership development efforts related to developing servant leaders?

Coded Responses to Question 5

Codes	Number of Times Applied
[servant]	(6)
[servant leader]	(6)
[leadership]	(6)
[servant leadership]	(5)
[methods]	(5)
[authority]	(4)
[shepherd]	(3)
[emotional health]	(3)
[humility]	(2)
[teaching]	(2)
[accountability]	(1)
[personal guidance]	(1)
[care]	(1)
[venues]	(1)
[power]	(1)
[competencies]	(1)
[coaching]	(1)

Question 6: How would you characterize a shepherd leader? What do they need to be equipped to do?

Coded Responses to Question 6

Codes	Number of Codes Applied
[shepherd]	(21)
[care]	(13)
[spiritual health]	(7)
[methods]	(5)
[emotional health]	(3)
[motivation]	(3)
[modeling]	(3)
[provide]	(3)
[personal guidance]	(3)
[equipping others]	(2)
[authority]	(2)
[accountability]	(2)
[servant leadership]	(2)
[protect]	(1)
[resources]	(1)
[character]	(1)
[hierarchal/position]	(1)
[teaching]	(1)
[strategic direction]	(1)

Question 7: How well do you believe Cru equips leaders to lead others into personal intimacy with Christ?

Coded Responses to Question 7

Codes	Number of Codes Applied
[shepherd]	(15)
[spiritual health]	(12)
[personal guidance]	(5)
[modeling]	(4)
[methods]	(4)
[provide]	(3)
[servant]	(2)
[connecting to Jesus]	(2)
[servant leadership]	(1)
[steward]	(1)
[complexity]	(1)
[coaching]	(1)
[mentoring]	(1)

Question 8: How well do you believe Cru equips leaders to deal with follower issues? (sin, doctrinal error, emotional issues, etc.)
Coded Responses to Question 8

Codes	Number of Codes Applied
[shepherd]	(16)
[care]	(16)
[protect]	(7)
[spiritual health]	(5)
[equipping others]	(5)
[emotional health]	(5)
[accountability]	(4)
[steward]	(2)
[leadership]	(1)
[authority]	(1)
[equipping others]	(1)
[personal guidance]	(1)

Question 9: How well do you believe Cru equips leaders to articulate clear, ongoing direction for those they lead?
Coded Responses to Question 9

Codes	Number of Codes Applied
[steward]	(14)
[strategic direction]	(14)
[shepherd]	(4)
[personal guidance]	(3)
[coaching]	(2)
[spiritual health]	(1)
[methods]	(1)
[mentoring]	(1)
[modeling]	(1)
[accountability]	(1)
[equipping others]	(1)
[competencies]	(1)

Question 10: What is one aspect you would change about Cru's leadership development efforts related to developing shepherd leaders?
Coded Responses to Question 10

Codes	Number of Codes Applied
[shepherd]	(11)
[care]	(4)
[methods]	(4)
[emotional health]	(3)
[motivation]	(2)
[modeling]	(2)
[equipping others]	(1)
[competencies]	(1)
[spiritual health]	(1)
[accountability]	(1)
[teaching]	(1)
[mentoring]	(1)
[coaching]	(1)

Question 11: How well do you believe Cru equips leaders in day-to-day skills to lead others into the mission and calling of Cru? Where does Cru do well? Where are the gaps?
Coded Responses to Question 11

Codes	Number of Codes Applied
[steward]	(12)
[competencies]	(8)
[strategic direction]	(3)
[complexity]	(3)
[methods]	(3)
[equipping others]	(2)
[coaching]	(1)
[mentoring]	(1)
[modeling]	(1)
[venues]	(1)

Question 12: How well does Cru develop leaders to best utilize all of the resources available to them to lead others into the mission of Cru?
Coded Responses to Question 12

Codes	Number of Codes Applied
[steward]	(10)
[resources]	(10)
[complexity]	(4)
[methods]	(3)
[shepherd]	(1)
[modeling]	(1)
[coaching]	(1)

Question 13: What is one leadership competency you believe Cru is very good at in developing leaders?
Coded Responses to Question 13

Codes	Number of Codes Applied
[competencies]	(7)
[steward]	(6)
[equipping others]	(1)
[strategic direction]	(1)
[venues]	(1)

Question 14: What is one leadership competency you believe Cru is deficient in toward developing leaders?

Coded Responses to Question 14

Codes	Number of Codes Applied
[steward]	(14)
[competencies]	(7)
[complexity]	(2)
[resources]	(2)
[shepherd]	(2)
[strategic direction]	(1)
[leadership]	(1)
[accountability]	(1)
[equipping others]	(1)
[servant leader]	(1)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aranoff, Gerald. "Shepherding as a Metaphor." *Jewish Bible Quarterly* 42, no. 1(2014): 36-38.

Arndt, William F., and F Wilbur Gingrich. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979.

Beavis, Mary Ann. "Ancient Slavery as an Interpretive Context for the New Testament Servant Parables with Special Reference to the Unjust Steward (Luke 16:1-8)." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 111/1 (1992): 37-54.

Bell, Skip. *Servants and Friends: A Biblical Theology of Leadership*. Berrien Springs, Michigan: Andrews University Press, 2014.

Bennett, David W. *Metaphors of Ministry: Biblical Images for Leaders and Followers*. 2nd rev. ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1993.

_____. "A Call to Develop Christ-Like Leaders." Lausanne Occasional Paper No. 41, prepared for the Lausanne Committee for World Evangelization, Pattaya, Thailand, September 29-October 5, 2004.

Best Christian Workplace Institute. "About." Accessed December 12, 2016. http://www.bcwinstitute.com/about.html.

Best Christian Workplace Institute. "8 Factors for a Flourishing Workplace." Free Resources. Accessed December 14, 2016. http://www.bcwinstitute.com/about.html.

Blanchard, Kenneth H., Bill Hybels, and Phil Hodges. *Leadership by the Book: Tools to Transform Your Workplace*. Colorado Springs, CO: WaterBrook Press, 1999.

Boda, Mark J., and J G. McConville. *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Prophets*. Vol. 4 of *IVP Bible Dictionary Series*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2012.

Brand, Chad, Charles Draper, and Archie England. *Holman Illustrated Bible Dictionary*. Nashville, TN: Holman Bible Publishers, 2003.

Bretscher, Paul G. "The Parable of the Unjust Steward: A New Approach to Luke 16:1-9." *Concordia Theological Monthly* 22/10 (October 1951): 756-762.

Bridge, Edward J. "Loyalty, Dependence, and Status with YHWH: The Use of 'bd' in the Psalms." *Vetus Testamentum* 59 (2009): 360-378.

Bullock, C Hassell. *An Introduction to the Old Testament Prophetic Books*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1986.

Burchard, Mary Jo. "'This Is How One Should Regard Us': An Exegetical Study on Paul's Treatise to the Corinthians Regarding His Relational Expectations with His Spiritual Children," *Journal of Biblical Perspectives on Leadership* 5, no. 1 (2013): 63-84.

Callender, Dexter E. "Servants of God(s) and Servants of Kings in Israel and the Ancient Near East." *Semeia* 83/84 (09/1998): 67-82.

Campbell, R. Alastair. "Review of *The Elder and The Overseer: One Office in the Early Church* by Benjamin L. Merkle." *Evangelical Quarterly* 77.3 (2005): 281-283.

Carnes, Phillip Gene. "Like Sheep without a Shepherd: The Shepherd Metaphor and Its Primacy for Biblical Leadership." Masters thesis, Reformed Theological Seminary, 2007.

Carson, D. A. *The Gospel According to John*. Pillar New Testament Commentary. Leicester, England: InterVarsity Press, 1991.

_____. *The Cross and Christian Ministry: An Exposition of Passages from 1 Corinthians*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1993.

_____. *The Expositor's Bible Commentary: with the New International Version of the Holy Bible*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1984.

Cochrell, Timothy Robert. "Foundations for a Biblical Model of Servant Leadership in the Slave Imagery of Luke-Acts." PhD diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2015.

Creswell, John W. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. 4th ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, 2014.

Daft, Richard L., and Patricia G. Lane. *The Leadership Experience*. 3rd ed. Mason, OH: Thomson/South-Western, 2005.

DeClaissé-Walford, Nancy L., Rolf A. Jacobson, and Beth LaNeel Tanner. *The Book of Psalms*. The New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2014.

Dowling, Elizabeth V. "Luke-Acts: Good News for Slaves?" *Pacifica* 24 (June 2011): 123-140.

Dumbrell, W. J. "The Content and Significance of the Books of Samuel: Their Place and Purpose within the Former Prophets." *JETS* 33/1 (1990): 49-62.

Fee, Gordon D. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. The New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1987.

_____. *1 and 2 Timothy, Titus*. Vol. 13 of *New International Biblical Commentary*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1988.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Gospel According to Luke: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. Vol. v. 28-28A of *The Anchor Bible*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1981-1985.

Fowler, Donald L. "The Background to the Good Shepherd Discourse in John 10." *Digital Commons@Liberty University* (1991): 1-13.

Furnish, Victor Paul. *II Corinthians*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1984.

Gladwell, Mary Beth. "The Shepherd Motif in the Old and New Testament." Xenos Christian Fellowship. http://www.xenos.org/essays/shepherd-motif-old-and-new-testament (accessed September 29, 2016).

Golding, Thomas A. "The Imagery of Shepherd-Part 1." *Bibliotecha Sacra* 163 (January-March 2006): 18-28.

_____. "The Imagery of Shepherding-Part 2." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 163 (April-June 2006): 158-175.

Green, Joel B., and Scot McKnight. *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*. Vol. 6 of *The IVP Bible Dictionary Series*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1992.

Grudem, Wayne A. *The First Epistle of Peter: An Introduction and Commentary*. Vol. 17 of *Tyndale New Testament Commentaries*. Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity Press, 1988.

Guthrie, Donald. *New Testament Introduction*. The Master Reference Collection. 4th ed. Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 1990.

Hamilton, Victor P. *Handbook on the Pentateuch: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1982.

Harris, Murray J. *Slave of Christ: A New Testament Metaphor for Total Devotion to Christ*. Vol. 8 of *New Studies in Biblical Theology*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2001.

_____. *Colossians & Philemon*. Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans, 1991.

Harris, R Laird, Gleason L. Archer, and Bruce K. Waltke. *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1980.

Heil, John Paul. "Ezekiel 34 and the Narrative Strategy of the Shepherd and Sheep Metaphor in Matthew." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 55 (1993):698-708.

Henry, Matthew. *Matthew Henry's Commentary on the Whole Bible: Complete and Unabridged in One Vo*lume. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1991.

Hernez-Broome, Gina and Richard L. Hughes. "Leadership Development: Past, Present, and Future." *Human Resource Planning* 27, no. 1(January 2004):24-32.

Hill, Andrew E., and John H. Walton. *A Survey of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Pub. House, 1991.

Howell, Don N. *Servants of the Servant: A Biblical Theology of Leadership*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2003.

Hutchison, John C. "Servanthood: Jesus' Countercultural Call to Christian Leaders." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 166 (January-March 2009): 53-69.

Jamieson, Robert, A R. Fausset, and David Brown. *A Commentary on the Old and New Testaments*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1997.

Jeremias, Joachim. *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus: An Investigation into Economic and Social Conditions During the New Testament Period*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969.

Jones, Galen Wendell. "A Theological Comparison Between Social Science Models and a Biblical Perspective of Servant Leadership." PhD diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2012.

Jones, Peter Rhea. "Biblical Teachings on Stewardship." *Review and Expositor* 70, no. 2 (1973):141-151.

Keener, Craig S. *Matthew*. Vol. 1 of *IVP New Testament Commentary Series*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2011.

Keil, C. F. and F. Delitzsch. *Keil and Delitzsch: Commentary On the Old Testament.* Vol. 1. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1996.

Kidner, Derek. *Proverbs: An Introduction and Commentary*. Vol. 17 of *Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries*. Nottingham, England: InterVarsity Press, 2008.

Kinnison, Quentin P. "Shepherd or One of the Sheep: Revisiting the Biblical Metaphor of the Pastorate." *Journal of Religious Leadership* 9, no. 1 (Spring 2010): 59-91.

Kistemaker, Simon. *Exposition of the Epistles of Peter and of the Epistle of Jude*. Vol. 26 of *New Testament Commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1987.

Kittel, Gerhard, and G. W. Bromiley. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. 10 vols. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1964-1999.

Klenke, Karin. *Qualitative Research in the Study of Leadership*. 2nd ed. Bingley, United Kingdom: Emerald Publishing, 2015.

Knight, George W. *The Pastoral Epistles: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. The New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans, 1999.

Köstenberger, Andreas J. *John. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2004.

Lafasto, Frank and Carl Larson. *When Teams Work*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2002.

Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University Of Chicago Press, 2003.

Lange, John Peter. *Lange's Commentary on the Holy Scriptures 12 Double Volumes*. Vol. 1. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1960.

Laniak, Timothy S. *Shepherds After My Own Heart: Pastoral Traditions and Leadership in the Bible*. Vol. 20 of *New Studies in Biblical Theology*. Leicester, England: Apollos, 2006.

Layton, Scott C. "The Steward in Ancient Israel: A Study of Hebrew (ĂŠER) AL-HABBAYIT in its Near Eastern Setting." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 109/4 (1990): 633-649.

Leedy, Paul D., and Jeanne Ellis Ormrod. *Practical Research: Planning and Design*. 10th ed. Boston, MA: Pearson, 2013.

Lennox, Robert. "The Servant of Yahweh in the Old Testament." *Theology Today* (October 1, 1958): 315-320.

Lyall, Francis. *Slaves, Citizens, Sons: Legal Metaphors in the Epistles*. Grand Rapids, MI: Academic Books, 1984.

Lynch, Chloe. "In 1 Peter 5:1-5, who are the πρεσβύτεροι and what is said about their role?" *The Expository Times* 123, no. 11 (2012): 529-540.

Martin, D. Michael. "Pauline Metaphors Describing Christian Leadership." PhD diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1980.

Martin, Ralph P. *2 Corinthians*. Vol. 40 of *Word Biblical Commentary*. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1985.

Marshall, I Howard. *The Gospel of Luke: a Commentary On the Greek Text*. Vol. 3 of *The New International Greek Testament Commentary*. American ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1978.

McCauley, Cynthia D., and Ellen Van Velsor. *The Center for Creative Leadership Handbook of Leadership Development*. 2nd ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2004.

Mein, Andrew. "Profitable and Unprofitable Shepherds: Economic and Theological Perspectives on Ezekiel 34." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 31, no. 4 (2007): 493-504.

Michaels, J. Ramsey. *1 Peter*. Vol. 49 of *Word Biblical Commentary*. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1982.

Morris, Leon. *The Gospel According to Matthew*. The Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1992.

Motyer, J A. *The Prophecy of Isaiah: An Introduction and Commentary*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1993.

Nel, Philip J. "Yahweh is a Shepherd: Conceptual Metaphor in Psalm 23." *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 27 (December 2005): 79-103.

Nelson, Richard D. *Joshua: A Commentary*. The Old Testament Library. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1997.

Niewold, Jack. "Beyond Servant Leadership." *Journal of Biblical Perspectives in Leadership* 1, no. 2 (Summer 2007):118-134.

Northouse, Peter Guy. *Leadership: Theory and Practice*. 6th ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE, 2013.

O'Brien, Peter Thomas. *The Epistle to the Philippians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. The New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans, 1991.

_____. *Colossians, Philemon*. Vol. 44 of *Word Biblical Commentary* Waco, TX: Word Books, 1982.

Powell, Mark Allan. *The HarperCollins Bible Dictionary*. New York, NY: HarperOne, 2011.

Rodin, R Scott. *The Steward Leader: Transforming People, Organizations and Communities*. Downers Grove, Ill.: IVP Academic, 2010.

Rowland, Deborah. "Why Leadership Development Isn't Developing Leaders." *Harvard Business Review* October 14, 2016. Accessed October 14, 2016. https://hbr.org/2016/10/why-leadership-development-isnt-developing-leaders.

Sheep101. "Sheep in History." Sheep101.info. http://www.sheep101.info/history.html (accessed September 28, 2016).

Smith, Julien C. H. and T. Lane Scales. "Stewardship: A Biblical Metaphor for the Formation of Christian Scholars." *Journal of Education and Christian Belief.* 17, no.1 (2013):79-97.

Stibbs, Alan M., and A. F. Walls. *The First Epistle General of Peter: A Commentary*. Vol. 17 of *The Tyndale New Testament Commentaries*. Leicester, England: InterVarsity, 1983.

Story, Cullen I. K. "The Nature of Paul's Stewardship with Special Reference to 1 and 2 Corinthians." *The Evangelical Quarterly* 48 (Oct-Dec 1976):212-229.

Thomas, Robert L. *New American Standard Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible: Including Hebrew-Aramaic and Greek Dictionaries*. Nashville, TN: Holman, 1981.

Thrall, Margaret E. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary On the Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. Vol. 34 of *The International Critical Commentary On the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1994-2000.

Tidball, Derek. "Leaders as Servants: A Resolution of the Tension." *Evangelical Review of Theology* 36, no. 1 (2012): 31-47.

Van Der Ploeg, J. P. M. "Slavery in the Old Testament." Vestus Testamentum Supplement 22 (1972): 72-87.

Vyhmeister, Nancy J. *Quality Research Papers: For Students of Religion and Theology*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids, MI.: Zondervan, 2008.

Wenham, Gordon J. *Numbers: An Introduction and Commentary*. Vol. 4 of *Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries*. Nottingham, England: InterVarsity Press, 2008.

Wood, D. R. W and I. Howard Marshall. *New Bible Dictionary*. Leicester, England: InterVarsity Press, 1996.

Woudstra, Marten H. *The Book of Joshua*. *New International Commentary on the Old Testament.* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1981.

Yoo, Yoon Jong. "The Shema (Deut. 6:4-5) in the Story of Samuel (1 Samuel 1-15)." *Expository Times* 123/3 (2011): 119-121.